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And then those immense structures go down, no one hears

. . . a flash and then it’s gone

leaving behind a feeling that something happened there once . . .

There was no one to tell us what it meant

When it meant what it did.

—John Ashbery, *Flow Chart*¹
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Abstract

Terrorism and atrocities have scarred the public memory in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Three atrocities, the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing, the 1996 massacre at Port Arthur Historic Site in Tasmania, Australia, and the 2002 Bali bombings, had a significant impact on the communities they most affected. How did the governments and communities at these sites respond to the sudden loss of life? How were the competing agendas of these groups managed at these sites? Are there shared and distinctive characteristics in memorialisation of atrocities at the turn of the millennium?

In responding to these questions this study analyses cultural differences in contemporary memorialisation at atrocity sites in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. It examines how different governments and communities responded to issues including the planning for the memorials, the timing of the construction of the memorials, and the ongoing management of the memorials, including the tributes left at the sites. It is an original comparative study of contemporary memorialisation by a heritage professional directly involved in the management of memorials at contemporary atrocity sites.

The original research includes the identification of the internet as a key influence on contemporary memorialisation, an in-depth analysis of the memorialisation of the 1996 massacre at Port Arthur Historic Site and the memorialisation in Bali and across Australia of the 2002 Bali bombings. It extends the current scholarship on the memorialisation of the Oklahoma City bombing through identifying the role of the internet in the memorialisation, through the timeframe of the analysis including reference to the 15th anniversary services in 2010, and a cultural analysis of the memorial museum. The comparative analysis of the management of tributes at all the sites identified issues not previously considered in Australian scholarship on contemporary memorialisation: that tributes and the management of them is part of the management of contemporary atrocity sites.

A combined research method based on an interpretive social science approach was adopted. This approach combined a range of methodologies including literature reviews, analysis of electronic material, site visits and unstructured in-depth interviews, and being a participant-observer at memorial meetings and services. Studies on history, memory and memorialisation provide the historical context and framework for my analysis of the contemporary memorialisation, and introduce an original proposal, that all three sites have shared histories of the memorialisation of war and ‘missing’ memorialisation. These shared histories, I argue, strengthen the justification for this comparative study.
This comparative study identified significant differences in how governments and communities have responded to these contemporary atrocities through distinctive memorial designs, in the enactment of legislation after the atrocities, in the management of tributes left at the sites, how anniversaries are marked, and how the perpetrators are acknowledged, if at all. These differences highlight the cultural divide that exists in contemporary memorialisation in the early twenty-first century. A number of issues have been identified for future research. These include the impact and management of the internet and electronic social networking sites on contemporary memorialisation, and how they will be captured and stored for future heritage professionals and researchers. Scope exists for a broader comparative global study on tributes and the management of them in contemporary memorialisation. Scope also exists for a more indepth global study on legislative responses to atrocities.

Regrettably, in the twenty-first century atrocities are still occurring across countries and cultures. Terrorist attacks and bombings have continued in Indonesia and Bali, in London and across Europe. Governments are still pondering how to remember the victims of these attacks. What governments and communities need to remember is that the way the events and the victims are remembered will impact on the history and memory of atrocities, both now and in the future.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>Australian Broadcasting Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFP</td>
<td>Australian Federal Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCITA</td>
<td>Australian Government Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFAT</td>
<td>Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA</td>
<td>Oklahoma City General Services Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>International Council on Monuments and Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIA/POW</td>
<td>Missing in action/prisoner of war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIPT</td>
<td>Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism (Oklahoma City, USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA</td>
<td>National Archives of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLA</td>
<td>National Library of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMA</td>
<td>National Museum of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>National Park Service (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAHS</td>
<td>Port Arthur Historic Site (Tasmania, Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAHSMA</td>
<td>Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority (Tasmania, Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMAG</td>
<td>Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Indonesian abbreviations and terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atman</td>
<td>‘Ghost’ in reference to a spirit that has not found a home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bantan</td>
<td>Daily offerings to the gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI</td>
<td>Jemaah Islamiyah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayonan</td>
<td>‘the tree of life’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPM (Kuta)</td>
<td><em>Lembaga Pemberdayaan Masyarakat</em> (Community Development Institution of Kuta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niskala</td>
<td>transcendent, outside material form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puputan</td>
<td>ritual suicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puri</td>
<td>small stone memorials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pura Besakih</td>
<td>the site of Bali’s mother temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemarisudha Karipubhaya</td>
<td>an elaborate purification ritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKI</td>
<td><em>Partai Komunis Indonesia</em> (Communist Party of Indonesia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsara</td>
<td>reincarnated spirit that finds a home in another form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sekala</td>
<td>material and visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YKIP</td>
<td>Yayasan Kemanusian Ibu Pertwi translated means Humanitarian Foundation for Mother Earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayang Kulit</td>
<td>shadow puppet performances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 1: Introduction

We erect monuments so that we shall always remember and build memorials so that we shall never forget.  

1 Arthur Danto, ‘The Vietnam Veterans Memorial,’ The Nation, 31 August 1986, p.152
1. **The topic**

Terrorism and atrocities have scarred the public memory in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Although the attack on the World Trade Center towers on September 11, 2001 has defined this time, three other atrocities, each for their own reasons, have lodged in the memories of the communities they most affected.

On 19 April 1995 a bomb exploded outside the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City in the United States of America (USA). The building collapsed and 186 people, including 19 children, died. On 28 and 29 April 1996, 35 people were killed by a single gunman in and around Port Arthur Historic Site in Tasmania, Australia. On 12 October 2002, suicide bombers exploded bombs in, and near, two packed nightclubs — Paddy’s Bar and the Sari Club — in Kuta, on the Indonesian island of Bali. The final death toll was 202 people, including 88 Australians. In each affected country governments and communities remembered the victims with memorials and ceremonies.

The focus of this study is a comparison of the memorialisation of these atrocities, through an analysis of the remembrance of the victims with built memorials, ceremonies, anniversary events and other activities. This comparative analysis considers how the different governments and communities responded to the planning for the memorials, the timing of the memorials, the engagement of the affected communities and the management of the memorials. In exploring whether cultural differences do exist in contemporary memorialisation across the USA, Australia and Bali, the key questions I consider are: what are the shared and distinctive characteristics of the memorialisation of atrocities at the turn of the millennium? And, further, how have the competing agendas of governments, communities and individuals been managed at these sites?

Memorialisation is about remembrance, for the case study sites of sudden and unexpected deaths from atrocities. Atrocities are defined as ‘deliberately inflicted extreme human suffering’. As is later outlined, at the sites of all three case studies the decision to deliberately cause grievous bodily harm and likely death was made or agreed to by all the perpetrators. In the countries where the three case studies are located, perpetrators have been convicted and sentenced for their involvement in the atrocities.

---


The memorialisation of these atrocities follows Young’s definition, that memorials can be ‘a day, a conference, or a space, [they do] not have to be a monument.’ The types of commemoration compared across the case study sites include built memorials, tributes left at these memorials and the Foundations established and other forms of remembrance.

Remembrance of those who died in war has influenced contemporary memorialisation, particularly in the west in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The war memorials built across the globe in the twentieth century were often monumental structures of stone, places for silent grief and mourning, for respect rather than engagement. In 1986 a war memorial was launched in the USA that had significant impact — there and across the globe — on how people engaged with memorials and how sites of sudden and unexpected death were marked. Maya Lin, the designer of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, envisaged that it would provide quiet space, ‘for personal reflection and private reckoning’. However she added that she would describe her memorials as ‘places … for experience and understanding experience.’ By the early twenty-first century memorials were no longer just places for private grieving, they were also expected to be ‘spaces of experiences, journeys of emotional discovery, rather than exemplary objects to be imitated.’ I will examine whether the memorials related to the three atrocities are places for private grieving and places for experience. By the late twentieth century, tributes including flowers, teddy bears and messages had become a feature of contemporary remembrance. These ‘spontaneous memorials’ are often the immediate response to an atrocity and have continued after memorials have been built. Through these tributes, memorials have become interative spaces, as described by Rosanna Weitzel from the US National Park Service in how people engaged with the Vietnam Veterans Memorial: ‘some people leave objects and messages, other people read the messages and photograph the objects, and some will take the messages or images away of what they remember about the memorial.’ In some instances this engagement has extended to the collection and exhibition of tributes. I explore the differing cultural responses to both the leaving and the management of tributes at these three sites.

In considering the cultural differences in memorialisation, I use the definitions of ‘culture’ as being ‘the customs, institutions and achievements

4 Young, The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning. p. 4
6 Kirk Savage, Monument Wars (Berkley University of California Press, 2009). p. 21
of a particular nation, people or group’ and ‘cultural’ as relating to the culture of a society. The cultural differences to be explored are those of American, Australian and Balinese communities in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. The cultures of the USA and Australia are similar and different, both reflecting different customs and institutions. However, with a shared language, and an exchange and sharing of cultures through media, arts and religious beliefs, the two countries are identified as western cultures. In contrast, Balinese culture, with the majority of the community following Balinese Hinduism, and the dominant languages being Balinese and Bahasa Indonesia, reflects an eastern culture. In contrast to the USA and Australia, where the religion of the majority is predominantly Christian, nearly 94 per cent of the population of Bali are Hindus.

One of the differences between Balinese culture and the western cultures of the USA and Australia is the strong interplay in Bali between traditional beliefs and the adaptation of religious, artistic, social and economic norms to support the survival of these beliefs, and the Balinese community, in a changing global environment. As Vickers argues, one of the distinguishing features of Balinese culture has been continual change to many facets of its spiritual, social and cultural life. For the Balinese, being modern also involves being traditional. Modernity for the Balinese is not about a single concept or form but rather about discourses, who is authorised, and who has the power to act in Balinese society. These discourses include the links between tourism and culture, with many Balinese arguing that tourism has reinforced their culture, as it has provided them with the means to maintain and perform many of their artistic forms. The acceptance of Balinese culture as being multifaceted, including traditional religious beliefs and the adaptation to changing social and economic situations, is the basis for my analysis of the Bali memorialisation of the bombing, and comparison of the cultural differences in memorialisation across the USA, Australia and Bali.

A number of factors influenced my selection of the case studies. The timing and location of the atrocities was crucial. Occurring before and after
September 11, the case studies have enabled a comparative analysis of memorialisation at the turn of the millennium in a global context. The 2002 Bali bombings were a terrorist attack, linked with the ‘global war on terror’. This link, the site of the bombings and the nationalities of the victims all impacted on the response of the Australian and Balinese governments and communities. Whereas the focus of the memorialisation at Oklahoma City and the Port Arthur Historic Site was at the sites of the atrocities, the remembrance of the Bali bombings took place across countries, in Bali, in Australia and online. The global war on terror resulted in the rise of the globalisation of memorialisation.

The timing of the atrocities coincided with increasing public access to the internet. The deaths at Oklahoma City and Port Arthur occurred during the infancy of the internet as a news and information source. Television, radio and the print newspapers were still the dominant source for information from the media. This had changed by the time of the Bali bombings — mobile phones and e-mail, and non-stop news feeds over the internet were part of the democratisation of witnessing atrocities. The global engagement of atrocities that began with September 11 continued with the Bali bombings. The case studies therefore are pivotal for examining the impact of the internet on memorialisation across the globe.

The atrocities were all regarded as significant events in their own countries, and in the case of Bali, internationally. The Oklahoma City bombing is still the site of the highest number of deaths in the USA from a terrorist attack by American citizens on American citizens. The Port Arthur massacre resulted in the most deaths from the actions of a single gunman on Australian soil in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The 2002 Bali bombings resulted in the highest number of deaths of Australian citizens overseas from an attack by a terrorist organisation in peacetime. The significance of these tragedies in the victims’ countries provided a benchmark for a comparative study of memorialisation across the three countries and cultures.

15 The phrases ‘September 11’ and ‘World Trade Center’ (with the American spelling of ‘Center’) are used as proper nouns to refer to the site where two building towers collapsed in New York City after two planes had crashed into them. The event is referred to by American writers as 9/11, September 11 and September 11th. In this work I am following the style of Sturken (2004) and Zeitlin (2006) in using the phrase ‘September 11’ when referring to this event. Marita Sturken, ‘The Aesthetics of Absence: Rebuilding Ground Zero,’ American Ethnologist, 31, no. 3 (2004), Steve Zeitlin, ‘“Oh Did You See the Ashes Come Thickly Falling Down?” Poems Posted in the Wake of September 11,’ in Spontaneous Shrines and the Public Memorialization of Death, ed. Jack Santino (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

The late twentieth century saw an increase in scholarly discourse on ‘dark tourism’,\(^\text{17}\) the interest of visitors in atrocity sites and sites of suffering. Through the twentieth century Port Arthur Historic Site and the island of Bali were both popular destinations for local and international tourists. The Oklahoma City National Memorial became a tourist destination after the memorial opened. All three memorials are included in Lonely Planet guides as places for tourists to visit.\(^\text{18}\) The case study sites therefore provide an opportunity to consider ‘dark tourism’ in a global context at the turn of the millennium. What impact did the atrocities have on tourism at the sites, and how did tourism influence the memorialisation at these sites? These questions are considered in exploring how governments and communities remembered these sudden and unexpected deaths. To introduce the topic, an outline of the atrocities at the case study sites follows.

2. The case studies

2.1 Bombing at Oklahoma City

On 19 April 1995 in Oklahoma City, USA, attackers detonated by remote control a 4,800-pound ammonium nitrate fuel bomb that had been placed on a truck parked in the north entrance of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building. The bomb explosion created a 30-foot crater, nine storeys at the front of the building collapsed and a children’s daycare centre on the second floor of the building was demolished from the force of the blast. It damaged 312 other buildings within a two-mile radius. Twenty-five were seriously damaged, and either their entire structures, or major parts of 10 buildings, were eventually demolished.\(^\text{19}\) As highlighted in Map 1, the Murrah Federal Building was close to the centre of downtown Oklahoma City.

In 1995 Oklahoma City had a population close to 1 million people, and roughly a third of the people knew people who were injured, or lost their lives, in the bombing. The final death toll was 183 people, including 19 children. Eight hundred and fifty people were injured, 30 children were orphaned, 219 children lost one parent, 462 people were left homeless and

\(^{17}\) This term became more popular after the publication of John Lennon and Malcolm Foley, *Dark Tourism: The Attraction of Death and Disaster* (London: Continuum, 2000).


7 000 people were left without a workplace.20 The rescue and recovery operations lasted for 16 days until 4 May 1995. More than 12 000 workers participated in this effort, ranging from local firefighters to 35 out of 49 mainland State fire departments. Due to structural instability, the building was imploded on 23 May 1995. On 29 May 1995, the last three bodies were removed from the site, nearly six weeks after the explosion.21

A few days after 19 April, Timothy McVeigh and Terry Nichols were arrested in relation to the bombing. Former US soldiers, their actions were in part attributed to the fact that they ended up on the marginal edges of society after leaving the Army and subsequently became involved with ‘paramilitary groups’ that had grievances against the American government.22 McVeigh was charged on 11 counts of murder and conspiracy. Due to the difficulty of finding an unbiased jury in the State of Oklahoma, his case was heard in Denver, Colorado. On 14 June 1997 the jury delivered a unanimous verdict on the charges. They found McVeigh guilty on all counts and agreed on the death sentence.23 In 1998 Terry Nichols was sentenced to life imprisonment in a federal trial for conspiring to assist with the bombing. Although the State of Oklahoma tried to have him convicted under State law, so he could also be sentenced to death, the attempt was unsuccessful and he remains imprisoned. A third man found to have been involved, Michael Fortier, received a term of 14 years imprisonment after striking an immunity deal with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to give evidence against McVeigh. On 14 June 2001 McVeigh was executed by lethal injection in the small town of Terre Haute, Indiana. One Australian newspaper described the media interest in his execution as ‘media frenzy.’24

Details of the trial and sentences of the bombers are included in the Oklahoma City memorial museum, so in an unusual way their stories are part of the memorialisation of the bombing. As the focus of my work is not to examine why the bombing happened, but how the atrocities were remembered, I have only examined a few works on McVeigh, and not reviewed the extensive literature available on the bombers and related conspiracy theories. Two works by journalists, Richard Serrano’s One of ours:

22 Linenthal, The Unfinished Bombing: Oklahoma City in American Memory, pp. 24-5
23 McVeigh was charged under USA Federal law with the murder of eight federal law enforcement agents. After he received the death penalty, the State of Oklahoma did not pursue a state trial against him for the other 161 deaths. Xavier Waterkeyn, Death Row (Sydney: New Holland Publishers (Australia) Pty Ltd, 2006), p. 114
Timothy McVeigh and the Oklahoma City bombing\textsuperscript{25} and Lou Michael’s and Dan Herbeck’s American terrorist: Timothy McVeigh and the Oklahoma City bombing\textsuperscript{26} were both based on extensive interviews with people who knew McVeigh, visits to Oklahoma City, and the areas frequented by McVeigh. These works provided me with well-researched background on the American response to the bombing, particularly the shock when McVeigh and his cohorts were identified as being former United States servicemen. However, these books provided no insights into aspects of American culture that supports the inclusion of details of the perpetrators’ trials and death in the memorial museum.

2.2 MASSACRE AT THE PORT ARTHUR HISTORIC SITE

Just over 12 months after the Oklahoma City bombing, a massacre of a different kind took place more than 12 000 miles away, in a small historic tourist site in Tasmania, Australia’s only island state. As outlined in Map 2, Port Arthur is located on the Tasman Peninsula on the state’s east coast.

Martin Bryant was a young Tasmanian man who had regularly visited the area around Port Arthur Historic Site. At 1:30 pm on Sunday 28 April 1996, after having lunch in the Broad Arrow Café at the historic site, he took an A15 semi-automatic rifle from his bag and began shooting people. He walked through the Café, into the gift shop and then back to the Café. ‘In less than two minutes he had killed twenty people and injured twelve.’\textsuperscript{27} Bryant then moved out of the Café to the car park where the tourist buses were parked and shot people moving around the buses. He changed guns in the boot of his car and then drove slowly towards the exit of the historic site. Port Arthur staff member Nanette Mikac and her two children were walking up the road towards the exit. Bryant left his car and walked up to them, shooting them all. He then shot four people near the front entry gate, took one of their cars, and drove over to the general store and service station. There he shot more people and took one man hostage. He then drove 10 minutes down the road to the Seascape Guest House. He had previously killed the owners, whom he knew, on his way to Port Arthur. He took his hostage into the guest house, handcuffed him and later shot him. Police surrounded the guest house and, not knowing whether the owners and hostage were still alive, conducted lengthy negotiations with Bryant by phone. Eventually Bryant rushed out of

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{26} Lou Michel and Dan Herbeck, American Terrorist: Timothy McVeigh and the Oklahoma City Bombing (New York: Regan Books, 2001); Serrano, One of Ours: Timothy McVeigh and the Oklahoma City Bombing.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{27} Margaret Scott, Port Arthur: A Story of Strength and Courage (Sydney: Random House, 1997). p. 56
the guest house, to which he had set fire, in burning clothes. He was arrested at 8.25 am on the morning of Monday 29 April 1996. He was charged with 72 crimes, including the murder of 35 people.\textsuperscript{28} The location of the murders in relation to Port Arthur Historic Site are outlined in \textbf{Map 3}. The trial of Martin Bryant by a judge in the Tasmanian Supreme Court was short. After initially pleading not guilty to all the charges on 30 September 1996, Bryant changed his plea and on 7 November 1996 pleaded guilty. With this change in plea, no witnesses had to be called. Damien Bugg, the Director of Public Prosecutions for the Tasmanian Government, presented a composite \textit{Victim Impact Statement}.\textsuperscript{29} On 22 November 1996 Martin Bryant was sentenced to concurrent jail terms for the term of his natural life for each of the 35 murders he had committed. The death penalty was not an option. The death penalty was abolished in Tasmania in 1968 and has been ‘abolished by the Commonwealth of Australia and all its states and territories.’\textsuperscript{30} Bryant will never be eligible for parole.\textsuperscript{31} After his trial he was returned to Risdon Prison outside Hobart, where he remains today. Of the three atrocities, Port Arthur in Australia is located in the only case study country where the death penalty was not imposed for the perpetrator(s).

As the lives of the Oklahoma City bombers have been described and analysed, so too has Martin Bryant’s life. Mike Bingham was a Tasmanian journalist who reported on the massacre. In \textit{Suddenly One Sunday}\textsuperscript{32} he analysed the massacre in the context of the life of Bryant, whom he presents as a loner with a low IQ. Bingham concluded that Bryant may have wanted revenge on people around Port Arthur who would not deal with him.\textsuperscript{33} He was known around the area and had lived on a property not far from Port Arthur. Tasmanian writer Margaret Scott, who lived near Port Arthur, described how this only added to the ‘horror and grief’.\textsuperscript{34} This reaction was echoed by former Port Arthur colleagues and others I spoke with who knew Bryant. The works on Bryant assisted my understanding of the response, particularly of the local community, to the massacre. The fact that he was known to the local community may explain why his name is not included in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{28} PAHSMA, \textit{The Port Arthur Tragedy} (Port Arthur: Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority, 1999).
\item \textsuperscript{29} Scott, \textit{Port Arthur: A Story of Strength and Courage}. pp. 204–5
\item \textsuperscript{30} Michael Fullilove, ‘Capital Punishment and Australian Foreign Policy,’ (Sydney: Lowy Institute for International Policy, 2006). The last person to be executed in Australia for a criminal offence was Ronald Ryan in 1967.
\item \textsuperscript{31} PAHSMA, \textit{The Port Arthur Tragedy}.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Bingham, \textit{Suddenly One Sunday}.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Ibid. p. 182
\item \textsuperscript{34} Scott, \textit{Port Arthur: A Story of Strength and Courage}. p. 154
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any interpretation of the massacre at Port Arthur. Books on Bryant, like the works on McVeigh and the other Oklahoma City perpetrators, are part of the history and memory of the atrocities and background to the memorialisation of the atrocities.

2.3 THE 2002 BALI BOMBINGS

Seven years after the Port Arthur massacre, an atrocity at another tourist site popular with Australians occurred. Since the 1970s Bali had been a popular Australian holiday destination. The island of Bali is close to Australia — from Sydney just four to five hours flying time. The sites of the atrocities — the nightclubs Paddy’s Bar and the Sari Club — were on Jalan Legian (Legian Street), just blocks from the famous Kuta Beach, as outlined on Map 4. Surrounded by shops, restaurants and hotels, the nightclubs were in the centre of the tourist area of Kuta, about nine kilometres from Denpasar, the main city on the island of Bali.

In 2002 Western intelligence agencies, including those in the USA and Australia, knew that a terrorist attack was being planned for early October. They knew that Indonesia was a likely target but possessed no further details. In October 2002 Javanese members of the Islamic terrorist organisation Jemaah Islamiyah made the final preparation for exploding bombs, outside the American Embassy and in Jalan Legian.

At 11.07 pm on Saturday 12 October 2002, a suicide bomber walked onto the crowded dance floor at Paddy’s Bar, a nightclub frequented by western tourists, setting off his bomb. ‘There was ... a flash and a roar, then the crashing of brick and wood and glass, flames and people screaming.’ People then poured into the street from nearby bars to see what was happening, as the bombers knew they would, and then a second suicide bomber set off a car bomb outside the Sari Club. As Neighbour describes, ‘the sky glowed orange, there was a massive fireball, the bomb had the force of a small earthquake, and was heard 25 kilometres away.’

The two nightclubs were destroyed, windows of buildings within a 1 kilometre radius were shattered, 450 buildings which included shops, market stalls and homes, were destroyed along with four electricity substations, 27 vehicles


36 Sally Neighbour, In the Shadow of Swords: On the Trail of Terrorism from Afghanistan to Australia (Sydney: HarperCollins, 2004). pp. 293-4

37 Ibid. p. 297

38 Ibid. p. 298
including cars, buses and motorcycles. The final death toll was 202 people and 324 recorded serious injuries. Victims came from 22 countries. The majority of those killed were Australians with 88 deaths, followed by Indonesians with 38 deaths.

More than 100 police from the Australian Federal, State and Territory police forces assisted the Indonesian National Police in Bali with the investigations into the bombing. Jemaah Islamiyah (JI), a south-east Asian terrorist organisation based in Indonesia, was identified as responsible for the attack. In October 2002 Muslim cleric Abu Bakar Bashir, the spiritual leader of JI, was arrested. Between 5 November and 6 December 2002 four key suspects were arrested in, or near, villages in East Java: Ali Imron, Iman Samudra, Amrozi bin Nurhasyim (known as Amrozi), and his brother Ali Ghufron, known as Mukhlas.

The trials of these four suspects commenced on 12 May 2003 in a court in Denpasar on the island of Bali, presided over by the Chief Justice of Denpasar and three other judges. In addition to the four main suspects, another 33 people were tried for their roles in the bombings. The three main suspects were all found guilty and sentenced to death: Amrozi received his sentence on 7 August 2003, Iman Samudra on 9 September 2003 and Mukhlas on 2 October 2003. After expressing remorse and agreeing to work with police to prevent further terrorist attacks, Ali Imron was sentenced to life imprisonment. The other 33 tried all received jail sentences. On 9 November 2008 Amrozi, his brother Mukhlas and Imam


40 A list of victims’ countries is at Appendix 1.


Samudra were executed on Java. Their bodies were flown to their home villages for burial.\textsuperscript{47}

Similarly to the studies on the perpetrators of the Oklahoma City bombing and the Port Arthur massacre, analyses of the motives and lives of the perpetrators of the Bali bombers provide a context for understanding how both the Balinese and Australian governments and communities responded to the bombings. One of the most comprehensive accounts of the motives of JI for the bombing is from ABC journalist Sally Neighbour, who describes the detailed planning, the background to the development of JI and the events on the day and night of the bombing in Kuta, Bali.\textsuperscript{48} Neighbour details the political motives for the attack, including the Australian engagement with the Americans in the Iraq war. She provides the background and context not only for the 2002 bombings, but other attacks that followed, including the bombing of the Australian Embassy in Jakarta. The International Crisis Group (ICG) provides an in-depth analysis of the motives and background not only to the 2002 bombing but also the bombings of the Australian Embassy in Jakarta and the 2005 Bali bombings in the context of the operations of JI and terrorist activities in Indonesia.\textsuperscript{49} Although Neighbour and ICG provide in-depth analyses of how JI evolved and continues to function in Indonesia and Bali, they do not consider the function of the Kuta Memorial as a deterrent to local Balinese joining JI; as suggested in interviews I discuss in Chapter 4.

The 2002 bombings were not the end of terrorist attacks in Indonesia. In August 2003 bombs exploded outside the Marriott Hotel in Jakarta, 16 people were killed and more than 140 were injured.\textsuperscript{50} On 9 September 2004 a car bomb exploded outside the Australian Embassy in Jakarta. Eleven people were killed and more than 100 injured.\textsuperscript{51} The Australian Consulate-General in Bali was immediately removed to an unidentified secure location. On 1 October 2005 three bombs exploded in Bali, one in Kuta Square and two on the beach restaurant strip at Jimbaran Bay. The 20 victims were from...
Australia, Indonesia and Japan. Four Australians were killed and 17 injured.\textsuperscript{52} Jemaah Islamiyah was identified as being responsible for both these bombings, and for the bombing in Jakarta in August 2003.\textsuperscript{53} No Balinese memorial has been built for the victims of the 2005 bombing. The Australian victims of the 2005 bombing are remembered on a plaque in the grounds of the Australian Consulate-General. Although the focus of this work is the response to the 2002 bombings, reference will be made to the 2004 bombing of the Australian Embassy and the 2005 Bali bombing in the context of the impact these events had on the memorialisation of the 2002 bombing, and on contemporary memorialisation in Bali.

3. **Analyses of the case studies**

For all three case studies I build on, and extend, research to date on the memorialisation of the atrocities. The analyses of two American historians on the Oklahoma City bombing and the aftermath provides a framework for understanding how and why the American community became so involved in the memorialisation of the bombing. In *The Unfinished Bombing: Oklahoma City in American Memory*, Edward Linenthal argued that ‘the popularity of memorialisation’ in the USA at the time of the bombing influenced the American community’s response.\textsuperscript{54} This popularity was largely due to the impact of the opening of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, also known as ‘the Wall’.\textsuperscript{55} The impact of the Wall on the community and memorialisation in the USA in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries is explored by Marita Sturken, both in *Tourists of History*,\textsuperscript{56} where she compared the memorialisation at Oklahoma City to that of September 11, and in her analysis


\textsuperscript{54} Linenthal, *The Unfinished Bombing: Oklahoma City in American Memory*. This term is used on p.133.


of the Wall in *Tangled Memories*. Describing the Wall as both a healing place and shrine, Sturken analysed how the Wall was pivotal in not only influencing a reassessment of American engagement in Vietnam, but also in providing a space for healing for Vietnam Veterans and for those who lost loved ones in the war. American and international community engagement with the Wall, through leaving offerings and tributes, has led to it becoming a powerful site of cultural remembrance in the American memorial landscape. I compare the American community engagement with memorials in the late twentieth century to the Australian and Balinese communities’ engagement with memorials at the time of the Port Arthur massacre, the Bali bombings and beyond.

Situating the Port Arthur massacre as a ‘traumascape’ to be compared with other major sites of violence across the world, including Bali and September 11, Australian historian Maria Tumarkin located the massacre as significant in contemporary history, while linking it with the past violence of the convict era. Tumarkin coined the term ‘Traumascapes’, which she defined as:

Places across the world marked by traumatic legacies of violence, suffering and loss, [where] the past is never quite over. Years, decades after the event, the past is still an unfinished business. Because trauma is contained, not as an event as such but the way it is experienced, traumascapes [are] ... spaces where events are experienced and re-experienced across time ... traumascapes catalyst and shape remembering and relieving of traumatic events. It is through these places that the past, whether buried or laid bare for all to see, continues to inhabit and refashion the present.

The site of the Oklahoma City bombing could also be defined as a traumascape. Whereas the focus of Tumarkin’s work is to identify and analyse if and why these places are traumascapes, I depart from her approach to focus on the planning for, and management of the memorials, and in particular the tributes left at the memorials.

Other scholars, including Frow and Nile, also linked the response to the Port Arthur massacre to the convict history of the site. In contrast, Scott argued that the massacre needed to be considered in the context of the longer

---

59 Ibid. p. 12.
history of the site, particularly as a small township with a focus on tourism. I follow Scott’s analysis that although the penal settlement of Port Arthur is central to tourist operations of the site, the response to the massacre needs to be considered in the context of the broader history of Port Arthur. Historian Carolyn Strange focused on the broader history of the site in analysing how the debates about remembrance of the massacre echoed the conflict between the site management, the local community and heritage profession on the management and interpretation of the site. I consider Strange’s proposition as I examine the ongoing and eventual resolution of the conflict over the memorial at Port Arthur.

After the Bali bombings, no longer did the remembrance of Australians who died overseas concern only those who died in declared wars. Inglis linked the memorialisation of contemporary atrocities with the remembrance of those who died in war in the third edition of his definitive text on Australian war memorials, Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape. He described the memorial at Port Arthur and the memorial in Kuta, Bali, while reflecting on the increasing proliferation of war memorials across Australia and overseas, and a continued interest in memorials in Australia. The link between war and contemporary memorials is continued by Weller in his assessment of the design of the Bali memorial in Perth in the context of the surrounding war memorials. I extend the connection made by Inglis and Weller and argue that it is not only the war memorials in the USA and Australia that are an extension of the history of the memorialisation of war. Bali also has a shared history, even if on a much smaller scale, of remembrance of those who died in war.

Scholars have yet to consider in detail the shared memorialisation of the 2002 Bali bombings across two countries. Santikarma provides a Balinese perspective, with a reminder of other atrocities in Bali that have yet to be publicly remembered. Hitchcock and Darma Putra focus on the impact of, and memorialisation of the bombings in Bali, with particular reference to

61 Scott, Port Arthur: A Story of Strength and Courage. Dr Margaret Scott was a member of the Board of PAHSMA when she passed away on 29 August 2005. I was fortunate to have met Dr Scott while I was working at Port Arthur from 1997 to 1999.
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the impact on the tourist industry. Following Vickers, they acknowledge that
the Balinese response to the bombing was a continuation of the Balinese
adaptability and resilience which has supported the survival of Balinese
culture into the twenty-first century. 67 I extend Vickers's theory to argue that
the Balinese have adapted and have now incorporated the need for western
memorialisation of the 2002 bombings into their daily life and rituals in Kuta,
but on their own cultural and religious terms. A more detailed analysis of the
scholarly and other responses to these atrocities and memorials follows in
later chapters.

Gaps still exist in the discourse on the memorialisation of the 1996 massacre
at Port Arthur Historic Site and the 2002 Bali bombings. No detailed
analysis is yet available on the planning for the Memorial Garden at Port
Arthur Historic Site. No comprehensive description or analysis is available
on the Australian memorials to the victims of the 2002 Bali bombings.
No description of the Balinese significance of the memorial in Kuta has
been published. No research has been published on the management of
the tributes left at the memorials at Port Arthur Historic Site and at the
memorials in Bali. This thesis aims to fill these gaps. The selection of these
case study sites was influenced by questions raised from my previous
research 68 and my work as a heritage professional. 69 This is the first research
in Australia on contemporary atrocity sites by a heritage professional who
has been directly involved in the planning and management of these sites.
Through my work, as I describe in later chapters, I established links between
all three sites in developing the guidelines for the management of tributes
left at the sites. This comparative project is the best way to show the shared
and distinctive way of memorialising in different national contexts, including
the complexities of planning for and managing atrocity sites.

67 Hitchcock and Darma Putra, *Tourism, Development and Terrorism in Bali*. p.9
68 Rosemary E. Hollow, 'Managing Heritage Sites of Human Atrocity: Ethics and Politics'
(Honours, Charles Sturt University, 2002).
69 I have worked in natural and cultural heritage management with the Tasmanian and
Australian Governments since the mid-1990s. From 1997 to 1999 I worked in the
Conservation Section at Port Arthur Historic Site. Since 2002 I have worked with the
Australian Government environment and heritage agency; currently the Australian
Government Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and
Communities. The Department has previously been called the Department of the
Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts, and the Department of the Environment
and Heritage. The Australian Heritage Commission was dissolved and the functions
incorporated into the Department of the Environment and Heritage in 2003. I am a full
member of Australia ICOMOS and also a member of Museums Australia and Interpretation
Australia Association.
4. **Key issues**

4.1 **HERITAGE MANAGEMENT OF ATROCITY SITES**

In considering atrocity sites, I follow Tunbridge and Ashworth, who articulate many of the issues that need to be considered in the heritage management of atrocity sites, particularly the need to balance the interests of victims, survivors and observers. As they conclude, difficulties are likely to occur at ‘living memory’ atrocity sites, as for some people they are an ‘intense form of sacralised space’. This was illustrated with the description of the blocks around the site of the Oklahoma City bombing as ‘sacred ground’, as it was the site where people had died. The three case study sites are all sites of ‘living memory’, and for victims and families would be likely to be sacred space. This description applies not just to the sites of death, but also to the temporary and permanent memorials. This is illustrated through the description of the Huon Pine Cross at Port Arthur as a ‘sacred site’. This designation of the memorials may also contribute to the conflicts and contestation about the memorialisation, as happened at Port Arthur.

The challenge for managers of the memorials at these ‘sacred sites’ is to provide space for private grieving in what are liable to become very public spaces. Heritage consultant Jane Lennon spoke about Port Arthur ‘being a public site in a public space meant a different form of grieving’. For managers of these sites, making decisions about atrocity sites includes balancing the interests of those who want to grieve and those who want to forget. An additional challenge faced by the site management and memorial committee at Port Arthur Historic Site was trying to manage the public space for tourists while considering the needs of victims and families. A decision was finally made by the memorial committee after a talk from Professor Beverly Raphael, a psychologist with expertise in mental health and disasters. Raphael's comments that ‘in grief people want to remember, in trauma they want to forget’ resulted in the memorial committee becoming determined to keep the remains of the Broad Arrow Café and incorporate

70 Tunbridge and Ashworth, *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. pp. 94–5
71 Ibid. p. 129
72 Linenthal, *The Unfinished Bombing: Oklahoma City in American Memory*. p. 190
74 Author interview with Dr Jane Lennon, Heritage Consultant, Canberra, 17 March 2006.
75 Professor Raphael is an internationally recognised expert in mental health aspects of terrorism and disasters and has long-term involvement and experience in research and management in the areas of trauma, grief and disasters. See Professor Beverly Raphael [accessed 4 December 2010] available from http://www.earlytraumagrief.anu.edu.au/network/about_us/beverley_raphael/
them in a memorial.\textsuperscript{76} When the atrocity sites are also heritage sites, as in the case of the Port Arthur Historic Site, this adds a layer of complexity for the managers in trying to protect the original heritage values, and at the same time manage what may become, as happened at Port Arthur, another layer of heritage to be protected.

Heritage is defined by UNESCO as ‘our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations’.\textsuperscript{77} All three sites have been acknowledged as being significant, either through formal heritage listings, as in the case of Oklahoma City\textsuperscript{78} and Port Arthur Historic Site,\textsuperscript{79} or even, as in Bali, through the construction of a memorial at the site. The massacre and memorial at the Port Arthur Historic Site are included in the National Heritage Listing for the site. Tunbridge and Ashworth sum up their discussion of heritage by drawing distinctions between the past (what has happened), history (selective attempts to describe this) and heritage (a contemporary product shaped from history).\textsuperscript{80} I base my discussions about the heritage of atrocity sites on Tunbridge and Ashworth’s definition, with an added refinement. Heritage is not only shaped from history, it is shaped from memory. The memory that shapes heritage is the personal, the private, which when shared becomes part of the collective or public memory. In the next chapter I explore the interrelationship of studies on history and memory to memorialisation.

For heritage to be protected and maintained for future generations, management regimes must be implemented. Heritage management is about places, objects and spaces that are significant to the local, national and international community. Guidelines for the management of heritage sites were developed by the international organisation of heritage professionals,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{76} Author interview with Dr Pam Fenerty (formerly Ireland), Tasman Peninsula resident, at Port Arthur Historic Site, 1 May 2006.
\item \textsuperscript{80} Tunbridge and Ashworth, \textit{Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict}. p. 20
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ICOMOS. In 1992 the Australian Chapter of ICOMOS developed the Burra Charter to provide guidelines for the conservation of important places in Australia. Reprinted and updated in 2004, the Burra Charter is 'widely accepted as the standard for heritage conservation practice in Australia'. Heritage consultant Jane Lennon used the Burra Charter for her Conservation Study on the Broad Arrow Café at Port Arthur. Scope still exists however, for separate heritage guidelines on the management of atrocity sites.

The late twentieth century was a time of increased engagement of heritage and museum professionals, including myself, in the development of memorials and associated museums. I examine the influence of heritage and museum professionals on the memorialisation and management of these sites. Curators in New York City and Washington described the challenges in responding to the aftermath of September 11 as 'working at the intersection of grief and history'. This description could be applied not only to museum curators, but also to heritage professionals involved in the development of memorials at atrocity sites. One of the consequences of working at sites of grief and trauma is likely to be conflicts about the management of the sites. This situation may have contributed to the conflict between the site management at Port Arthur and the local community about the memorialisation of the massacre.

4.2 CONTESTATION AND MEMORIALISATION

Are conflicts and contestation inevitable in the management of atrocity sites? Scholars suggest they are likely to be. Historians Jay Winter and Emmanuel Sivan concluded that as war memorials involve dialogue between communities and governments then contestation 'is likely to be one of the

81 ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) is a non-government professional organisation with a focus on heritage matters and headquarters in Paris. It is UNESCO's principle adviser on cultural matters and World Heritage. Australia ICOMOS Inc., The Illustrated Burra Charter: Good Practice for Heritage Places (Burwood: Australia ICOMOS Inc. 2004), p. 6
83 Australia ICOMOS Inc., The Illustrated Burra Charter: Good Practice for Heritage Places. It has been translated into French, Spanish and Indonesian and used as background for the development of the China Principles for heritage management.
permanent features of remembrance’. As I illustrate, this also applies to
memorials for contemporary atrocities. Conflict may result from balancing
the needs of victims, survivors, tourists and management at the memorials.
In Oklahoma City, for example, conflict between the memorial management
and families occurred when the memorial management decided to restrict
access to the sculptured chairs, as visitors’ tracks around the chairs were
damaging the grass.

As I illustrate with reference to the planning for the memorial at Port
Arthur Historic Site, since people are likely to be working through their
grief and anger as they plan for structures or events to remember their
lost loved ones, it may be inevitable, as Sturken concluded, that although
‘public commemoration is a form of history-making yet it can also be
a contested form of remembrance’. However, as Linenthal noted in relation
to September 11, differences and controversy did not mean that something
was wrong, rather that people are passionate and engaged and likely to be
more so at atrocity sites.

4.3 MEMORIALS AND TOURISM

At all three case study sites, management of the sites involved balancing the
needs of tourists and mourners. How does one distinguish — or should you
— between those who are visiting a site to grieve, and those who are tourists
at the site? Are all three case studies sites of ‘dark tourism?’

The term ‘dark tourism’ was coined in the late 1990s by Lennon and Foley, to
refer to increasing tourist interest in sites of death, disaster and atrocity. In
arguing that ‘dark tourism’ sites are a product of the late twentieth century,
they cite the management of these sites for tourists, including the provision
of facilities such as museums and shops, as supporting the increase in this
phenomenon. They also suggest that interest in these sites has been
influenced by the increasing availability of information through the media
and the internet. Other scholars have analysed tourist interest in sites
of death. In using the term ‘thanatourism’, Seaton suggested that tourists
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visiting atrocity sites are partly motivated by actual or symbolic encounters with death.\textsuperscript{92} Rather than encounters with death, Sturken argued that tourists visit these sites for the connection with the events that caused the deaths. Through visiting places such as Oklahoma City and the World Trade Center site, tourists can feel they have a connection to these events and have gained a trace of authenticity by extension.\textsuperscript{93} Curiosity about the events and location are also the reasons tourists are likely to visit these sites, Ashworth and Hartman concluded, adding that other motives for tourists visiting these sites included empathy (with the victims and those affected) and horror (people are attracted by horror).\textsuperscript{94} Uzzell also suggested that a combination of curiosity combined with empathy are motivating factors. He argued that ‘the curiosity of people about the suffering of their own kind appears to be insatiable and motivated by empathy, excitement, and other psychological stimuli of varying moral worth’.\textsuperscript{95} A fourth, less significant reason exists for researchers, though interlinked with this, is the shared issue of curiosity and the desire to pay homage.

The internet has not only encouraged tourists to visit these sites, it has also affected how tourists to these sites can be defined. With the internet, as Nelson and Olin have described: ‘The past becomes a media spectacle ... [with] travel by mouse click and remote monuments are becoming increasingly easier to access’.\textsuperscript{96} It is not only the past that is so much easier to access but also the present. As images of the atrocities, the aftermath and the memorials are now readily available online, it is less easy to distinguish between those who are ‘dark’ or voyeuristic tourists, and those who are visiting to pay respects, or even being interested in the heritage of the site.

At the case study sites, the motives of visitors are likely to be multifaceted. For some it will be about paying homage, for others curiosity about the events and location, and for others it might be wanting to visit the sites of death. As both Port Arthur Historic Site and Bali were significant tourist sites before the atrocities, it is difficult to designate them solely as ‘dark tourist’ sites. Visiting the site of death may be a motivation for some of the tourists, but it is likely that many tourists will be at the sites for reasons completely

\textsuperscript{93} Sturken, \textit{Tourists of History}. p. 11
\textsuperscript{94} Gregory J. Ashworth and Rudi Hartmann, eds., \textit{Horror and Human Tragedy Revisited: The Management of Sites of Atrocity for Tourism} (New York: Cognizant Communication Offices, 2005). pp. 7–9
unrelated to the atrocities. The majority of tourists visit Port Arthur Historic Site to experience the convict heritage, and similarly many tourists will be in Bali on holidays.

The memorials have added another layer of interest in these sites, and for some visitors have become a place to leave flowers and messages for those who died. The leaving of tributes has become one of the characteristics of memorialisation at the turn of the millennium.

4.4 SPONTANEOUS MEMORIALS OR TRIBUTES?

Flowers, T-shirts and teddy bears, and other objects left at the memorials and atrocity sites are described in a number of ways. Allen uses the evocative term ‘offerings’ as the title for his book on the ‘artefacts’ left at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington.97 Linenthal referred to the ‘poems, cards, flowers, stuffed animals’ sent to Oklahoma City after the bombing as ‘offerings’ and ‘spontaneous memorials’.98 In her analysis of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the Oklahoma City National Memorial and September 11, Sturken refers to these items as ‘objects’, ‘artifacts’ and ‘items bearing witness to pain’.99 To Edkins, items left at memorials to the Great War and Vietnam, at Oklahoma City and after September 11 are things, artefacts and messages.100 Doss describes objects left at the sites of unexpected death as ‘the material and visual culture of grief’,101 which echoes the description of Moriarty referring to ‘the material culture of Great War remembrance’.102

To use the term ‘artefacts’ implies that they are already or likely to be deposited in a museum. As will be discussed in Chapter 6, this is not always likely; it depends on the culture of the country and the response of the museum curators of that country where these objects are left. In writing about the response to the death of Princess Diana, and the flowers and gifts left not only at her home, Kensington Palace, but at many other places

97 Thomas B. Allen, Offerings at the Wall: Artifacts from the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Collection (Atlanta: Turner Publishing Inc., 1995). Throughout this work I use the Australian spelling ‘artefacts’ rather than the American spelling ‘artifacts’ except where I am using a direct quotation with the American spelling.
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across Britain, English Theological Professor Douglas Davies uses the term ‘tributes’. 103

The term ‘tributes’ provides a succinct description of the offerings left at memorials or the sites of death. This is the term I use when referring to objects left at the sites of death or the memorials for victims of these atrocities. These items and messages, personal responses to loss and grief, are more than artefacts or objects. They are an intimate link to a lost loved one and as such require greater recognition, regardless of whether they are collected and curated for a museum collection, or left to the elements. As I conclude in Chapter 6, the acknowledgement of these tributes as part of the mourning process and keeping a record and some of the tributes will assist heritage managers in the future to understand and interpret how a community responded to the unexpected atrocity and sudden death of their loved ones.

4.5 TIMING OF MEMORIALS

In examining when the memorials at the case study sites opened, I consider whether these atrocities all reflect a change in the timing of memorials. This is foreshadow by Foote in his reflection on the opening of the Oklahoma City National Memorial within five years of the bombing. Foote mused that ‘it seemed to appear too quickly and on too grand a scale for a site associated with mass murder and terrorism’. 104 In the first part of his text written before the Oklahoma City bombing and response, he considered even then that ‘memorialisation seems to be a slightly more common event than it was once’. 109 Following Oklahoma City and with calls for a memorial for the victims of September 11 within days of the attack, Foote concluded that the trend in American memorialisation for both marking atrocity sites and doing so in a short time frame after the event was continuing. 106 I consider whether this appraisal can also be applied to trends in memorialisation in Australia and Bali.

Pennebaker and Banasik use the term ‘memory cycles’ in their discussion of how memorials are often built either immediately after the event, or in 20- to

105 Ibid. p. 166
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30-year cycles thereafter. Whereas the Oklahoma City memorial opened five years after the bombing, memorials to the Bali bombing in Australia and Bali were opened within 12 months of the bombing. I consider that reasons for the differences in the timing of these memorials include the greater engagement of the community with the planning of the memorials, the influence of tourism, and the role of governments in the memorialisation. I propose that by the early twenty-first century this theory of ‘memory cycles’ needs reframing, as the timing of memorials has changed.

4.6 THE INTERNET AND MEMORIALISATION

One of the most significant influences on the change in timing of memorials first appearing, as I have noted, is the internet. Through the internet the timing of information about an atrocity changed, which in turn affected the planning for, and timing of, memorials. Information on atrocities in the late twentieth century became available not only in a shorter timeframe, but it was available in greater detail and for longer periods. Linenthal refers to how the media coverage of the rescue and recovery attempts for the three weeks after the Oklahoma City bombing ‘made it possible for millions to image themselves as part of a worldwide bereaved community’. Dupré describes how September 11 launched the Internet’s most ‘expressive hour’ and how in the immediate aftermath millions shared their grief and opinions through electronic chat rooms and commemorative sites. Through the internet the collective mourning began while the media coverage was still continuing. The development of the internet, combined with extensive media coverage of these atrocities, has clearly produced a change in the timing of the memorials as well as a change in community expectations. In comparing the difference in timing between the building of memorials at Oklahoma City, Port Arthur and Bali, as I explore in the following chapters, I conclude that communities, by the early twenty-first century, appear to expect governments to respond with services and planning for memorials often before the rescue and recovery after an atrocity is completed. This conclusion about the impact of the internet on the timing of memorials provides a new framework for the discourse on the memory cycles.
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5. **Research Objectives**

In examining the shared and different characteristics of the memorialisation at the case study sites, and how the differing agendas of governments, communities and individuals have been managed at these sites, I will consider the following issues:

- the memorialisation of each of the case study sites;
- the timing of the memorials;
- the impact of the internet;
- the links between tourism and memorialisation at each site;
- how, and if, heritage management issues are considered at each site; and
- the management of tributes left at the sites, including the guidelines developed for the tributes at Port Arthur and the Bali memorials.

Through my analysis of the remembrance of three atrocities I will provide an overview of contemporary memorialisation in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. My methodology for this study is outlined below.

6. **Methodology**

To gain an understanding of the memorialisation of these three atrocities, and analyse how communities and governments responded to these atrocities, I used a qualitiative research approach. Qualitative research was the most appropriate methodology as it is better suited to people, more appropriate for providing an understanding of people's needs and aspirations, and more able to encompass personal change over time.\(^{111}\)

My methodology included a combination of in-depth interviews, participant observation, analysis of texts, and ethnographic research. I have followed ethnographic research in allowing people to speak for themselves through the use of direct quotations, and through an analysis of the qualitative data I collected.\(^{112}\) The material reviewed included printed and electronic material, including mass media coverage. Sources examined included journal articles, books, newspaper articles, government reports, websites, current affairs journals, contemporary magazines, and a film made on the Bali bombings.

My research focused on the collection of information on private, public and

---


collective responses to the atrocities, so I could undertake a comparative analysis of these responses. I adopted an interpretive social science approach for my research, as I judged this appropriate to gathering information on how governments, communities and individuals responded to sudden and unexpected deaths from violence. This approach uses ‘various methods to get inside the ways others see the world, and is more concerned with achieving an empathetic understanding of feelings and world views than with testing laws of human behaviour’. \(113\) The methods I used included unstructured in-depth interviews, participation in services at the memorials, and meetings with memorial managements. I followed standard qualitative research techniques including descriptive research to describe the planning and design of the memorials. \(114\) Participant observation at the memorials and anniversary services provided insight into the community and government engagement and responses to the memorials.

Through comparative research, similarities and differences across the communities and cultures, and how they responded to the atrocities and the perpetrators, were identified. The benefits of comparative research have been recognised; it provides a perspective and orientation that would not be available if there was only analysis of a single site. \(115\) A strength of comparative research is the raising of new questions and theories. However, comparative research also has limitations, including limitations of number and size of samples which can limit generalisations. \(116\) In acknowledging that these limitations apply to this research, I argue that the validity of the information used from primary and secondary sources supports my key findings.

At the three case study sites I interviewed family and community members affected by the atrocities, people involved in the planning and ongoing management of the memorial, memorial designers and museum curators. Following a qualitative framework, my interviews were open-ended and in-depth. This allowed for a ‘personal’ approach, appropriate for talking with people about sensitive and emotive issues. In-depth interviewing has been described as ‘an appropriate method to gain access to the individual’s words and interpretations’. \(117\) This was my aim in interviewing people at the case study sites: to hear in their own words their responses to the
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memorialisation of the atrocities. The possible impact of my interviews can be summed up through Olick’s assessment of the link between interviews and collective memory, they are not part of this memory, ‘but the knowledge produced does have the potential to be part of it’. Similarly through my long-term involvement with the Port Arthur Historic Site, my knowledge may contribute to the collective memory of the aftermath of the massacre at Port Arthur.

I have more material on Port Arthur than on Oklahoma City or Bali due to my ongoing connections with Port Arthur Historic Site following my work in the Conservation Section at the Port Arthur Historic Site from 1997 to 1999. While in the Conservation Section I was responsible for managing a number of interpretation projects, including preparing signs and displays for a number of convict buildings, including the Penitentiary and Smith O’Brien’s Cottage. I worked with the local community on the Tasman Peninsula on the design and installation of sculptures, signs and an accompanying booklet for a ‘Convict Trail’ for visitors to the Tasman Peninsula. These projects were funded by the Australian Government, as part of the support to the Port Arthur Historic Site and the Tasman Peninsula community after the massacre, to encourage tourists to return to the area. Through my work with the Australian Government and membership of heritage professional organisations, I have maintained contact with site management and former colleagues. I attended meetings at Port Arthur on a range of heritage management issues connected with my work with the Australian Government. I attended an Australia ICOMOS conference at Port Arthur in 2002, and have met colleagues from Port Arthur Historic Site at Australia ICOMOS meetings and conferences in Canberra and Sydney.

In conducting this research my role varied, from being a tourist at the case study sites, to being an observer, or a participant observer, where I was or had been directly involved in the planning for the memorials. Before and after my one visit to Oklahoma City in 2005, I was in regular email contact with memorial staff. Through visits to Bali in January and October 2004 and September and October 2006, contact with the Australian Consulate and with Australians who had lived in Bali and Balinese in Australia, I have developed some understanding of both Balinese culture and some of the impact of the bombings on both the Balinese and Australian communities. I again visited Bali in October 2010 to participate in the anniversary services held at the Australian Consulate-General and at the memorial in Jalan Legian. Details of my site visits and people interviewed are at Appendix 2.

118 Jeffrey K. Olick, ‘Collective Memory: The Two Cultures,’ Sociological Theory 17, no. 3 (1999). p. 346
7. **Structure of the thesis**

In the next chapter, I examine contemporary scholarship on memorialisation, and shared histories across the case study countries. In describing and analysing the memorialisation at the case study sites, including the tributes left at these sites, I am responding to Young’s conclusion that the ‘life and texture of monuments’ should include the time and places they were conceived, the historical, political and social environments in which they were developed, and go beyond their finished form to consider their place in public memory, and their ‘ever evolving lives in the minds of their communities over time’.\(^{119}\) As Young demonstrated in his discourse on the Rapoport monument, it is not the form or even the motives for a monument that influence the public memory and understanding of monuments and their historical landscape. The impact of the monument on the historical landscape and the public memory will depend on the interaction of public and private memory of the use of the monument, and the changing physical, political and social landscapes of the monument over time.\(^{120}\)

I consider that it is not just monuments that need to be situated in how they were developed, their place in the landscape and their ongoing use and adaptation by governments and communities, but also the memorialisation of an atrocity. Savage concluded that the ‘history of memorial landscape is important’ and that the ‘interplay of aspiration and practice makes the memorial landscape come alive’.\(^{121}\) So too is the history of memorialisation of an atrocity important, and the interaction between what was planned, what eventuated, and how the community responded and engaged with the remembrance is part of the history and memory of the atrocities. My comparative analysis of the case studies is framed in this context. I aim to illustrate the landscape of the development and use of the memorials, and the government, community and individual response to the memorialisation of the atrocities.

In Chapter 2 the framework for the comparative analysis of the memorialisation of the three case study sites is outlined. The focus of Chapter 3 is a description and analysis of the memorialisation of the Oklahoma City bombing. The response to and the memorialisation of the massacre at the Port Arthur Historic Site is detailed in Chapter 4. The memorialisation at Port Arthur is compared with that at Oklahoma City, and reasons for the different responses are considered. The focus of Chapter 5
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is the memorialisation of the 2002 Bali bombings. I describe and analyse the shared and separate responses with memorials built and ceremonies held in Bali and across Australia. In Chapter 6 I consider the differing responses across countries and cultures to tributes left at the atrocity sites, and the memorials constructed at these sites. A summary of my analyses of the key questions is outlined in Chapter 7, including issues for future research.
Chapter 2: History, memory and memorialisation: across countries and cultures

1. Introduction

The remembrance of the sudden and unexpected deaths in Oklahoma City, Port Arthur Historic Site and Bali are shared with built structures, anniversary events and memorial foundations. The collective memory of these atrocities has developed from the images, the structures, and the shared experiences of those affected. I consider the memorialisation and management of these atrocities in the context of studies on history and memory, as I argue that how these sites are managed will impact on the memories of the atrocities. As context for my analysis I begin by examining the relationship of definitions of history, memory and memorialisation to the case study sites. I then explore the shared histories of remembrance of war, and ‘missing’ memorialisation across the case study countries, to support my argument that these three countries have shared histories of how their governments have remembered, or not, deaths from violence. I close the chapter with a brief summary of how sites of sudden death were marked in the late twentieth century, as background to how these atrocities are remembered. I begin by considering how memorials are defined and the scholarly discourses and influences on memorialisation in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

2. Definitions and discourse on memorials and memory

2.1 Memorials and memorialisation

Memorials are defined in the Oxford Dictionary as ‘structures or objects established in memory of a person or event; intended to commemorate someone or something’. For this study memorials extend beyond fixed structures or objects to include an array of events and activities to remember those who died. The focus of the memorials in Oklahoma City and at Port Arthur, as stated in their respective mission statements, is to remember those who died, those who survived and those who assisted in

the rescue and recovery. The built memorials at the case study sites have another function: they mark the landscape where the deaths occurred. Commemoration is part of the remembrance; it is ‘honouring the memory, as a mark of respect, especially with a ceremony or memorial’. The opening of the memorials, the anniversary services and the wreath-laying ceremonies are the public and often official commemoration services. It is these events, Savage remarks, that stir the ‘collective memory in some conspicuous way’. Memorials become part of the collective memory, as Torquil Canning, the designer of the Memorial Garden at Port Arthur Historic Site concluded: ‘public memorials are a symbolic form of collective memory’. What is the collective memory, and how has it been defined?

2.2 HOW ARE COLLECTIVE AND OTHER FORMS OF MEMORY DEFINED?

From the early twentieth century, scholars have defined and reworked definitions of ‘collective memory’. In the 1920s Halbwachs described the ‘collective memory’ of people as being shaped by the community around them. He considered that how people remembered an event depended on how they related to what he called ‘social frameworks’. In the context of this study, social frameworks would include family members and friends, rescue workers, and those in the community providing support. Rather than ‘collective memory’, Winter and Sivan use the term ‘collective remembrance’ to describe people sharing and making public their recollections. This term could be used with the sharing of memories at particular times, such as anniversaries. For example, the collective remembrance of Australians gathered at the memorial in Kuta, Bali during anniversaries contribute to people’s collective memory, not just of the bombings but also of the memorial.

In referring to the increase in discourses about collective memory and public commemorations, Marcuse made a distinction between (in his italics) remembering, as the individual act of recalling experiences and knowledge to the conscious mind, and recollection as the group process of collecting.
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creating and propagating information about the past.¹²⁹ Marcuse expressed his concern that the term ‘collective memory’ could be used to refer to a whole range of historical events at one particular time. This could result in disparate and conflicting memories being grouped together. For example, the memories of German veterans of the Second World War could be combined with those of concentration camp survivors into the term ‘German collective memory’. Marcuse states that he prefers the term ‘public recollection’ to what he describes as the vague term ‘collective memory’.¹³⁰ Marcuse’s reticence in using the term ‘collective memory’ when referring to the memory of the German community and the Second World War is understandable. However with these three atrocities, I am referring not to a range of historical events but to specific events and how they were marked; therefore I use the term ‘collective memory’ of these tragedies and their aftermath. There is likely to be, for example, a collective memory of many Australians that a gunman killed a large number of people around Port Arthur in the late twentieth century. What may not yet exist is a collective Australian memory of the memorial at Port Arthur Historic Site.

Yet not all scholars agree with the terms ‘collective memory’ or ‘remembrance’. Sontag has argued that:

there is no such thing as collective memory … but there is collective instruction. All memory is individual … what is called collective memory is not a remembering but a stipulating: that this [Sontag’s italics] is important and this is the story how it happened.¹³¹

The memorials at the case study sites can in this sense be seen as governments and communities stipulating that the remembrance of these atrocities was important. The detailed interpretation of the bombing at the Oklahoma City National Memorial is an example of collective instruction. In considering how different communities across the USA, Australia and Indonesia remembered the victims of the atrocities, Sturken’s definition of the ‘collective memory of a specific culture’ as ‘cultural memory’ is particularly relevant. Sturken defined this type of memory as outside ‘formal historical discourse yet is entangled with cultural products and imbued with cultural meanings’.¹³² She qualified it by adding that items left at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, for example, become part of cultural memory. Using this
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definition, the tributes left at the case study memorials would be part of the cultural memory of these countries. The distinctive Balinese design of the memorial in Kuta, described in detail in Chapter 5, would be part of the cultural memory of the bombings. I will explore to what extent the tributes, the memorials and other responses are part of the cultural memory of these countries.

By the early twenty-first century, memory is being shaped by the internet. Extending Huyssen’s argument that memory ‘is shaped by such public sites of memory as the museum, the memorial and the monument’, 133 I maintain that memory is now being influenced by electronic media. The images and reporting of the opening of the memorials and how communities engage with memorials through tributes, events and publications, all become part of the collective memory. Through the media and the internet in the twenty-first century, a ‘global collective memory’ now exists.

The collective memory is also shaped by museums. Across the globe, as Williams has explored, the numbers of memorial museums and museums dedicated to atrocities increased in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. 134 This trend has not extended to Australia, nor to Bali. Only Oklahoma City has a memorial museum, with exhibitions and displays on the atrocity and the aftermath. No museum contributes to the collective memory of the atrocity at Port Arthur Historic Site. The National Museum of Australia in Canberra includes just a few items from the 2002 Bali bombings, as part of the Australian memory of the bombings.

The difference in interpretation and information at the atrocity sites points to cultural differences in how atrocities are presented and remembered. It also raises the question, how is the decision made on the interpretation of the atrocity? Is it based on information visitors to the site might want, or what best suits the memorial management? At Oklahoma City, the curator of the memorial museum said she wanted all visitors to leave knowing the impact of violence, 135 but, we may ask, does the information on the perpetrator McVeigh contribute to this? Edkins has described how ‘after traumatic events there is a struggle over memory — some forms of remembering can be seen as ways of forgetting’. 136 The minimal interpretation at Port Arthur Historic Site and in Bali might be an attempt
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at trying to erase the memory of the atrocity and the perpetrators while remembering the victims. At Port Arthur the decision not to refer to the perpetrator is based on both the concern for those still working at the site who knew some of the victims, and management preference, rather than considering what information visitors might want to know. No interpretation is yet available at the Kuta memorial in Bali, where the focus is the victims, not the event.

Even within a global collective memory, private memories of an atrocity will remain. Despite the global sharing of images, conflict may exist between the public and the private memory of an atrocity and the aftermath. Thomson and Hamilton have explored how the private memories of those who returned from war were sometimes different from the public or collective memory of war. The same may be true for the private memories of those affected by atrocities. The transition from private to collective memory may happen when private memories are made public. This was illustrated with the publication of the story of the relocation of the Huon Pine Cross at Port Arthur, now part of the collective memory of the memorialisation at Port Arthur Historic Site.

Whereas the collective memory of atrocities may be about the events and people, for some people the memory of the atrocity will be of the place where it occurred. All three atrocity sites and memorials are now, to use Nora’s phrase, ‘places of memory’. In explaining how forgetting impacts and interlinks with memory, Ricoeur concluded that ‘what distinguishes places of memory from places of history is a will to remember’. Port Arthur has long been a place of history in Australian memory. With the massacre, another layer of history has been added to the site. At Oklahoma City, Port Arthur and in Bali the ‘will to remember’ had a significant impact on the memorialising of the atrocities, and has ensured that these ‘places of memory’ will be enshrined in history.
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Traumascapes, as noted, is a concept that could be applied, in retrospect, to sites of world wars and Holocaust sites. In writing on Holocaust memorials, Young describes how one of his aims was ‘to break down the notion of any memorial’s ‘collective memory’’. His preference is for the term ‘collected memory’, which he describes as ‘the many discrete memories that are gathered into common memorial spaces and assigned common meanings’. Whether the term ‘collected memory’, ‘collective memory’ or ‘public recollection’ is used, the memorials at all the case study sites will influence the memory of the atrocities. My preference, and the term I will use, is ‘collective memory’, based on Halbwachs’s original definition of a shared memory about events, and in this case the atrocities, and in time of the memorials. However in the early twenty-first century the collective memory develops through sharing stories and information across a range of media, including the internet. Through the internet the extent of the collective memory has broadened, and the time for a collective memory to develop has shortened.

In time, for some people their private and collective memories of the atrocities may be of the memorial rather than the event itself. This was declared by Rosenberg and Simon after the Montreal massacre, in describing the massacre as including not just the murders, but also the public response and the memorialisation of the massacre. This is relevant to the three case studies, particularly Bali to which some Australian families may not want to, or be able to, travel. For them, the Bali memorials in Australia may remain an enduring link with the atrocity, and their focus for mourning.

2.3 HOW ARE MEMORIALS DEFINED?

The memorials at the case study sites were built at a time of changing definitions and expectations of memorials. Although at the turn of the millennium memorials were expected to be spaces of experiences, I maintain they were still expected to be, as Young referred to Holocaust memorials, ‘special precinct[5] … a segregated enclave where we honour the dead’. Foote concluded that successful commemorative memorials provide both space for personal grieving and space for commemorating a
community’s or nation’s loss.\textsuperscript{147} As I describe in the following chapters, the built memorials all provide very different spaces for both private grieving and public commemoration.

It is not only people’s expectations of memorials that had changed by the turn of the millennium: memorial designs had also evolved. In comparing the Bali memorial in Perth’s Kings Park to the surrounding war memorials, Weller concluded that: ‘This memorial tells you where to move, what to see and how to grieve — three things that traditional monuments … don’t.’\textsuperscript{148} This description could be applied to memorials in Oklahoma City and at Port Arthur. Although of very different designs and covering very different spaces, they are all memorial spaces to be walked around and explored. Even the singular Bali memorial in Kuta provides space and design elements to explore — from the Balinese shrine to the memorial pond and the altar for offerings. All three memorials provide spaces for people to leave flowers and offerings, and to contemplate their losses.

\subsection*{2.4 \textbf{PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT WITH MEMORIALS}}

By the late twentieth century personal grieving in the public space of a memorial has often included the leaving of tributes and messages. Through the collection and display of tributes from memorials in the USA, this personal engagement with memorials had become part of the public memory of the memorials. Sturken concluded that leaving tributes had become the ‘active participation in the accrual of [the memorial’s] history’, and the collection of these objects as subsuming them in history.\textsuperscript{149} The leaving of flowers and messages at memorials is not a new mourning practice. Flowers were left at the Cenotaphs in London and Sydney after the First World War. The difference was that by the late twentieth century this mourning practice included the leaving of personal effects such as T-shirts, teddy bears and photos at memorials. In the final chapter of this study I explore how people shape the meaning of the three study site memorials through the leaving of tributes, and the varying response of their management agencies to extending and recording this meaning through the collection of these tributes.

By the late twentieth century, engagement with memorials extended beyond leaving tributes at a memorial. It has extended to many of those affected becoming involved with the planning of the memorial. A Task Force of more than 350 people, including families, rescue workers, survivors and other
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community members, were involved in the planning for the Oklahoma City National Memorial. The engagement of the community was described by Linenthal as the ‘democratization of memorialisation’. Governments may oversee and fund memorials but affected communities now have a greater say in how their lost loved ones were remembered. Many of those affected by the Port Arthur massacre, including the local community and rescue workers, were involved in the planning for the Port Arthur Memorial Garden. Families in towns and cities across Australia, including Sydney, Fremantle and Brisbane, worked with local governments on the development of the Bali memorials in these places. By September 11, 2001, the involvement of families and many of those involved in the rescue and recovery efforts was accepted as being part of the memorialisation of this atrocity.

Being involved with the planning of the memorials may be an extension of the therapeutic benefits of memorials. The importance of memorials as therapeutic spaces for grieving has been acknowledged by psychologists and historians. Holocaust memorials and museums have been recognised as having an important therapeutic role; they are spaces which allow both individuals and communities to witness and grieve. The opening of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was assessed as having a significant positive therapeutic impact for servicemen and women, their families and friends. The memorial was described as establishing the design standard for the ‘therapeutic monument’, as a multifaceted space which allowed traumatised groups to heal. Linenthal recognised that the process for developing the memorial at Oklahoma City was designed to be therapeutic, involving hundreds of people, ‘to help the community engage in the traumatic impact of the bombing’. As Savage concluded, by the early twenty-first century, the space and experience of memorials was now expected to be therapeutic.

The therapeutic benefits of memorialisation extend beyond involvement in the planning for the memorials, the built structures and the anniversaries;
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they include all facets of memorialisation, including the shared memories, and the shared stories and images over the internet and through social networking sites.

It is not only creating memorials that can be therapeutic, but also the marking of anniversaries for families, victims and others affected by atrocities. The positive effects of anniversaries include the provision of opportunities for relatives and survivors to come together and share the passing of time and enable collective remembrance to assist in the healing process. However, anniversaries may also have a negative effect in that they may bring on post-traumatic stress. Governments and communities building memorials and organising anniversary services need to consider both the positive and negative effects of holding anniversary services at memorials. In examining the differing responses to anniversaries across the case study sites I will consider whether the marking of anniversaries is a cultural difference in memorialisation.

**THE POLITICS OF MEMORIALS**

Do cultural differences exist across the case study countries, in what the memorials represent to the communities? For some Balinese community members the Kuta Memorial was not just about remembrance; they also hoped that the memorial would serve political purposes. The designer of the Kuta Memorial, Balinese architect Ir. I Wayan Gomudha, MT (Mr Gomudha), and Pak Komang, head of the LPM, both said it was good to have the memorial as a reminder of the bombings. Shadow Puppet Master I Made Sidia said he hoped the memorial would serve as a reminder of the carnage and devastation on that day, and therefore be a deterrent for some of the males who were involved with terrorist groups and were thinking about more bombings or joining Jemaah Islamiyah. These responses highlighted some of the cultural differences in memorialisation across the case study countries.

The use of memorials for political purposes is not new. Memorials have, from classical times, partly represented victories in battle and dominance.
over other countries. The memorialisation of atrocities that resulted from politically motivated attacks, including the Oklahoma City bombing and the Bali bombings, have significant political overtones. Through memorialisation of the Bali bombings in particular, the Indonesian and Australian governments and the Balinese provincial government sought to reassert national identity. The Australian Government’s response to the 2002 Bali bombings with services and a memorial at Parliament House, Canberra, typified this response. Government engagement with memorials remains in critical focus due to deaths across the world from ongoing terrorist attacks, including the bombing of the Australian Embassy in Jakarta in 2004, the 2005 Bali bombings, the train and bus bombings in London in 2005, and the 2009 bombing at a hotel in Jakarta. Memorialisation is part of the global response as governments not only encase the names of those who died in bronze and gilt plaques but build monuments and organise events to affirm the strength of their nations against those who attack their countries and citizens.

The politicisation of memorialisation is about how and what to remember. Governments may decide not just how atrocities will be remembered, but whether they will be officially remembered. Governments can influence how and what is remembered through providing, or not, land, money and resources for memorials. What all three case study countries shared is delayed, or lack of official memorials, for significant atrocities.

3. A shared history: missing memorials

All three countries have examples of how ‘monuments missing from a landscape can be as significant as those erected’. These countries share a history of not marking the sites of deaths from certain atrocities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the USA and Australia significant delays occurred in the official memorialisation of Indigenous massacres. Two massacres of Indigenous people in Australia, at Myall Creek in northern
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NSW in 1838, and at Coniston in Central Australia in 1928, were not marked by memorials until the late twentieth and early twenty-first century respectively. These types of responses were echoed in the USA. Two significant massacres, the 1864 massacre of Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians at Sand Creek in Colorado, and the 1890 massacre of Lakota Indians at Wounded Knee in South Dakota, were not designated as historic sites until the late twentieth century, and in the early twenty-first century planning is still continuing for a memorial at Sand Creek. Why did it take so long for recognition to be given to the sites of Indigenous massacres in Australia and the USA? Were the massacres not acknowledged through memorials, so the white settlers could deny or forget the atrocities undertaken in their quest for expansion across land already occupied? In the USA cultural conflict is given as one of the main reasons for the difficulties of the Lakota community to receive acknowledgement and compensation for the losses at Wounded Knee.

The selective remembrance in Australia extended beyond nineteenth and twentieth century Indigenous massacres. No Australian Government-funded memorials have been built to the 10 Australians who died in the World Trade Center towers on September 11, either in Canberra or at the Australian Consulate-General in New York City. The only memorial in Australia is a bench in a peace garden near Gosford, erected by the mother of one of the Australian September 11 victims. No Australian Government-funded memorials have been built in Australia for the Australian victims of the 2005 Bali bombings. The only Australian Government memorial to the Australian victims of the 2005 Bali bombing is in the grounds of the Australian Consulate-General in Bali. No public space exists in Australia for private grieving on the anniversaries of September 11 and the 2005 Bali bombings each year.


In Bali, the ‘missing memorialisation’ is for those killed in the 1965–66 massacres. On 30 September 1965 disaffected Indonesian army officers led an unsuccessful uprising in Jakarta. Following the deaths of six generals across Indonesia, the military retaliated and massacred people who were, or were said to be, members of the Partai Komunis Indonesia (PKI), the Communist Party of Indonesia. Approximately 80,000 Balinese were killed in the 1965–66 massacres. No commemoration or gravestones mark these deaths. No ceremonies or official memorials remember those who died. Not only is there no public memorialisation of these massacres, there has been little public discussion or debate about the lack of memorialisation. Only in 2000 did then Indonesian President Wahid apologise for the killings and try to establish a Day of Commemoration.

The deaths in the 1965–66 massacres may not be officially acknowledged or publicly remembered in ceremonies or in stone, but they remain part of the history and memory of the Balinese community. The issue has been raised by Balinese and Australian scholars, before and after the 2002 Bali bombings. In 2009 Indonesian, Australian and American academics participated in an international conference in Singapore about the massacres. The strength of private grief has kept the massacres in the public memory, despite the lack of memorials. Vickers and McGregor discuss how, although academics are beginning to write about these killings and they are beginning to be publicly discussed, there is still a long way to go. More public discussion about the lack of memorialisation for these killings may be one of the unlikely impacts of the response to the Bali bombings.

The three case study sites share more than a history of missing memorialisation; they also share histories of remembering those who died in war. Much of the response to the commemoration of war has been described as being considered either in the political context of national...
identity or the psychological context of mourning. Yet it was inevitable, as Ashplant et al. accurately analyse, that ‘the politics of war memory and commemoration always [their italics] has to engage with mourning.’ The same holds for the commemoration of contemporary atrocities. Are there links between the memorialisation of war and the remembrance of these atrocities? Do the three countries share histories of the remembrance of those who died fighting for their countries?

4. A shared memory: the memorialisation of war

The memorialisation of war is part of the landscape of history and memory in the USA, Australia and Bali. In all three countries ceremonies are held each year to remember those who died in war, on 31 May, Memorial Day in the USA, on Anzac Day, 25 April in Australia and in Bali on Indonesian Independence Day, 17 August. As all three countries share the remembrance of contemporary atrocities, they also share a history of the memorialisation of war.

4.1 War memorials for Australians

The First World War has been described as ‘a crucial moment in western cultures of death and mourning [with] ... millions lost on all sides’. Considering these losses it was inevitable that it was also a significant time in western memorialisation as individuals, communities and governments remembered those who died. More than 60,000 Australians died fighting overseas in the First World War. Many bodies of Australian soldiers were never found or identified. Australian names are among the almost 73,000 names inscribed on a memorial at Thiepval in France, with those of the British and Allied servicemen whose bodies were never found. The soldiers who died fighting together are remembered together. The losses and memorialisation of war became shared across the globe. The First World War could be described as the beginning of the ‘globalisation of memorialisation’.
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182 Bart Ziino, A Distant Grief: Australians, War Graves and the Great War (Crawley, WA: University of Western Australia Press, 2007). p. 2
The link between ‘globalisation’ and ‘memorialisation’ is not new. ‘Globalisation’ is the exchange and flow of people, ideas and emotions as well as economic interaction.\(^{185}\) Globalisation has been described as having an impact on the theoretical frameworks for war memory and commemoration. This is due to the centrality of nations to the politics of war memory.\(^{186}\) The globalisation of war, memory and memorialisation is not a new phenomenon. The travel of Australians to fight in Turkey, Palestine, France and other countries in the First World War was part of the globalisation of war in the early twentieth century. The shared memorialisation of the many nationalities who died fighting in Europe continued the global response during and after the First World War.

The First World War marked the beginning of cultural differences in memorialisation across the case study countries. In 1917 the United States government promised to bring all the American war dead home for burial, a practice that continues to the present day. Most, although not all, the American war dead are buried in the national military cemetery, in Arlington,\(^{187}\) Virginia, USA (photo 4). This has resulted in a significant difference in the memorialisation of war between the USA and Australia: Australia does not have a national military cemetery.

The Australian Government followed the lead of the United Kingdom Government in deciding that the bodies of those who died fighting overseas would not be brought home.\(^{188}\) This resulted in shared mourning and memorialisation as soldiers from the Commonwealth countries, including Australia, New Zealand, England, India and South Africa, were buried together in the countries where
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they died. As there were no war cemeteries in Australia, after the First World War between 1500 and 2000 war memorials were built across the country for those who died fighting overseas. For Australians who had no graves to grieve at or lay flowers on, these statues, plaques and buildings became their centres of mourning as well as public places for private grieving. The Australian death toll of 27 000 from the Second World War was lower than that from the First World War. Often the names of the dead from the Second World War were added to the existing First World War memorials, and so became part of the collective remembrance of the Australian engagement overseas in two world wars.

The mourning for lost family members was not confined to stone memorials. During the First World War many of the Australian families of those who died requested photographs of the graves overseas through sources such as the Red Cross and the Office of War Graves, and for many these photographs became the focus for their grieving. In Australia a unique form of commemoration began in the late 1880s, the publication by families of ‘In Memoriam’ notices in newspapers. The publication of these notices in the Australian press reached their peak during the First World War. Similar notices did not appear in the English press until 1914. It was a public expression of private grief. Other public remembrance included the planting of memorial avenues across Australia, including at Port Arthur.

4.2 A WAR MEMORIAL AT A CASE STUDY: PORT ARTHUR HISTORIC SITE

At just one of the case study sites is a memorial for those who fought and died in the First World War. The war memorial at Port Arthur Historic Site is part of the history and memory of the local communities’ losses. In the First World War 39 men from the Port Arthur area fought overseas; 15 of them did not return home. In 1918, in the township of Carnarvon (previously and later known as Port Arthur, now Port Arthur Historic Site), relatives of the 39 men planted a row of cypress trees (photo 5). Metal nameplates for each

---


191 Australian War Memorial, Australian Military Statistics.

192 Bruce Scates, Return to Gallipoli: Walking the Battlefields of the Great War (Cambridge: CUP, 2006). p. 15

of the 39 men were affixed to each tree. When the memorial to the 1996 massacre was being planned, the local community spoke about the Memorial Avenue as an example of the durability of memorials. On Remembrance Day, 11 November 2003, a plaque was unveiled listing the names of the 39 soldiers for whom the trees were planted. The Memorial Avenue is part of the collective memory of the Port Arthur community.

The collective memory of loss in war has been sustained through the twentieth and twenty-first centuries through war memorials and museums. In Australia war memorials are being expanded, while new ones are being built and imprinted on the landscape. For example, the Shrine of Remembrance in Melbourne has been extended and given public access to the ‘underground’ section of the memorial. Extensions and new exhibitions at the Australian War Memorial in Canberra have resulted in an increase in visitors. New memorials are being built in the streetscape of monuments along Anzac Parade, the avenue leading to and from the Australian War Memorial. It has become a ‘landscape of memory’. In the USA the opening of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial raised the profile of memorialisation across the USA beyond the remembrance of war.

194 These metal nameplates have disappeared, but they may still be in the trees. There are examples where metal plates have become part of cypress trees when they have grown, and this may be the case with the Memorial Avenue trees at Port Arthur. Author interview with Ross Reid, Grounds and Gardens Supervisor, Port Arthur Historic Site, 11 May 2007.

195 Details on the Memorial Avenue are from the Memorial Avenue file in the Resource Centre, Port Arthur Historic Site, and interview with Ross Reid, ibid.

196 The names on the plaque identify the strength of the local community connection to the site. They are also the surnames of some of the current site employees — three generations of some local families have now worked at the site.
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A WAR MEMORIAL IN THE USA: THE VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL

The response to, and use of, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington DC, USA has influenced the way the American and other communities engage with memorials. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial, as noted also known as 'the Wall', was officially opened in Washington DC in 1985. It contains the names of 58,249 American servicemen and women who were killed, or identified as missing in action, during the Vietnam War (photo 6). This memorial was built with private and corporate funding following a campaign by Jan Scruggs, a Vietnam Veteran.

As Linenthal described, the ‘democratization of memorials and memorial processes’ which characterised contemporary memorialisation in the USA, began with the development of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Scruggs highlights how the creation, development, and construction of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial ultimately involved two US presidents, the US Congress, hundreds of volunteers, a dedicated full-time staff, and hundreds of thousands of Americans who donated the nearly US$9 million needed to build it.

The opening of the Wall had an unexpected impact on memorialisation in the USA; as Sturken described, ‘it seemed as if the mourning and memory that had been held in check were suddenly released in a national embrace.

Photo 6: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the Wall, Washington DC, May 2005

200 Although the Wall of names is the public image of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, this memorial has three components, identified by the National Park Service as the Wall of names, the Three Servicemen Statue and Flagpole and the Vietnam Women’s Memorial. National Park Service, Vietnam Veterans Memorial (NPS, 2001 [accessed 3 May 2001]); available from http://www.nps.gov/vive/home.htm.
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of remembering.” Other memorials were subsequently constructed in the Washington Mall, including the Korean War Memorial and the Second World War memorial. At least another 150 memorials to Vietnam Veterans were subsequently built across the USA. The impact of the Wall was to extend beyond influencing the landscape of the Washington Mall to influencing the landscape of memorialisation across the USA and beyond.

The Wall not only influenced the involvement of the American community in the planning for memorials, but also influenced how people engaged with memorials. In 1982, while the Wall was being built, a US Navy Officer left the Purple Heart awarded to his brother who died in Vietnam in the memorial’s foundations. That began the leaving of ‘offerings at the Wall’. By 1995 more than 30,000 items had been left there. By 2005 approximately 80,000 items had been collected from the Wall. I examine the leaving and collection of tributes from the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in detail in Chapter 6. It was this new and different relationship with a memorial, Linenthal has argued, that contributed to the popularity of memorialisation in American culture. The Wall provided a space not just for private grief, but also for public remembering and engagement with a memorial. This response signals another difference in memorialisation across the three countries: only in the USA was a memorial built in the late twentieth century which had an impact on how the community responded to and engaged with memorials. It is not just in the USA and Australia that war memorials are part of the landscape of memory.

4.4 WAR MEMORIALS IN BALI

In Bali, war memorials are also significant in the landscape. At Margarana, central Bali, there is a war memorial for those who died fighting the Dutch in the War of Independence from 1946 to 1949, at the site of a battle where, on 20 November 1946, the Balinese commander I Gusti Ngurah Rai and 92 Balinese died. This battle is enshrined in Indonesian history and memory. Services are held at Margarana annually on 17 August, Indonesian Independence Day.
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More than 3000 symbolic puri or small stone memorials (photo 7) commemorate the Balinese and others who died fighting the Dutch.\(^{211}\) These puris are not gravestones marking the site of burial; they represent symbolic remembrance for those who died in war. The majority of Balinese are Hindus. When Balinese Hindus die they are cremated on auspicious days and their ashes are scattered at sea. Each symbolic puri at Margarana has a name, date and symbol identifying the religion of those who died.\(^{212}\) Margarana is not the only war memorial in Bali.

Many of the battles for the War of Independence were conducted in the mountains of Bali; memorials mark these battles and the local villagers who died. In the village of Wanagiri, in the centre of Bali, a memorial depicts figures with battle tools: guns and sharpened bamboo sticks (photo 8). Repaired and repainted in 2005, it is reminiscent of the war memorials in Australian towns, where the figures of veterans stand tall above the names of those who died in war.\(^{213}\)

These puris and statues are not the only memorials to the Balinese who died in conflicts with the Dutch. When the Dutch first invaded southern Bali in


\(^{213}\) I owe a debt to the filmmaker John Darling for taking me to Margarana and Wanagiri and for our discussions about war and other memorials in Bali in October 2005.
the early 1900s, some Balinese royalty led members of their courts to death in ritual suicide or puputan. After the War of Independence ended in 1947, memorials were built to those who died in the puputans, at Klungking and Denpasar, the capital city of Bali. 214 A large puputan memorial and square is located in Renon in Denpasar, near the Australian Consulate-General. In reflecting on the puputan memorials, Balinese scholar Degung Santikarma described them as being ‘created as part of the project of nation-building, giving motivating form to the force of postcolonial developmentalist agenda’. 215 As Santikarma implies, in Bali it is still the national and provincial governments that define the agenda for memorialisation. As I describe in Chapter 5, however, the memorialisation of the Bali bombings has had an impact on the Balinese community, who engage in their own way with the Bali memorial. Whether this engagement has an ongoing impact on memorialisation in Bali remains to be seen.

5. Memorialisation in the late twentieth century

As the sites of atrocities in Bali in the 1960s were not marked, similarly both the USA and Australia share a history of not marking the sites of many violent deaths until the late twentieth century. However, in the USA and Australia, in the late twentieth century marked changes did occur in how the sites of violent deaths were marked.

5.1 MEMORIALS AT ATROCITY SITES

It is likely that the memorialisation at both Oklahoma City and Port Arthur Historic Site influenced the change in how sites of violent deaths were marked. In considering the change in memorialising these deaths in the USA, Foote details how no memorials mark the site of two 1966 atrocities: the killing of eight nurses in Chicago and the mass murder of 16 people at the University of Texas, Austin. 216 Foote identifies the first memorials at the sites of mass murder in the United States being erected in 1990 in California, then in 1991 in Texas, then in 1993 in New York for the victims of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing. 217 This 1993 memorial was destroyed

214 At Klungkung in 1906 Balinese royalty led 400 members of court to their deaths. In Karangasem more than 1100 Balinese are estimated to have died in these ritual suicides between 1906 and 1908. Pringle, A Short History of Bali, Indonesia’s Hindu Realm. p. 106
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on September 11. Foote concludes that these memorials, followed by the
memorial at Oklahoma City, set a precedent for sites that would have ‘once
been considered too shameful to mark’. 218

A comparative response can be found in Australia. In August 1987 seven
people were shot and killed in Hoddle Street, Melbourne. 219 Although a
small grove of trees has been planted to mark the event, no plaque or other
memorial marks the site of the deaths. 220 In December 1987 a man shot dead
eight staff and wounded others at the Australia Post Offices in Queen Street,
Melbourne. After the shooting the gunman jumped to his death. 221 The
building was refurbished and now houses serviced apartments. No memorial
marks the site of the murders. 222 In 1991 a man killed six people and then
himself in the Strathfield Shopping Plaza in Sydney. This massacre is marked
with a small brass plaque and anniversary services.

Given the response to the Bali bombings and memorials constructed across
Australia, it is likely that the memorialisation of the Port Arthur massacre
also set a precedent in Australia for the public marking of sites of tragic and
unexpected deaths, including deaths from car accidents. In the late twentieth
century across the globe the private mourning in public places extended
beyond leaving flowers and tributes at memorials to the construction of
memorials at sites of sudden and unexpected death.

5.2 ROADSIDE MEMORIALS

What also changed in the USA and Australia in the late twentieth century
was an increase in the number of roadside memorials. Marking the site of
unexpected death is a mourning practice that goes back centuries. The 1896
dition of The Antiquity described crosses cut into the turf or painted on
a wall at the site of a fatality. The same types of crosses were reported in
England at the sites of fatalities in the early twentieth century. 223 Markers
and crosses have also been left at the sites of gypsy and other deaths in
England from the early twentieth century. In the USA, the tradition of
roadside shrines dates back to the early Spanish exploration and settlement
in America. 224 In the USA in the late twentieth century there was a marked
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increase in the number of these memorials. The increase in these memorials was described as not only partly a response of reminding motorists of the risk of fatalities, but also an immediate response from families and friends to sudden and unexpected deaths. With greater community engagement in memorials in the USA in the late twentieth century, individuals and families may have felt they were able to take responsibility for erecting and maintaining memorials.

In Australia, roadside memorials also became more prominent in the landscape in the late twentieth century. This trend has been attributed to the increasing secularisation of Australian society, less focus on religious ceremonies as part of the ritual of farewelling loved ones, and greater focus for some on tangible memorials at the site of death. The public marking by families or friends of the site of death is also a reminder to authorities of fatalities that occurred that were beyond the control of the driver.

The memorialisation of those killed in roadside accidents has extended beyond the crosses, plaques and messages left by the road. Websites now include photos and details of these memorials. In Australia a single memorial has been built for all truck drivers killed. Located at Tarcutta, New South Wales, on the Hume Highway between Sydney and Melbourne, the Australian Truck Drivers’ Memorial also has a website with photos, names, and the life stories of those whose names are on the memorial.

5.3 PORTRAITS OF GRIEF

At the turn of the millennium, life stories became some of the first memorials to those who died in atrocities. Providing an unusual link to the ‘In Memorium’ notices of the First World War, newspapers again became the focus for tributes from families and friends on the sudden death of loved ones. Three days after September 11, The New York Times began publishing columns of photos and the life stories of the missing World Trade Center victims. These columns were soon tagged the ‘portraits of grief’.


Other American newspapers followed suit. Australian newspapers and magazines imitated this response after the 2002 Bali bombings. In the weeks after the bombings, the media included columns and pages of ‘portraits of grief’ of those who died and were missing. Families of those who were killed, missing or injured provided life stories and photographs. After the Bali bombings these ‘portraits of grief’ in the Australian media became in effect the public memory of the Australians who died. They have become part of the collective memory of the Bali bombings. As many of these newspapers were available online, these tributes and life stories became part of online memorialisation.

5.4 ONLINE MEMORIALS AND BEYOND

Are cybershrines or online memorials the new form of memorialisation of the twenty-first century? Electronic memorials, described as ‘cyber memorials’ or ‘cybershrines’ by Grider, are web pages containing photographs of the material shrines, photomontages as well as websites for lighting candles and virtual condolence books. This innovation in memorialisation in the USA in the late twentieth century has now extended across the world. This trend in American memorialisation reached its peak after September 11 when hundreds and thousands of memorial sites flooded the internet. The websites and online tributes to the Bali bomb victims are likely to have been some of the early web-based memorials in Australia.

The private grieving at public spaces was no longer about visiting, walking around and leaving tributes at stone structures. Given the increasing popularity of social networking sites and media such as Facebook and Twitter, the trend of online memorialisation has grown. After sudden and unexpected deaths, for example in road accidents, online memorials to deaths become part of the immediate response of friends and family. Similar to the tributes left at memorials, these online memorials are often a spontaneous and transient response. Domain names often are valid just for a few years. Unless these online memorials are archived they may disappear from the public and private memory of an atrocity. It is the stone memorials
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with engraved names that have permanence. Yet the online resources are part of the story of how a community responded, and if they are able to be archived and stored will be an invaluable resource for future curators and interpreters wanting to understand and explain to audiences how communities reacted to these atrocities.

6. **Summing up**

In examining how governments, communities and individuals remember the sudden and unexpected deaths at the atrocity sites examined, I follow Young’s definition that memorials can be ‘a day, a conference, or a space, [they do] not have to be a monument’.\(^\text{234}\) I consider the memorials at the case study sites in the context of Savage’s statement that by the early twenty-first century memorials were expected to be ‘spaces of experiences, journeys of emotional discovery, rather than exemplary objects to be imitated’.\(^\text{235}\) These memorials, and the multifaceted remembrance of the atrocities, will impact on the collective memory of the atrocities. In the early twenty-first century, the global, collective memory develops through sharing stories and information across a range of media, including the internet.

I have considered the shared histories of memorialisation, of ‘missing’ memorials and the memorials of war, to provide the background to the development of the memorials at the case studies. What these shared histories demonstrate is that the remembrance of atrocities will depend on a number of factors including the location, the reason for the deaths, and the politics of the government.

By the late twentieth and early twenty-first century memorialisation had extended beyond built structures. Memorials were no longer the province of governments; individuals and communities became involved with memorialisation, through building their own memorials, through the planning of memorials, and through leaving of tributes at the memorials. Through media coverage and the internet a strong public and collective memory of these three atrocities developed soon after the event, and this in turn influenced communities and governments to publicly remember the victims with memorials and anniversary services.

The engagement of communities with memorialisation was a defining factor in the memorialisation of the Oklahoma City bombing, which is explored in the next chapter.
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Chapter 3: The democratisation of memorialisation: remembering the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing

We come here to remember

Those who were killed, those who survived, and those changed forever

May all who leave here know the impact of violence

May this memorial offer comfort, strength, peace, hope and serenity

Photo 9: Oklahoma City National Memorial, April 2005

On 19 April 1995 a bomb exploded outside the Alfred F. Murrah Federal Office building in Oklahoma City in the United States of America. The building collapsed and 186 people, including 19 children, died and 850 people were injured. Three hundred and twelve buildings within a two-mile radius were damaged by the blast. Timothy McVeigh was convicted of murder and conspiracy for his role in the bombing and sentenced to death. He was executed in June 2001. Terry Nichols received a life sentence and Michael Fortier was imprisoned for 14 years for their roles in conspiring to assist with the bombing.

1. **Introduction**

In this chapter, I describe and analyse the memorialisation of the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing in the context of whether cultural differences do exist in contemporary memorialisation across the USA, Australia and Bali. I consider the popular and academic responses to the bombing, and the remembrance of the bombing through services, the memorial and the marking of anniversaries. This analysis sets the framework for the comparison of the memorialisation of the three case study sites. I examine the overall response to the Oklahoma City bombing in the context of Linenthal’s assessment that the community involvement in the memorialisation at Oklahoma City was due to the ‘popularity of memorialisation’ across the USA. In the comparative analysis, I consider whether this statement could be applied to the other case study sites, or only to the USA.

To what extent does the Oklahoma City memorial result reflect trends in contemporary memorialisation in the USA? After the opening of the Oklahoma City National Memorial, Linenthal summed up American expectations of memorials at the end of the twentieth century: they should be places to remember and mourn the dead, as places for music, reflection and forums, both on the dangers of terrorism, and as reminders that terrorism had not won. By the early twenty-first century Savage concluded that memorials in the USA were expected to be ‘spaces of experience and journeys of emotional discovery’. I will examine whether the Oklahoma City
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National Memorial either reflected, or influenced, American expectations of memorials at the end of the millennium.

Of the three case studies, political motives influenced the motives of the perpetrators at two sites, in Oklahoma City and Bali. Whereas the Bali bombings were the result of an international terrorist attack, the Oklahoma City bombing was the result of ‘home grown terrorists’. What impact did this have on the media and academic response to the bombing? The American community was stunned by the event and the impact of the bombing. It was described as having a ‘shocking impact’ across the United States, not only because ‘it took place in a political context’, but also because it took place in the Midwest, America’s ‘heartland’, where ‘violence of this kind was unanticipated’.  

With such a response, it is not surprising that a wealth of literature on the bombing eventuated.

2. How media and writers responded to the bombing

At all the case study sites the popular media coverage of the atrocities has contributed to the collective memory of these tragedies. Newspapers, books, articles, government reports and websites all tell the story of the Oklahoma bombing and the aftermath. The graphic photos, stunned responses of local journalists and interviews with families and survivors in the local newspapers, highlighted the effect of the bombing on the local community. One of the most evocative responses was from the local newspaper, *The Daily Oklahoman*. The high regard for this coverage by the Oklahoma City National Memorial was demonstrated through the sale of a facsimile edition of the first nine pages of *The Daily Oklahoman*, published the day after the bombing, in the memorial stores in 2005.  

This coverage continued to be part of the history and memory of the bombing. Of all the case study sites, Oklahoma City is the only site where a detailed account of the bombing, the rescue and recovery efforts and subsequent investigation, is available through the publication of the official government report on the bombing. In marked contrast to some of the more emotive media coverage, this report highlights how both the recovery and investigation was due to the shared resources of emergency workers and investigators across the USA. This report would be an invaluable resource if, in retrospect, a detailed heritage study was undertaken on the sites of the bombing and the many areas affected.
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One of the distinguishing features of the Oklahoma City bombing is that it is the only case study site where scholars have described and analysed in detail the memorialisation of the atrocity. The engagement of the American community with memorialisation after the opening of the Wall extended to American scholars’ analyses of memorialisation. Whereas the response to the Port Arthur massacre is largely considered in the context of the convict history of the site, and the response to the Bali bombings has been considered in the context of the impact on tourism and the local community, American scholars have considered the memorialisation of the Oklahoma City bombing in the context of contemporary American memorialisation, and the relationship of the remembrance at Oklahoma City to the remembrance of September 11.

Through his description and analysis of the development of the Oklahoma City memorial, Linenthal highlights a significant difference between the memorialisation at this site and the responses at Port Arthur Historic Site and Bali. The memorial at Oklahoma City was developed at a time when memorials had a high profile in the USA, and many of the community were engaged with memorials. It was a time of ‘the democratization of memorialization’ across the USA which was continued at Oklahoma City through the involvement of many of those affected and the community in the development of the memorial. Completed before September 11, 2001, Linenthal’s *The Unfinished Bombing: Oklahoma City in American Memory* has been described by Sturken as not only ‘the definitive text on the memorialisation of the bombing’ but also as the definitive text on the effects of the bombing on Oklahoma City and its survivors. It covers the planning for, and design of, the memorial and the trial and sentencing of the perpetrators. This work provides a template for a description and analysis of the planning and development of memorials at other contemporary atrocity sites, including the other two case study sites. Linenthal also explores Foote’s argument that the response to Oklahoma City resulted in a dramatic transformation in the way [American] culture treated the sites of mass murder. This transformation continued with the response to September 11.

In *Tourists of History* Sturken uses both September 11 and the Oklahoma City bombing as the significant events on which to base her analysis of American culture in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries in relation to cultural memory, tourism, consumerism and kitsch. In comparing the
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memorialisation of the Oklahoma City bombing with the American response to September 11, Sturken argues that the consumerism and kitsch that have been produced after both tragedies are examples of the American comfort culture which is related to their patriotism and how they see themselves in relation to the rest of the world.\textsuperscript{247} Part of this consumerism and kitsch are the teddy bears and t-shirts, not only left as spontaneous memorials but now available as items in the memorial store as part of the Oklahoma City Memorial. Sturken’s work highlights a significant difference in Australian and American memorial culture: the lack of souvenirs or kitsch items at the sites of major Australian tragedies. Sturken considers the similarities and differences in the responses to Oklahoma City and September 11 and the contact between the Oklahoma City memorial and those involved in planning the memorial in New York. Despite this, she concludes, the planning for the memorial in New York City remained fraught, and the people of New York seemed to have learned little from the memorialisation in Oklahoma City.\textsuperscript{248}

It remains to be seen, when the memorial at the World Trade Center is completed, whether this was the case. Two very different sites in two very different cities, yet, as American Professor of English David Simpson has written, ‘it would be difficult for the World Trade Center memorial site to avoid both comparison with and allusion to Oklahoma City’.\textsuperscript{249}

It was also inevitable, I argue, similar to Sturken, that both academic and popular American writers would compare the aftermath of September 11 and Oklahoma City. Linenthal writes that although ‘New York is not Oklahoma City’, the experience of developing the memorial at Oklahoma City, and the insistence that the families, survivors and rescuers have a say in the memorial, was relevant to New York.\textsuperscript{250} In a similar vein Foote concludes that the Oklahoma City memorial had set a precedent in terms of the scope and scale of the memorial for the response in New York.\textsuperscript{251}

In reviewing a travelling exhibition on September 11 at the Oklahoma City Memorial Museum, anthropologist Jeffrey Feldman noted that artefacts and images in the exhibition from the World Trade Center site, including rescue helmets, dented panels from rescue vehicles and images of piles of rubble, were valued not for their connection to the events of September

\textsuperscript{247} Ibid. p. 6
\textsuperscript{248} Ibid. p. 164
\textsuperscript{249} David Simpson, \textit{The Culture of Commemoration} (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006). p. 81
\textsuperscript{251} Kenneth E Foote, \textit{Shadowed Ground: American Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy}, p.341
11 but for their similarity to artefacts from Oklahoma City. American art historian Kirk Savage also noted that the influence of the therapeutic model of the Oklahoma City memorial ‘loomed large’ in the planning for the September 11 memorial. These analyses linking the atrocities of Oklahoma City and the sites of September 11, including New York City, highlight another difference between the case study sites. Oklahoma City has become linked with one of the most significant atrocities of the twenty-first century. Through shared exhibitions, scholarly discourse and personal connections, the Oklahoma City bombing and the September 11 attack were part of the American collective memory of terrorism, and memorialisation, at the turn of the millennium. One of the precedents set at Oklahoma City that was followed at the World Trade Center site was the holding of services while recovery efforts were under way. The early memories and collective memories of all three case studies would include the services held in the days after the atrocities.

3. The first services and memorials

In Oklahoma City the first services were held while the site was still being cleared. Memorials have been recognised as being important as therapeutic spaces for grieving. The services held in the immediate aftermath of the atrocities are also therapeutic, and assist communities and individuals in their recovery from the tragedies. The first memorial service at the Murrah Federal Building site was held on 23 April 1995, while the search for survivors and the recovery of bodies was still under way. Thousands of Americans joined Oklahomans at services held in buildings and stadiums around Oklahoma City. The services were led by the Reverend Billy Graham and attended by then US President Bill Clinton.

The first memorials at Oklahoma City were also set up while recovery work was under way. These spontaneous memorials were an example of how by the late twentieth century ‘people had a growing desire to act immediately and in a personal manner’ to memorialise tragic deaths. The first onsite memorial was a concrete slab at ground level on the Murrah Federal Building.
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site, which a rescue worker had sprayed with the words: ‘Bless the children and the innocent’, while the recovery work was in progress (photo 10). This slab became a spontaneous memorial, as flowers, messages, photos and flags were left there. Described as a ‘memorial for the rescuers’, it was the final meeting place for rescue workers on 4 May 1995, the day when the official rescue and recovery operations ended.

The following day, 5 May 1995, several thousand workers and volunteers gathered at the remains of the Murrah Federal Building for a memorial service. Another memorial service for survivors was held on 14 May at the ruins of the building. On 23 May the remains of the building were imploded and on 29 May the last three bodies were recovered.

The next temporary memorial was in the grounds of the First Methodist Church, adjacent to the site of the bombing. Called the ‘Heartland Chapel’, it was dedicated on 5 July 1995. The temporary memorial remained until the permanent one was opened in April 2000. However, while a permanent memorial was being planned, another type of memorial was evolving — the electronic or cyber memorial, which developed with public use and access to the internet.

![Photo 10: The slab that became the focus for flowers and memorial services: photograph from display in the Oklahoma City National Museum, April 2005](image)
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4. **Timing of the memorial: impact of the internet**

The development of, and public access to, the internet has had a significant impact on contemporary memorialisation. In the late 1980s and early 1990s access to the internet in the USA was limited mainly to government departments and universities.\(^{260}\) This changed in the mid-1990s. Whereas in 1995 only 9 per cent of Americans had access to the internet, by 2005 this had increased to 68 per cent.\(^{261}\) By the turn of the millennium it had become a popular communication medium, part of contemporary memorialisation, initially in the USA and gradually across the globe. It has influenced the timing of memorials, the engagement of the community with atrocities, and led to the ready development of a global collective memory of the atrocities, and the memorials that followed.

The Oklahoma City bombing coincided with the emergence of the internet as a public space. It marked the beginning of the use of the internet as not only a source of information, but as a memorial site. On 20 April 1995, the day after the Oklahoma City bombing, *The Wall Street Journal* reported that ‘hundreds, and possibly thousands of people sidestepped CNN [the American television news channel] in favour of a newer, more instantaneous service: the Internet’,\(^{262}\) adding that ‘in times of crisis, the internet has become the medium of choice for users to learn more about breaking news, often faster than many news organisations can deliver it’.\(^{263}\) *The New York Times* on 25 April 1995 reported that almost before the explosion at Oklahoma City had ended ‘cyberspace was alive with commentary’. This 1995 article illustrates how recent the use of the internet was at the time, as the article goes on to explain what a ‘World Wide Web page contains’ and how list-servers work.\(^{264}\)

Also on 25 April 1995, *The Denver Post* highlighted that for the first time there was a different response to the news of the bombing, as ‘Americans
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flocked to national on-line computer services and the Internet’. It explains how the student newspaper from the University of Oklahoma began putting up photos and stories, which other media began to use, on their internet site on the day of the bombing, resulting in the student newspaper becoming a clearing house for information about the bombing.265

Another US newspaper noted this ‘marked another first in cyberspace development. The Internet service providers based in Oklahoma City became information providers to the world — a local correspondent ... for the Internet.’ It also reported that US service providers reported a huge increase in users logging on for information about the bombing.266 The popularity of the internet at the time of the bombing saw it become another medium for memorialisation, as more than 1200 people ‘signed their condolences onto a cyberspace card’, hard copies of which were later delivered to the schools, libraries and churches in Oklahoma City.267

The internet not only altered the media response to an event. Images and accounts of an event, transmitted almost as soon as it happened, helped to formulate the public memory of how events would be later perceived. Linenthal has described how:

> the media saturated a worldwide audience with the drama of rescue and recovery from April 19 until May 5 ... intense and enduring media coverage [of memorial services, even funerals] made it possible for millions to image themselves as part of a worldwide bereaved community.268

Through media coverage and internet access of information on the bombing and the memorial services, the global community became engaged in the bombing and the aftermath of this atrocity. Few scholars refer to the impact of the internet on the collective memory of the bombing. Linenthal notes how the internet had become not only a news and community information site, but also a site for discussion about conspiracy theories on the bombing.269 However he does not expand on the broad impact of the internet. In considering the popularity of web-based memorialisation after September 11, Foote et al. only refer to the Oklahoma City bombing
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However these authors do not consider the impact of the internet on memorialisation of the bombing. The internet was to have a lasting and significant impact on the memorialisation and memory not just of the Oklahoma City bombing but of the other case study sites. Through the internet a global collective memory of an atrocity and the memorialisation of an atrocity could develop. Through the internet people could regularly ‘visit’ a memorial, and, in the case of the Oklahoma City atrocity, purchase books and souvenirs from the memorial store. Within a few years of the Oklahoma City bombing, the first memorials to sudden and unexpected deaths would be online memorials. In the immediate aftermath of Oklahoma City, however, the focus was on planning for a built memorial on the site of the Murrah Federal Building.

5. Planning for the Oklahoma City memorial

The planning for the Oklahoma City memorial was described as a unique approach, and ‘something quite significant in the history of public memorialisation’. As Linenthal concluded:

It would be hard to find a memorial process, however, that included over three hundred people, many of whom had just suffered traumatic loss. It would be hard to find a memorial process consciously designed to be therapeutic, to help individuals become a bereaved community … [It] served as an ingeniously designed model of community consensus building. … it sparked civic engagement in the city.

Official planning for a memorial began three months after the bombing, when Oklahoma City Mayor Ron Norick formed a Memorial Task Force and invited all those who had been affected to participate. More than 350 people responded, including survivors, family members, rescuers and volunteers. The task force spent nearly 12 months consulting widely through surveys and received thousands of submissions not only from people in Oklahoma, but from across the country.
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Contributing factors to the success of this process were that the bombing occurred in a regional city with a strong sense of community and identity. This was illustrated with the phrase ‘the Oklahoma standard’, used to describe food, accommodation and other support provided gratis by the local community for the rescue and recovery workers in the weeks after the bombing. This sense of community contributed to ready engagement in developing the memorial design.

In Oklahoma City this sharing of the development extended to the task force organising a competition to select the design for the memorial. All the members of the task force and all those affected by the bombing were invited to help with the selection of designs to be short-listed, and then the final design. However, heritage issues raised during the process were not included in the selected design. In contrast to the memorial at Port Arthur, no detailed heritage studies were prepared before the construction of the memorial at Oklahoma City, despite the historical significance of many of the damaged buildings.

6. Heritage concerns

The community engagement in developing the memorial at Oklahoma City did not, however, extend to the protection of the cultural heritage of the bomb site and surrounding area. The physical remains of an atrocity can be a more powerful reminder of the violence than a memorial. Yet despite attempts to keep more evidence of the damage caused by the bombing, little physical evidence remains. Seventy-three of the 300 damaged buildings in Oklahoma City were recognised by the State Preservation Office as having historical significance. Structural damage resulted in the demolition of 14 of these buildings. Government agencies in Oklahoma City did try to protect the heritage buildings damaged by the bombing, not always with success. The State Heritage Preservation Office suggested that evidence of the bombing be kept, ‘retention of the crater left in the street and preservation of the scarred building in the immediate area could have allowed the public the opportunity to reinterpret the event onsite in relation to future

275 Osborne, ‘Terrorist Attack: Disaster Response for the Oklahoma City Bombing.’
occurrences and philosophies’. Precedents exist for incorporating damaged buildings into memorials in other countries, for example in Coventry Cathedral, England and at the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park, Japan. At both these sites, Sturken reminds us, the ruins ‘[evoke] a sense of the destructive forces’. A few small damaged sections of the buildings are visible around the Oklahoma City memorial, but they are hard to find and are dwarfed by the new structures, as illustrated in the photographs below (photos 11, 12 and 13).

The piece of damaged formwork (photo 11) near the entrance gate in 2005 was nearly covered by vegetation.

The space where the children’s day care centre had been (photo 12) was grassed over and fenced, with a small area of damaged wall left nearby.

Did American cultural expectations influence the decision to keep only small sections of the damaged walls? Although agreeing that ‘the power of ruins is undeniable’, Young has suggested that ‘Americans have never ... allowed ruins to define ...’
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their present’. Or was it, as Foote suggested, that prior to the Oklahoma City bombing, American society did not normally mark the sites of mass murder, so that there was no desire to keep any physical evidence of the atrocity? Of the three case study sites, Port Arthur is the only site where physical remains of the buildings at the atrocity site have been incorporated into the memorial, and this was after much debate.

Debates about clearing a site can be emotive and ongoing even after the site has been cleared. One of the survivors of the bombing, Oklahoma City resident Janet Beck, was working for the Social Security Department on the First Floor of the Murrah Federal Building when the explosion happened. Her initial response was that the damaged building should have been left as it was. However now that the memorial has been built she realised that if the damaged area had been retained:

it would have been the worst thing we could have done, even if the building were structurally sound ... it would have been a constant reminder of the bad ... it would always have been a negative, it would have let the world see what we went through, but having it turned to where it is now... it’s showing remembrance, showing respect to those who were killed, to the rescuers, that we haven’t forgotten you.

If remains of an atrocity site are retained, they can be a particularly evocative part of the memorialisation of the bombing. One building that was not extensively damaged was the Journal Record Building, which now houses the Memorial Museum and the Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism (MIPT). Graffiti from one of the rescue crews, left where it was written on the side of this building, provides a lasting link with the immediate aftermath of the bombing (photo 14), a spontaneous message now integral to the interpretation of the bombing.
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Photo 14: Recovery workers’ graffiti, Journal Record Building, April 2005
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The challenge for heritage managers is to balance the keeping of evidence and records of an atrocity against the practical needs for memorialisation, safety and the needs of those directly affected by the atrocity. It may not have been possible, for safety reasons, to keep the remains of the Murrah Federal Building. However, from a heritage management perspective it would have been useful to undertake a heritage assessment of the remaining buildings, and use this as part of the planning process. Of the three case study sites, Oklahoma City covers the largest area. The physical size of the memorial, and all the components, would dwarf the memorials at Port Arthur and Bali. Yet the size of an area damaged should not inhibit heritage studies being part of the planning process. Heritage studies have been undertaken at large sites, for example, the 125.6 hectares (310.3 acres) of the landscape and buildings at the Port Arthur Historic Site. A heritage study of all the buildings and landscape damaged by the bombing would have contributed to the collective memory of the impact of the bombing. At present, the memorial’s size and landscape indicate the extent of areas damaged and now incorporated in the memorial complex.

7. **The Oklahoma City National Memorial**

The size and the many components of the Oklahoma City National Memorial has, and will continue to influence the public and private memory of the bombing. Due to the popularity of the memorial as a tourist venue, in time the collective memory for those not directly affected by the bombing may be of the memorial rather than the bombing. The site for some visitors may be a ‘touristscape’ rather than a ‘traumascape’.

At the turn of the millennium, American scholars had concluded that memorials were expected to be special precincts where the dead were honoured, \(^\text{282}\) places of experiences, \(^\text{283}\) and should include areas where people could apply their own meaning to a memorial through leaving tributes. \(^\text{284}\) Memorials extended beyond built structures, to include performances, foundations and other activities. \(^\text{285}\) Does the memorial complex at Oklahoma City meet these American expectations of memorials? The design of the memorial complex outlined below does provide a variety of spaces and opportunities for remembrance.
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7.1 THE OUTDOOR MEMORIAL

The Oklahoma City National Memorial covers two city blocks, Map 5 (photos 15 and 16). It includes the site of the Murrah Federal Building, and the land where 14 damaged buildings were later demolished.\(^{286}\) The Journal Record Building, where Oklahoma City's long-running newspaper was published, is on the western boundary. In the middle of the site are two striking ‘gates’ or bookends at the east and west pedestrian entrances. The time the explosion commenced, 9.01 [am], is inscribed on one gate, and the time the explosion finished, 9.03 [am], is inscribed on the other. What was the road in front of the main entrance to the Murrah Federal Building on North West Fifth Street, where the bomb crater was, is now a reflective pool. Near the eastern end of the Memorial is a Survivors' Tree. There is also a Rescuers' Orchard, and a plaque containing the names of all the survivors. The footprint of the Murrah Building is covered by 168 glass and stone chairs, each inscribed with a victim's name; 19 of the chairs are child size.

In front of the memorial museum is a children's area (photo 17). This area has a wall of glazed tiles sent from children across America.\(^{287}\) It also has a space where people can interact with the memorial: tiles on which children and adults can write and draw. The memorial at Oklahoma City is the only one of the three case study sites that provides interactive space where visitors of all ages can provide responses through drawings and words. It is an example of Glassberg's suggestion that sites of tragedy should 'create spaces for dialogue about history and for the collection of memories, to ensure that memories are heard in those spaces'.\(^{288}\) Inside the museum that is part of

\(^{286}\) Osborne, ‘Terrorist Attack: Disaster Response for the Oklahoma City Bombing,’ p. 44

\(^{287}\) Ann E. Clark, A Memorial Walking Tour (Oklahoma City: The Oklahoma City National Memorial Foundation, 2005).

the site, further space is provided for visitors to add to the memories of the memorial. Initially a whiteboard area, visitors can now type in their messages on a computer. These messages are randomly displayed on a screen above it. Although memorial museums, such as Holocaust museums, provide visitors’ books for comment, few memorial museums provide other forms of interactive space for visitors.

Is Oklahoma City a ‘successful national memorial’, one that has places that allow ‘visitors a wide range of potential in interactions and rituals … a space where people can speak to their dead’? The Oklahoma City memorial does provide a variety of opportunities for mourning and memory. The different spaces across the memorial complex are places for interactions and rituals, although they are not all managed as the designers envisaged.

One area that the memorial designers hoped would be an interactive space for visitors and affected families to explore and engage with are the sculptured chairs (photo 18). The sculptured chairs, each with a name, are arranged in nine rows that replicate the nine floors of the building where people were when they died. For the memorial designers, this space was meant to be an ‘outdoor room … and by the chairs being grouped together, according to where people worked, meant that there were friends amongst friends’. To the Butzers the chairs were designed to be ‘the memory of the victims … to fill that void left in the building’. The Butzers said ‘the field was designed to be open, to allow people to interact with [the chairs]’.

Photo 17: Tiles and interactive space, at entrance to the memorial museum, April 2005
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However, decisions by the memorial management have resulted in the chairs no longer being accessible: the area is now roped off. With the exception of families, people are only allowed to walk around the chairs at anniversaries. The Butzers said that not only was this not what was planned, but that ‘the strongest feedback we got from family members and survivors was that they did not like the fence [around the chairs] because it pushed them back again, away from the site, away from this place where a real tragedy occurred ... They were not, those with whom we spoke — in favour of that fence standing’. Although these comments were made in 2003, the fence around the chairs was still in place in April 2005. When asked about the fence, Jane Thomas, the curator at the Memorial Museum, responded, ‘we don’t want the public running around [them] ... anyone who wants to go to the chairs is always able to, they just need to ask someone ... we just don’t want everyone there’. The restricted access to the chairs decreed by the memorial management is an example of how sites of living memory may ‘constitute a particularly intense form of sacralised space’. This ‘outdoor room’ has now become a closed space where one has to ask permission to enter. The chairs have been described as recalling ‘the names of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial’. Yet unlike at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial people cannot take rubbings of names or leave items on the chairs, unless they are family of the victims and ask permission. The conflict between the ideals of the designers and the management response illustrates how differences may occur when plans for memorial sites become a reality and have to be managed.

Difficulties are likely to occur when balancing competing interests in the management of atrocity sites. Sturken writes of the ‘intense community involvement with the memorial’ and how ‘the memorial is integrated into the community of Oklahoma City in a number of ways, including families and survivors volunteering
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However, it was evident during interviews in Oklahoma City that the relationship between families, the community and the memorial management is not quite so straightforward. Joanne Riley, the Museums Operations Director at the Oklahoma City National Memorial, maintains regular contact with many families and survivors of the bombing. When asked about the local community’s response to the memorial she said, ‘there is mixed local feeling about it … for some, it [the memory] is so horrific they don’t want to revisit the place, for others, it’s like it is in their backyard and they don’t notice’.

Although survivors and some of the local community are working at the Memorial Museum, curator Thomas said ‘locals do not visit, sometimes to the memorial, but not to the museum’. Melinda Parks, a schoolteacher at Westmoore High School in Oklahoma, did not know anyone who was killed or injured in the bombing, yet had not visited the memorial before the tenth anniversary events in 2005. Her response was that ‘the memorial is quite lovely, the grounds are beautiful [but] I’ve always avoided the site, just because I wasn’t quite ready to deal with it … I had always avoided it until I became part of the Model United Nations Schools program that is part of the anniversary.’ Parks had not been to the museum. She added ‘two cousins of mine had a good friend who died in the bombing … they will not go down to the site and they have not been to the museum.’

The comments of Parks were echoed by another member of the Oklahoma City community, Ken Thompson. In 2005 Thompson was Director of External Affairs for MIPT, providing support for families and rescue workers in other terrorist attacks including September 11. Thompson was a member of an Oklahoma City bombing victim’s family — his mother’s body was one of the last three bodies to be removed after the building was imploded on 5 May 1995. In talking with him about whether local people visited the memorial, he said ‘there are a lot of people around the State of Oklahoma who knew someone that was killed and never had the ability or desire to come here, as there are too many raw emotions, and the museum is very difficult to go through … there’s a number of survivors who were in the building and able to get out, and a number of responders who have no desire to come here, they want to move past that difficult period of their life.’
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However, Thompson also raised the issue that the reason some local families do not visit was due to their differences with the management of the memorial, including the lack of consultation with the local community on changes to the management regime. In 1997, the Oklahoma City National Memorial Trust was set up to own and operate the Memorial and Museum in partnership with the US National Park Service (NPS). This partnership was dissolved in 2004 and the Oklahoma City National Memorial Foundation was set up as an independent foundation to operate the memorial site and the museum, although it remained an affiliate of the NPS. Thompson’s concern was that the changes were made without being referred back to the task force.

These conflicts at Oklahoma City are examples of the difficulties in managing atrocity sites that become popular tourist sites, particularly in balancing the needs of survivors and tourists. The Oklahoma City bomb site, like the other case study sites, is, to use Tumarkin’s definition, a ‘traumascape’. Particularly for the families and those directly affected, the area is likely to remain a place where ‘the past is never quite over’. Thus the decisions of management about how the places and the memorials are used may result in dissonance. The issues about access to the chairs highlight the influence that any memorial management may have on the memorialisation of atrocities, including the public and private memory. At all the case study sites, heritage and museum professionals have had significant impact on the memorialisation of the atrocities. In Oklahoma City, the decisions they made concerned both deciding how the site was used, and the interpretation of the atrocity.

7.2 THE MEMORIAL MUSEUM

Memorial museums are defined as a ‘specific kind of museum dedicated to a historic event commemorating mass suffering of some kind’. Although Williams describes the growth of these museums as ‘seemingly
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Oklahoma City is the only case study site with a memorial museum. Why has a memorial museum been built at Oklahoma City, and not at the other sites? Are memorial museums another indicator of cultural differences across the case study sites, even if they have been built in many countries across the globe?

The key features of memorial museums are described as including a site integral to their identity, a clientele who have a special relationship (such as victims and survivors), the holding of significant special events (such as anniversaries), often strong political focus on issues such as human rights, and the provision of psychological support and education programs. Other criteria or situations are also important for supporting the development of a memorial museum. These include the availability of a relevant collection of material, or the funding and ability to access and develop a collection and suitable displays and exhibitions, and support from memorial management or hierarchy for the development of a museum. On these issues differences existed between Oklahoma City and the other case studies which supported the development of a memorial museum: significant amounts of material were available for inclusion in a collection, and staff and funding were available for the development of a museum. Comparable situations did not exist at Port Arthur or in Bali.

The Oklahoma City National Memorial Museum has two floors of exhibits and displays. It includes remains of damaged cars, replays of television reporting of the bombing, and some of the tributes left at the site. It is a practical example of a community, in this case the memorial management and museum curators, trying to make sense of the past through representing it in words, pictures and exhibitions. Visitors enter the museum by taking a lift to the top floor. Adjacent to an exhibition on terrorism, the first display visitors walk through is about Oklahoma City on the morning of the bombing. Visitors then proceed to a closed room containing a recording of the bomb explosion, flashing lights, and photos of all those killed. The noise, graphic images and presentations in this display are confronting. After the door opens, the next display is of artefacts and images of the bombed site (photos 19 and 20). This is followed by a gallery of photographs of those who died and includes items donated by victims’ families (photo 21).

On my first visit to the museum, I found it was too disturbing to spend more than an hour and a half there. Returning the next day to complete my tour, I queried museum staff about whether the sound of the bomb explosion...
and the accompanying flashing lights and images might be disturbing for some, particularly children. I was told that the guide who opened the room told visitors there was an alternative entrance to the rest of the museum. On the three occasions that I went through the museum I was not given the option of bypassing this section by going through a different entrance.

In 2005 the museum included, with no warning to visitors, graphic footage of the World Trade Center attack and its collapse. World Trade Center rescuers who visited the Oklahoma City memorial for anniversary activities in 2005 found this footage offensive as they were not prepared for it. Objections were also made about the images used of people falling to their deaths on September 11. These images of people at their moment of death, are, Thompson argued, ‘images that cross the line’. Thompson also said he was offended by the use of media images of families grieving, images that were taken late in the day on 19 April ‘before the media was removed from the Family Assistance Center’. He adds that to show ‘the open grieving of families without families knowing media is around is to me crossing the threshold’. Sontag has argued that although ‘harrowing photographs do not ... lose their power to shock ... they are not much help if the task is to understand. Narratives can make us understand.’

Photo 19: Damaged church window frame: Oklahoma City National Memorial Museum, April 2005

Photo 20: Displays in the Oklahoma City National Memorial Museum, April 2005
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accompanying these images, the impression given is that they are included more for the shock effect than to enhance an understanding of the impact of violence.

When asked about the images of September 11 and other images people may have found offensive or confronting, curator Thomas responded that the images were used to get messages across about violence. The graphic pictures were used to illustrate that ‘this is what violence is all about’ and that ‘violence is not okay’ and that ‘we have to make it graphic for all other people [i.e. not the survivors or families] to know what happened.’ It was about achieving one of the aims of the task force which said: ‘May all who leave here know the impact of the bombers.’ Aware that the entry to the museum through the sound and light of the bombing was agitating for some people, when asked if she would recommend this as a way to enter a similar museum, Thomas’ response was ‘I don’t know.’

Given the high death toll, the many injured and the destruction in downtown Oklahoma City, interpreting the bombing was always going to be difficult. As with other aspects of the memorial, it was likely to cause conflict with some of the families. The dissonance about interpretation of atrocity is about the conflicts of grief and healing, and families and victims feeling sensitive about the details of their suffering being presented to visitors.

Although part of a memorial, the museum could be construed by some to be presented as ‘entertainment’. Time can be a healer, but whereas some affected may distance themselves quite quickly, it may take generations for the strong emotions to dissipate. An example of the differing engagement

Photo 21: The photo gallery of victims: Oklahoma City Memorial Museum, April 2005

Author interview with Jane Thomas.
of families with the museum is that not all families were willing to provide objects to accompany the victims’ photo gallery. Considering the layout of the museum, it is not surprising that local community members do not visit, as they have no options on the path to take through the museum.

With such a difficult and sensitive topic to explore, it may have been appropriate to design a space where visitors could explore just some displays without having to go through all the exhibitions. This is not possible with the current layout. The museum is laid out as a narrative museum, where visitors follow a specific direction. They cannot backtrack or choose their own way through the museum.\textsuperscript{316} Museum scholars have analysed the problems of museums organised in this way. They not only have to be viewed in a particular sequence, but also at a particular pace.\textsuperscript{317} They also only allow for the views of the curator and the institution to be depicted.\textsuperscript{318} A narrative path not only restricts visitors independently exploring the museums, it also limits the opportunities for interactive spaces for visitors in them.\textsuperscript{319} Yet this museum layout is not uncommon for the depiction of atrocities. The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington DC is also arranged on a narrative path.\textsuperscript{320}

The Oklahoma City Memorial Museum curators met with the Holocaust Memorial Museum curators when the Oklahoma City museum was being planned.\textsuperscript{321} The Oklahoma City Museum imitates the Holocaust Memorial Museum in other ways. At Oklahoma, the display cases of the collection of objects — keys left behind, damaged phones, caps of rescue workers — imitate the display cases of shoes and other objects in the Holocaust Memorial Museum. The difference between the two museums is that the one in Oklahoma City is onsite and was developed a short time after the atrocity, whereas the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington DC is distant from the site of the atrocities of the Second World War in Europe. Many of the people who were directly affected by the Oklahoma City bombing still live in the area. For these reasons, flexibility with direction and interaction with the museum exhibitions may have been more appropriate.

The section that resonated most with me at the Oklahoma City National Memorial Museum was not the noise of the blast, or even the sad footage of
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funerals and families' grief. Rather, it was the sections of damaged buildings and offices and the familiar objects of desks and office furniture crushed and damaged (photo 22), juxtaposed with the view out of the window of the memorial outside with the backdrop of Oklahoma City. As I work in an office, the crushed desk and office was more relevant to me. It brought home to me the reality of what survivor Janet Beck had gone through when she described crawling over furniture in the darkness to escape. If I had been able to explore this part of the museum first, I may have then gone back and spent time at the other exhibitions. Narrative museums make it difficult to retrace one's steps, to go back and explore sections with which one may want to re-engage. By following a narrative, museums are limiting their educational role and the opportunity to educate the public is lost, if visitors do not get the message or engage with the exhibits on their first walk through.

Although the exhibitions at the Oklahoma City Memorial Museum are organised on a narrative path, one exhibition is separated from the main displays through its spatial arrangement. On a separate ‘corridor’ on the first floor of the museum is a display on the trial of McVeigh and the other perpetrators (photo 23). Oklahoma City is the only case study site where details of the trial and State execution of one of perpetrators is included in an onsite museum. This is another part of the museum that has caused conflict with the local community. Not all members wanted a display or reference to the perpetrators as part of the memorial. The display with a photo of McVeigh and the date of his execution — 14 June 2001 — is on the floor below the exhibition on the perpetrators’ trial (photo 24). Ironically, the exhibitions on either side of the information on McVeigh are entitled ‘Remembrance and rebuilding’ and ‘Hope’. The information on McVeigh is titled ‘Justice’ and is directly opposite the display of some of the damaged parts of the building, and the window looking out to the memorial site, a link and reminder of the damage caused by the bombing.

Author interview with Janet Beck.

Linthal, The Unfinished Bombing: Oklahoma City in American Memory. p. 240
When I first read that information on McVeigh’s trial and the date of his death were included in the memorial, my response was that this information would change the tenor of the memorial — no longer would it be just a memorial to victims and the survivors. The memorial would also be part of a narrative about the bomber, American society and how this society responded to three of their citizens combining to cause the death of so many in Oklahoma City. Visiting the memorial museum in 2005 confirmed these responses.

Acceptance of the death penalty and guns has been described as part of the American cultural identity. In April 2010, the death penalty was authorised in legislation in 37 states across the USA, the Federal Government and the US Military. The state of Oklahoma has one of the highest rates of executions for the death penalty in the USA. Yet, as Linenthal described, not all Oklahomans support the death penalty. The responses of families to McVeigh’s sentence were mixed. Bud Welch, who lost his daughter in the
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bombing, not only became a passionate opponent of the death penalty but ‘in a powerful act of reconciliation’, met McVeigh’s father and sister.328

In all three case study countries legislation was enacted in response to the atrocities, thereby providing another issue for comparison. After the Oklahoma City bombing in the USA, State and Federal governments passed legislation to restrict the rights of convicted death row inmates and to increase victims’ rights. An Act popularly known as the Victims’ Bill of Rights was also passed in 1997 to give victims ‘the right to both observe trials and to offer impact testimony’.329 After lobbying by victims’ family members, reforms of the habeas corpus provisions were signed into law in 1997 which restricted the rights of death row inmates to appeal their sentences.330 One of the arguments presented for McVeigh’s sentence to be speedily carried out is that once he was executed he would no longer be the focus of media attention.331 Yet attention is still focused on McVeigh with the display on him and the other perpetrators at the Memorial Museum.

The exhibition on the trials and execution has been assessed as being a missed opportunity, as it avoids discussing why right-wing militias — the type of group that McVeigh and his accomplices were associated with — exist and what their existence suggests about American culture.332 If the museum designers really wanted to challenge visitors it could mount an exhibition of the differing responses to, and impact of, the death penalty and how other countries sentence their criminals who are convicted of mass murder.

The exhibition on the trial of the perpetrators and the death of McVeigh is in marked contrast to the response to the perpetrators at Port Arthur and Bali. At Port Arthur, the gunman’s name is not used on any signage or publications and no reference is made to his sentence. No references are made to the Bali bombers at the memorials in Bali and Australia. The inclusion of the exhibition on the perpetrators in the Oklahoma memorial museum highlights a differing cultural response to perpetrators.

How can the ‘success’ of a memorial museum be gauged? Is it through visitor numbers? Whereas association with a particular group such as victims or survivors has been described as a feature of these museums,333 this is not the case in Oklahoma City. Although the situation may be different in
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2010, in 2005 museum staff said that the local community did not visit the memorial museum.\textsuperscript{334} The entry fee, in 2010, of US$10, may also deter some visitors.\textsuperscript{335} By 2008, although 4.4 million people had visited the Outdoor Symbolic Memorial, just 1.6 million had visited the Memorial Museum.\textsuperscript{336} With this number of visitors, the museum has become part of, and contributed to, the history and memory of the bombing. As it still remains the only memorial museum at the case study sites, it does indicate that this is one of the American cultural responses to atrocities, and memorialisation. What other aspects of the memorial in Oklahoma City are representative of American culture?

7.3 THE MEMORIAL STORE

The Oklahoma City National Memorial is the only case study site with a memorial store (photo 25). This store has been described by Sturken as being part of the ‘elaborate consumer networks of mass-produced goods [that] ... exist in American culture around events of national trauma’.\textsuperscript{337} In other words, in the USA commodification has been a cultural norm. Memorialisation of atrocities interlinked with consumerism remains a feature of American culture. The Memorial Store is located in the foyer of the Memorial Museum. After entering or leaving the building, one can buy books, postcards, teddy bears, books for children and other souvenirs including snow domes and key rings. Although T-shirts were available after the bombings in Bali, at Port Arthur the store only sells two books on the massacre.

\textbf{Photo 25: Memorial Store, Oklahoma City National Memorial Museum, April 2005}
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The only comparable response in Australia is the shop at the Australian War Memorial in Canberra, which sells a wide range of books and souvenirs broadly related to Australia's engagement in war. In the early twenty-first century a wide range of souvenirs relating to an atrocity is still only a feature of memorialisation in the USA, not in Australia or in Bali.

7.4 THE MEMORIAL INSTITUTE FOR THE PREVENTION OF TERRORISM

The remembrance at Oklahoma City extends beyond the memorial and the museum. Another feature unique to Oklahoma City is the Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism (MIPT), a research foundation involved in outreach work across the world with communities that have been subjected to terrorist attacks. This institute was established following the mission statement of the Memorial Task Force, which stated that a ‘living memorial’ should be set up, run by people and for people. It should undertake research and provide support to others affected by atrocities.\(^{338}\)

The MIPT was the result. The institute has set up a database on equipment, training and procedures for responding to terrorism.\(^{339}\) It has also produced the publication *Oklahoma City, Seven Years Later: Lessons for Other Communities*.\(^{340}\)

Dissonance at atrocity sites may result if differing groups using the sites do not have a shared understanding of how each group operates, and remembers the victims. Although similar to the Oklahoma City Memorial and Museum, the MIPT was set up on the recommendations of the Memorial Task Force. The relationship between MIPT and the other memorial bodies remains strained. The MIPT is actually physically located in the same building as the Memorial Museum at the opposite end of the Journal Record Building. Yet there is little contact between the two organisations. In 2005 an MIPT Director indicated that the Memorial Museum did not use MIPT research facilities or consult with MIPT staff about exhibitions.\(^{341}\) Part of the reason given by Thompson for this lack of cooperation was that MIPT was funded separately by the Federal Government Department of Homeland Security. He suggested that ‘we’re [MIPT] probably better known in Washington than Oklahoma City\(^{342}\) due to its research on terrorism for the national
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government. The lack of engagement between the MIPT and the Memorial and Museum suggest that the MIPT may not be accepted as an integral part of the bombing memorialisation. The relationship is another indicator of the complexity of memorialisation, and that dissonance or contestation can be about relations between organisations as well as being between families, victims and memorial management. The MIPT is another indicator of cultural differences in memorialisation. No terrorism research institutes were established in Australia, or in Bali, Indonesia, after the atrocities at those sites.

8. Tourism at the Oklahoma City National Memorial

One of the shared features across the three case study sites is tourism. Is the Oklahoma City National Memorial just another ‘dark tourist’ site? The memorial complex meets all the criteria: it is commercial, with facilities provided for visitors, an education element and a retail outlet.\(^{343}\) Yet the motives of some of the visitors would be varied. For families and friends it would be a site of mourning and remembrance; other visitors are likely to want to pay homage to those who died;\(^ {344}\) and some visitors would have a curiosity about the site encouraged through ready access to information through the media and the internet.\(^ {345}\)

The Oklahoma City National Memorial is the only case study site where the memorial at the atrocity site and the anniversary activities are actively promoted as tourist attractions.\(^ {346}\) Kari Watkins, the Oklahoma City National Memorial Executive Director, acknowledged that ‘the Memorial … has been a strong catalyst for the renewal of downtown Oklahoma City’.\(^ {347}\) The number of visitors to the memorial has continued to increase since it opened. Between the dedication of the memorial on 19 April 2000 and the end of September 2000, approximately 340,000 people visited the memorial.\(^ {348}\) By 2005 the memorial had received more than 2 million visitors.\(^ {349}\) The total number of visitors by 2008 was more than 4.4 million. These visitors came from
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all 50 states of the USA and 26 different countries. The growth in the number of visitors to the memorial has resulted in increases in employment, income for the businesses in the downtown area, and in tourism to the State of Oklahoma. This promotion of the memorial as a tourist attraction designates the focus on tourism as yet another indicator of cultural differences across the case studies. Although tourists do visit the memorials at Port Arthur and Bali, only in the USA is the case study memorial promoted, and managed, as a tourist attraction.

With increasing visitor numbers and focus on the operations of the memorial as a tourist site, could tourism be one of the reasons why some of those affected and local residents do not feel comfortable visiting the site? In speaking on behalf of the survivors at the tenth anniversary memorial church service, local resident Ernestine Clark talked of the friendships she had made and the support from others who had been injured or lost family members, and remarked how they preferred being at the memorial site ‘late at night, when it was deserted, quiet, and there were no visitors to observe us in our sometimes fragile moments’. Clarke articulates one of the challenges faced by managers of atrocity sites — the need to balance the interests of tourists with those wanting to visit the sites to grieve. At Oklahoma City, the income from tourists helps fund the ongoing operation of the site. We may ask, has reliance on this income encouraged the very public ceremonies that are organised on the anniversary of the bombing each year?

9. Remembering each year: anniversaries

Does the official marking of anniversary services each year also designate a cultural difference in memorialisation? The marking of anniversaries can have both positive and negative effects. It can provide an opportunity for shared mourning and remembering, and yet also bring back painful memories. At Oklahoma City, with events organised annually, the focus is on the positive aspects, the shared remembering.
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The Oklahoma City National Memorial organises a service each year on 19 April. Although the content of the services varies, two events, 168 seconds of silence and the reading of victims’ names are always included. A week of activities was held for the tenth anniversary in April 2005. The organised activities seemed both connected and disconnected with the atrocity; the focus of the anniversary events was not just remembrance. The activities linked the event with other atrocities and events that would bring large numbers of people to Oklahoma City. Beginning with a concert and candlelight ceremony at the memorial, other events included church services, a forum with journalists, a public lecture by Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel, lunches and dinners for families, survivors and rescuers, and a memorial marathon. For the tenth anniversary, each of the street banners for the marathon was dedicated to a bombing victim (photo 26).

At the same anniversary, the Reflections of Hope Award was established by the memorial management. It is now awarded annually, for a person or group whose work has been of major benefit to a community or country. Recipients include two women from Afghanistan who founded a radio station, and an organisation that brings together Israeli, Palestinian and Egyptian teenagers. The other event, held each anniversary, is the Model United Nations Security Council, where students from up to 20 high schools across the State of Oklahoma come together to discuss current world events. The memorialisation is therefore not now just for those who died or survived, it links events and people around the world.

Oklahoma City focuses more on the remembrance of anniversaries than do the other case study sites. In 2006, the eleventh anniversary, the ceremony lasted for about an hour and included reading of the Memorial Mission Statement, an invocation, and music.
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including the National Anthem.\textsuperscript{358} In 2008, the anniversary events included addresses by the former Mayor of Oklahoma City and New York City. It also included the Model United Nations Security Council and the Reflections of Hope Award.\textsuperscript{359} On the fifteen anniversary in 2010, fifteen events including tree planting, activities for schools and the annual memorial marathon marked the occasion.\textsuperscript{360} These anniversary activities contribute to the public and collective memory of Oklahoma City; it has become not just the site of the bombing and the site of the memorial, but also the site of events held on each anniversary.

Some of the memorialisation practices at Oklahoma City have been repeated at the other case study sites. Common features extend beyond tourism, to the establishment of memorial foundations. These foundations either support the education of children, as in Oklahoma City and Bali, or support children who have been victims of violence, as at Port Arthur. In Oklahoma City a scholarship fund was set up for the children of the bombing victims. Established by community leaders after the bombing to cover education costs for young children up to and including college students,\textsuperscript{361} the fund received millions of dollars in donations from across the world.

10. \textbf{Summing up}

The site of the Oklahoma City bombing is more than a traumascape. It has become part of the American memorial landscape of the late twentieth century and early twenty-first centuries. After September 11, both the memorial and the process for planning the memorial in Oklahoma City were referred to as providing guidance as to how a community could respond to a major atrocity.

The Oklahoma City bombing is significant in that it was the first time that the internet became part of the response to, and the memorialisation of, an atrocity. Through the internet, the public history and memory of an event


\textsuperscript{361} Oklahoma City National Memorial, \textit{Press Release: 15 Projects for the 15th Anniversary of the OKC Bombing}. 
developed almost in real time, rather than in weeks, months or years. This in turn influenced the timing of memorials, which were built more readily after atrocities.

Of the three case study sites, the memorial at Oklahoma City has a number of unique features. It is the only one of the three memorials where there is a sculptured tribute to each victim; and names inscribed on each of the 168 chairs. It is the only site with a memorial museum, a research institute, and where detailed information is available on the perpetrators, their trial and sentences, including the death penalty for the main perpetrator. It is the only site where tributes are systematically collected; incorporated in the museum’s collection and used in outreach programs for schools. Only Oklahoma City has a memorial store, with books and souvenirs also available online. It is the only site with interactive space for children, and where adults are provided with space in the museum to add comments, which are collected. With all these features it defines the popularity of memorialisation in the USA in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

Some of the responses to the Oklahoma City bombing have been replayed, if not at Port Arthur, then on Bali, particularly the extensive media coverage and the use of the internet. In the next chapter, I explore the memorialisation of the Port Arthur massacre, which happened just 12 months after the Oklahoma City bombing, and had a devastating impact on a small community in Tasmania, Australia on the other side of the world to Oklahoma City.
Chapter 4: Contested tragedy: remembering the 1996 massacre at the Port Arthur Historic Site

On 28 and 29 April 1996, 35 people were killed and 19 people were wounded by a single gunman, Martin Bryant, in and around Port Arthur Historic Site in Tasmania, Australia. Bryant was arrested nearby on 29 April 1996. On 22 November 1996 he was sentenced to life imprisonment on each of 35 charges of murder. Bryant remains in Risdon Prison near Hobart, Tasmania.

1. Introduction

In this chapter, I examine the memorialisation of the 1996 massacre at Port Arthur Historic Site, Tasmania, Australia. I consider the similarities and differences between how the governments and communities at Oklahoma City and Port Arthur responded to their losses in the services held, the development of the memorials, the interpretation of the atrocities and
the marking of anniversaries. Whereas the remembrance at Oklahoma City was described as being an example of the ‘democratisation of memorialization’, in contrast I argue that the interplay of private, public and official responses at Port Arthur Historic Site was an example of contestation and memorialisation. It was, to use Sturken’s phrase, a place where public commemoration was both history-making and a contested form of remembrance.\textsuperscript{362} As I illustrate, this contestation began with debates about the linking of the massacre to the convict history of the site and continued with conflicts about the on-site memorialisation. However, I conclude, the differences were resolved and the whole of Port Arthur Historic Site today could be described as a memorial to the massacre victims.

2. **How media and writers responded to the massacre**

One of differences between the Oklahoma City bombing and the Port Arthur massacre was how the atrocities were reported and analysed. Whereas following the Oklahoma City bombing media focus was on the victims and the likely perpetrators, after the Port Arthur massacre many of the media wrote about a possible link between the massacre and the penal history of Port Arthur. This difference in media coverage and later scholarly analysis of these two atrocities was the result of differences in history and memory.

Photo 28: The Penitentiary and the Memorial Garden, May 2006
of the sites rather than cultural differences. Whereas the Oklahoma City bombing happened at a government building, the massacre at Port Arthur was at one of Australia’s most significant convict heritage sites and popular tourist destinations. This location influenced how the media and other writers responded to the massacre.

Many of the media and other writers evoked Tumarkin’s later analysis of Port Arthur as a traumascape, a place where ‘the past in never quite over’. Given the dominance of convict-era buildings and the tourism focus on these buildings, it would be difficult to ignore the site’s penal history when writing about the massacre. However it was not just references to the site’s convict history that caused conflict, it was how that history was described. Using headlines for example as ‘Place evil calls home’ and ‘Where misery still dwells’, the media reminded readers of the unsavory elements of Port Arthur’s convict history, which many in the local community regarded as inappropriate. It was not only journalists who linked the massacre to the convict history of the site. Australian scholar Richard Nile evocatively wrote, ‘the empty shell of the Broad Arrow was like a mirror image of the sandstone Penitentiary [photo 28] on the other side of the harbour, both stark, empty reminders of the horror that happened within’. The dominance of the convict buildings also had an impact on Frow, who evoked Nora in describing the site before the massacre as already ‘a memorial … to use Nora’s expression, already a Lieux de memoire, a place of memory’. The massacre added another layer of memory to the complex history of the site.

The complex history of Port Arthur was alluded to by Tasmanian writers who objected to writers not only linking the massacre to Port Arthur’s convict history but ignoring the longer history of the site. Activist Rodney Croome and scholar Peter Hay objected to journalists referring to the massacre as Tasmania ‘losing its innocence, as this ignored the nineteenth century massacre of Tasmanian Aboriginals’. Furthermore, Hay argued, Port Arthur may be sombre at times but there was no way the place could be described as ‘atavistically evil’. Similarly, responses such as those of Bird, who maintained that ‘there is a poetic and thematic link between the events
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of 1996 and the events of last century', and Simpson, who concluded that ‘Port Arthur has never been a place of laughter’ [Simpson's italics], reinforced the misguided perceptions of Port Arthur’s penal history, based on a fictional, yet albeit still popular account of Port Arthur as a penal colony. First published in 1874, and still in print, Marcus Clarke’s *For the Term of His Natural Life* was a popular source during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries on life in the penal colony at Port Arthur. It had a major influence on the development of tourism at Port Arthur, and has contributed to public awareness of the convict life. Yet as Brand and Scott have analysed, Clarke’s book is based on imagination rather than fact. Although Port Arthur has been on very separate occasions, in two different centuries, the site of violence and trauma, in between it was a township, a community centre and still is an ongoing heritage site. The conflict over the response to the massacre demonstrated the place Port Arthur holds in the history and memory of many people who worked at, or have connections to, the site.

A personal connection with Port Arthur is a continuing thread in responses to the Port Arthur massacre. For writers such as Croome, Scott and Hay, it was a place of memory, a place where they worked and visited, a popular tourist and heritage site. The late Margaret Scott, who at the time of the massacre lived near Port Arthur, described and analysed the massacre in the context of the broad history of the area in *Port Arthur: a story of strength and courage*, published just 12 months after the massacre. Her detailed
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description of Port Arthur on the day of the massacre, the treatment of
the injured and later the arrest of Bryant, had an added poignancy, as it
was interspersed with quotations from people who were at the site that
day working — people she knew from living on the Tasman Peninsula.
They included Ian Kingston, a manager at the site who described how ‘the
destruction of bodies was unbelievable … How many were dead, how many
were lying down, I didn’t know. I had time to think I was going to die … to
think … that my children would lose their father.’ These recollections are
now part of the ‘collective remembrance’ of the massacre.

Following her conclusion that the compassion and courage of the close-knit
community helped those affected overcome the effects of the massacre,
Scott raised some evocative questions, suggesting that the response to
the massacre should include a re-assessment of the convict history of Port
Arthur and acknowledgement that both convicts and those who managed
Port Arthur were human, as was Martin Bryant. In the early twenty-first
century two Tasmanian scholars have presented the convicts and their
contributions to Tasmanian life in a more positive framework. These works
may be indirect and unintended responses to Scott’s analysis, but both have
reassessed the role of convicts in nineteenth-century and later Tasmanian
history.

Other writers with personal connections to Port Arthur Historic Site and
Tasmania have contributed to the collective memory of the massacre.
Lindsay Simpson had met three of the victims, Nanette Mikac and her
children, while conducting writing workshops at Port Arthur. Simpson wrote
of her dilemmas when asked by a newspaper to interview Walter Mikac
the day after Bryant had killed his wife and children at Port Arthur. She
interviewed Mikac and later co-authored his story with him as a tribute to
his wife and children. It is a sad and moving story, of the family he lost, and
how he survived, and his links with families whose children had been killed
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by a gunman in Dunblane in Scotland. The Mayor and parents of Dunblane contacted Port Arthur immediately after the massacre and Mikac wrote how their compassion and later meeting them helped him. These references to Dunblane provide an international dimension to the response to the massacre.

Although having no direct personal connection to Port Arthur, journalist Carol Altmann lived in Tasmania for three years around the time of the massacre, and therefore had an awareness of the effect of the massacre on the broader Tasmanian community. She published interviews with victims and families to coincide with the tenth anniversary of the massacre. Similar to Scott, Altmann concluded that the strength and bonds of the local community supported both the individuals’ and community’s recovery. Altmann made a significant contribution to the history of the memorialisation at Port Arthur through publication of the details of the moving of the Huon Pine Cross. This interview was also published in a popular Australian women’s magazine. As with Scott’s work, Altmann has contributed to the collective memory of the impact of the massacre on the local community.

Following visits and interviews with Port Arthur staff, scholar Carolyn Strange provided a considered analysis of the memorialisation of the massacre in the context of the history and management of the site, and of the debates over gun control legislation. In reinforcing the impact that site and heritage managers may have on the memorialisation of an atrocity, Strange reminded us that ‘events do not “make” history: decisions about what and how to remember, and public reactions to those decisions do.’ Both Scott and Strange highlight that differences between the site management and the local Tasman Peninsula community over such issues as access to the site was a feature of the history of Port Arthur. Strange concludes, quite accurately, that the complex history of the site made it inevitable that the memorialisation of the massacre would be part of the contested history and memory of the site. However, as I later discuss, the site management and the local community did eventually resolve their differences and reached agreement on the memorial at the site, and arrangements for anniversaries. An unexpected outcome of the massacre was increasing contact between
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the management of Port Arthur Historic Site, the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority (PAHSMA) and the local community, and PAHSMA accepting the recommendation of the local community that the remains of the Broad Arrow Café be kept and incorporated in the memorial. It highlighted that memorialisation can be about agreement, as well as differences.

The responses of media and other writers to the Port Arthur massacre has provided the background for my analysis of the memorialisation of the massacre. Although the initial response of media and other writers was to consider the massacre in the context of the convict history of the site, I follow Scott in arguing that the massacre and remembrance of the victims should be considered in the context of the broader history of the site. The massacre is part of the twentieth century history of Port Arthur Historic Site, separated by time though not location from the convict history.

The shared grieving of Port Arthur staff, management and the local community began at the massacre site, and continued with the memorial services. In contrast to the Oklahoma City bombing, within days of the Port Arthur massacre all the victims had been identified; no lengthy rescue or recovery was required. The first services were held in Hobart, the capital city of Tasmania, just over an hour’s drive from Port Arthur Historic Site.

3. **The services and the first memorial**

As with Oklahoma City, the official memorialisation of the Port Arthur victims began with services. Whereas the first services at Oklahoma City were held on site, the Port Arthur victims were remembered in church services in Hobart, just three days after the massacre. On 1 May 1996, at St David’s Cathedral in Hobart, victims’ families were joined by the Governor-General Sir William Deane and politicians including the Prime Minister of Australia, John Howard, the Premier of Tasmania, Tony Rundle, and thousands of Tasmanians who gathered inside and outside the church. The combination of politicians and families resulted in a service where ‘private grief [was] overlaid by national mourning.’ As the church bells tolled 35 times, families laid single red roses on the altar. A minute’s silence, as a mark of respect for the victims, was observed around Australia at 10:30 am. On the same day, memorial services were held in Melbourne and Sydney. The media reported
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how Sydney ‘came to a standstill’, trams stopped running in Melbourne, and the Australian stock markets stopped trading.  

Memorial services continued in the following days and weeks. On 3 May 1996, a service was held in the shell of the roofless convict-built church at Port Arthur Historic Site, led by a local church Minister. Three weeks later, on Sunday 19 May 1996, thousands of people attended a second service at Port Arthur to mark the official re-opening of the site to tourists. Thirty-five white doves were released at the end of the service. On 14 July, cleansing services at Port Arthur were led by Buddhist, Hindu and Muslim clergy. These services were held not only to farewell the dead, but as a Hindu representative said, ‘the ceremonies would restore to the site spiritual health … so people of the faiths could return without fear of evil’. These public ceremonies have become part of the collective memory of the massacre. Holding services at the atrocity site and other locations, and by organisations with differing spiritual beliefs, was also to be a feature of the remembrance of the Bali bombings.

The memorialisation of the Port Arthur victims was not just through services and structures; in the weeks after the massacre a memorial of a different kind was developed. It was an example of Young’s description that memorials can also be intangible responses. Two days after the massacre Prime Minister John Howard vowed ‘to do everything humanly possible to achieve tougher and uniform gun laws.’ On 10 May 1996 the Australian State and Territory government ministers agreed to a national ban for the regulation of firearms, which became known as the National Firearms Agreement. Under this agreement high-powered automatic and semi-automatic weapons were banned in Australia, and national registration of firearms was introduced. This agreement between the Australian and State and Territory governments for legislation on gun control was described by The Age newspaper ‘as historic … and a memorial to all those who died so tragically in Port Arthur less than two weeks ago’.
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subsequently enacted in September 1996 for a levy for all taxpayers to fund a gun buyback scheme.\(^{397}\) Lively public debate both for and against this legislation continued in the media for months afterwards.\(^{398}\) Those who objected most stridently to the legislation were farming groups and recreational shooters; however as Australian and State government political leaders were determined to enact and enforce this legislation, all objections were overruled. No precedent existed in Australia for such legislation.

In detailing the legislation and the ensuing debate, Chapman maintains that although the massacre was the catalyst for agreement on gun reform, the years of advocacy by supporters for gun reform contributed to the ready acceptance of this legislation by all the Australian governments.\(^{399}\) International precedents also existed for reform of a country’s gun laws after mass shootings. In the 1980s and 1990s the governments of the USA, Canada and the UK introduced restrictions on ownership of semi-automatic rifles after mass killings by guns. Canada introduced compulsory registration of firearms, and following the Dunblane massacre, the British Government banned private ownership of handguns.\(^{400}\) However, it was only the Australian Government that introduced a compulsory gun buyback scheme. Following other shooting incidents, the Australian Government developed an agreement on firearms trafficking in 2002, and further legislation for a handgun buyback scheme in 2003.\(^{401}\) These legislation changes have had a significant impact on gun-related deaths. Since the National Firearms Agreement, there has been a drop in firearm suicides in Australia by 80 per cent, and a likely similar decrease in firearm homicides.\(^{402}\) This ‘intangible’ memorial in the form of legislation continues to be a unique Australian memorial to the massacre victims.

Debates about this gun legislation continued in the media for months afterwards, as many people objected to the changes. Part of the social significance of the Port Arthur massacre in Australia is now the association with restrictions on gun ownership and gun buyback schemes.\(^{403}\) Differences
between Oklahoma City and Port Arthur in the types of legislation passed because of the atrocities, were not the only indicators of political and cultural differences across the two nations. Differences existed in the processes for the planning of the memorials. Reasons for these differences included the size of the towns where the atrocities occurred and the operation of Port Arthur Historic Site as a significant heritage tourist site.

4. The impact of tourism on memorialisation at Port Arthur Historic Site

Whereas the Oklahoma City National Memorial became a popular site with tourists after it opened, Port Arthur was already a tourist site before the massacre. The heritage and tourism of Port Arthur had a significant impact on the timing of the memorial at Port Arthur. Developing the memorial site was intended to restore the area so tourists would feel comfortable about returning. My former colleague, Greg Jackman, echoed what I remember when he said, ‘there was such enormous pressure to do something, as a gesture of progress so we couldn’t have … built a memorial at a more leisurely pace’.404 Whereas in Oklahoma City the focus for the development of the memorial was remembrance for lives lost, at Port Arthur the memorialisation was also about managing the area so it could be integrated in some way with the tourist operations that focussed on the convict history of the site.

Photo 29: Tourists and the churches at Port Arthur Historic Site, May 2005

404 Author interview with Greg Jackman, Manager, Archaeology, Port Arthur Historic Site, Port Arthur, 8 May 2006.
The first tourists visited Port Arthur while it was still a penal colony. After the penal settlement closed in 1877, tours were organised from Hobart, buildings converted to hotels and museums opened.\footnote{David Young, *Making Crime Pay: The Evolution of Convict Tourism in Tasmania* (Hobart: Tasmanian Historical Research Association, 1996), pp. 12–18} From the late nineteenth century, the Tasmanian Government supported tourism at the site, with the tourists bringing much needed revenue to the state.\footnote{Ibid., p.32} The popularity of the site with tourists continued through the twentieth century. By 1995 tourism contributed approximately 10 per cent to the state’s Gross State Product. Across the state, by 1995 nearly 19,000 people were working in tourism.\footnote{Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Tasmanian Year Book 2000*, 27th Edition ed. (Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, 1999).}

The maxim that acts of violence have a crippling effect on tourist numbers, and hence the local and state economies,\footnote{Williams, *Memorial Museums: The Global Rush to Commemorate Atrocities*, p. 142} was evident. Before the massacre, tourism in Tasmania had been increasing at an annual rate of about 6 per cent a year; this rate decreased to 4 per cent by late 1996.\footnote{Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Tasmanian Year Book 1998*, 26th Edition ed. (Canberra Commonwealth of Australia, 1997), pp. 189–191} Although Tumarkin wrote ‘in the wake of the 1996 tragedy no one believed [Port Arthur] could go back to being a tourist site’,\footnote{Tumarkin, *Traumascapes*, p.47} in fact the local community wanted and needed the tourists to return to the site. Scott wrote of the dependence of the local community on Port Arthur both for employment and as the main drawcard for other businesses on the peninsula. In doing so she acknowledged that it was hardly surprising that staff requested that activities such as ghost tours be resumed, as many of the locals depended on these tours for income that could not be earned elsewhere.\footnote{Margaret Scott, ‘Towards a Fresh Apprehension of Past and Present,’ *Island magazine*, no. 67 (1996).}

Similarities and differences existed in the motives for tourists visiting Oklahoma City and Port Arthur. At both these sites there may have been elements of curiosity and horror, but also empathy,\footnote{Ashworth and Hartmann, eds., *Horror and Human Tragedy Revisited: The Management of Sites of Atrocity for Tourism*, pp. 7–9} and the desire to pay homage to the victims.\footnote{Tunbridge and Ashworth, *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*, p. 94} The motives for tourists visiting Port Arthur after the massacre would have been more complex. A distinctive motivation at Port Arthur after the massacre was that a large percentage of tourists went to the place with no desire to engage with the massacre site: they went to
visit the convict heritage site (photo 29). Informal discussions with guides suggested that from the time of the massacre until the present (2010) the majority of visitors go to Port Arthur Historic Site to explore the convict heritage of the area. This in turn affected the planning for the memorial, which was about ensuring that remembrance of the massacre victims would not dominate, or impinge on, the convict history of the site.

Tourism, and the memorialisation of the massacre, was also to have an impact on the landscape of Port Arthur Historic Site. At the time of the massacre, the area around the Broad Arrow Café was central to the provision of services for visitors to the site, including the ticket office, catering and departure point for guided tours of the site, Map 6. Following the massacre, and with financial support from the Australian Government, a new Visitor Centre and carpark were built away from the Broad Arrow Café, which became the site of the Memorial Garden, Map 7. Although planning for improved visitor facilities had begun prior to the massacre, the planning for the memorial increased the pressure to have these works developed and completed. The provision of facilities for visitors contributed to the conflicts that arose on developing the memorial.

5. Planning for the memorial at Port Arthur Historic Site

Despite the differences in size of the two communities, similar to the Oklahoma City Memorial, many of those affected and the local community became involved in planning for the memorial at Port Arthur. The development of the memorial at Port Arthur could be described as the ‘democratisation of memorialisation’, but on a much smaller scale. The differences in the planning for the memorials did not so much reflect different cultures of memorialisation, but different geographical and social situations.

In contrast to Oklahoma City, where a large memorial task force was set up, at Port Arthur the local community initially established a small committee to discuss a memorial. In the small township of Nubeena, not far from Port Arthur, recovery meetings were held each week after the massacre, open to anyone on the Tasman Peninsula or Hobart, including State Emergency Service and ambulance workers. At one of these meetings it was decided to form a committee to discuss a memorial. The first formal meeting of the memorial committee was held on 26 June 1996. The then local doctor, Dr Pam Fenerty, said the local members were ‘self-selected’. The Mayor of the Tasman Council, Neil Noye, members of the Tasmanian Government
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Premier’s Department and Port Arthur site staff were invited to join also, bringing the membership to about 15. Fenerty chaired the committee, until Mr Ray Groom, Tasmanian Government Minister for Tourism, took over. In July 1996, on behalf of the committee, Pam Fenerty (as Pam Ireland) wrote to all the victims’ families saying ‘on the Tasman Peninsula a group of us has got together to form a committee to consider ideas for a memorial for the victims. We … are keen to hear the ideas of victims’ relatives and friends.’ The committee advertised in the local and interstate newspapers for submissions on the memorial. They received nearly 200 replies.

The early discussions of the memorial committee were not always easy. Tasman Councillor and memorial committee member, Joan Fazackerly, said ‘it was hard going at first, working with relatives and staff, a lot of who were hurting bad … and you had to be careful you didn’t offend those who were hurting the most.’ It was not only that people may have been passionate and engaged, but that as many of them had lost friends or been injured in the massacre, it was an emotional, engaging process. Despite the formation of the memorial committee in 1996, and consultation with family members, the deliberations of the committee then stalled, largely due to differences over what to do with the remains of the Broad Arrow Café.

The development of the memorial at Port Arthur was an example of how public commemoration can be contested. In March 1997, it was acknowledged in internal correspondence at Port Arthur Historic Site that the design of the memorial had stalled over the issue of whether any remains of the Broad Arrow Café would be kept. Pam Fenerty related how there was ‘always friction between the site and the locals,’ particularly about what to do with the remains of the Broad Arrow Café. A contributing factor to the delays in agreement about a memorial around the café were other disputes being played out in the media about the management of Port Arthur Historic Site.

Contestation around Port Arthur included public criticism in the media of the response of the Port Arthur management to the massacre. Both the
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Chief Executive Officer, Michael Mazengarb, and the General Manager of the PAHSMA Board, Craig Coombs, subsequently resigned in June 1996. The Tasmanian Government then set up an inquiry into, among other matters, ‘problems between the community and Port Arthur Historic Site’ and the long-term financial operation of the site. The report from this inquiry — the Doyle Report — was released in June 1997. Following the recommendations of the Doyle Report, a new Board was appointed which included members with heritage management skills. At the same time the Heritage Advisory Panel was created to provide professional heritage management advice to PAHSMA and the Board, and significant changes were made to the financial operations of Port Arthur Historic Site. It was recognised that tourism would not generate sufficient income for the conservation and management of the convict heritage, so Port Arthur Historic Site would be exempted from maximising financial returns under the Government Business Enterprise Act. This changing of the Port Arthur Board, an inquiry into the operation of the Board and the appointment of a heritage advisory board, not only highlighted the ongoing conflicts after the massacre, but signaled another difference in the aftermath of the atrocities between Oklahoma City and Port Arthur Historic Site. Internal and external disputes have not been documented as part of the memorialisation of the Oklahoma City bombing, whereas at Port Arthur these disputes, the government inquiry and reports are part of the Tasmanian collective memory of the massacre and the aftermath. However, the local community and PAHSMA did eventually reach agreement on a memorial to the atrocity victims.

During these government inquiries planning continued for the memorial. In contrast to Oklahoma City, where a competition was held to select a memorial design, in December 1996 the Port Arthur memorial committee agreed that Tasmanian designers be asked to submit proposals. This suggestion was made by Premier Ray Groom, Chair of the committee. The designers selected were Peter Adams, an artist and woodcraftsman who
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lived on the Tasman Peninsula; sculptor Stephen Walker, who was well known for his cast bronze work around Hobart and in Sydney; stonemason Peter McFarlane, and landscape designer Torquil Canning. Canning had written to the Port Arthur committee in May 1996 with suggestions for a memorial design. All four designers met the committee at a workshop to discuss proposals. Canning said no direction was given about keeping the remains of the Broad Arrow Café. However, in a letter to the design team in December 1996 it was requested that they consider ‘retention of part of the building fabric or re-use of some of the material in the memorial’. Keeping part of the building was later raised by Beverly Raphael as an important part of the healing process for families and friends, as part of the therapeutic benefits of the memorial.

As memorials have been recognised as therapeutic spaces, so too can engagement with the development of the memorials be therapeutic. To assist in the resolution of differences about the remains of the Broad Arrow Café, as chair of the memorial committee Fenerty organised key trauma psychologists, including Beverley Raphael, then Director of Mental Health in New South Wales, to talk with them. Memorial committee member and local resident Alan Andrews said Raphael spoke about people who had not yet accessed the site who needed to stand in the building as part of the healing process, and that it was important to leave evidence to allow people to grieve. It was this feedback from Raphael that made him realise how important it was to leave the remains of the Broad Arrow Café as it stood. Likewise, committee member and local resident Joan Fazackerly said she was one of those who changed their minds about the remains of the Café. ‘I wanted the Café demolished,’ she said, ‘now I realise that ... you’ve got to leave a little bit of the old structure, otherwise future generations don’t understand.’ This is relevant not just to atrocity sites, but to all heritage sites.

The underlying premise of the Burra Charter, which sets the standard for heritage management in Australia, is to ‘do as much as is necessary to care for a place ... but change it as little as possible so the cultural significance is maintained’. Although the work of PAHSMA was focused on the
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conservation and management of the convict site buildings, to assist visitors in understanding the convict heritage of the site, the site management did not consider that the fabric of the massacre site should be protected and conserved in the same way as the convict heritage remains were conserved. This was just one of the issues of conflict in the aftermath of the massacre.

By October 1997, the Memorial Committee and Port Arthur Historic Site staff had agreed on a project brief for the memorial, and agreed that the massacre victims should be remembered by:

- one memorial — to focus the memory of the tragedy in one location;
- it should be adjacent to, or on the site of, the Broad Arrow Café;
- it should include tributes to the deceased, the wounded, those who rendered assistance;
- space for people to lay wreaths should be included; and that it be
- a memorial physically separated from other parts of site.  

As with Oklahoma City, a Vision Statement was developed that outlined that the memorial should be:

> An enduring tribute to the 35 who lost their lives, and to the many others who suffered … [it] should acknowledge those who were working at the Historic Site and the many … who responded … the memorial shall symbolize the immeasurable social impact of the event … shall serve as a place of spiritual contemplation, remembrance and healing.

In contrast to the Vision Statement from Oklahoma City, the Port Arthur Vision Statement also added that ‘the memorial must invite the question as to why this event ever occurred’. It was a challenging statement, and one that has yet to be addressed in the minimal interpretation about the massacre at Port Arthur.

The final decisions about the memorial were made after Jim Bacon became Premier of Tasmania in September 1998 and took over as Chair of the memorial committee. Committee member Alan Andrews commented that when Bacon took over he made it clear that the committee had to
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make a decision about the memorial. He said that although Bacon listened to the committee, he would then say ‘now we’re going to do this’ [and make a decision for the committee]. Andrews said that it was a credit to the strength of local community members that they would not let Bacon make decisions that they did not agree with or thought family members would not be happy with, but added that ‘we [the memorial committee] could have taken more time’.\textsuperscript{435} The pressures of tourism and political pressures from the Premier influenced the memory cycles of the memorialisation at Port Arthur.

Other factors also made it easier for the Port Arthur management to finally develop the site around the remains of the Broad Arrow Café as a memorial. In December 1998 the new Visitor Centre had opened, making the catering and visitor facilities around the Broad Arrow Café redundant. In January 1999, the memorial committee agreed that Torquil Canning be approached to develop his design for the Broad Arrow Café site. Some of the memorial committee would have preferred the design of local sculptor Peter Adams, which would have involved people in a ‘raking of the sand’ at the base of ancestral stones, similar to what is done in a Japanese temple.\textsuperscript{436} Andrews said Adams’s design ‘was wonderful and would have involved people and visitors in an ongoing way ... [but one of the reasons it] wasn’t accepted [was] because of the cost’.\textsuperscript{437} As Adams also acknowledged, the memorial committee did not want to focus on the 35 individuals.\textsuperscript{438}

The planning for the memorial at Port Arthur was by disparate groups of people with a shared interest of remembrance, trying to reach agreement on what form the remembrance would take. The development of war memorials has been described as a business where ‘sculptors, artists, bureaucrats, churchmen and ordinary people had to strike an agreement and carry it out.\textsuperscript{439} The same description could be applied to the development of the memorials at the case study sites. At all the three sites memorials were being developed for areas that were or were about to become popular tourist sites. The committees or groups involved in planning for the memorials had to reach agreement and balance the interests of ‘victims, survivors and observers’\textsuperscript{440}, and in the case of Port Arthur, tourists. Tourism compressed
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the timeframe for the design and construction of Port Arthur memorial. Jackman said it was ‘a shame [that it was contested] as it was such an important part of history, it really deserved a more unified approach’. 441

With the pressures on Port Arthur as a tourist site, and the differences between the memorial committee and management, it was likely that contestation would be part of the memorialisation. A major difference between Port Arthur and Oklahoma City was that Port Arthur was still operating as an historic tourist site, and while the planning for the memorial at Port Arthur was in progress, staff were also planning the new Visitor Centre and interpretation centre, and maintaining the buildings and the gardens. The memorial was only one component of the work at Port Arthur, whereas at Oklahoma City planning and development of the memorial were the main focus of the work at the site.

6. Heritage issues

Port Arthur was the only case study site where the management of the atrocity site became interlinked with the previous history of the site. As journalists foreshadowed, the proximity of the convict heritage to the massacre site (photo 30) was to influence management of the Broad Arrow Café site. A significant difference between Oklahoma City and Port Arthur was that at the time of the massacre, as noted, Port Arthur Historic Site was recognised as a significant heritage site by both the Tasmanian and Australian Governments. This official recognition contributed to the conflicts about the memorialisation of the massacre. Heritage professionals expressed concerns about the impact of the memorial on the convict heritage of the site, 442 and there were conflicts about protection of the convict remains around the memorial site. 443

The remains of convict buildings below the remains of the Broad Arrow Café and the surrounding car park were covered with buildings and a sealed car park in the 1950s. By 1996, no archaeological excavations had yet been
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carried out around the site of this car park or the Broad Arrow Café.\textsuperscript{444}

In a report in March 1999, the Heritage Advisory Panel recommended to PAHSMA that it accept the recommendations of the heritage report by Inspiring Place consultants, as it allowed ‘recognition of both the convict significance of the area and the significance associated with the Tragedy.’\textsuperscript{445}

This recommendation was not accepted. When Jackman raised the issue of the convict remains at a memorial committee meeting chaired by Premier Jim Bacon in 1999, he was reminded by Bacon that the focus for the area was a memorial, not convict remains.\textsuperscript{446} It was an issue that was never resolved and in 2010 no information on the convict remains of this area is available at the site.

However the concerns about the heritage values of the Broad Arrow Café which had been raised by the Australian Heritage Commission\textsuperscript{447} encouraged PAHSMA to commission a Conservation Study of the Broad Arrow Café from heritage consultant Dr Jane Lennon. It was hoped that this study would also assist the resolution of differences about the remains of the Broad Arrow Café. The study was a unique feature of the memorialisation at Port Arthur.

\textbf{Photo 30: The Memorial Garden from the Penitentiary, May 2007}

\textsuperscript{444} Ibid. These remains were from an Assistant Overseer’s cottage built in the 1840s, a ‘Stone Cutter’s Shed’ and possibly cottages and stores for quarry and stone workers in use in the 1860s and 1870s. It is likely these buildings were demolished when the area became allotments farmed after the penal settlement closed and when the area was renamed Carnarvon. Two trenches that were dug in March 1999 provided evidence of convict terraces and drain features at the site.

\textsuperscript{445} Author interview with David Young; and reports of Port Arthur Heritage Advisory Panel — 4th meeting, 19–20 November 1997 and 8th meeting 23–26 March 1997.

\textsuperscript{446} Author interview with Greg Jackman.

\textsuperscript{447} From PAHS file 14 BRO Vol.1.
At neither of the other case study sites were the cultural and social significances of the atrocity sites assessed before memorials were built. The key requirement for the study was to ‘assess the significance and effects of [28 April 1996] on the overall historic site … and to identify the heritage values of the Broad Arrow Café and formulate policies and strategies to guide its management in the immediate future’.

The challenge Lennon identified was that her study was dealing with ‘private grieving in public places’. In following the Burra Charter guidelines where participation of key stakeholders is part of the planning for a heritage site, Lennon consulted with relatives and friends of victims, Port Arthur staff, emergency services staff, members of the local community, tourist operators, and heritage professionals. Lennon said many people responded that ‘we don’t want to be involved, but we’re happy to go along with the majority response … and then people who said no originally changed their mind [and got in contact]’. Submissions to Lennon highlighted the differing views regarding the Café remains. One submission stated that: ‘Under no circumstances should any more of this building be removed. The Broad Arrow Café is a sacred site and should be treated with absolute respect.’ In contrast another wrote, ‘I don’t think we need the Café … it is a terrifying reminder of the terror that went on that day … we feel strongly against having such a reminder of that day.’ Yet another added: ‘By removing anything to remind us of what went on that day … we effectively wipe the slate clean, leaving only a nice place to reflect and remember.’

In considering how to resolve these differences, Lennon considered the positive impact of the remains of the Café on the recovery and healing, an issue that had been raised by Raphael with the memorial committee. Lennon identified ‘the response of one family member who when they saw the size [of the Café] realised there was no chance of saving a family member … was a reminder of why the physical reminder of the building was so important.’

In her final assessment, Lennon concluded:

The Broad Arrow Café has cultural significance primarily for its social value as a place of remembrance of those who died and were injured in the tragedy. For survivors, friends, relatives and others touched by the

---
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tragedy, the place became a symbol, as well as a memorial, evocative of the events of 28 April 1996.\footnote{454}

In acknowledging that the meaning and the significance of the Café would change in time, Lennon recommended that ‘the heritage values of the Café “... should be conserved by retaining enough of [its] structure to commemorate those who lost their lives.”\footnote{455} Lennon’s study was important not only for the contribution to the planning of the Broad Arrow Café, but for the collection and compilation of people’s responses within two years of the massacre. Lennon’s Conservation Study was used in the preparation of the first Conservation Management Plan for the whole site. This plan echoed Lennon’s assessment that the Broad Arrow Café was significant as a memorial and place of remembrance.\footnote{456} Through the material collected from her study, Lennon has ensured that these private responses have contributed to the public memory of the massacre.\footnote{457} Lennon’s study not only helped resolve the differences about the remains of the Broad Arrow Café, it provided a template for the assessment and planning for memorials at other atrocity sites. Lennon demonstrated that the Burra Charter\footnote{458} could be used as a guide for this assessment, and that consultation is an important part of the planning for memorials, and also the investigation and detailing of the history of an area, even if it is not a recognised heritage site. Of the three case study sites, Port Arthur is the only site where the history of the area prior to the atrocity has been documented in detail.

However, despite this documentation gaps still exist. Detailed records about the site and decisions about the Broad Arrow Café building should have been kept as part of the history of Port Arthur’s heritage.\footnote{459} These records could have been part of the official history of the massacre. In the course of my research, I found that gaps exist in the records at Port Arthur — for example, no complete photographic record exists of the changes to the Broad Arrow Café from the time of the massacre to when it became a memorial site. This demonstrated the need for guidelines addressing what and how heritage issues should be considered in the immediate aftermath.

\footnote{454}{Lennon, ‘Broad Arrow Café Conservation Study.’ p. 8}
\footnote{455}{Ibid. pp. 9–10}
\footnote{457}{In addition to her ‘Broad Arrow Café Conservation Study’, Lennon also assessed the development of her study in Lennon, ‘The Broad Arrow Café, Port Arthur, Tasmania: Using Social Values Methodology to Resolve the Commemoration Issues.’}
\footnote{458}{Australia ICOMOS Inc., The Illustrated Burra Charter: Good Practice for Heritage Places.}
\footnote{459}{Casella, ‘To Enshrine Their Spirits in the World: Heritage and Grief at Port Arthur.’}
of an atrocity. Part of these guidelines should include documentation of the clearing and rebuilding of the site.

As the process for developing the memorial at Oklahoma City was therapeutic, and helped in the healing process, so can the clearing of the atrocity sites and the construction of the memorials be both therapeutic and part of the remembrance. The sharing of stories about the aftermath of the massacre has made an important contribution to the history and memory of the atrocity. Former colleagues related stories to me about the clean-up of the massacre with the police and fire brigade, done at midnight so no media would know, and when no staff were on site. In reflecting on how he and other staff recovered, Weston said that the grounds and gardens of Port Arthur were ‘the perfect place to work and get over the event … the gardens were therapy’. The removal of buildings around the shell of the Broad Arrow Café and the construction of the memorial was undertaken by the Port Arthur Historic Site works crew and other local contractors. This work was more than just about undertaking jobs on site; it was about the contribution of people involved in the immediate aftermath of the massacre in a memorial for colleagues, friends and local community members who were killed. John Featherstone said that ‘at the end of the day, that you had to keep going, 35 people had been killed, if you let it get to you then Bryant would have affected a whole lot more’. He added that in hindsight, all staff should have been removed from the site, and professionals should have been brought in to clean up and get the site ‘back on track … there were a lot of individuals that came here … days after and subsequently left work … it affected their family, what they had seen, heard or witnessed.’ He discussed the camaraderie of the works crew, how they all got together as a group, he said that no-one had to come to work if they didn’t want to, and how they talked regularly at smoko, and in fact after a couple of weeks sent away the counsellor who came to talk with them — ‘he only made you feel worse. We kept an eye on each other.’ The works crew also engaged outside contractors to work with them, which he said helped to have a different mix of people, but finally they decided to continue with the building work around the site, which eventually included dismantling of the buildings attached to the Café, and fixing the walls and floors to form part of the memorial. Documentation of the actual clearing of the atrocity sites and
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the practicalities of building the memorials is rarely referred to as part of the memorialisation of an atrocity. This work, particularly when undertaken by friends and colleagues of the victims, is as significant in the memorialisation as the built structure that follows. The works crew at Port Arthur assisted with the installation of the first memorial on site, a private memorial that became the focus of much public debate in the years ahead.

7. The Memorials at Port Arthur

7.1 THE FIRST MEMORIAL: THE HUON PINE CROSS

Spontaneous shrines have been described as a contemporary mourning ritual on the occasion of untimely death.\textsuperscript{465} Sloane suggested that they are constructed at sites of mass death such as atrocity sites, as people do not want to have to wait for an official memorial.\textsuperscript{466} Furthermore, they are sites of pilgrimage; they commemorate, memorialise, and invite participation from the public, as space to leave flowers and tributes.\textsuperscript{467} The Huon Pine Cross, the first memorial installed at Port Arthur, meets all these criteria. This cross was installed on the waterfront near the Broad Arrow Café on 18 May 1996

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{huon_pine_cross_1998.jpg}
\caption{Huon Pine Cross in original location by the waterfront, 1998}
\end{figure}


\textsuperscript{466} Sloane, ‘Roadside Shrines and Granite Sketches: Diversifying the Vernacular Landscape of Memory.’

\textsuperscript{467} Santino, ‘Performative Commemoratives: Spontaneous Shrines and the Public Memorialization of Death.’ p. 12
The 2.5 metre-high cross was made by two local artisans — Mick McMillan, who was working at Port Arthur — and sculptor Peter Adams. They used Tasmanian timbers — stringy-bark (*Eucalyptus obliqua*) for the upright and Huon Pine (*Dacrydium franklinii*) for the crosspiece.\(^{468}\)

Until the official memorial around the grounds of the Broad Arrow Café opened, the cross was a prominent feature in the landscape at Port Arthur. Rather than the remains of the Broad Arrow Café, or the other locations of sites of death, the cross was the focus for mourning and memory in the four years following the massacre. After anniversary services in the convict church in 1997 and 1998, people moved down to the cross to leave flowers and messages. Port Arthur archaeologist Greg Jackman remarked, ‘I went to the first anniversary service [at the cross]. It was a very powerful ceremony, you could see why the cross remained, for some people, the memorial.’\(^{469}\)

On 28 April 1999, I also attended a moving anniversary service at the cross, which included prayers, a minute’s silence and laying of flowers. On the same day, local journalist Bruce Montgomery referred to the cross as ‘a sacred site, a sacred place’.\(^{470}\) As war memorials and the Oklahoma City bombing site were designated as sacred sites, so too was this spontaneous memorial, located close to the site of many of the Port Arthur deaths.

The cross became a powerfully symbolic memorial for many staff, local community and visitors. It also became a symbol of contestation in remembrance of the Port Arthur massacre. After it was installed, the cross was described by Port Arthur Historic Site as a ‘temporary memorial [which] ... will eventually be replaced by a permanent memorial’.\(^{471}\) In June 1996, the Port Arthur Historic Site Conservation Section noted that ‘the temporary cross is very popular’.\(^{472}\) However, by October 1997, PAHSMA announced in the staff newsletter that the Memorial Cross would be moved ‘in the next 2–3 weeks’. It was being moved to the top of the quarry [overlooking the remains of the Broad Arrow Café] where it would ‘improve upon the present location by providing a private and more peaceful situation which is more conducive to contemplation’.\(^{473}\) A site was cleared and gravelled and safety fencing installed in preparation. I was working at Port Arthur then and recall that, following political pressure and the media response, the cross was not

---

\(^{468}\) Author interview with John Featherstone.

\(^{469}\) Author interview with Greg Jackman.

\(^{470}\) Montgomery, ‘Long Road Back from Sunday April 28.’


\(^{472}\) Discussion paper: issues relating to the Broad Arrow Café, draft 17 June 1996, PAHS file 18/7 Part 1.

moved. To this date, the gravelled area is still a lookout that overlooks the memorial garden.

Concerns from Port Arthur staff influenced the decisions of PAHSMA to try to move the cross. Some of the guiding staff had known people who had been killed or injured in the shootings. These guides had to walk past the cross each day when they took visitors on tours around the site. John Featherstone confirmed ‘we found that it [the location] was affecting staff ... some of the guides felt really uncomfortable’.474 Several Port Arthur staff also suggested that the permanent memorial should not include a cross. It was ‘too Christian’ and the victims were from several denominations.475 Memorial designer Torquil Canning said that in discussions with the memorial committee they made it clear ‘that they didn’t want the cross there [in the Memorial Garden] as one of the victims was Buddhist’. He added that ‘there was some talk that it should be preserved, but that was all’.476

The interplay of private and public engagement with the cross in the years immediately after the massacre made it highly significant to both private individuals and the public, as Lennon and other heritage consultants recognised. Lennon cautioned that ‘given the strength of attachment to the Memorial Cross in its current position ... it may be appropriate to leave it in its present position until the Memorial Garden is ready’.477 A study on Port Arthur’s heritage gardens suggested that the cross be permanently relocated in front of the remains of the Broad Arrow Café so ‘the outlook over the water ... is retained’.478 The draft Conservation Management Plan, released in 1998, referred to both the cross and location being ‘of high social significance because it serves as a place of remembrance for visitors, and for relatives and friends of the victims of the Tragedy’.479

When the Memorial Garden around the remains of the Broad Arrow Café was opened on the fourth anniversary of the massacre on 28 April 2000, the location of the cross was still unresolved. The following year, in the early hours of the morning of 28 April 2001, it was moved to the back of the Memorial Garden, in front of the bluestone quarry face (photo 32). Media reports quoted Chief Executive Officer of Port Arthur Stephen Large as

---
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saying 'it was moved by a group of local people unknown to the site or the
government.' However, he added that ‘the cross will now stay in the Memorial
Garden’.\footnote{480}{Andrew Darby, ‘Port Arthur; Five Years On,’ \textit{The Sunday Age}, 29 April 2001.} One victim’s family from Adelaide complained about the move in a letter to the Hobart newspaper \textit{The Mercury}.
\footnote{481}{Ron Neander, ‘Memorial Move,’ \textit{The Mercury}, 5 May 2001.}

Tumarkin alluded to the contestation about the location of the memorial
cross when she wrote: ‘With the unveiling of the official memorial ... in
April 2000 the cross was moved ... and relegated to the back of the official
memorial, where it is expected to silently rot away and fade into oblivion.’
\footnote{482}{Tumarkin, \textit{Traumascapes}. p. 211} The cross was not actually moved until 12 months after the memorial was
opened. Tumarkin may have been unaware of the impact of the location
of the cross on some Port Arthur staff. She may also not have known that
the Tasmanian timbers used for the cross were used for boats and window
frames and likely to last for over 100 years. At the time Tumarkin’s book was
published, it was not public knowledge that members of the local community
had moved the cross.

In April 2006, the tenth anniversary of the massacre, details of the actual
moving of the cross were publicised. Dr Pam Fenerty, the first chair of
the memorial committee, acknowledged that she had coordinated the

\textbf{Photo 32: The Huon Pine Cross in the Memorial Garden, May 2007}
moving of the cross. She said it had been local community members who were responsible for moving the cross, not the site management.\textsuperscript{483} This acknowledgement was important not only for the history and memory of the memorialisation of the massacre, but also for the Port Arthur management. The CEO of PAHSMA Stephen Large said in 2006, ‘there are still some people out there who believe that PAHSMA moved it’.\textsuperscript{484} Fenerty later acknowledged that some of the contestation continues with ‘ongoing discussion about the cross, and you still get people saying it shouldn’t have been moved’.\textsuperscript{485} Now permanently located at the back of the Memorial Garden, the cross continues to be the focus for floral and other tributes at the memorial, particularly on anniversaries. The relocation of the cross signals a major difference between the memorial gardens at Oklahoma City and Port Arthur, in that 12 months after it opened, a private memorial became a feature of the public memorial at Port Arthur.

The engagement with the Huon Pine Cross, a spontaneous memorial, was not unlike the response of the Oklahoma City community to the fence around the bombsite which became, and still is, the focus for tributes, and was moved to one side of the memorial. In both Oklahoma City and Port Arthur, planning for the official memorials did not include the temporary or spontaneous memorials, yet both are now part of the permanent memorials. A shared response demonstrates both the power and emotive engagement of grieving communities with spontaneous memorials. The Huon Pine Cross is now a feature of the Memorial Garden at the Port Arthur Historic Site.

7.2 THE MEMORIAL GARDEN

Located at a historic site rather than near the centre of a city, and commemorating fewer deaths, it would be expected that the Port Arthur memorial would be very different to the Oklahoma City memorial. However, similarities do exist. Despite the differences in size, both memorials meet Sturken’s criteria for national memorials, as places where opportunities are provided for a range of interactions as well as spaces where people can ‘speak to their dead’.\textsuperscript{486} Both can also be described as spaces of experiences.\textsuperscript{487} The various components of the

\textsuperscript{483} Altmann, After Port Arthur: Personal Stories of Courage and Resilience Ten Years on from the Tragedy That Shocked the Nation. pp. 131–2

\textsuperscript{484} Author interview with Stephen Large, Chief Executive Officer, Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority, Port Arthur, 5 May 2006.

\textsuperscript{485} Author interview with Pam Fenerty.

\textsuperscript{486} Sturken, Memorializing Absence.

\textsuperscript{487} Savage, Monument Wars. p. 37
Memorial Garden provide space both for private grieving, and public remembrance of the massacre.

Situated to one side of the convict site, and in front of a quarry face, the Memorial Garden overlooks but is separate by design and landscape from the convict remains and gardens of Port Arthur Historic Site. The roofless shell of the Broad Arrow Café is surrounded by the Memorial Garden. The walls of the Broad Arrow Café were rendered to look, I suggest, like another ruin on site (photo 33). The memorial includes a reflecting pool, seating and dry stone walls, another link to the surrounding convict-era structures. Margaret Scott was commissioned to write two poems for the memorial. One of these is inscribed around the edge of the reflective pool in order ‘to engage
people in the memorial as they have to walk around it’, to read the poem. The other verse is inscribed into the bluestone paving near the pool:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Death has taken its toll}
\textit{Some pain knows no release}
\textit{But the knowledge of brave compassion shines}
\textit{Like a pool of peace.}
\end{quote}

At the entry point, flush with the paving, is a stone ‘doorstep’ inscribed with the words ‘28th April 1996 Memorial’. The massacre happened in the middle of Australia’s autumn. A sculpture of 35 autumn leaves, one for each victim, is set into the reflective pool (photo 34).

The Memorial Garden at Port Arthur was officially opened on Friday, 28 April 2000. Three church ministers led the service attended by over 1000 people, a children’s choir sang and candles were lit. In a gesture of peace, thousands of coloured paper swans made by schoolchildren around Australia were floated on the memorial pool. Under the headline ‘In the rubble a garden grows’ media reported that as well as being a time for remembering, ‘there was a sense of calm and new beginnings’ and that ‘ghosts were laid to rest’.

\textbf{Photo 35: Memorial plaque in the Memorial Garden, April 2006}
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Despite the consultation and planning, conflict over the use of victims’ names continued up to the opening of the memorial and beyond. Just a month before the opening, *The Mercury* newspaper reported that the victims’ names would not be included.\(^492\) Canning said the memorial committee had made it clear to him that they did not want a list of victims’ names in the memorial. He had plans for inscribing the names on rocks, but respected their wishes.\(^493\) The day before the memorial was due to be officially opened, a plaque with the victims’ names was installed on a stone cairn in the garden (photo 35). It had been organised by the Tasman Council, and was not part of the original plan. The media reported that one of the victims’ families requested that the name of their relative be removed.\(^494\) I recall the same request being made after the plaque was affixed to the memorial cross; the family had indicated to PAHSMA that they did not want the name of their family member used in memorials on site. After the memorial cross was moved to the site in 2001, the victims’ names were now on two plaques in the gardens. The differences about the inclusion of names is part of the story of the evolution of the memorial. It also illustrates that despite broad consultation and the decisions of the memorial committee, some families have left their own imprint on the memorialisation of the massacre. At Port Arthur both the local council, through the installation of the stone cairn, and the local community through moving the Huon Pine Cross, have influenced the landscape of the memorial.

One of the differences between the Oklahoma City and Port Arthur memorials is that over time, as the plants grow larger, the appearance of the memorial garden at Port Arthur has changed. Whereas at Oklahoma City the sculptured chairs, memorial pool and grassed area still dominate the appearance of the memorial, at Port Arthur the remains of the Broad Arrow Café no longer dominate the memorial; it is the garden that has become the ‘landscape of memory’. As the native Tasmanian species in the garden grow, the remains of the Café are becoming less visible, not only from the Memorial Garden, but from around the Historic Site. This is illustrated in photos 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40 taken from 2003, 2006 and 2010. As the garden is growing the physical appearance of the landscape of memory is changing.

One impact of this changing appearance is that with more privacy, the Memorial Garden has become even more of a special precinct where the dead are honoured.\(^495\) As the garden became established, it has also become less obvious to the casual observer that the victims’ names are listed twice.

---


\(^493\) Author interview with Torquil Canning.

\(^494\) Lovibond, ‘Port Arthur Memorial to Omit Names.’

\(^495\) Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning.* p. 3
Photo 36: The Memorial Garden looking towards Stewart's Bay, 2003

Photo 37: The Memorial Garden looking towards Stewart's Bay, April 2006

Photo 38: The Memorial Garden looking towards Stewart's Bay, November 2010

Photo 39 (left): The Memorial Garden and the remains of the Broad Arrow Café, 2003

Photo 40 (right): The Memorial Garden and remains of the Broad Arrow Café, November 2010
The planting of native species in the memorial garden was recommended both to separate the area from the European gardens of the convict areas, and as an opportunity to reintroduce some of the original vegetation of the area.\textsuperscript{496} There were also practical reasons for using native plants. The then head groundsman, Richard Weston, explained it was a joint decision with Canning, and that:

The native plants came into it for a number of reasons ... the site with its south-easterly location below the quarry face, and considering the rest of the site, classical European in the centre, but on the edges and above the memorial Tasmanian endemics, looking at what would suit it and what would grow well.

He said that the soil and climate of the area were unsuitable for roses: ‘it’s damp and wet, it’s very compacted underneath ... roses wouldn’t have worked, would have got black spot, it’s too shady [for roses].\textsuperscript{497} Weston added that the native plants are ‘almost sombre ... that’s their strength, they’re not gawdy [and so are suitable for a memorial]’.\textsuperscript{498} The decision to plant native species was criticised by some locals and visitors, but by 2006, Maria Stacey, Director of Tourism Operations at Port Arthur, noted ‘now the garden has grown there’s very little criticism and far more positive than negative comments from visitors ... if we get a comment about the garden at all it’s about how beautiful it is and how appropriate and thrilled they are’.\textsuperscript{499}

One shared feature of the case study sites is that the memorials extend beyond the actual sites of the victims’ deaths. Similar to the extent of the Oklahoma City National Memorial, the Port Arthur memorial extends over a much greater area than where the majority of people were actually killed. The size of the memorial did initially concern some of the Port Arthur staff. Susan Hood, Resource Centre Manager, reflected that her initial response was that ‘it was too big, it was bigger than I felt it needed to be ... this is not to say that what happened in 1996 was not significant in any way ... [it is a fact that] no-one ever forgets, no one will ever forget what happened down here.’ She added that ‘I’ve come to accept it ... probably due to [the] time factor.’\textsuperscript{500} This raises an issue of the impact of the memorial on the history and memory of the massacre; will people in time consider that the deaths
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all occurred around the site of the memorial? However, other memorials do exist to some of the massacre victims, onsite, online, and through music.

7.3 OTHER MEMORIALS AT PORT ARTHUR HISTORIC SITE

The influence of family and community members on remembrance of the massacre has extended beyond the landscape of the Memorial Garden. The Memorial Committee agreed there would only be ‘One memorial — the memorial should focus the memory of the tragedy on one location, not divide it up into different locations where persons died’. Yet other memorials have been erected in and around the Port Arthur Historic Site.

A plaque in the Visitor Centre honours the three Port Arthur staff victims (photo 41). The families of Nicole Burgess, her cousin Elizabeth Howard, and Nanette Mikac requested that they be remembered in this location. The sign, with photos and the poem Do not stand at my grave and weep, was developed in consultation with the victims’ families. It is the only reference to the massacre inside the Visitor Centre.

In 2000, following the requests from two victims’ families, four small bronze autumn leaves with names engraved on the leaves were set in stone where their family members had died. Three of these poignant small bronze autumn leaves were placed under the trees where Nanette Mikac and her daughters were killed, which at the time was near the entry road to the site (photos 42 and 43). The other autumn leaf is near the waterfront where a bus driver, Royce Thompson, was killed. The deaths of the Mikac girls are also remembered through the Alannah and Madeline Foundation, which supports children at risk.

The memorialisation of the massacre extended beyond these built memorials and the foundation. Australian composer Peter Sculthorpe, who grew up in northern Tasmania, described how after the tragic events at Port Arthur he was moved to write a piece called ‘Port Arthur — In Memorium .... which towards the end ... we offer a little bit of hope ... that’s the way I felt when I

---

Sculthorpe’s music was a creative response to the atrocity by a member of the artistic community with a connection to the area.

An unexpected intangible memorial after the massacre was a change in the Tasmanian Government requirements for the operation of Port Arthur Historic Site. In the years after the massacre the Tasmanian Government began to support the refocusing of the PAHSMA operations on heritage conservation, and removed the requirement under legislation for PAHSMA to be self funding. The culmination of these changes was an announcement in April 2000, at the official opening of the ‘Convict Trail’, a new interpretation trail on the Tasman Peninsula by Premier Jim Bacon, that Port Arthur would be allocated A$10 million over five years for conservation work on site. Stephen Large described this funding as ‘recognition of the importance of the Port Arthur Historic Site and its historical significance in a national and international context’. He added that this funding was secured following the preparation of a comprehensive Conservation Plan and the work of the Port

---

Photo 42 (above): Mikac memorials on original entrance road to the Port Arthur Historic Site, May 2006

Photo 43 (right): Mikac memorial, 28 April 2006

---


Arthur Board in developing a strategic plan. Following years of PAHSMA struggling to fund the heritage conservation of the convict site, finally in the new millennium these funds were provided by the Tasmanian Government.

This impact of the massacre was succinctly summed up by former colleague and Port Arthur staffer, Richard Weston, who said that:

A lot of good has come from the 28th in some shape or form, the site has gained an enormous amount, not that you would have wanted it to happen that way, but the Visitor Centre, the car park, the $10 million have all helped to secure the long-term future of the site, so perhaps you could say that the loss of the 35 people wasn’t in vain.

In this context, the whole of Port Arthur as it is today could be described as a memorial to the 35 people who died at, or near, the Port Arthur Historic Site on 28 April 1996. As the memorial complex at Oklahoma City is now the ‘landscape of memory’ of the bombing and the aftermath, so too could the whole of the Port Arthur Historic Site be the landscape of memory for the massacre victims. In time, this could be part of the interpretation of the massacre, that one of the unexpected consequences was a refocusing and funding for the management and interpretation of the convict heritage of Port Arthur. Whereas interpretation of the convict heritage through signs and displays has been part of the ongoing work of PAHSMA, telling the story of the massacre for visitors has not been easy.

8. Interpretation of the massacre

One of the major differences between Oklahoma City and Port Arthur is the availability of information about the atrocities at the memorials. In contrast to Oklahoma City, information about, and interpretation of, the massacre at Port Arthur is minimal. This is not just a difference in the response of site management to the atrocities, it is also an indicator of cultural differences in the representation of violence and death. Whereas in many parts of the world, including the USA, there has been a ‘rapid escalation in the development of memorial museums in the last 20 years … [which] play an important role in the shaping of historical consciousness’, the increase in memorial museums has not extended to Australia.
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Public information about the Port Arthur massacre includes a sign, information in the visitor guidebook, a brochure, and a ‘page’ on the Port Arthur Historic Site’s website. Previously just referring to the 35 people who were killed, the updated visitor guidebook printed in 2010 also refers to the 19 people who were injured.\(^\text{508}\) For many years the minimal interpretation of the massacre was deliberate. For the first year after the massacre, a sign at the entrance to the site asked visitors to respect the feelings of staff and not to ask questions. A similar notice is in the visitor guidebook.\(^\text{509}\) In April 1998, an interpretive sign erected near the Huon Pine Cross contained information about the massacre. The day after the sign was erected, it was vandalised and reference to the gunman scratched out. The sign was then removed and not replaced.\(^\text{510}\)

In February 1999, Port Arthur Historic Site produced a brochure for visitors who asked for information about the massacre.\(^\text{511}\) From April 2000, the visitor information booklet handed to all visitors included information on the memorial and the massacre.\(^\text{512}\) At the end of 2001, an interpretive sign with information about the massacre and the memorial was installed at the Memorial Garden (photo 44). In 2001, the brochure for visitors who asked about the massacre was updated. It includes the following:

Please understand that for many people, including staff members at Port Arthur, answering questions about the events of 28 April 1996 can be very disturbing. We prefer not to use the name of the person responsible.\(^\text{513}\)

In 2010, this is the brochure still given to visitors if they ask about the massacre. Bryant is only referred to on signs at Port Arthur as ‘the gunman’. His name is not used. Former colleagues and heritage associates could not recall when it was agreed that Bryant’s name would not be used on site. We remembered that it was a deliberate ‘forgetting’ so the focus would remain on the victims and not the perpetrator.\(^\text{514}\) It was not just Port Arthur
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Historic Site that only referred to Bryant as ‘the gunman’. Mikac and Simpson also wrote how they deliberately did not use Bryant’s name, following a decision made by the families at Dunblane, hoping the perpetrator would be forgotten. Cultural differences including differing legal systems contribute to the differing responses to the perpetrators at Oklahoma City and Port Arthur Historic Site; whereas McVeigh received the death penalty for his crimes, the Port Arthur perpetrator Bryant remains alive in Hobart’s Risdon Prison. While he is still alive, many of those affected by the massacre would rather forget his existence, hence his name is not used.

The PAHSMA has acknowledged that the interpretation of the massacre could be more comprehensive. Maria Stacey noted that ‘visitors now [criticise] … the lack of interpretation of the massacre … it’s not uncommon for people to ask where did it occur and that’s after they’ve been on site, they miss it … sometime in the future it would be good to make it a bit more obvious.’ Updating and extending information about the massacre should also include consideration of actually referring to Bryant by name on site. Onsite and online visitors to Port Arthur could be provided with more information and interpretation without PAHSMA having to install more signs or print more brochures. PAHSMA could use the internet and social networking sites such as Twitter and Facebook to provide visitors with information on the massacre and the memorial.

9. **The internet and the Port Arthur massacre**

Similarly to the Oklahoma City Memorial website, the Port Arthur Historic Site website does provide some information about the massacre and Memorial Garden. Updated in 2010, it now includes a copy of the brochure on the massacre, and a list of books published about it, including those of Mikac, Maria Stacey.
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However the information from Port Arthur Historic Site is not as extensive as the website for the Oklahoma City National Memorial. One of the reasons for the differences is that the website for the Oklahoma City Memorial is dedicated to the memorial and museum, whereas the Port Arthur Historic Site’s website covers all the convict heritage tourism activities and history of the heritage site. Similar to the Oklahoma City bombing, in the immediate aftermath of the massacre, however, the internet was one of the media used to share information about the atrocity. As the Oklahoma City bombing marked the time when the internet was becoming more publicly accessible across the globe, the Port Arthur massacre coincided with the introduction of public access to the internet across Australia.

Similar to the USA, public use of the internet was still in its infancy in Australia at the time of the massacre. In 1996 the internet was beginning to be used more widely both in Australia and across the globe. The Sydney Morning Herald reported how from midnight on 29 April 1996 its online edition ‘received more than 180 000 file requests from more than 10 000 individual users in Australia and overseas’. The newspaper also added that international news services ‘approached The Herald seeking to republish massacre stories … which they had first read on the Internet’. Access to information about the massacre via the web was more for international than local users. Few Australians used the internet in 1996 as a source for news stories. Although 31 per cent of Australian households frequently used a computer in 1996, only 7.5 per cent of these users accessed the internet. In 1996 Tasmanian households had the lowest computer usage across Australia. By 1998 in Tasmania only 10 per cent of households had internet access.

However, despite this limited local access and use of the internet, the massacre and development of the internet influenced the management of information at Port Arthur. The impetus for the Port Arthur Historic Site setting up its website late in 1996 was the number of requests received for information about the massacre. Consequently, the Port Arthur Historic
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Site’s first website included information about the massacre.\textsuperscript{522} In 2010 it also included reference material. However no information is provided on anniversary services.\textsuperscript{523} This marks another difference in the memorialisation of the atrocities at the Oklahoma City bombing site and the Port Arthur Historic Site.

10. **Anniversaries of the Port Arthur massacre**

The interpretation of the atrocities is not the only difference between the memorialisation at Oklahoma City and Port Arthur. Significant differences also exist in how the anniversaries are marked. Although the marking of anniversaries has been acknowledged as therapeutic and part of the recovery process,\textsuperscript{524} it may also be that not marking anniversaries with public ceremonies may also be therapeutic, in that it enables people to grieve privately in the public space of the memorial. Unlike at the Oklahoma City Memorial, official ceremonies are not held at the Port Arthur memorial or around the site of the massacre on every anniversary. In 2000 the media reported that the public ceremony for the official opening of the memorial on the fourth anniversary would be ‘the last official memorial to be organised at Port Arthur Historic Site.’\textsuperscript{525} Keith Moulton, who lost his daughter and granddaughters in the massacre, and who later became a Church of Christ Minister, said after the official opening of the memorial in 2000 that in future anniversaries ‘would be a private time for those who want to come … the days of the big church services are finished here’.\textsuperscript{526} With no public ceremonies, the Port Arthur community was able to maintain their ownership of the remembrance of the massacre and remember the victims in private.

No official service was organised in 2001. It was instead a time of ‘informal remembrance’. Friends and families laid wreaths around the cross and held a minute’s silence at 1:30 pm, the time the shooting began. Keith Moulton read a prayer but there were no speeches.\textsuperscript{527} The following anniversaries from...
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2002 until 2005 were also marked with prayers and the laying of wreaths, but no formal services.  

However, on the tenth anniversary of the massacre in 2006 public ceremonies were again held at Port Arthur. In explanation, PAHSMA CEO Stephen Large said that a number of families [affected by the massacre] approached him about a service. He said that ‘Port Arthur was obligated to do something, there were people that hadn’t been back, and they needed to have an opportunity to participate in some sort of service.’ As if to confirm the appropriateness of their comments, Large said he was approached after the service ‘by a lady who hadn’t been back since … she’d lost her husband [in 1996] and said she didn’t know if she could come back, but she did and said the service was wonderful, today was one of the highlights, to me that made the whole thing worthwhile.’ John Featherstone attended with some of the works crew. He said he wasn’t going to, but was glad he did, saying it was a good service.

The format of anniversary services marks another cultural difference in memorialisation between the USA and Australia. In contrast to the Oklahoma City ceremonies, the tenth anniversary at Port Arthur was not a week of events. A small committee of Port Arthur staff, family, and community members organised a service with prayers, music and readings, focused around the theme ‘Looking forward, looking back.’ About 700 people attended. The Rosny Children’s Choir, which had sung at the opening of the

---
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Memorial Garden, returned to sing again. Families and friends placed candles in the Memorial Garden pool, 35 in total, one for each of the victims (photo 45). Before and after the ceremony, flowers were laid around the Memorial Cross (photo 46), and as always, a wreath was sent from the Dunblane community.

Initially two days of events had been planned for the anniversary, a memorial service on 28 April 2006 and a concert and family picnic on 29 April 2006. However, the week before the tenth anniversary, three generations of a local Tasman Peninsula family died in a fishing accident. For the Tasman Peninsula community, the day after the anniversary, 29 April 2006 was instead a day of funerals. About 1500 people attended the funerals, more than attended the anniversary service. For the Tasman Peninsula community it was another layer of tragedy that would be linked forever to the tenth anniversary of the Port Arthur massacre. No formal ceremonies have been organised by PAHSMA on the anniversary of the massacre since 2005. Wreaths are laid, but for those who want to remember they can do so in private, at the memorial or elsewhere at Port Arthur Historic Site.

One of the features of these three contemporary atrocities is that for some, they are linked with other tragedies and sudden unexpected deaths. The Oklahoma City bombing and memorial is now linked with September 11, where recovery workers and others share remembrances. As the anniversary

Photo 46: The Huon Pine Cross in the Memorial Garden, 28 April 2006
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services in Bali for the 2002 bombings are linked through location and time with the 2005 bombings, so too the remembrance of anniversaries at Port Arthur, in private ceremonies, for some will remain linked to another tragedy.

11. **Summing up**

The Memorial Garden at Port Arthur Historic Site is the focus for remembrance for the families, community and government agencies affected by the massacre at Port Arthur. At Port Arthur, as with Oklahoma City, many of those affected by the tragedy were consulted during the planning for the memorial. Yet the development of the memorial remains contested. The location of the Huon Pine Cross, the inclusion of the remains of the Broad Arrow Café, tourism and the centrality of Port Arthur to the local community, drove the debate on how to mark 28 April 1996.

The recognised heritage significance of Port Arthur not only distinguished it from Oklahoma City, but provided an opportunity for resolution of differences over the remembrance plan. The preparation of a Heritage Conservation Plan for the Broad Arrow Café led to an agreed decision on what to do with the remains of the Café and the development of a memorial at the site.

Similarities and differences exist between the built memorials at Oklahoma City and Port Arthur Historic Site. Both are on the sites of the atrocities, and both sites include memorial pools surrounded by memorial gardens. Whereas the Memorial Garden at Port Arthur surrounds the remains of the Broad Arrow Café, a sculptural tribute to each of the victims covers the site of the Murrah Building in Oklahoma City. The cultural differences in memorialisation across the two countries and cultures are signalled through the minimal interpretation of the atrocity at Port Arthur, no memorial museum on site, and the lack of reference to the perpetrator by name or in photographs. Other cultural differences to be explored in chapter 6 include differences in how tributes left at the sites are managed.

One of the aftermaths of the Port Arthur massacre was an increase in research and publications by Australian scholars and writers on memorialisation. The massacre encouraged the involvement of the community in memorialisation and contributed to memorialisation being part of the Australian cultural memory by the early twenty-first century. Did the response to Port Arthur influence the Australian response to the 2002 Bali bombings? This is one of the issues I explore in the next chapter, where I consider how the Balinese and Australians remembered the victims of the 2002 Bali bombings.
Chapter 5: Across countries and cultures: the memorialisation of the 2002 Bali bombings

On 12 October 2002, two suicide bombers set off two bombs in and near two packed nightclubs — Paddy’s Bar and the Sari Club — in Kuta, Bali, Indonesia. The two nightclubs were destroyed, windows in buildings within a kilometre radius were shattered and another 450 buildings including shops, market stalls and homes were destroyed. The final death toll was 202 people, and 324 people were seriously injured. Victims were from 22 countries. The majority of those killed were Australians, with 88 deaths, followed by Indonesians, with 38 deaths.

1. Introduction

In this chapter, I continue my comparative analysis of memorialisation across cultures at the turn of the millennium through examining the memorialisation for the victims of the 2002 Bali bombings. I consider the similarities and differences to the responses in Oklahoma City and Port Arthur Historic Site. Acknowledging that the victims of the bombings were from 22 countries, in the context of this comparative study I focus
on the Balinese and Australian remembrance of their victims, and explore
the differing responses in the context of whether the selection of not just
what but also how a remembrance reflects a culture. As the internet was
more widely accessible across the globe by 2002, I examine the change
in mediascapes and memory cycles between Oklahoma City and the Bali
bombings.

I first examine the memorialisation by the Balinese in Bali, as this was the
site of the bombings. I examine to what extent the purification ceremonies,
and the built memorial, reflected Balinese culture. I argue that the
Balinese engagement with the Kuta Memorial indicates that as with other
facets of western culture, the Balinese have adapted western rituals of
memorialisation to suit their own needs. I then trace the remembrance of
the bomb victims by the Australian Government and communities in Bali
and across Australia. I highlight how for some Australian families, who for
economic or other reasons may not wish to travel to Bali, the memorials
in Australia may become their ‘sites of memory and sites of mourning.’
I conclude that the Balinese and Australian remembrance of the bombing
victims across two countries and cultures illustrates both similarities and
differences in contemporary memorialisation across these two countries and
cultures.

As in Oklahoma City and Port Arthur, the media coverage and academic
discourses on the Bali bombings have influenced the collective global
memory of the atrocities. The media coverage of the bombings, and the
ready access of information and images through the internet, also influenced
the memory cycles of the memorialisation, both in Bali and Australia.

2. Responses to the Bali bombings: in print, in film,
in performance and online

2.1 IN PRINT

Similarly to Oklahoma City and Port Arthur, media coverage in newspapers
and popular magazines in Australia provided vivid illustrations of the
bombings. In the weeks after the bombings, the Australian media, similar
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to the media in the USA after the Oklahoma City bombing and September 11, saturated readers with stories of rescue and recovery and the life stories of the victims. The ‘portraits of grief’ in the Australian media of those Australians who died became part of the Australian public memory of the bombing.\textsuperscript{537}

The discourse on the Bali bombings is not as comprehensive as that on the Oklahoma City bombing. No analysis of the memorialisation of this atrocity in either Bali or Australia has been developed that compares to Linenthal’s analysis of the Oklahoma City National Memorial. However similar to the response to the Port Arthur massacre, scholars and popular writers have described the impact of the bombings on the local community, and how Balinese and Australians were directly affected. One of the differences in the responses to the Bali bombings to those of Oklahoma City and the Port Arthur tragedies is the multilingual responses from Indonesian and Australian scholars. Another difference in the publications on the Bali bombings in comparison to the material on the Port Arthur massacre are the number of first hand accounts available. Although first hand accounts of survivors and others affected by the Port Arthur massacre are included in the works of Scott, Altmann and the combined work of Mikac and Simpson,\textsuperscript{538} no first hand accounts from those injured in the massacre or those who assisted in the recovery have yet been published. The timeframe of the atrocities may be a contributing factor. The timing of the Bali bombings, after September 11 and when information on the atrocities was more readily available through the internet, may have encouraged those involved to publish their stories. It has resulted in a greater volume of material being available on the history and memory of the bombings than is available on the Port Arthur massacre.

A number of writers have provided descriptive accounts of the impact of the bombings. My analysis is of books published in English, though there are Indonesian texts on the bombings.\textsuperscript{539} Alan Atkinson’s \textit{Three weeks in Bali} is
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now available in a multilingual edition. Atkinson, an ABC journalist, was at the end of a family holiday in Bali when the bombs exploded, and stayed for three weeks to report for the ABC on the aftermath of the bombing. Atkinson’s description is an important record of the immediate impact of the bombings on the Balinese and Australian communities. He concludes with justified concern about the long term impact of the bombing on tourism and in turn the well-being of the Balinese. Two Australian footballers injured in the bombings, with assistance from journalists and writers, document how a particular group of Australians was affected by the bombings. Not unlike Walter Mikac’s story about the loss of his family at Port Arthur, Adelaide magistrate Brian Deegan has described how he survived the loss of his son Josh who died in the Sari Club on Bali. Dewi Anggraeni, an Australian-based Indonesian journalist, provides an Indonesian perspective on the bombings, investigations and trials of the bombers in Who did this to our Bali? However, the focus of these books is on survival and recovery and not on memorialisation.

The beginning of the Balinese memorialisation, including the ceremonies held and the development of the memorial in Kuta, is detailed in a publication of the Bali Province Government. Published before the completion and official opening of the Kuta Memorial, this local perspective highlights the devastating effect of the bombing on the local community and their main source of income, international tourism. It provides a context for understanding why the Balinese wanted a built memorial, even if memorials had not been built for other atrocities, and also why some Balinese hoped the memorial would act as a deterrent for future bombings.

The response of Balinese scholars to the bombing signals cultural differences in memorialisation to those of American and Australian scholars. Rather than considering the histories of the sites, or the histories of how wars and atrocities were remembered, Balinese scholars focussed both on the effect of the bombing on tourism, the mainstay of the Balinese economy, and the lack of memorialisation for previous atrocities. For the Balinese scholars the bombings were reminders of former atrocities not marked, and an opportunity to consider differing responses in remembering the
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victims. Santikarma argued that memorialisation of the bombings should be less focused on fixed memorials and more about considering issues such as the effect of tourism on Balinese society, and inter-religious issues facing the Balinese, including Islamic fundamentalism. Written before the Kuta Memorial was opened, Santikarma highlighted that not only did memorialisation remind the Balinese of previous atrocities not officially marked, but that ‘intangible’ memorials such as forums could be an important form of remembrance.

In Tourism, Development and Terrorism in Bali, English and Balinese scholars Hitchcock and Darma Putra analysed the effects of the 2002 bombings on tourism in Bali in the context of what they describe as the global phenomenon of tourism on the island. In referring to the Balinese puputans reported in Europe in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, they remind us that the Bali bombings were not the first atrocities in Bali reported internationally. These authors suggest that the underlying strength of the Balinese is their resilience, the strength of their culture and ability to adapt their culture over time, and that this supported the economic and moral recovery from the bombing. These cultural traits, as they acknowledge were defined by Vickers, in turn were reflected both in the Balinese recovery from and memorialisation of the bombings.

Memorialisation across different cultures is considered by Tumarkin as she explores the traumascape of Bali. Tumarkin is not sure whether the differing death and mourning rituals of the two different countries and cultures could be reconciled. Through my descriptions of Australians participating in memorial services in Bali, and the use of Balinese symbols in some Australian memorials, I maintain that if not a reconciliation, then there was an acceptance of the cultural differences. Tumarkin considered that the memorial in Bali was ‘built specifically to honour the international victims’, not the Balinese victims. However, following Vicker’s interpretation of

546 Hitchcock and Darma Putra, Tourism, Development and Terrorism in Bali.
547 As described in chapter 2, puputans were ritual suicides by Balinese royalty, where families led by the Crown Prince marched, dressed in white, to their deaths at the hands of Dutch invaders. In 1906 more than 1000 Balinese died in a puputan at Klungkung in eastern Bali. Pringle, A Short History of Bali, Indonesia’s Hindu Realm. pp. 106–8
548 Hitchcock and Darma Putra, Tourism, Development and Terrorism in Bali. p. 4
549 Ibid.p.9, pp. 184–5
550 Ibid. p. 9
551 Tumarkin, Traumascapes. p. 8
552 Ibid. p. 213
Balinese culture, I maintain that the Balinese have adapted and incorporated the Kuta Memorial for their own remembrance.

Critiques by Australian scholars on the Australian memorials have focussed on the design of the memorials. Weller considers the design of the memorial in Fremantle in the context of the surrounding memorial landscape dominated by war memorials. From a landscape architect’s perspective, he concludes that although it is over-designed, it is an elegant memorial that provides appropriate space for anniversary services. Importantly, it situates the bombing as part of not only Western Australia’s, but Australia’s history and identity. In contrast, Abra’s critique of the memorial in the Sutherland Shire focuses on the local community and family engagement in developing the memorial. She concluded by hoping that this process helped the grieving families. These critiques by landscape architects highlight the focus of many Australian memorials on the local victims. They are a missed opportunity to consider contemporary Australian memorial design in a broader global context, and for example to compare the Australian designs with the Balinese design for the memorial in Kuta.

Much of the analysis of the bombings has centered on the interlinking of the bombing with tourism, and how this tourism, particularly from Australia, influenced the memorialisation of the bombings. Although tourism influenced the aftermath of the bombings, I extend Hitchcock and Darma Putra’s analysis to argue that the shared responses between Australians and Balinese were part of the globalisation of memorialisation. This has been demonstrated both through the Australian engagement with the memorialisation in Kuta, and the adaptation of western forms of memorials by the Balinese for mourning and remembrance.

Beyond publications on the Bali bombings and memorials, films and performances have also contributed to the collective Balinese, Australian and global memory of the bombings.

2.2 IN FILM

An example of Young’s statement that memorials can extend beyond built structures is illustrated through Australian John Darling’s film *The Healing of Bali*. Darling described the film as ‘a memorial in itself’, not just to those who died but to the resilience of the Balinese who survived. Darling
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lived in Bali from the 1970s to the 1990s. He described the production of this film as a personal journey of trying to understand the bombings, and the Balinese response. By making use of television footage of the atrocity, interviews with Balinese who assisted in the recovery of the deceased, and Australians and Balinese who lost family members in the bombings, Darling’s film provides a historical record of the bombing and the sharing of grief and recovery across cultures. Images of Australian and Balinese police working together on the forensic investigations and Muslim and Balinese Hindu women, who became friends after the bombings, illustrates how in the aftermath of the tragedies, Australians and Balinese shared experiences.

2.3 IN PERFORMANCE

One of the unique responses to this atrocity, that may now be part of the ‘cultural memory’ of the bombing, is a shadow puppet performance about the tragedy, a very distinctive Balinese response. Shadow puppet performances, or Wayang Kulit, have been performed in Bali for more than 1000 years and in the twenty-first century are still integral to temple festivals in Bali. Shadow Puppet Master I Made Sidia (Sidia) produced a shadow puppet performance about the bombings. Sidia took this Wayang Kulit around Bali to explain to villagers outside Kuta what had happened. The first performance, later televised across Bali, was on the site of the bombings that occurred on 4 January 2003. Part of Sidia’s message was that although there had been a dreadful event, the Balinese people should also look to the future, and remember what is important, including rituals and offerings to the gods. This type of theatrical depiction was not replicated in any way after Oklahoma City and Port Arthur. In contrast to the Balinese who received information about the bombing through this shadow puppet performance, for many Australians and the global community the internet was a source of information.
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By the time of the Bali bombings, for the global community and for many Australians, the internet was a source for media reports and information about the bombings. The two Bali bombings occurred shortly after 11 pm on Saturday evening Bali time, approximately 3 am eastern Australian time. Many Australians first heard the news on the morning of 13 October 2002. Online memorialisation, which began with the Oklahoma City bombing, continued in Australia after the Bali bombings. Through the internet, newspaper, radio and television websites, the stories of private losses became an accessible and ongoing part of the history of the bombings. By 2002 online remembrance was part of the community’s response. Two Australian football clubs set up memorial sites for their lost team members.\textsuperscript{565} The ‘portraits of grief’ in newspapers were included on their websites.\textsuperscript{566} These online memorials became part of the ongoing history and memory of the bombings. The ‘88 Australian stories’, with details of the Australian lives lost in Bali, included in \textit{The Age} newspaper on 7 October 2003, were still available online in January 2004.\textsuperscript{567} The internet also became a medium for government responses. The Australian Government used its websites for information about the bombings, and eventually as sites for newsletters for families about services and support during the trials of the bombers, and for anniversary activities.\textsuperscript{568}

Access to the internet was not however equitable across the USA, Australia and Indonesia. In 2002 internet access across Indonesia was still limited. Of a population of 210 million in mid-2000, only 7.5 million had telephone connections, three million of which were in Jakarta. By 2003, the estimated number of internet subscribers across Indonesia was around 800 000, out of a potential 7.5 million users.\textsuperscript{569} In comparison, close to two-thirds or 66 per cent of Australian households had access to the internet in 2003.\textsuperscript{570} In the USA the percentage of people with internet access increased from 9 per cent
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in 1995 to 68 per cent in 2005. Although internet usage was increasing among the ‘more highly educated urban Indonesians,’ in 2003 a combination of ‘computer illiteracy, poverty and the lack of public infrastructure’ was likely to restrict widespread access to the internet across Indonesia in the near future. The use of the internet for access to information, and as a site for memorialisation, was more of an American and Australian than Balinese and Indonesian response in the early twenty-first century. The cultural differences in memorialisation extended beyond differences in access to and use of the internet; it extended to the type of ceremonies and the reasons they were held.

3. Rituals and remembrance in Bali

3.1 BALINESE CEREMONIES

Cultural differences in memorialisation between the USA, Australia and Bali were demonstrated in the ceremonies held in Bali after the bombings. Bali is a Hindu enclave in a predominantly Muslim country. In contrast to the USA and Australia, where the religion of the majority is predominantly Christian, nearly 94 per cent of the population of Bali are Hindus. This difference in beliefs resulted in different ceremonies and responses. Whereas the services after the atrocities at Oklahoma City and Port Arthur largely focused on remembrance of the victims, for the Balinese it was more than remembering the victims, it was also about cleansing the trauma of the bombings and appeasing the gods. Initially the Balinese community construed the bombings as a sign from the gods that they were displeased with the Balinese for not carrying out all their rituals, and for focusing on immoral and ‘un-Balinese’ tourism developments. The purification ceremonies were held partly to respond to this.

The first services were interfaith ceremonies followed by purification ceremonies. The first interfaith ceremony was held on a day auspicious for the Balinese — the full moon of 21 October 2002. Interfaith ceremonies were held at the bombsites, at football fields in Denpasar and at Pura Besakih, Bali’s mother temple. The ceremonies were followed on 15 November 2002.
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with an elaborate purification ritual, *Pemarisudha Karipubhaya*, held in Jalan Legian (Legian Street), televised around the world. The aim of the ceremony was 'to cleanse the island of evil spirits that inspired the bombings and to guide the victims’ souls to the afterlife in peace'.

This ceremony reflected the principal tenets of Balinese Hinduism, that a balance must be maintained between positive and negative forces. If the order of the world has been disturbed either by natural catastrophes or by human-induced disasters such as bombings, then order must be restored. After death, Balinese Hindus are cremated on an auspicious day and the deceased’s ashes are scattered at sea. This ritual is followed by ceremonies in which ‘the purified spirit is installed in a special shrine in the family temple ... as a deified ancestor awaiting rebirth’. The soul does not leave the body until cremation, and the soul may cause families problems if the correct ceremonies have not all been carried out. As the remains of not all of the victims were found or properly cremated, one of the reasons this ceremony was organised was so all the souls would be at rest.

This Balinese purification ritual held on 15 November was conducted around the remains of the nightclubs and on Kuta Beach. It included prayers and the sprinkling of holy water. Animals were sacrificed and drowned at sea to appease evil spirits. The ceremony was attended by more than 6 000 Balinese, diplomats from 22 countries, Indonesian and Australian politicians and 51 relatives of Australian victims. The Australian media reported the ceremony as being part of a national day of mourning, and explained that the Hindu priests prayed for harmony to return to the island, for the balance of God, the environment and humans to be restored, and for the bombsite to be cleansed and neutralised. Australians participated in the ceremony with their own rituals: an Australian woman in traditional Balinese dress threw into the water treasured mementoes of a lost son and brother, including an Australian Football League club badge and a tiny golden football.

---
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Families who were still waiting for their missing family members to be identified also attended. An Australian woman, who lost her sister in the bombings, said she ‘found the ceremony cleansing’, and other Australians said they thought the Balinese prayers were meaningful and would be beneficial to everyone as they all tried to rebuild their lives. Shared mourning and grieving took place, as Australians participated in and found comfort from a Balinese Hindu ceremony. It was an example of the continued expansion of the globalisation of memorialisation.

The development and use of the memorial adjacent to the sites of the bombing, in Jalan Legian in Kuta, also became another site for shared mourning and grieving.

### 3.2 THE KUTA MEMORIAL

In contrast to the memorials at Oklahoma City and Port Arthur Historic Site, the Kuta Memorial was not developed through engagement and consultation with those affected. Memorialisation in Bali did not have the popular status that it did in the USA when the Oklahoma City memorial was being developed. Although Balinese community organisations from Kuta and the nearby areas of Seminyak and Legian were consulted about the memorial, there was no engagement with families of the international victims. A number of Balinese government agencies, led by the Badung Regency and representatives of foreign delegations including the Australian Consul-General were involved in the planning for the Bali memorial. The Badung Regency formed a committee to consider the reconstruction of the area around the bombed nightclubs. The Regency wanted a memorial built at the site, where the first purification ceremony was held after the bombings. The committee called for designs for a memorial, and 17 entries were received. In August 2003, the Badung Regency announced that the design of local architect and university lecturer I Wayan Gomudha, MT (Mr Gomudha) had been selected for the memorial.
In contrast to Oklahoma City and Port Arthur, the Bali memorial was not built on the site of the atrocities but in the vicinity of them — in an area in Jalan Legian between the sites of the two bombed nightclubs, the Sari Club and Paddy’s Bar, Map 7. Despite being very different in design and location to the Oklahoma City and Port Arthur memorials, the Kuta Memorial could also be described as a national memorial, in that it provides space for a range of interactions, and space where people can speak to the dead.\(^5\) It was designed to provide space for private grieving in a public space. Mr Gomudha said he began designing a memorial before the competition was announced.

He heard the explosion of a third bomb outside the US Consulate, near where he lived. Mr Gomudha wanted to contribute to the reconstruction of the Kuta bombsites, and to develop a tribute to the victims, and he was concerned that there was no significant place where people could remember them. By late 2002, people were leaving flowers, cards and offerings at a small shrine around a tree that survived at the Sari Club, but the bombsites were otherwise vacant. He drafted plans for a memorial that included a memorial museum on the Sari Club site and a garden and café area on the Paddy’s Bar site.\(^5\) The memorial that was built did not extend to either of these sites.

Key features and symbols of Balinese Hinduism are integral to Mr Gomudha’s design. It faces north, towards the holy mountain Mt Agung and Pura Besakih, the most important temple in Bali. The memorial is dominated by a sculpture of Kayonan or ‘the tree of life’, representing the lives of the victims in the world and the afterworld (photo 48). Water is a symbol of purity in Bali. The water in the fountain is a representation of the struggle of life and the daily life in Kuta where
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people protect the balance and harmony between their freedom and fulfill their obligations as members of the community. A lotus with eight petals inside the pond represents the eight points of the compass symbolising the nine manifestations of God that protect the stability of the world (photo 49). A Balinese household temple is located at the north-east side of the memorial — the direction where the sun rises every day (photo 50). An altar was included for the daily ritual offering to the gods, and for others to send prayers or messages for the victims (photo 51).

In contrast to the Memorial Garden at Port Arthur, but similar to the memorial in Oklahoma City, the names of all the Bali victims are included in this memorial. The names of all the victims are embossed in gold on black marble so that generations will remember them (photo 52). The names of victims from western countries are on the left or western side of the honour roll, and those from eastern countries on the eastern side. Due to the involvement of the Australian Consulate-General in the development of the memorial, the names of the Australian victims are in English. The names of all other victims are in Bahasa Indonesia. Twenty-two flagpoles mark the victims’ countries. Mr Gomudha hoped that his memorial would contribute to the public memory of the response to the bombings. He hoped also that the children and grandchildren from the victims’ families would continue to visit the memorial.

Photo 49 (above): Lotus pond, Kuta Memorial, Bali, October 2006
Photo 50 (right): Balinese temple at the Kuta Memorial, Bali, October 2006
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The Kuta Memorial covers the least amount of landscape of all three memorials, yet it is still a significant ‘site of memory and site of mourning’. It provides space for ‘experience and emotional discovery’ as Savage suggested American memorials do in the twenty-first century. It also provides spaces for reflection, and for music, as demonstrated by the Balinese music and dance performances around the memorial on anniversaries. Through the design it reinforces the significance of Balinese Hinduism in memorialisation, both for local and international visitors to the memorial. The inscriptions of names and details of the bombing in Bhasa Indonesian signify that although many westerners were killed, this is an Indonesian, and Balinese memorial.

The Kuta Memorial was officially unveiled on the second anniversary of the bombing on 12 October 2004 (photo 53). Amidst tight security following the bombing of the Australian Embassy in Jakarta, the ceremony began with a welcome organised by the Australian Consulate-General, Bali. A more elaborate Indonesian ceremony followed. The unofficial unveiling of the memorial by the Indonesian Governor of Bali was accompanied by Balinese music and dancing. These performances continued through the evening. At 11 pm, just before the time of the first bombing, hundreds of people present lit candles and prayed. The shared mourning included the flowers, messages and tributes left at the memorial and along the Sari Club fence.

The memorial in Bali is the case study with the least amount of interpretation of the atrocitiy. The only reference to the bombing is the

Photo 51: Tributes on the altar at the Kuta Memorial, Bali, October 2006
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inscription at the top of the honour board, in Bahasa Indonesia, which translated reads: *Names of victims of bomb explosion on Jalan Legian Kuta 12 October 2002*. In 2005, no English translation of this inscription was available on site, nor was there, in Bahasa Indonesian or English, any interpretation of the Balinese symbolism of the memorial. The Australian Consul-General agreed that if text was written for an interpretation sign, it would consider funding this sign. I drafted text for a sign in consultation with Mr Gomudha and Balinese academic Dr Darma Putra. Due to staff changes at the Australian Consulate-General, in 2010 the development of this sign remains a work in progress. However, if plans for a Bali Peace Park on the Sari Club site eventuate, this sign may be included in the museum planned for the site.

Cultural differences in memorialisation between Bali and Australia exist in the representation of memorials. The symbolism of the Kuta Memorial and its place within the community is distinctly different to the symbolism of the Oklahoma City and Port Arthur memorials. For Australians, the built

*Photo 52 (above): Names of the victims at the Kuta Memoria, Bali, October 2005*

*Photo 53 (right): After the official opening of the Kuta memorial, 12 October 2004*
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memorials on Bali and across Australia are a tribute to those who died; like war memorials, a focus for mourning. For the Balinese, the Kuta Memorial is as much a reminder of the event as of the victims, and it is hoped it will be a deterrent to any future bombers. In a response similar to those of Pak Komang and Sidia referred to in chapter 2, Mr Gomudha said that he wanted to remind people of the bombing. None of those interviewed in relation to the memorials at Oklahoma City and Port Arthur expressed these views.

As the Balinese have accommodated western tourists, so too have some Balinese adapted to western memorialisation. The Kuta Memorial is also an example of what Darling and Couteau, in support of Vickers, refer to as the adaptation of the Balinese to western tourism, and how this adaptation and the accompanying income has supported the survival of traditional Balinese culture that might otherwise have been lost. Darling described this as ‘the ability of the Balinese to adapt and adopt, they maintain their own essence and beliefs, but they are quick to adapt and appreciate what comes from outside. One example is the Barong [an important figure in Balinese dance] which is the result of Chinese influence over a hundred years ago.’ The building of what may be described as a western-style memorial with Balinese Hinduism symbolism and designs is an indication of the Balinese adaptation of western memorialisation to their own needs.

The design of the Kuta Memorial was planned to provide space for families of both Balinese and international victims to remember their losses. It is not just for international victims as Tumarkin has implied. It provides a space where the Balinese can publicly remember the international victims, and their own losses.

It is not just western memorials that are therapeutic; so too is this memorial in Kuta. In speaking about the memorial, two of the Balinese widows, who work at a sewing cooperative set up after the bombing, reflected on the comfort it gave them. Jontri Ni Ketut (Jontri) and Ni Luh Erniati (Ni Luh) said it was good to have a reminder of what happened. Poignantly Jontri, who talked about the problems her daughter had in adjusting to her father’s death, said she liked to be able to show her children
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their father’s name. The significance of the memorial for the families and friends of the Balinese victims was demonstrated on the fourth anniversary of the bombing, when the Balinese widows and their children, after photos and speeches, all returned to leave offerings under the names of their husbands (photo 54).

On the eighth anniversary of the bombings, on 12 October 2010 (photo 55), I observed Balinese widows and their children again leaving bantan, the Balinese offerings including flowers, food and incense, below the names of the Indonesian victims. After leaving the offerings they stood in silence, hands together in prayer, before turning away from the memorial in tears.

On the same night at 11.00 pm, just before the time of the first bombing, a Balinese high priest came to the memorial to offer prayers. Tourists and mourners were silenced and photographs prohibited as he and his associates sat by the pool and with offerings and prayers for those who died, a powerful

---

Photo 54: Balinese widows and children of Bali bomb victims at the Kuta memorial, 12 October 2006
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607 I recognised this family as I had previously met them, with other Balinese widows in October 2006. They were also identified to me as widows of the bombing victims by a Balinese man, a Muslim, whom I met at the memorial. This man was mourning his Balinese partner who died in the bombings. He told me her name and showed me her name on the memorial wall.
demonstration that the sites of death and the memorial are now part of the Balinese religious rituals. The memorial in Kuta is now part of the international and Balinese landscape of memory.

The engagement of the Balinese with the Kuta Memorial is an example of Balinese taking elements of western traditions to suit their needs. The Balinese shrine on the right of the memorial, the strong Balinese elements and the daily leaving of bantan, the offerings to the gods at the memorial, all highlight how this memorial is now part of Balinese life and ritual in Kuta.

The site of the bombings adjacent to the memorial is also a site of mourning for the Balinese. In 2004, during the ceremonies for the official opening of the memorial, a family in formal Balinese dress lit incense and left offerings below a photo attached to the fence in front of the Sari Club site (photo 56). The construction of the memorial adjacent to atrocity sites has not inhibited the Balinese continuing with their own mourning rituals.

However although some of the Balinese have embraced the memorial in Kuta, differences still exist between how the Australian and Balinese regard the land where the nightclubs had been. Tumarkin accurately assesses the story of Kuta’s bombsites as reflecting the cultural differences between the Balinese and westerners, particularly Australians, to trauma sites. She described in 2005 how ‘Australian relatives spoke with bitterness and sadness about the sites being uncared for and … Australian journalists wrote scathing articles about what they called their nation’s sacred sites being
nothing short of eyesore[s]. As previously referred to, for the Balinese, it is not so much the site of death rather than the rituals associated with death that are significant. It is important for the appropriate death rituals to be carried out, particularly in the case of sudden and unexpected death, so the spirits of the deceased are at peace, and according to the principles of samsara (reincarnation) will find a home in another form. If the correct ceremonies are not carried out, then an atman or ghost of the deceased can annoy the deceased’s family. It is through rituals, including cremation, that the released souls will find another home or ‘ultimate oneness with God’.

A number of Balinese people reported that the land was not likely to be used for another bar or restaurant or similar commercial uses due to ‘bad spirits’. Balinese people, however, continue to leave daily offerings for the gods at the sites. In January 2004, a tree that survived the bombing in the front of the Sari Club had become a shrine, with daily offerings to the gods left at the tree (photo 57). A small shrine in front of the Paddy’s Bar site that survived the bombing was still being tended (photo 58). Banana trees had been planted on the site. Locals recounted that while these trees grew then it meant that the bad spirits would have gone and the land could be used again (photo 59).}
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In 2006 the sites of the Sari Club and Paddy’s Bar were still vacant blocks (photo 60). The tree in front of the Sari Club was still a shrine. The small shrine in front of Paddy’s Bar had been replaced by a bigger shrine at the back of the site. By 2010 the Paddy’s Bar site had undergone a radical transformation. A three-storey building now covered the site, with an Australian surfwear clothing store on the ground floor, and a bar on the
upper two floors (photo 61). The plans to extend the memorial over the two original nightclub sites\textsuperscript{613} were unlikely to eventuate. However plans for a memorial on the Sari Club site may be successful. In October 2010 the Sari Club site was being used as a car park (photo 62). An Australian group has developed plans and is raising funds for a peace park and memorial museum on the Sari Club site. The Governor of Bali spoke at the launch of their plans at the Australian Consulate-General on 11 October 2010. The project is being developed in consultation with Balinese architects and designers.\textsuperscript{614} The Sari Club site may yet be the site of reconciliation between Australian and Balinese differences about how this atrocity site should be managed.

3.3 HERITAGE ISSUES AND THE KUTA MEMORIAL

Similarly to Oklahoma City, and in contrast to the planning for the Memorial Garden at Port Arthur Historic Site, heritage studies of the atrocity sites were not part of the planning for the memorial at Kuta. Not unlike Oklahoma City, the impact of the bombings in Kuta damaged many of the surrounding buildings, which for safety reasons were later demolished. Although a source of employment and income for the local Balinese community, the nightclubs were likely to have been identified as being more significant to the western tourists than the local community. For the Balinese these sites may therefore not have warranted a heritage assessment.

Heritage issues were included in the planning for the memorials at Oklahoma City and Port Arthur, but not in the development of the Kuta Memorial. Although governments and communities in Bali are engaged in the protection of Balinese cultural heritage, the area of the bombings has not yet been identified as part of this heritage. A non-government heritage

\textbf{Photo 62: Sari Club site, October 2010}

\textsuperscript{613} Author interview with Pak Komang.

\textsuperscript{614} Malcolm Quekett, ‘Bali Peace Park to ‘Pay for Itself’,’ \textit{The West Australian}, 12 October 2010.
organisation was established in Bali in 2000, with the aim of engaging the community in the protection of Bali’s cultural heritage. The proposed development of the Sari Club site may provide an opportunity for the development of a heritage plan for the area around the Kuta Memorial, including identification of the heritage values of the area for the Balinese community and international visitors.

3.4 OTHER MEMORIALS IN BALI

Similarly to Oklahoma City and Port Arthur, memorials in Kuta have extended beyond the atrocity sites. The memorial in Oklahoma City covers not just the site of the Murrah Building but another city block. At Port Arthur a number of small memorials have been installed at the actual sites of death. Similarly in Bali, Kuta is not the only site for a memorial. Other memorials are nearby, or in places familiar to the victims. One of these is in the grounds of the Bali Beach Hotel (photo 63). In early October, to coincide with the end of the Australian football season, a football competition for expatriate footballers based in capital cities in Asia is held each year in Bali. Many of the matches are played on the football fields at the Bali Beach Hotel. In a corner of one of these fields, a small memorial to the expatriate footballers who were killed in the bombings now stands. Funded by the football clubs that lost members in the bombings, this small memorial is part of the history of the bombings.

Another memorial highlights a link between Balinese Hinduism and remembrance of the bombing. A memorial in the grounds near the entrance to the White Rose Hotel (photo 64), is just a short walk from the Kuta Memorial.
Memorial. This memorial includes the words ‘God are you angry with us ... God please forgive us ... God please make us stronger.’ This memorial was still in place and being tended to in October 2010. The words on this memorial reflected the initial concerns from some Balinese, including the puppet master I Made Sidia, that before the bombings the community may have focused too much on tourism and neglected religious obligations.  

As with the Oklahoma City and Port Arthur tragedies, the memorialisation extended beyond the built memorials. The setting up of foundations is a shared feature of the memorialisation across Oklahoma City, Port Arthur and Bali. In Bali, Rucina Ballinger, a Bali-based American writer on Balinese dance, set up Yayasan Kemanusiaan Ibu Pertiwi (YKIP) with the original intention of helping Balinese victims to obtain the medical services they needed. The organisation has continued to provide support for the Balinese families of bomb victims. It includes a scholarship program for children of the bomb victims, therapy programs for school children and adults, and it has helped a number of widows set up small businesses. YKIP also operates a sewing cooperative to assist Balinese widows and their families who lost their husbands, fathers and breadwinners in the bombings.

Two of these widows, Ni Luh and Jontri, related how through YKIP they have received assistance with work, income and their children’s education, and forged friendships. YKIP also supports the widows and families at anniversary time. YKIP could be described as another example of the globalisation of memorialisation, not only being supported by organisations from Canada, the USA, Australia and Norway for example, but also in reporting on global remembering of the victims, such as the story and photos of an annual golf day to remember an Australian victim.

Another form of memorialisation after the Bali bombings is the increasingly popular Ubud Writers and Readers Festival. Janet de Neefe, an expatriate Australian, was completing her book on her life in Bali when the bombings occurred. Her decision to organise the festival came from a desire to do something positive that would have a lasting benefit for the community,
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and also as a way to encourage visitors back to Bali, particularly people who might write about and help promote Bali in a positive way. De Neefe organised the first festival in 2004, to coincide with the anniversary of the 2002 bombings. In 2005, just before the start of that year’s festival the second Bali bombings caused many visitors to cancel their bookings. While attending the 2006 festival I joined other participants at a memorial service for the victims of the 2005 bombings. In 2010 the festival website still included the information that the festival was established as a healing project after the first Bali bombing. This festival has provided an important boost to international tourism in Bali. It is increasing in popularity, attracting a range of high profile authors from across Asia, Europe and the USA, as well as Indonesia and Australia. As at Port Arthur, tourism was a major source of income for the Balinese before the atrocity. Similarly to Port Arthur, tourism declined after the Bali tragedies. The importance of tourism, particularly international tourism, was a significant factor in the memorialisation in Bali, including the development of the memorial in Kuta.

4. Tourism, timing and memorials in Bali

Tourism had a significant influence on the memorialisation of the atrocities at both Port Arthur Historic Site and in Bali. At both sites building a memorial on the sites of the atrocities extended beyond remembering the victims; it was also to render the sites acceptable so tourists would return. Pak Komang, head of the LPM in Kuta, said many of their members suffered from loss of income with the downturn in tourist numbers after the bombing, so they were keen to have a monument at the site. This echoed the response of management and the community at Port Arthur Historic Site, that a memorial at the atrocity site would support the return of tourists and much needed income.

This need to encourage tourists to return influenced the timing of the memorials at both Port Arthur Historic Site and Bali. In both areas it resulted in a change in the memory cycles of remembrance. As Darma Putra said ‘the Balinese do build memorials, but often many years after the event … the memorial to the bombing victims was built much more quickly, due to tourist and other influences’.
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The Bali memorials to those who died in the *puputan* or ritual suicide in 1906 were built in 1977, almost 70 years after the deaths. The war memorial at Margarana was initially a park and it was not until some years later that the memorials were erected on the site.\textsuperscript{626} Similarly to Port Arthur, building an official memorial in Kuta provided a space to which tourists would feel comfortable returning. The impetus for the memorial at Bali was not to encourage those interested in ‘dark tourism’, in visiting sites of suffering,\textsuperscript{627} but rather to encourage the international and Australian holiday visitors to return.

The Balinese who suffered greatly were those reliant on international tourists for their livelihood. Hitchcock and Darma Putra described the multiplier effect of the impact of the bombings, of the effect not only on those working in tourism who lost their jobs, but those working in areas supporting tourism such as taxi drivers and shop workers.\textsuperscript{628} Other Balinese whose work was also dependent on tourism, such as beach vendors, were also affected.\textsuperscript{629} Australian-born Bali-based hotel owner Asri Kerthyasa said to me, ‘when one Balinese loses their job then many family members who rely on their income for support also suffer’.\textsuperscript{630} For these reasons, it was critical that the tourists were encouraged to return.

\textbf{Photo 65: Tourists at the Kuta Memorial, January 2004}
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Parallels between Port Arthur and Bali extended beyond their dependence on tourism as a source of income. Tourism in both places began well over 100 years before the atrocities — at Port Arthur in the late 1800s and at Bali about 1908. The development and impact of tourism on Bali has been well documented and discussed, particularly in the works of Vickers and Picard. Hitchcock and Darma Putra describe the adverse impact of the bombing on tourism. To use their phrase, ‘tourism arrivals plummeted in the aftermath of the bombings’. Similarly to Port Arthur, it was an example of how violent attacks can have devastating effects on tourism numbers and in turn local economies. The Bali Tourism Promotion Board documented the drop in visitor numbers: in 2001 the total number of foreign visitors to Bali was 1.35 million, in 2003 this number had dropped to 994,616. In 2005 the number of international visitors again reached 1.3 million, and declined again to 1.2 million after the 2005 bombing. This decrease in international tourism was matched by a drop in revenue: in 2000 the total revenue from international tourists was US$5.4 million, in 2002 it was US$4.4 million and had still only recovered to US$4.7 million by 2004. Although anecdotal response from management at Port Arthur Historic Site and the Balinese community has suggested that the opening of the memorials has supported the increase in tourism, no studies have yet been undertaken on the correlation between the opening of these memorials and the gradual increase in tourism: it is another related area of research still to be explored.

5. **Australian remembrance in Bali**

The tourism to Bali, in particular the Australian tourism, was to have another effect on the memorialisation on the bombings in Bali. The 88 Australians who died in Bali were on holidays; many were young tourists. Their deaths in Bali resulted in the Australian Government becoming involved in the memorialisation in Bali, both through the construction of memorials and through providing memorial scholarships and funding. Memorialisation became part of the responsibilities of the Australian Consulate-General in Bali, initially through organising services and later with the management of a memorial. The first service at the Australian Consulate-General in Bali
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was held on 17 October 2002, attended by the Prime Minister John Howard and other Australian politicians.\(^637\) It was held in the garden area outside the memorial, which had been surrounded with floral tributes.\(^638\) In February 2003, the Australian Government announced a ‘Living Memorial’ to the ‘88 Australians killed in the atrocity’. The memorial included a donation of A$10.5 million to the Provincial Government of Bali and a scholarship program for Balinese health care workers to study in Australia.\(^639\) The Australian Minster for Foreign Affairs and Trade, Alexander Downer, officially opened a memorial in the grounds of the Australian Consulate-General in Bali on 28 April 2003.\(^640\) A wooden cross, erected outside the Australian Consulate-General two days after the bombing, was installed as part of the memorial.\(^641\) Reminiscent of the Huon Pine Cross at Port Arthur, this cross was later relocated, albeit without the conflict that overshadowed the relocation of the cross at Port Arthur Historic Site. A brass plaque on the memorial read: ‘In memory: This memorial garden is dedicated to the Australian victims of the tragic bombing that took place in Bali on 12 October 2002’. The memorial at the Australian Consulate-General may be part of the collective memory, particularly of the Australian families of victims of the bombing. In contrast to the memorial at Oklahoma City, it was a memorial that has been moved a number of times.

The Australian memorial was relocated as part of a number of relocations of the Australian Consulate-General due to security concerns following bombings in Bali and Jakarta. In 2004 the memorial was located just inside the main gate of the Australian Consulate-General, and visible to passersby through the surrounding fence (photo 66). This allowed people to visit the memorial without going through the security or formalities required for entering the Consulate-General. A stream of Australians visited the memorial, particularly during the Australian summer school holidays, the peak time for Australian tourism. In January 2004 tributes at the memorial included an Australian flag and a T-shirt dedicated to one of the victims, flowers and teddy bears (photo 67).

\(^{637}\) Sugriwa, ed., *Bali Bombing*. p. 96
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\(^{641}\) This detail was taken from a sign at the Australian Consulate-General Bali memorial in October 2006.
Following the bombing of the Australian Embassy in Jakarta in September 2004, the Australian Consulate-General on Bali was immediately removed to an unidentified secure location, and then to temporary premises while a new consulate-general was being built. The memorial at the Australian Consulate-General remained in its original location for approximately six months after the 2004 Jakarta bombing, during which time Australian families were able to visit the memorial if accompanied by a Consulate-General staff member.

On 9 September 2004, 11 people were killed and more than 100 injured. Moore and Romples, ‘Australian Embassy Attack: Evil at Our Gate.’
The temporary Consulate-General premises which opened in 2005 had tight security of high walls, and a strong police presence. Visitors were required to sign in at an entrance gate building. The memorial was located to the left of the entrance gate building, through another gate and fence, and surrounded by high walls (photo 68). It was separate from the main Consulate-General building. The friendly open feeling that surrounded the memorial in its original location was no longer present. The brass plaque from the original memorial was still in place, as were some items that had been at the memorial in January 2004. These items included an inscribed Australian flag, the T-shirt with a victims' photo, and some flowers (photo 69).

In 2007, the memorial was relocated for the third time to the grounds of the new Australian Consulate-General (photo 70). The brass plaque with details
of the unveiling of the original memorial in 2003 is not included in the new memorial. Two plaques on stone plinths mark the entrance to the memorial. One plaque includes the following: ‘The wooden cross is a symbol of great significance ... erected outside the Australian Consulate General ... after 12 October 2002 ... It has now reached its permanent home in this garden’. The other plaque acknowledges the Australian victims of the 2002 and 2005 Bali bombings, although the victims’ names are not listed.

Twenty-two stone pillars in a pond represent the victims from 22 countries (photo 71). During the service at this memorial on 12 October 2010 representatives of the nationalities of people killed in this bombing, the Australian, Indonesian and Japanese governments, and the families of the victims placed wreaths and flowers below the cross. No T-shirts or teddy bears or other tributes were left.

The memorial has become very much an official monument to be formally visited at a prearranged time. The tightened security at the Consulate-General entrance, introduced after the 2004 Embassy bombing in Jakarta and increased after the 2005 Bali bombing, has continued. In October 2010 the entrance to the Australian Consulate-General and the memorial is through the high security entrance (photo 72).
victims of the Bali bombings is no longer a space to drop in to, surrounded by the sights and smells and noises of Bali, as it was in the grounds of the original Consulate-General in 2003 and 2004. In 2010, with the Australian flag flying nearby, the memorial has been transposed from a small space on the perimeter of the Australian Consulate-General to a very formal monument reminding all visitors to the Consulate-General of the Australian Government’s response to the bombings. However despite this formality with the landscaped gardens used to physically separate the memorial from the high security entrance and the offices of the Australian Consulate-General, it is an area that provides space for reflection, and for private grieving.\footnote{Maya Lin, \textit{Grounds for Remembering}, p. 13} This was evident during the anniversary services held at the memorial in October 2010.

Managing the memorials has become part of the work of the Australian Consulate-General. The bombings have impacted not just on the families, but on both the Australian Consulate-General’s official duties in Bali and now on the landscaping of the office itself. The bombings also had an impact on the work of other Australian Government departments. A legacy of the Bali bombings was the development of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)’s travel advisory websites. Neighbour details that prior to the bombing the Australian government knew that terrorists were planning an attack, and possibly in Bali.\footnote{Neighbour, \textit{In the Shadow of Swords: On the Trail of Terrorism from Afghanistan to Australia}, p. 293} Given the high Australian death toll, the media suggested if this information had been shared fewer Australians might have
travelled to Bali and been killed. The Australian Government responded by developing these travel advisories, which can now cover all parts of the world. The travel advisories are an unlikely memorial, but an ongoing reminder of the impact of the Bali bombings on the Australian community.

Has security become part of memorialisation in the twenty-first century? Given the tightened security in the USA after September 11, for example at airports and in shopping malls, increased security may not only be one of the ongoing reminders of the attacks that are remembered at these memorials, it may also be part of the culture of western memorialisation in the twenty-first century. Of the case study sites, the memorial at the Australian Consulate-General in Bali is the only memorial with restricted access. This is the only case study where mourning at one of the memorials is now by invitation only, where remembrance has to be considered in advance; it cannot be spontaneous.

This was illustrated in the information about the services being held for the eighth anniversary of the Bali bombings at the Australian Consulate-General on 12 October 2010, where it is stated that “for security reasons attendance is by invitation only ... those interested in attending should contact the Australian Consulate-General.” This was not always the case; when it was first established the memorial at the Australian Consulate-General was accessible to all. For Australians who want to be able to grieve in their own time and space, with no restrictions, the memorials in Australia to the victims of the 2002 Bali bombings may provide those spaces.

6. Remembrance of the Bali bombing victims in Australia

6.1 Memorials Across Australia

Another significant difference in the memorialisation of the Bali bombings in comparison to the remembrance of the tragedies at Oklahoma City and Port Arthur Historic site is the number and location of memorials, and who these memorials remember. Whereas the memorials in Oklahoma City and Port Arthur are for all the victims of the atrocities, many of the Australian


memorials are for the local victims of the bombings. In contrast to Oklahoma City and Port Arthur Historic Site, where in the immediate aftermath of the atrocities the focus for services and memorials was around the sites of the atrocities, after the Bali bombings services were held and memorials built across Australia. It has resulted in many sites of memory and sites of mourning for the families and friends of the Australian victims.

As the memorialisation in Bali began with services, the official memorialisation in Australia also began with services. The Australian Government declared a National Day of Mourning for all the Bali victims on 20 October, 10 days after the bombings.648 This was followed with a National Memorial Service, held in Parliament House, Canberra, on 24 October and attended by politicians, representatives of the Diplomatic Corps, community leaders and families affected by the tragedy.649 An Australian Government memorial was unveiled on 16 October 2003 by Prime Minister John Howard in the formal gardens around Parliament House in Canberra (photo 73). A plaque on a stone cairn is inscribed with the words ‘In memory of Australian citizens and residents who lost their lives as a result of the terrorist attacks in Bali on 12 October 2002’. The surrounding gardens do provide space for contemplation, but it is a very unobtrusive national memorial. Ninety-one names are listed on the memorial. The memorials in Sydney, Perth,
the Gold Coast and in Kuta Bali refer to 88 Australian victims. This is the number quoted by media and politicians, and on the new plaques adjacent to the memorial in the Australian Consulate-General, Bali. Centrelink, the Australian Government agency that supported affected Australian families, said that the initial number of 88 Australians includes those who have Australian citizenship only, the figure of 91 includes those who have dual citizenship. These three are included on the memorial in Bali under the other countries where they had citizenship. This discrepancy highlights how the complexities of global and shared citizenship can impact on memorialisation.

As many affected families were involved in the development of the memorials at Oklahoma City and at Port Arthur, many of the memorials built across Australia were also developed in consultation with families and community members. Many of the Australian Bali memorials were designed by local artisans and designers, and incorporated Australian motifs and native plant species. They were designs that did not seek to imitate war memorials, but rather reflected contemporary Australian culture in both design and landscape. A number of the memorials also included Balinese motifs, to acknowledge not only the place of death but a sharing of the cultures in mourning.

In Sydney, memorials on beachside parks and public spaces attempt to enshrine the bombings in the public memory. Adjacent to North Cronulla Beach is a memorial, unveiled in September 2003, that was developed in consultation with the families of seven women from the area who were among the bomb victims (photo 74). The families requested that the memorial be situated by the beach, as a reminder of the area the girls loved and grew up in, and of Kuta, the place where they died. The memorial is a pink sandstone sculpture of a *Banksia robur* seed, a native plant from the Sutherland

---


Although a distinctive Australian design, the location of the memorial, within sight and sound of the waves and local cafés, is not unlike the landscape of the Kuta Beach foreshore.

North of Cronulla on the headland at Coogee, another Sydney suburb, stands a memorial to all the victims of the Bali bombings (photo 75). It was unveiled on the first anniversary in October 2003. A father who lost his 15-year-old daughter in the tragedy said that the memorial reminded him of the support all the victims received in the days following the bombings.

Photo 75: Memorial at Dolphin Point, Coogee Beach, Sydney, November 2007

Photo 76: Baths gateway and football club memorial, Coogee Beach, Sydney, November 2007
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Two other Bali memorials in Coogee are a short walk away from the headland. On an inside wall of an art deco gateway (photo 76) that was once the entrance to sea baths is a bronze plaque containing names and photos of the 20 victims of the bombings who lived in Sydney’s eastern suburbs. The plaque includes the words ‘Kuta Beach ... a popular holiday destination for generations of Australians, was shattered by a terrorist attack.’ It is the only memorial in Australia to refer to Kuta as a popular tourist destination for Australians. The headland has been renamed Dolphin Point in memory of the seven members of the local Dolphin Football Club who died in the bombings. The football club has erected a separate brass plaque on a stone cairn nearby with the names of the seven footballers.

The largest memorial to the Bali bomb victims in Australia is in Kings Park, Perth, Western Australia. Dedicated on 12 October 2003, this memorial overlooks the Swan River, the city and the mountains (photo 77). It is a memorial in a sculptured European landscape. The names of the 16 Western Australian victims are listed on a plaque, with the following description: ‘The main axis of the memorial aligns with the sunrise on 12 October each year when the dawn’s light will pass through the memorial space to illuminate the commemorative plaque.’

For many Australians, the dawn light striking the commemorative plaque is a reminder of the dawn services held on Anzac Day, although it is meant to acknowledge the deaths in the Kuta nightclubs which began at 11.07 pm. This design may have been influenced by the 32 war memorials in the surrounding park. This memorial too has a distinctive Australian ambience.

Photo 77: Bali Memorial, Kings Park, Perth, Western Australia, March 2004

654 Author, personal observation from visit to Bali memorial in Perth, Western Australia, March 2004.
The engraving on the red walls is reminiscent of the red rocks and sand of the western Australian desert. The memorial includes 16 grass trees, a popular Australian plant. The vista over the city and the Swan River to the hills beyond does not bring to mind a Bali beach scene.

Other Australian memorials to the Bali bomb victims contribute to the collective and public memory of the bombings. In Adelaide a memorial garden was opened on 10 April 2003 in a corner of Unley Oval to remember two Bali bomb victims from the Sturt Football Club. It includes two black granite memorials to the victims, and two benches, one in Balinese Teak and the other in Australian Jarrah. Members of the Balinese community living in Adelaide participated in the opening ceremony, which began with Balinese music and dancing and closed with Balinese Hindu offerings. In Queensland, families of victims and a local cemetery combined with a non-profit organisation to build a memorial in the grounds of the Allambee Memorial Park, Nerang on the Gold Coast. The Balinese-style memorial, opened on 12 October 2003, was designed and built in Bali in consultation with Balinese community members. A bronze plate lists the names of all the Australian victims. In Carlton, Melbourne a memorial was dedicated on 12 October 2005 to the 202 victims of the Bali bombings. It depicts an island with 202 lights and 91 fountains representing the Australian victims. Apart from the Canberra memorial, this is the only other memorial that refers to 91 Australian victims. For Australians, who for economic and/or emotional reasons may not want to, or be able to visit Bali, the local memorials may become significant places. The ongoing use of these memorials for anniversary activities and services is likely to perpetuate not only their use, but their significance in the community. In the future, they may be the only places many Australians will associate with the Bali bombings, whether they knew people who died or not.

Built memorials were not the only responses in Australia. In Tasmania, a scholarship was set up in memory of a university law student and champion rower who died in the bombings. In Forbes, NSW, football club members who lost their team mates wore jumpers the following year inscribed ‘Never forgotten’. Also in Forbes, the Greg Sanderson Memorial Golf Day
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is held each year in memory of one of the victims, and in 2009 the funds raised were donated to YKIP in Bali. Further research may uncover more memorials to the Australian victims.

6.2 MUSEUM OR MEMORIAL: THE AFP EXHIBITION

As no museum yet depicts the impact and the aftermath of the Port Arthur massacre, similarly no museum yet exists on the Bali bombings. This demonstrated that Australia has not imitated the American and worldwide trend in developing memorial museums. However following the engagement of the Australian Federal Police (AFP) in the investigations of the bombing, the AFP museum curated a temporary exhibition on the AFP’s work. The exhibition *When the Roof Became Stars* focused on the AFP’s forensic investigation into the bombing and its collaboration with the Indonesian Police (photo 78). The accompanying brochure stated that the exhibition was ‘In memory of 202 people including 88 Australians who lost their lives in the Bali bombings’. Not only a memorial, this response demonstrated that exhibitions can be part of the therapeutic response to atrocities.

---

**Photo 78: Damaged sign in AFP exhibition on the Bali bombings, Powerhouse Museum, Sydney, October 2005**

**Photo 79: AFP exhibition on the Bali bombings at the Powerhouse Museum, Sydney, NSW, October 2005**
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First exhibited at Old Parliament House, Canberra in 2003, the AFP museum then adapted the material into a travelling exhibition. In 2005, the exhibition was shown at the Powerhouse Museum, Sydney (photo 79). Although the focus of the exhibition was on the forensic investigations related to the bombings, the exhibition included photographs, survivor accounts, police uniforms and items collected from the nightclubs. In Canberra and Sydney the forensic material was placed either in a corridor or on a side wall. Visitors could walk through the main part of the exhibition without viewing the forensic exhibits. In common with the Oklahoma City tragedy, the AFP’s exhibition provided visitors with information on the atrocity while remembering those who died.

One of the differences between the AFP exhibition and the memorial museum at Oklahoma City is that the AFP exhibition included information on counselling and support services available for victims and families. At the Canberra venue a ‘quiet room’ for contemplation with lounge chairs and flowers was provided. No such space or support information is included in the Oklahoma City Memorial Museum. Another difference was that the AFP referred to the perpetrators only in the context of how the police investigations enabled them to be identified. Unlike the Oklahoma City memorial and museum, no details on the trials or sentences of the Bali bombers were included in the AFP exhibition. Whereas the Oklahoma City museum dwelt upon the impact of the violence, the AFP exhibition dealt with how to find the perpetrators of the violence. It presented the unique cooperation between the Australian and Indonesian police forces in the investigations into the bombings, another example of a multicultural response to the Bali bombings. The link between the exhibition and memorialisation of the bombing was the staging of the exhibition in Canberra and Sydney to coincide with the anniversaries of the bombing.

7. **Remembering each year: anniversaries**

A number of differences exist between the anniversary services held at Oklahoma City and Port Arthur Historic Site and those held to remember the victims of the Bali bombings. Whereas in Oklahoma City and Port Arthur the focus for anniversary services are the sites of the atrocities, the marking of anniversaries of the 2002 Bali bombings has been at services in both Australia and in Bali. On 12 October 2003, memorial services were held in Melbourne, Adelaide and Canberra. On the same day the memorials in Sydney, Brisbane and Perth were officially unveiled. 664 As noted, the Kuta
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Memorial was officially opened on the second anniversary of the bombings on 12 October 2004.

Another difference in the remembrance of anniversaries across the atrocity sites was the impact of subsequent atrocities in Bali and Jakarta on the location and services held in Bali. Since the 2005 Bali bombings, the services organised by the Australian Consulate-General have been held away from the actual site of the bombings. Security concerns have been the reason cited. In 2006 the Australian Consulate-General held a commemorative service in an area known as the Wisnu Kencana Cultural Park, about one hour’s drive from Bali. It was a location where tight security, deemed necessary by the Australian Consulate-General, could be organised. Since the new Australian Consulate-General opened in Bali in 2007, the anniversary services organised by the Australian Government are now held around the memorial in the secure grounds of the Consulate-General. Although Balinese and other nationalities attend services at the Australian Consulate-General, one of the impacts of the 2005 bombings has been less of a sharing of mourning and remembrance.

For a number of years after the opening of the memorial in Kuta in 2006 the Balinese LPM continued to organise anniversary services at the memorial. These services were not only for the Australians who return for the anniversary but to remember all the victims. Wreaths were laid and services held in 2008 and 2009. No formal ceremonies were held at this memorial in 2010, however many wreaths were laid, and as noted a Balinese high priest made offering at the memorial.

The Australian remembrance of anniversaries varies. No services have been held in Canberra since the first anniversary. However services continue to be held at the Australian Consulate-General in Bali each anniversary. Services are held and wreaths laid at the memorials in Sydney, and wreaths are laid at the other Australian memorials. In 2009 services were held in Perth and Queensland. One of the impacts of memorialisation across countries and cultures with multiple memorials is that the focus on anniversaries has dissipated at some sites. Whether the tenth anniversary for the
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2002 bombings will be marked with ceremonies that resemble the tenth anniversaries at Oklahoma City and Port Arthur remains to be seen.

8. Summing up

In Bali and across Australia communities remembered the victims of the Bali bombings with services and memorials. Bali has for a long time been a popular holiday destination for Australians. The memorialisation of the 2002 bombings added another shared experience for those whose home is in Bali, and those for whom Bali is a holiday destination. Australians participated in the Balinese ceremonies, and used Balinese symbols in some of their memorials. The Kuta Memorial has provided a space for the Balinese, Australians and people of other nationalities to come together at ceremonies and anniversaries. The ceremonies and memorials in Kuta are, I conclude, examples of the globalisation of memorialisation, with shared remembrance across cultures. The Australian memorials have provided places for families and friends, who may be unable or not want to go to Bali, to grieve.

Features of the Balinese remembrance highlighted cultural differences. The purification ceremony held, the design of the Kuta Memorial, the daily leaving of offerings at the memorial and a shadow puppet play about the memorial are distinctive Balinese responses. The design of some Australian memorials, with a Christian cross in the memorial in the grounds of the Australian Consulate-General in Bali, and the Australian landscape features of the memorial in Perth, mark some of the cultural differences in the memorialisation between Australia and Bali. The lack of reference to perpetrators is just one of the differences between the memorialisation at Oklahoma City and in Bali. For the Balinese the Kuta Memorial is not just remembrance, but a symbol of what many of the community hope will be a deterrent to those considering joining terrorist organisations. This factor, and the distinctive Balinese responses, have led me to conclude that cultural differences do exist in contemporary memorialisation across the USA, Australia and Bali.

One shared feature of contemporary memorialisation across the case study sites are the flowers, tributes and messages left at the memorials. In the next chapter I compare and contrast the management of the tributes at all the three case study sites, and document my work in trying to ensure that records of the tributes at Port Arthur and Bali are kept, but not always with success.
Chapter 6:
What to do with the teddy bears: tributes left at the memorials

I cannot believe the majority of these cards will be of the slightest interest as a museum exhibit.\textsuperscript{669}

Material I have collected during my research includes a box of items from the Australian Consulate-General, Bali relating to the 2002 Bali bombings. These items include:

\begin{itemize}
  \item a handmade visitors book;
  \item an inscribed Australian flag;
  \item photographs of Australian victims supplied by families to the Australian Embassy, Jakarta for display boards at the first anniversary service in Bali in 2003;
  \item a T-shirt and hat produced for Australian Consulate staff to wear at that service; and
  \item a small box, measuring approximately 40 cm x 45 cm, of history and memories of the Bali bombings collected by the Australian Consulate-General.
\end{itemize}

These items and tributes are now in storage, as I have been unable to find an Australian museum willing to accept these objects for their collection.

\textsuperscript{669} Words from a government official responding to the material collected from the Cenotaph in London in 1920 and held by the Imperial War Museum in London. Quoted in Edkins, \textit{Trauma and the Memory of Politics}. p. 68
1. **Introduction**

In this chapter, I continue to examine the shared and distinctive memorialisation of the three case sites through an analysis of the management of tributes such as flowers, teddy bears and T-shirts left at the atrocity sites and the memorials. My aim is to focus on the management of these tributes, rather than why people leave tributes. I begin with an overview of how American and other scholars have analysed the management of tributes. I then follow with a brief history of the management of tributes at two war memorials, the Cenotaph in London in the 1920s and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington DC, to set the historical context for the response to tributes left at the case study sites. The management of tributes left at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial by the US NPS had a significant influence on the culture of memorialisation in the USA in the late twentieth century. As Sturken concluded, by the time the Oklahoma City memorial was built the public expected the items would be collected. I illustrate how the management of tributes is now part of the memorialisation of atrocity sites in the USA through an analysis of the collection of tributes in the USA, including at the Oklahoma City National Memorial and after September 11. I then trace the differing engagement of government agencies and museum curators in Australia to the tributes left for the victims of the Port Arthur massacre and the Bali bombings. I argue that the differing responses to tributes left at the case study atrocity sites signals another cultural difference in the memorialisation of atrocity sites across these three countries. The differing cultural response to tributes across the case studies is also evident in the differing response of scholars to the leaving and management of tributes.

2. **The management of tributes: how scholars have responded**

The scholarly analysis of the management of tributes highlights the differing interest in tributes across countries. Australian scholars have not yet considered tributes as part of the memorialisation of atrocity sites. The efforts of the English Government to manage the tributes left at the Cenotaph in London after the First World War have been analysed by English scholar Jenny Edkins, who concluded that the differences between government agencies on how to manage these tributes reflected the difficulties of both governments and individuals coming to terms with the
trauma of war. In the late twentieth century tributes were again a popular mourning ritual for a community coming to terms with the trauma of war. The offerings left at the Wall are well documented in print and online. Colour photographs of boots, letters, toys, beer cans, cards, teddy bears and army memorabilia left at the Wall in *Offerings at the Wall* depict the myriad of objects that are now part of the collective memory of this memorial.

The leaving of offerings at the Wall resulted in an increasing American scholarly analysis on tributes. American scholars have acknowledged that by the late twentieth century the leaving of tributes was part of the ritual of remembrance in the USA. Sturken analysed the leaving of objects at the Wall as part of ‘a desire to transfer private memories into a collective experience.’ However, Sturken later concluded that this ritual of leaving objects extended beyond the collective experience; it ‘became an aspect of national culture when people began to leave things at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial as a means of speaking to the dead’. The national culture now includes the management of these tributes.

Although some American scholars have considered the management of tributes, as Doss concludes, much of the American scholarship on tributes or spontaneous memorials focuses on the representation of these objects and memorials as part of contemporary mourning rituals. This includes the edited volume by American folklorist Jack Santino which includes analyses of the spontaneous memorials across the USA, including roadside memorials and after September 11, as part of the contemporary American response to grief and mourning. Doss acknowledges the increasing trend towards the preservation of these memorials, which she describes as ‘unique …
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and irreplaceable collections entitled to respect and preservation. This includes the objects such as photographs, flowers, teddy bears and messages left on the fence at the Oklahoma City National Memorial, which Doss evocatively describes as a ‘Memory fence’. I argue that these tributes and spontaneous memorials should be preserved not only for their representation of ‘changed dimensions of mourning’, but also for future museum curators and interpreters, as a record of how a community responded to sudden death through wars and atrocities.

However, although governments might direct the management of tributes, for museum curators the collection of tributes may not be an easy task. Following her description of the collection of tributes after deaths from a bonfire at Texas A & M University, Grider concluded that collecting tributes was ‘a complicated, painstaking and emotional process’. The material Grider and her colleagues at the Anthropology Department at the university collected was evocatively described by American scholar Lawrence Biemiller as ‘three hundred boxes brimming with grief’. Similarly, curators from New York and Washington who met to consider how to respond to the masses of tributes left after September 11 described it as ‘working at the intersection of grief and history’. The emotional difficulties of dealing with tributes may be one of the reasons why Australian curators are reticent about managing tributes.

The references to tributes in Australia are descriptive rather than analytical. Just two scholars refer to the tributes left at Port Arthur Historic Site. Strange refers to the exhibition of artworks and some of the donated items at Port Arthur. Tumarkin refers to items being left at the site of the Mikac family’s deaths. Few references are made to the tributes from the Bali bombings. Hitchcock and Darma Putra include photographs of the tributes left at the Kuta memorial in Bali, but do not refer to these tributes in their
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analysis of the impact of the bombing on tourism in Bali.\textsuperscript{686} Articles in the Friends Magazine of the National Museum of Australia (NMA) described the few tributes from Bali memorials in their collection.\textsuperscript{687} These articles are a missed opportunity for an analysis of the significance of these items in Australian museum collections. No reference is made in these articles to the broader issue of managing tributes left at atrocity sites.

\section*{3. The management of tributes: the historical context}

Responding to and managing tributes is part of the twentieth century history of memorialisation. Although spontaneous shrines have become an increasing popular mourning ritual in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries,\textsuperscript{688} Edkins highlights how the leaving of tributes was a ritual begun many years earlier.\textsuperscript{689} In the early twentieth century, the ritual of leaving tributes was not just for those who died, but also for those who were away from home, fighting in war. It was a ritual shared across western cultures. During and after the First World War, ‘spontaneous memorials’ were a common feature of English towns, with flowers, photos and messages left around the Rolls of Honour listing the names of men serving.\textsuperscript{690} In Australia on many Anzac Days flowers and messages were left on the gates of the Woolloomooloo Wharf in Sydney, the site where many Australians farewelled their loved ones leaving to fight overseas in the First World War, many never to return.\textsuperscript{691} No record exists of these tributes being collected or managed as part of the history and memory of a community’s engagement with war.

However records do exist of the English Government’s response to the management of tributes left at a war memorial in London after the First World War. Wreaths and flowers were left at the temporary Cenotaph erected in 1919 and at the permanent memorial completed in 1920.\textsuperscript{692} Similar to the descriptions of the memorials and atrocity sites in the late

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\footnotesize
\item[686] Hitchcock and Darma Putra, \textit{Tourism, Development and Terrorism in Bali}.
\item[688] Jack Santino, ‘Performative Commemoratives: Spontaneous Shrines and the Public Memorialization of Death,’ p. 5
\item[689] Edkins, \textit{Trauma and the Memory of Politics}. p. 67
\item[692] Kavanagh, \textit{Museums and the First World War: A Social History}. p. 154
\end{thebibliography}
twentieth century, the Cenotaph in London in the early twentieth century was described in newspapers as being ‘sacred space’ for grieving families. This may have been why the UK Office of Works began to collect some tributes from the London Cenotaph. Edkins described how ‘the cards and ribbons from wreaths left at the temporary Cenotaph had been collected up and kept. However, they were damp and mostly indecipherable, and ... they eventually became so offensive they had to be destroyed. It was resolved to make special arrangements to preserve all cards from wreaths deposited at the new Cenotaph.’

After the unveiling of the permanent Cenotaph in November 1920, the responsibility for managing the items collected from the memorial was handed over to the Imperial War Museum. The Office of Works proposed that cards from the wreaths be collected and sorted at Crystal Palace. The cards would then be inserted into albums, and preserved as a record. By 11 January 1921, a total of 21,257 cards had been collected, cleaned ... By March, it had reached 30,000. The variety of shapes and sizes was causing some difficulties and the idea of albums was abandoned ... a curator of the Imperial War Museum was not enthusiastic about [these cards] and one official comment[ed] ‘I cannot believe the majority of these cards will be of the slightest interest as a museum exhibit.’

Edkins then implies that the collected cards were discarded when she adds ‘the [Imperial War] Museum does not house any such cards today.’ The opportunity to capture the personal expressions of grief at the time was therefore lost. The missing cards could have filled a gap in our understanding of post-First World War British social history. These cards could have provided information on what motivated the mourners to leave tributes, and the solace the Cenotaph gave them.

The collection of tributes from the Cenotaph led to what may be the first twentieth century government guidelines on the management of tributes at a memorial. In 1922, following questions in the House of Commons, it was decided that private wreaths could be left at the Cenotaph, but only for a certain period of time. This was to be managed by having ‘a quiet word with those who arranged the new flowers and removed the old ones to the
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effect that no memorial has any prescriptive right of position or prominence, just because it is made of permanent material.

Those responsible for the memorial acknowledged that the leaving of tributes was part of private grieving, and as such, the management of these tributes should be equitable.

The only remaining records of the tributes are the files in the Public Records Office, and newspaper and private photographs. No tangible keepsakes have been kept for museum curators. Unlike the focus on the tributes from the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in the late twentieth century, scholarly discourse and media coverage of the tributes did not support or sustain interest in the tributes from museums or the public records office. The social and economic conditions, particularly the onset of the Depression, would have contributed to the lack of interest in tributes as a record of public and private remembrance of those lost at war.

In the latter half of the twentieth century, media and scholars described the flowers left as tributes to accidental and violent deaths across the globe, however references were not made to any management of these tributes. In the USA, masses of flowers were left near the site of President Kennedy’s death in Dallas in 1963. Bouquets were left outside the apartment in New York City where John Lennon was shot in 1980. In 1966 in Aberfan, Wales, a primary school was destroyed by an avalanche of coal waste and all the children inside the school building died. After this tragedy The Times newspaper reported how ‘wreaths were sent from all over the world, enough to make a cross a hundred feet tall’. In England in 1989, more than twenty years later, a barrier collapsed at the Hillsborough soccer stadium and 96 soccer fans died. Masses of flowers and soccer scarves were left as tributes at the stadium.

Brennan analysed these tributes as being partly an English cultural response, where private grieving is repressed, although public grieving is acceptable. Although the leaving of tributes was a popular mourning ritual across the globe in the twentieth century, it was the opening of the Wall that resulted in government agencies again focusing on the management of tributes, as they had done in London early in the twentieth century.
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4. Management of tributes in the USA

4.1 OFFERINGS AT THE WALL

Although the Wall was dedicated in 1982, the US National Parks Service (NPS) did not begin collecting tributes until it took over management of the memorial in 1984. Duery Felton Jr. described the initial response of the NPS to the objects left at the Wall as ‘benign neglect’. It was not until 1986 that ‘the NPS concluded that people visiting the Wall from around the world and leaving objects was not going to go away, so the objects would be treated with the same deference as objects at any other [NPS] historic site and would be [collected] and recorded’. Similarly to the Cenotaph in London, it was a war memorial that soon after opening became an area of sacred space, that ‘took on all the trappings of a religious shrine’. It was not unlikely that the ‘offerings at The Wall’ would also be regarded as sacred, and therefore subsequently collected by the NPS when they took over management of the memorial.

In contrast to the mixed response of the English government agencies to the objects collected from the Cenotaph, once the objects left at the Wall began to be collected the NPS then developed guidelines for the management of the tributes in consultation with Vietnam Veterans. It was agreed that not all the tributes left at the Wall would be kept. The NPS collects tributes

Photo 81: Offerings at the Wall, Washington DC, USA, May 2005
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relating to individuals whose names are on the Wall, objects relating to the design and construction of the Wall, and objects relating to the other memorials to Vietnam Veterans nearby (photos 82 and 83). The majority of items are collected, except for fresh flowers and unattributed American flags; the latter are given to school and community groups. 

Tributes left by visitors from countries involved in the Vietnam War, including Australia (photo 84), have broadened the international dimension of the collection.

The development of these guidelines by the NPS not only set a standard for the management of tributes, but the development of them was part of the formal acknowledgement by the US NPS that the tributes left were part of the memorialisation of the Wall. In contrast to the response to the tributes left at the Cenotaph, it meant that no one individual could decide that the tributes could not be kept; it was now government policy that the offerings at the Wall would be managed as part of the history and memory of the Wall.

The policies of the US NPS in managing the tributes left at the Wall have had an impact on both the volume of material left at the Wall, and the representation of this material. By 1984 a total of 554 objects had been collected, by 1995 more than 30 000 and by 2005 about 80 000
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Photo 82: Photo and flag at the Wall, May 2005

Photo 83 (above): Vietnam Veterans Memorial Collection: Soldier’s boots left at the Wall, May 2005

Photo 84 (left): Vietnam Veterans Memorial Collection: Australian Army soldier’s slouch hat, May 2005
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items had been collected. The tributes left include ‘photographs, letters, MIA/POW bracelets, medals, helmets, dog tags, boots, unopened beer cans, cigarettes, toys and birthday cards’ — a myriad of objects with conservation challenges for the NPS curators.

One of the consequences of the management of tributes by the NPS is that people now leave objects at the Wall to be included in the collections of the NPS. In describing the objects collected by the NPS from the Wall as being ‘subsumed in history’, Sturken noted significant differences between these archives and other archives, in that the public decided what these archives would include, just by leaving the objects at the Wall. No restrictions are enforced by the NPS on what can be left at the Wall, with the consequence that people leave objects ‘for any war, any date, any reason’. A result of this NPS policy is that ‘people now leave items at the memorial because they know they will be preserved and attain the status of historical artefacts’. These tributes are no longer private tributes in a public place, but have become public offerings that will become part of the history and memory of the Wall. Although in 1987 the objects left at the Wall were described as ‘providing us [American historians] with documents to tell the social history of the Vietnam War generation’, by the early twenty-first century the objects left and collected from the Wall provide a much broader view of the social history and the history of commemoration in the USA.

By the late twentieth century the management of tributes in the USA was extended to include exhibitions of these tributes. Exhibitions of ‘offerings at the Wall’ have supported the objects becoming part of the American collective and cultural memory of memorial. In October 1992, the Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of American History and the NPS organised an exhibition of more than 1500 tributes from the Wall entitled ‘Personal Legacy: the Healing of a Nation’. Intended to be a six-month
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temporary exhibition, it was so popular that it was extended until 2003. This exhibition set a precedent for the use of tributes in museum exhibitions. In 2004, tributes from the Wall were included in the new permanent exhibition on war at the Smithsonian Institute. Tributes from the NPS collection are included in a permanent display in the Imperial War Museum in London and at temporary displays around the USA. As Felton summed up:

Who would have thought in 1982 [when the Memorial was dedicated] there’d be collections and exhibitions, who would have thought there’d be other memorials, who would have thought there’d be a Visitor Centre [which is currently being planned] it keeps going ... In the 1980s would you have seen the internet where it is now?

The impact of the NPS management of tributes from the Wall was to influence the management of tributes at other memorials and atrocity sites across the USA, including the Oklahoma City National Memorial.

4.2 THE OKLAHOMA CITY NATIONAL MEMORIAL COLLECTION

Similar to the response to the offerings left at the Wall, US government agencies responsible for managing the site of the Oklahoma City bombing did not initially focus on the management of tributes. Flowers and messages for rescue workers were left at the site of the Oklahoma City bombing while recovery efforts were still under way. After the Murrah Federal Building was

Photo 85: Tributes on the fence, Oklahoma City National Memorial, May 2005


717 National Park Service, *The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Collection: Collection Overview*.

718 Author interview with Duery Felton Jr.
imploded and a chain link fence erected around the site, ‘visitors would hang mementos on the fence ... poems, key chains, brief scribbled messages of condolence, car tags and airline tickets’. The fence became, and still is, ‘America's sympathy card’. (photo 85).

As with the NPS, no plans were initially made by the Oklahoma City General Services Administration (GSA) for the long-term storage or management of these objects. While the site was being cleared the GSA began to collect some of the material left on the fence. In June 1995 historian and museum curator Jane Thomas was asked to serve as a volunteer on the Oklahoma Memorial Taskforce Archives subcommittee. She then began working with the Oklahoma Historical Society in developing an archive of material relating to the bombing. In October 1995, Thomas was handed 15 bags of material that had been collected by the GSA. Similar to the material that was collected from the Cenotaph in London in 1919, much of it was damp and had to be discarded. These bags, and other objects she had collected, were stored in a warehouse until March 1997, when the Oklahoma City Memorial Taskforce decided a museum would be included as part of the memorial. Thomas became the first curator of the memorial museum. She received funding and warehouse space to sort and catalogue material collected by the GSA, the Mayor's office and other groups and businesses after the bombing for an archive and museum. Using volunteers, Thomas began sorting and cleaning the collected objects. ‘Masses of material were delivered to [the] warehouse and stored with little documentation available ... over the next few years the collections not only multiplied in number but were also moved twice.’ Her collection philosophy, she said, was to ‘collect broadly and let somebody prune later’. She did decide, however, that collected items had ‘to be of value for exhibition, research or outreach’. This has meant that in time these tributes would be part of the collective memory of the memorial.

Following the US NPS process for the Wall, Thomas developed a Scope of Collections statement in consultation with victims’ families and survivors. The development of this collections statement and guidelines continued the ‘democratization of memorialisation’ at the Oklahoma City National Memorial. It was a continuation of the ongoing engagement of the American
community in memorialisation. The Scope of Collections statement, which included guidelines for removing objects left at the site, \(^7\) highlights the importance of the tributes, and management of them, as part of the memorialisation of the atrocity. The collection is part of the role of the memorial management to be ‘preservers of the deceased’s stories and memories. [It was important as] ... we don’t ever want our deceased to become just a number. We want them ... to be remembered as individuals.’ \(^7\)

The policy on items that directly refer to ‘a victim, survivor or impacted agency [is that they] are not removed unless specific permission is granted by a family member, survivor or agency representative, or items become detached from the fence and are blowing on the ground.’ \(^7\)

By leaving items on the fence in memory of a particular victim (photo 86), by the photographic recording of all the tributes left on the fence, and by collecting and storing objects left on the chairs, the stories and memories of the victims are maintained as part of the history and landscape of the atrocity.

The management of tributes at the Oklahoma City National Memorial also includes objects left on the sculptured glass chairs. These chairs are popular sites for tributes, particularly on the anniversary of the bombing and at other times such as Christmas and Thanksgiving (photo 87). Tributes left on the chairs are routinely collected — they are left for a maximum of 24 hours, or
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72 hours on anniversaries. All tributes removed from the chairs are included in the permanent collection, with the information about whose chair they were collected from, and the date on which the tributes were collected. The official response to tributes also includes taking photographs once a month, and at anniversaries and Christmas, by the memorial museum. This photographic record will be resource material for future historians and museum curators on how the community responded to, and engaged with, the memorial. However, does the collection of these tributes also impact on the private grieving at the memorial?

Has the management of these tributes affected the private grieving for the victims of the bombing? It may have resulted in people not leaving private tributes at the Wall and Oklahoma City, if they do not want their private responses collected and made public. Although the Oklahoma City National Memorial is a public space for private grieving where all affected people could grieve together, private grieving may be difficult at times. Given the public focus on the tributes left on the sculptured chairs at the Oklahoma City National Memorial on anniversaries, it would be difficult to leave a private tribute on this day.

Following the public collection of tributes, do people feel pressured because of this public memorial to publicly display their grief and sorrow? Has this public memorial and the subsequent ceremonies and collections overtaken what might otherwise have been private grieving in a public space? These

Photo 87: Tributes on the chairs, Oklahoma City National Memorial, April 2005
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questions were raised two days after the tenth anniversary of the bombing in April 2005, when I assisted memorial staff collecting tributes from the chairs. From the details on a card taken off one of the children’s chairs, it seemed that the card had been delivered by a florist. The card was on the chair of one of the children whose recovery and subsequent death had received wide publicity. The public and media attention on this significant anniversary may have been overwhelming for the family. I was told that a number of groups, including World Trade Center survivors, ensured flowers were left on each chair on every anniversary. The public focus on tributes at the Oklahoma City memorial has resulted, on some occasions such as the anniversaries, as tributes extending beyond being private expressions of grief, to being part of the public response, to ensure that all the chairs were included in these exhibitions of shared loss.

The management of tributes at the Oklahoma City National Memorial includes the provision of facilities for conservation and storage. Oklahoma City is the only case study site which has a purpose-built collections storage area (photo 88), and a museum professional engaged to manage the tributes left at the site. This situation gives the Oklahoma City Memorial a distinct advantage over the other case study sites which do not have similar procedures or facilities in place.

Similar to the Wall, the management of tributes left at the Oklahoma City memorial has influenced the volume of objects left at the memorial. As with the Wall, people now leave objects on the fence, as they know they will be collected. The flow of tributes resulted in a review of how they were left.
managed. Assistant Curator Heidi Vaughn said ‘initially we were cataloguing everything and giving them numbers ... now we have a list of items that we use for outreach, these go into ‘Hope Trunks.’ The Hope Trunks (photo 89) are sent to schools on request, and include information and workbooks as part of the Oklahoma City memorial outreach and education program. Other objects such as American flags are sent to US soldiers, and teddy bears are sent to children involved in conflicts around the world.

The actual number of items collected and then circulated is an indication of how many items are left on the fence. After September 11, more than 60 000 teddy bears were sent to children in New York. More than 1500 stuffed animals have been sent to children in Iraq and Afghanistan. More than 2000 American flags collected from the fence have been sent to American soldiers serving in the Middle East. This worldwide distribution of tributes from the Oklahoma City National Memorial could be described as part of the globalisation of memorialisation.

In reflecting on the development of the collection policy Vaughn said that ‘the evolution of the policy has been good [but] we couldn't go on collecting everything’, and she added, ‘I don't think stuffed animals are meant to sit on tubs on a shelf; they are meant to be hugged, to be with children.’ The importance of the archives could not be underestimated, however, as ‘without a collection you don't have a museum.’ As the Oklahoma City National Memorial has demonstrated, tributes can be important not only for the collective memory of how a community responded to a tragedy, but as tangible items for future museum curators and interpreters to use in displays and exhibitions.

4.3 MANAGEMENT OF TRIBUTES AT SITES OF TRAGEDY ACROSS THE USA

In the USA in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century the management of tributes extended to other sites of sudden and unexpected death, and demonstrated the extent to which tributes were part of contemporary American memorial culture in the late twentieth century. At Columbine High School in Colorado on 20 April 1999, two students carrying firearms killed twelve students and injured 24 before killing themselves. About 20 000 tributes were left at the high school within
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two weeks of the deaths. Volunteers organised by the Colorado Historical Society collected and catalogued these objects, ‘similar to those left at the Vietnam Memorial’, including team shirts and poems. In describing this community involvement with tributes, Senie raises a crucial issue when she argues that without a community that considers its history worth preserving or a local institution to store it, objects left at memorials are left to decay. Tributes may be part of the culture of remembrance in the USA, but only if an individual or a group takes responsibility for the collection and conservation of the tributes.

It was Grider and her colleagues at Texas A&M University who took responsibility for collecting tributes were collected from another tragedy in the USA in November 1999. This university had a tradition of building a huge ‘Aggie Bonfire’ for more than 90 years. Every year, up to 70,000 people would watch the bonfire, sometimes up to five storeys high, burn before the annual rival football game with the University of Texas. On 18 November 1999, 12 students died and 27 were injured when the bonfire collapsed while burning. Within hours of the tragedy flowers and mementoes were being left at the site and at other areas on campus. These shrines were, as Grider described, ‘the emotional core of the public response to the accident, making it essential that the artifacts be collected and preserved’. Grider’s interest was in a content analysis of this material culture of grief, and she concluded that the objects reveal as much about the mourners as they do about the victims. Yet this collection is not only a research archive for the study of grieving communities; in broader terms it is part of the history of memorialisation in the USA at the turn of the millenium.

One of the reasons for differing responses to tributes across countries may be concerns about who owns the tributes. In the USA, the NPS has designated material left at the Wall as being abandoned — it no longer has an owner so the NPS is able to collect and take on ownership of the material. Items left at spontaneous shrines across the USA have thus been regarded
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as technically abandoned; and once jurisdiction is established over the shrine families can take what they want before it is demolished.\textsuperscript{745} In collecting items after the collapse of the Texas A&M University bonfire, Grider implied that she followed the precedent of the US NPS in regarding the material as abandoned, with no owners.\textsuperscript{746} This precedent of the NPS also supported the collection of tributes to missing and victims of September 11.

4.4 MANAGEMENT OF TRIBUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 11

The collection and management of tributes was discussed by curators and historians from more than 30 collecting institutions from Washington DC and New York who met in New York on 4 October 2001 to consider how to respond to the events of 11 September 2001. Some of those present had witnessed the attacks, others had lost friends and colleagues, but they all agreed they had a ‘shared responsibility to collect and interpret the events of September 11’.\textsuperscript{747} The group acknowledged that it was part of their obligation to future historians, audiences, and researchers to record not only what happened but also the impact of the attack on American life in the early twenty-first century.\textsuperscript{748} The tributes left around the World Trade Center site were part of the record of what happened and how the community responded.

Part of the challenge of managing tributes is considering the ethical issues over whether tributes should be collected at all. The director of the Brooklyn Museum of Art was concerned that removing the memorial materials from the public square into a museum might damage their spontaneity and emotional message: ‘these posters and ... collections of flowers and candles ... [are] made up of tears. What happens if ... you put a box of plexiglass over it?’\textsuperscript{749} The museum curators in New York were also concerned that by removing material, museums might be ‘declaring public closure for the public before many people were ready to move on’.\textsuperscript{750} Amy Weinstein, curator at the New York Historical Society, spoke about a more poignant role of the tributes left after September 11. Many bodies or remains of the victims were never found or identified. A wife whose husband’s remains were never found set up a shrine in his memory, and then she and her family offered it to the
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Weinstein said that the society accepted the shrine, as ‘although memorializing is not our main function, he represented the workers ... who were illegal immigrants or undocumented’. In this case this tribute represented the collective memory of a group of workers.

One option open to curators and heritage managers is not to remove the material, but to take a photographic record of the tributes, or if practical, to display the material in situ. Near the World Trade Center site, objects are displayed where people left or sent them. Directly across the road from the World Trade Center is St Paul’s Chapel. Built in 1776, only a tree in the grounds of the chapel was damaged on September 11. The chapel was used as a rest and refuge centre for recovery workers from the World Trade Center site for eight months after the attack. During this time, cards and tributes, including a banner from Oklahoma City, were sent as messages of support to the rescue workers. Still used as a church, around the pews and columns is a display of a variety of tributes including teddy bears, firemen’s badges and cards. With its simplicity and focus on objects, it is a moving tribute to those who died.

**Photo 90:** Tributes to September 11 victims and rescuers, St Paul’s Chapel, New York City, May 2005

**Photo 91 (above):** Tributes to September 11 rescue workers, St Paul’s Chapel, New York City, May 2005

---


752 Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York, ‘St Paul’s Chapel Parish of Trinity Church,’ (New York: Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York, nd).

A small amount of the material collected has been displayed, but what about the material collected by other museums across New York City and Washington? Will the public have access to this material through exhibitions? One of the challenges for government agencies and museums is having sufficient funding for the mounting of exhibitions of tributes. Do alternatives exist to the exhibition of tributes in museums?

5. Tributes online

Online exhibitions are not only less costly than onsite exhibitions in museums but can also reach a global audience. Through the internet, museums can give global access to their collections of tributes. It is an option to be considered when funding and space for exhibitions are limited. The NPS was probably the first organisation to use the internet for displaying images and information on tributes. By July 1997, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Collection was available online through the NPS website.\(^{754}\) Objects from the Vietnam Veterans Collection in the Smithsonian Institute exhibitions were also available online.\(^{755}\) In the early years of the Oklahoma City Memorial website, a selection of objects collected was included.\(^{756}\) Now visitors to the website can access more detailed information through the memorial’s collections objects database.\(^{757}\)

Just as Sturken wrote that it is now expected that objects left at memorials should be collected, I argue that in the USA it is expected that objects collected will be accessible online as an integral part of contemporary memorialisation. The response of museums and other organisations in curating online exhibitions and memorials to the victims of September 11 is an example of this.\(^{758}\) The New York-based community heritage organisation City Lore collected images of tributes to victims around New York, including posters, photographs and messages, then posted these images on their website. These collected images and poems became part of the memorialisation of September 11.\(^{759}\)
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The management of online tributes is now part of the management of contemporary memorialisation. The use of the internet for online condolences began with the Oklahoma City bombing. By the late twentieth century, online tributes were part of the global response to unexpected death. Within the first two weeks of the death of Princess Diana in August 1997, the website of the British Royal Family received 600,000 messages, many from the USA. In the early twenty-first century online tributes have moved beyond the internet to include social media networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter. With a sudden and unexpected death, condolence and support messages can be immediately posted on a Facebook page, messages can be exchanged through Twitter, and can become memorials. No longer do people have to attend anniversary services; remembrances and memories can be shared across mobile phone and a range of other electronic media.

The challenges for museum professionals has moved beyond the collection of tributes as a record of how a community responded. The challenge is now to collect and archive these electronic responses, part of the collective memory and remembrance of the twenty-first century.

For heritage and museum professionals, the collection and archiving of electronic tributes requires time, funding and access to appropriate space and technology for electronic storage. It also requires recognition that online, electronic and virtual tributes are an important part of the history and memory of a community’s response to sudden loss. Other issues include changing electronic technology, and often short-lived electronic addresses. If curators take on the responsibility of collecting material for their colleagues to use in the future, part of the challenge with electronic material is not knowing what equipment will be available to access this material in the future. As sound recorded on cassette recorders can now only be accessed through dated machinery, so too in the future many websites will not exist or will be inaccessible. However, curators can maintain hard copy records of electronic sites, to ensure future curators have the information available on how communities responded to atrocities in the early twenty-first century.

By the early twenty-first century the leaving and collection of tributes had become part of the culture of commeration in the USA. Were there any parallels in the response of heritage and museum professionals in Australia to the tributes left at Port Arthur Historic Site?
6. The management of tributes in Australia

In contrast to the USA, where the NPS had set a precedent for the collection of tributes before the Oklahoma City bombing, no such precedent existed in Australia prior to the Port Arthur massacre. This resulted in a differing response from government agencies and museum and heritage professionals in Australian to the management of tributes. It is one of the differences in the cultures of commemoration across these countries.

6.1 Tributes from the massacre at Port Arthur Historic Site

The management of tributes to the Port Arthur victims began with the collection of the tributes after the massacre. Not unlike the situation at Oklahoma City, the collection of tributes was not part of any planned response. In the days after the massacre, flowers and tributes were left around the Broad Arrow Café and other sites where people had died. They were part of the shared grieving in the public space of the historic site. In the week after the massacre, after the staff returned to the site, the then Chief Executive Officer (CEO) at Port Arthur Historic Site, Craig Coombs, asked the Grounds Supervisor, Richard Weston, to collect tributes left at the Broad Arrow Café and other areas around the site. Weston said, ‘I was responsible for collecting toys and cards, making sure they were put away properly upstairs [in the Conservation Store]. Day after day, week after week you’d be picking up flowers ... and teddy bears.’ The tributes were stored along with other historic artefacts in the Collection Store at Port Arthur Historic Site.

It was twelve months later at Port Arthur Historic Site that plans were made for the ongoing management of these tributes. The preliminary meetings...
The decision to close access material for up to 30 years was not considered at the other sites. It raises the issue of the role of heritage professionals in the management of atrocity sites, and the responsibilities of museum curators to future curators and researchers. The emotional difficulties of sorting through tributes have been acknowledged, as has the need to consider future museum colleagues. However restricting access to material for this length of time may result in few of those affected being able to provide information on the objects when the boxes are opened; nor the context for the collection. This material is part of the history and memory of the massacre; it may have been appropriate to consider a review of this
decision for example within 10 or 15 years of the massacre. After that time, it may have then been appropriate for some of the material to be made available, for example, to researchers to consider as part of the history and memory of the massacre.

The preliminary management of tributes at Port Arthur Historic Site also included an exhibition. In 1998 a small selection of material from the April 28, 1996 Collection was put on display at Port Arthur in an exhibition entitled *Words Fail Me*. This exhibition was open for a month. It included tributes collected at and sent to Port Arthur, including quilts, poetry, murals and artworks responding to the massacre. It provided an opportunity, albeit in a short timeframe, for a shared and collective understanding of the broader community response to the massacre. However this exhibition also marked a change in the response of the PAHSMA to the management of the tributes.

After this exhibition little, if any, attention was given to the April 28, 1996 Collection. Tributes including artworks were still being sent to the Port Arthur Historic Site up to 1999, which were added to the 1996 Collection. However, due to a combination of factors, including changes to the curatorial and conservation staff at Port Arthur, and other work priorities, such as the planning for the Memorial Garden and the development of the new Visitor Centre, no attention was given to the material from the April 28, 1996 Collection between 1999 and 2002. In contrast to the process followed at the Oklahoma City memorial, collection and management policies were not developed in consultation with families, nor was the material catalogued with the provenance of its collection.

As mentioned, in contrast to the USA, Australian scholars have yet to analyse tributes as part of memorialisation of contemporary atrocity sites. In 2002 in a presentation at a conference held at Port Arthur Historic Site I suggested that tributes should be considered in the management of atrocity sites. Afterwards, two former Port Arthur colleagues, Susan Hood and Maria Stacey, Visitor Services Manager, told me that the tributes collected after the massacre were still in the Conservation Store and had not been sorted or catalogued. My discussions at Port Arthur Historic Site in 2002 led to a renewed engagement by government agencies in the management of these tributes.

Australian Government agencies involved in the ongoing management of the tributes included the Australian Heritage Commission (my then employer),
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and heritage colleagues at Port Arthur Historic Site and TMAG. In 2003
the AHC agreed for me to provide assistance to heritage colleagues at
Port Arthur Historic Site sorting the material that had been collected and
developing guidelines for the management of these tributes. I returned to
Port Arthur in July 2003 and began a series of meetings, negotiations and
site visits over three years on the management of the past and present
tributes at Port Arthur. On this first visit, I photographed and recorded
details of the tributes and other objects relating to the massacre in the
Conservation Store. All were objects of the ‘material culture of grief’.
This material included boxes of teddy bears and artworks, newspapers from
the week of the massacre, cards, six very large quilts made by quilters from
all over Australia and two bottles of wine made to commemorate one of
the victims who was a local winemaker (photos 93 and 94). Not unlike the
material collected after the Columbine massacre in the USA, the boxes were
‘brimming over with tears and emotions’. Most of the material had no
labels, or dates. It would have been difficult to determine their provenance.
Just as Duery Felton Jr. described the initial response of the NPS to the
material collected from the Wall, these objects had been treated with ‘benign
neglect’. After a change in curatorial staff, no one had taken responsibility for
the collection.

Photo 93: More tributes left after the
massacre in the Conservation Store, Port
Arthur Historic Site, July 2003

Photo 94: Conservation Store, Port Arthur
Historic Site: boxes of tributes to massacre
victims, July 2003
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As conflicts occur over the memorialisation of atrocity sites, differences may occur in memorial management considering how to manage tributes. This was demonstrated with the differences amongst the museum curators and heritage professionals involved in the management of tributes at Port Arthur Historic Site.

The conflict about the tributes at Port Arthur from 2003 onwards related to the management of what had already been collected, and the ongoing collection of tributes. In a meeting held at the Port Arthur Historic Site in 2003, Elspeth Wishart, History Curator at the TMAG, said that ‘in regard to material relating to 28th April, it is an important collection that needs proper documentation and management. It is both a nationally and internationally significant collection. TMAG would be keen to assist with the project of ensuring complete documentation of material on the April 28th is held at both Port Arthur and TMAG’.771 Susan Hood, Resource Centre Manager at the Port Arthur Historic Site, also supported the formal collection of tributes. She said that ‘we have a responsibility to do something about the items that are left, because the event was so significant ... and that maybe descendants of these people may come along and say they would like to have a look at things people left at the time.’772 Yet not all the conservation staff at Port Arthur shared this view.

Differences were also voiced over draft guidelines prepared for the collection and management of the tributes, based on the guidelines of the US NPS and the Oklahoma City National Memorial.773 The draft guidelines suggested that conservation staff consider collecting cards left on the flowers at the memorial cross and some tributes left at the site, and that a photographic record be compiled of all the tributes. Some staff expressed concerns that the focus on tributes would be to the detriment of the management of the convict heritage of Port Arthur. Julia Clark, Curatorial Manager from 2000 to 2007, acknowledged that ‘I didn’t know anyone who died, though I did know people who were wounded, and I can see the impression it’s left on them.’ She raised her concern that ‘Port Arthur is in danger ... of having its meanings twisted and contorted by this event.’774 Clark was also concerned about the practicalities of balancing the managing of tributes with other work priorities, and the staff time and cost involved. Other issues raised by Port Arthur staff included beginning the systematic
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collection of cards and tributes seven years after the massacre; and the possibility of negative publicity about the collection and curating of this material from staff and the community. As I later document, some of these issues were never fully resolved.

The ethical issues in collecting and managing tributes later echoed by American curators after September 11 were also raised. Peter Romey, Conservation Manager at the Port Arthur Historic Site from 1999 to 2007, said he had still not resolved what the most appropriate response was to these objects. He said 'when someone leaves something at a memorial, what are their expectations about what happens to it? It is their expression of how they feel at the time, do they have any expectation or care what happens to it, whether it becomes a relic or museum object or part of a database? I find it difficult to make that transition from an expression of grief to an object on a database.' Yet an object on a database can still be an expression of grief. Private tributes that become part of public collections and memory contribute to the collective understanding of private loss.

The conflict over the management of tributes to the victims of the Port Arthur is another example of conflicts that may occur in the management of atrocity sites. The Port Arthur staff who were supportive of the management of the tributes were those who were working at the site at the time of the massacre and knew victims or their families. The least supportive were staff who had not been resident in Tasmania at the time of the massacre and did not know any of the victims. Roth has written that 'acknowledgement of trauma and forgetting is also a condition of piety, of the caring attention one can provide to parts of one's past.' Perhaps for those who lost friends and colleagues in the massacre, support for the collection and management of tributes was part of their own caring for the past and lives lost. Edkins has written that the leaving of objects, or giving them to collecting institutions, was one of the ways people responded to trauma. Conversely, I maintain that not responding to, or not engaging with, the management of tributes left at a trauma site is also part of a response to trauma, in not wanting to engage in the aftermath of trauma.

As the differences over the development of the Memorial Garden at Port Arthur Historic Site were resolved, some of the conflicts over the
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management of the tributes were also resolved. Through the support for the collection of tributes by the CEO, Stephen Large, and other key staff, including Ross Reid, the Port Arthur Grounds and Gardens Supervisor, and Susan Hood, it was agreed that a preliminary collection of tributes still being left at the site would begin. This would include tributes left in the Memorial Garden, and cards from flowers left at the Memorial Garden and at other memorials at the site. These tributes would now become, to use Sturken’s term, part of the ‘cultural memory’ of the memorialisation of the atrocity. Some four years after the original collection and then exhibition of tributes had ended, the collection of tributes that were part of the history and memory of the massacre recommenced.

The renewed engagement in the management of tributes at Port Arthur signalled a change in the Australian culture of commemoration of atrocity sites. It may have been the response of a small group of heritage professionals at Port Arthur Historic Site, but it signalled an Australian acknowledgment that tributes were part of the memorialisation of an atrocity site. Beginning in 2004, conservation staff at Port Arthur collected cards from the flowers left at the memorial cross and around the site; these cards are held in the Resource Centre and information on the location and date on which they were collected is included on a database. By April 2006, the collection I had viewed in July 2003 had been sorted. Many of the items were in a cupboard in the curators’ office; two boxes of newspaper clippings were in the Resource Centre, but as of April 2006 not sorted or catalogued. The quilts hung in the Conservation Store.

However, in contrast to Oklahoma City where details and many photographs of tributes are not only included in a database but also available for public access through their website, the collation and recording of information on the tributes at Port Arthur Historic Site was minimal. In May 2006, the details of the tributes were yet to be entered on the Port Arthur collections database. However the manager of Collections at Port Arthur said: ‘We’re not going to catalogue them as such, just do a single line entry of groups of items that are listed ... and as to the future of that collection, no-one knows, there’s no policy, no sense of what needs to happen next.’ The provenance and details of the tributes were still to be added, a few steps ahead from the ‘benign neglect’, but still some way to go before matching the databases on the NPS and the Oklahoma City National Memorial collections. In 2009
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and 2010 there were further changes in curatorial staff at Port Arthur, so collecting the information on the provenance of these tributes, and adding this information into a database, is still a work in progress.

The renewed management of tributes at Port Arthur had extended to including a display of the tributes during the tenth anniversary events. Three of the quilts that were part of the original April 28, 1996 Collection were put on public display (photo 95) in the room where people gathered for lunch after the tenth anniversary service in April 2006. Former staff and friends of the victims commented that they appreciated seeing these quilts, indicating that tributes can also be part of the therapeutic aftermath of a tragedy.

Extending the management of tributes left at atrocity sites to the display of tributes can raise ethical issues. In describing the Smithsonian exhibition on September 11 tributes as being 'like a memorial,' Kirshenblatt-Gimblett echoed the uneasiness many people felt about the exhibition of these objects — ‘some families weren’t ready to have their loved ones historicized so quickly’. The 1998 exhibition Words Fail Me at the Port Arthur Historic Site may have been a rare example of an exhibition of contemporary tributes in late twentieth-century Australia. Regrettably, no information is available in the Port Arthur files on visitor reactions to the exhibition. No adverse responses were received from families to the Australian Federal Police exhibition of the forensic investigations into the 2002 Bali bombings, as discussed in Chapter 5. No negative feedback has been received on the small display of items from Bali exhibited at the National Museum of Australia.

Although it is 14 years since the massacre at Port Arthur, it may be too soon to

---
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have an exhibition of the tributes and associated ephemera. In 2003, 25 years after her murder, the exhibition on the life and death of Anita Cobby, *Anita and Beyond*, was held at the Penrith Regional Gallery in New South Wales. Developed in consultation with her family and friends, the exhibition included a range of personal effects, memorabilia and commissioned artworks. A number of the media who reported on her death and trial said that for them the exhibition was important for coming to terms with their engagement with her life, death and the aftermath.\(^{787}\) An exhibition of the tributes left at Port Arthur and the other objects in the April 28, 1996 Collection — the teddy bears, the quilts, the brass plaques from schools, the bravery awards to staff, the appreciation certificates from the Tasmanian Police and the handcrafted artworks — would make an important contribution to the public memory of how people responded to the 1996 massacre. Such an exhibition may also encourage Australian museum curators and heritage professionals to consider tributes as part of the history and memory of an atrocity.

In contrast to the management of tributes in the USA, despite the engagement of some of the staff at Port Arthur Historic Site, the management of tributes is not a high priority for heritage professionals and museum curators across Australia. The draft guidelines I prepared for Port Arthur on the management of tributes in 2003 are still draft guidelines. In 2010 Port Arthur has yet to prepare any final guidelines, or policies for the short and long-term responses to the objects left at the site, or for the long-term management of the objects already collected. Sue Hood acknowledged in 2006 that what was needed was ‘a policy and some sort of procedures for the management and the storage, adequate storage, all the sorts of issues you would consider in any collection’.\(^{788}\)

What is also needed is sufficient funding for the conservation, maintenance, and at the appropriate time, exhibition of such a collection. Stephen Large, CEO of the Port Arthur Historic Site, believes the tributes should be properly curated and provenanced, but understands it is a challenging task. We discussed that over time it is likely to become less difficult and confronting. Large acknowledged that PAHMSA did need to know what was in the collection, and have a strategy for managing it.\(^{789}\) This has yet to be developed.

---
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The differing responses from Port Arthur heritage colleagues to the collection and management of tributes from the massacre illustrates how lack of shared understanding or agreement on the significance of tributes as part of the historic collection at Port Arthur Historic Site, and staff changes, can affect the management of tributes. The tributes were not considered in any of the conservation management plans prepared for the site, nor considered as part of the heritage of the massacre to be assessed and maintained. Australian guidelines do exist for the assessment collections, including heritage items, but these guidelines were not used to assess the tributes.

Another example of the differing responses to tributes between museum curators, heritage professionals and government agencies in the USA and Australia was demonstrated through the response of Australian agencies to the tributes left to Australian and other victims of the 2002 Bali bombings. Whereas American curators met after September 11 to consider how to respond to and manage the tributes left to the victims and those missing from the World Trade Center towers collapse, Australian curators did not meet to consider the management of tributes from the Bali bombings. The involvement of the Australian Government in the management of these tributes began in 2003.

6.2 AUSTRALIAN TRIBUTES FROM THE BALI BOMBINGS

As the management of tributes at the Oklahoma City National Memorial was linked to the management of tributes at the Wall, the management of tributes from the Bali bombings was linked to the management of tributes from Port Arthur Historic Site. While I was working with the Port Arthur Historic Site on tributes from the massacre, images of flowers, T-shirts, poems and other tributes left at the memorial in Bali filled Australian television screens and newspapers. Although Australian museums were not yet engaged in the collection of tributes, as a heritage professional these images raised the question, should Australian curators consider collecting evidence of the Australian response at the memorials in Bali, as part of the Australian history and memory of the bombing? The Australian War Memorial has material relating to Australian engagement and deaths in wars overseas. Would it be appropriate for tributes for the Australians who died overseas in an attack described as part of the ‘war on terror’ to also be collected? A collection of these tributes could contribute to the Australian and global history and memory of the response to the bombings.

As the tributes left at Oklahoma City and Port Arthur were part of the ‘material culture of grief’, so too were the tributes left at the memorial in Bali. The focus for my analysis is on the management of tributes left at the memorials in Bali, as the site of the bombings. Although I have regularly visited the Bali memorial in the grounds of Parliament House in Canberra, including on a number of anniversaries, I have yet to see any tributes left there. Flowers and messages are left at the memorials across Australia to the Bali victims on anniversaries. Due to the geographic spread of Bali memorials across Australia, the recording and research on tributes left at these memorials remains a topic for future research.

6.2.1 Tributes at the Australian Consulate-General in Bali

The initial focus of the Australian Government on the management of tributes was on the tributes left at the memorial at the Australian Consulate-General in Bali. Australian families visited this memorial, and left tributes on anniversaries and at other peak times for Australian visitors to Bali, particularly at Christmas and the following school holidays in January. In January 2004, tributes left at the memorial included teddy bears, an Australian flag, and a T-shirt (photo 96). These items of private grief had been subsumed into the Australian Consulate-General’s management of its property. In late 2003 the Australian Consul-General, Bali requested advice on what to do with the tributes left at the memorial in the grounds of the Consulate-General. As they were left in the grounds of the Australian Consulate-General, the tributes had become technically the property of the Australian Government. The issues of ownership faced by American curators were not an issue here; rather than ‘abandoned property’.

---
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these tributes were now the property of the Australian Government. The area occupied by a foreign mission is regarded as being the responsibility of that mission.

The Australian Consul-General consequently felt a responsibility for these objects. Many people who worked in the Australian Consulate-General, both Australian and Indonesian, had assisted in the aftermath of the bombings; some of them knew victims’ families, and these objects were a reminder of the event. In 2003 and 2004 the Consulate-General was housed in a small building with an obvious shortage of space. The Consul-General said for both practical and emotive reasons, it would be better if these objects were returned to Australia; the cost of returning them would be covered by DFAT. Consulate-General staff had also collected material relating to Australian Government-organised memorial services in Bali. This material included T-shirts and caps worn by Consulate-General staff, some cards and photos, anniversary programs, and some local newspapers. There were also three large photo boards used at the first anniversary service in Bali, compiled and mounted by staff at the Australian Embassy, Jakarta using photos supplied by the families of victims. It was all material that was the responsibility of the Australian Government, and the Consul-General hoped it could be lodged with an Australian Government collecting institution.

For the Australian Government representative in Bali, the management of tributes extended to concerns about the maintainence of the memorial in Jalan Legian, still under construction in 2004. The Australian Government had been involved in planning for the memorial and many Australians visiting the memorial left tributes, identified as Australian through the messages, photos and types of objects. In January 2004 flowers, photos, poems and Balinese offerings adorned the memorial in Jalan Legian (photo 97). Acknowledging that some Australian families had commented on the untidy state of the memorial, the Consul-General said it would assist if guidelines were available on the ongoing care and maintenance of the memorial for the LPM, who was responsible for daily management of the memorial.
As museum curators in the USA considered the management of tributes after September 11, representatives from three Australian Government agencies agreed to discuss the management of the tributes collected by the Australian Consulate-General in Bali. In 2004 an informal working group was established, with the support of the Director of the National Museum of Australia and my employer, the Department of the Environment and Heritage. The working group comprised three people: myself, a curator from the NMA, and Desley Hargraves, Manager of Social Work Services for Centrelink, the Australian government agency that supported Australian families after the bombings. One of the first issues discussed were guidelines I had prepared for the management of tributes left at the memorial at the Australian Consulate-General in Bali, and for the Kuta Memorial. The guidelines prepared by the NPS and the Oklahoma City National Memorial were again used as a template. It was intended that these Australian guidelines would cover all the material left at the Kuta Memorial, not just the items left for Australian victims.

These draft Australian guidelines were likely to have been the first guidelines prepared by an Australian Government working group to cover the management of tributes at an Australian overseas delegation, and for a memorial for Australians who died overseas. The draft guidelines recommended that tributes directly referring to a victim or survivor be left at the memorial for three months; and that objects still in one piece after three months such as T-shirts, toys and framed photos be collected. The tributes could then be sent to DFAT offices in Canberra, where it was hoped that one of the Australian Government collecting institutions would consider assessing the material for their collections.

As the Oklahoma City Taskforce consulted with families about the development of guidelines for the management of tributes, the informal working group agreed that Australian families should be consulted about the collection of tributes from the Australian Consulate-General. In August 2004, to engage Australian families, a notice was prepared for inclusion in the Baliassist newsletter, circulated by Centrelink, to all the Australian families affected by the bombings. This notice referred to the guidelines for recording the tributes, and asked for comments. Regrettably, due to differences among Australian Government agencies, this notice was never circulated.

796 These guidelines are at Appendix 7.1.
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Contestation about memorialisation and remembrance may also extend to decisions about the management of tributes. Differences within Australian Government agencies arose on progressing the guidelines for managing the tributes, including contact with affected families. Concerns were expressed by the then Australian Government Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts (DCITA) on the involvement of Australian Government collecting institutions, including the NMA, the National Library of Australia and the National Archives of Australia in the development of these guidelines. As DCITA was responsible for the funding and key policy decisions for these collecting institutions, these agencies decided not to progress discussions on these guidelines without DCITA’s support. In contrast to the support from government agencies in the USA, particularly the US NPS, no Australian government agencies responsible for museum collections were willing to support the management of the tributes left at the memorials in Bali.

The response of government agencies to management of tributes from the memorials in Bali was similar to the response to the management of tributes at Port Arthur Historic Site. Due to staff changes and conflict about whether these tributes should be managed, despite the initial support and interest of a key collecting institution and other Australian Government agencies in the tributes left at the Bali memorials, this support was not maintained. Neither the National Museum of Australia nor other museums in Canberra would agree to take responsibility for assessing the items collected by the Australian Consulate-General in Bali for their collections. In 2004, the NMA requested details of the items held by the Australian Consulate-General, for a preliminary assessment.

The Australian Vice-Consul in Bali, Adelaide Worcester, provided the NMA with details of 19 objects. These included a T-shirt with a photo of Josh Deegan, one of the Australian victims, a number of small teddy bears, and albums with photos of the official opening of the memorial cross. On October 2005, the NMA wrote to Worcester requesting more information on four
of these items that it was considering assessing for its collections. In late October 2005, Worcester replied to the NMA. By August 2006, she was still awaiting their response.\textsuperscript{799} Following staff changes at the NMA, a new curator was given responsibility for overseeing the Bali material. As background for the new curator, I sent an issues paper on the collection of tributes from the Bali memorials, updated in 2006.\textsuperscript{800} Aside from an acknowledgement, no further comments were received. Following this change of curators at the NMA, it appeared that interest from the NMA in tributes from the Consulate-General had waned.

Whereas the tributes left at memorials in the USA are regarded as ‘sacred, and should not be destroyed’,\textsuperscript{801} the lack of interest in the tributes from the memorial at the Australian Consulate-General in Bali by Australian collecting institutions suggests that in Australia tributes do not have the same status. While visiting the Australian Consulate-General in Bali in 2006, I was asked if I would take responsibility for the items staff had collected from the 2002 bombings. The Consulate-General was moving to new premises in 2007, and the issues previously raised in 2003 still held: due to space and staff sensitivities, they did not want to keep the box marked ‘Bali heritage objects’\textsuperscript{802} (photo 98). These included the 19 items submitted on a list to the NMA in 2005, such as T-shirts and caps used at the first memorial service in Bali, an inscribed Australian flag, books of photographs from the first memorial service, and handwritten messages books. No space existed in the new office for these items. If I did not take the tributes, they would be disposed of. After four years of trying to find a home for these tributes, I decided to store them and find a permanent home for them later. My lack of success in engaging collecting institutions to take on the responsibility for the management of tributes from the Australian Consulate-General memorial in Bali did not encourage me to even raise with the national collecting institutions the issue of a photographic recording of the tributes left at the Bali memorials in Australia. The memorial garden in the grounds of the Australian Consulate-General is still accessible to the Australian public; however with a high security entrance as illustrated in the previous chapter, few tributes are left at the memorial, except for the flowers and messages left during the anniversary services in October each year.
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6.2.2 Material from the Bali bombings in Australian collections

Despite the lack of interest from Australian Government collecting institutions in the tributes to the Australian victims of the Bali bombings left at the Australian Consulate-General memorial, a number of Australian Government agencies have collected objects and publications relating to the Bali bombings and the services held. However, these Australian Government agencies only collect and manage material that meets their existing collection guidelines. The National Archives of Australia (NAA) has the responsibility for collecting printed Australian government material, and has consequently collected official programs of memorial services organised by the Australian Government and photographs of these services. The NAA does not, however, collect associated ephemera. The National Library of Australia has some material relating to the bombings, including a banner from the Australian Embassy and programs from memorial services held in Jakarta. Other Australian Government agencies, including the DFAT and the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, have collected material, including cards, letters and condolence books, photographs and toys left on the steps of Parliament House in Canberra on the first anniversary service in 2003. Material was also collected by a Victorian Government agency. The Victorian Coroner’s Office offered the NMA nine boxes of material, including tributes left on the steps of Parliament House, Melbourne, which had been declined by museums in Melbourne. After assessment, the NMA later accepted a only small sample from this collection. The location of the remainder of the material is at present unknown. The objects, all part of Australian’s reaction to the Bali bombings, represented a community’s collective grieving. Although material has been collected by a number of different Australian Government agencies, no agreement has been made for all this material to be held by one museum or collecting institution, so it could be readily located and accessible to future researchers and museum curators.

The National Museum of Australia has acquired and exhibited a number of objects relating to the Bali bombings. Would the NMA be the appropriate collecting institution to be the central repository for material from the Bali bombings? Trinca acknowledged the importance of collecting ‘some material that represents the public outpouring of grief around Bali’ but added that ‘the things that are nationally significant have to be collected selectively.
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because it’s what’s possible’. To Trinca, ‘the collection and retention of memory about Bali cannot be just the NMA’s responsibility; it should be the responsibility of museums and institutions across the country.’ Yet we may ask, what happens when no shared agreement exists between museums and institutions about what to collect from a nationally significant event such as the Bali bombings? For a comprehensive collection to evolve, one collecting institution should co-ordinate what is in collections across the country on the Bali bombings, which should include a database of material, and even developing co-ordinated Australian collections guidelines on the response to atrocities involving Australians. Would it not be appropriate for the NMA to take on this role, to ensure that a comprehensive collection of the Australian tributes to the Bali victims exists? In comparison, the main collections relating to Australians at war are held by the Australian War Memorial in Canberra, not dispersed through museums across the country.

Similarly to the concerns expressed by both curators in the USA after September 11 and from heritage professionals at Port Arthur Historic Site on the ethics of collecting tributes, Mat Trinca also expressed concerns about the ethics of collecting tributes from atrocity sites. He added that whether Australian people who leave tributes ‘are pleased or not about that being taken into a public collection, and I think the jury is still out on that’. The shared concerns of Australian curators may have influenced the NMA’s reticence in taking responsibility for collecting material from the Bali bombings. No Australian curators from the national collecting institutions took the lead in collecting tributes after Bali, as their American colleagues had done after September 11. However the NMA has collected some objects from the bombings.

Objects from atrocities can be powerful museum exhibits. These objects are not only saved from anonymity and decay; if they are restored and displayed they are likely to be loaded with emotion and achieve historical significance beyond their initial use. The NMA has displayed some of the 36 items it has collected relating to the Bali bombings. These items include T-shirts sold in Bali after the bombings, with slogans such as ‘F… terrorists’ and ‘Osama don’t surf’, collected by John Darling while making the film The Healing of Bali. Simon Quayle, coach of the Kingsley Amateur Football Club in Perth, was in the Sari Club with his fellow club members when the bombs exploded.
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Seven members of the club died in the explosion. He donated to the NMA the T-shirt he had been wearing at the time of the explosion. The T-shirt is on display in the ‘Eternity’ exhibition. This is an exhibition which focuses on how differing emotions have engaged the Australian community. These objects do tell the story more evocatively than a sign or photographic display could do.

The lack of agreement among Australian heritage and museums professionals on how tributes from the Bali bombings should be managed has resulted in a disparate collection of objects from Australia’s involvement with and response to the 2002 bombings being held in a number of collecting institutions, and some of the material is still waiting for a permanent place to be appropriately stored and conserved. At the time of writing, in late 2010, the box from the Australian Consulate-General that contains an Australian flag, photos and memories remains in storage. What happened to the remaining material from the nine boxes of tributes and memories collected by the Victorian Coroner’s office, that no museum in Melbourne wanted, after the NMA took only a small selection? Did it suffer the same fate as the cards collected from the Cenotaph in London, disposed of as museum officials thought no-one would be interested? And what has happened to the tributes left at the memorial in Kuta in Bali — have any of them been collected?

Photo 99: Banner along fence opposite the site of the former Sari Club, morning after official opening of memorial, 13 October 2004
7. Collection and management of tributes from the Kuta memorial

In contrast to the management of the Memorial Garden at Port Arthur Historic Site, and the memorial at the Australian Consulate-General in Bali, the management of the memorial in Jalan Legian in Kuta, Bali, and consequently the tributes left at this memorial, is more complex. The memorial comes under the Balinese regional governing body, Bandung Regency, however the daily management of the memorial is the responsibility of the local Balinese governing group the LPM, whose members are responsible for cleaning and security around the memorial site.

In contrast to the culture of commemoration in the USA, Balinese Hinduism does not have a culture of collecting tributes. The traditional Balinese offerings left for the gods at many sites are part of the daily offerings at the Bali memorial in Kuta. These offerings, known as banten, are coconut baskets of rice, fruit, flowers and incense (photo 102). Left for the gods, they are offerings which are ‘something tangible at the time of prayer’.812 The banten and other offerings are left to disintegrate in the elements. However, as Australian heritage
managers collected some of the tributes to the Port Arthur massacre victims, the Balinese responsible for the Kuta Memorial have also collected tributes left for the victims of many nationalities, including tributes left during the official opening of the memorial in 2004.

The global popularity of leaving tributes as part of contemporary memorialisation was demonstrated at the official opening of the Kuta Memorial on 12 October 2004. Hundreds of tributes to victims from 22 countries including Australia, Indonesia, Norway, Japan, England and the USA were left at the memorial and at the sites of the bombings. These tributes, and the images of them in the media, online, and in the personal photographs of those who attended, became part of the ‘active participation in the accrual of history’.\textsuperscript{813} The focus for many of the tributes at the official opening of the Kuta Memorial was the fence opposite the memorial, where the Sari Club had been. Tributes from westerners and Balinese people were placed along and below this fence (photos 100 and 101). A long banner strung along the fence was covered in messages and tributes (photo 99). In front and alongside were candles, huge floral tributes and small Balinese offerings. The banner in Kuta evoked memories of another fence of grief and memory, at the Oklahoma City National Memorial.

As the management of the tributes from the fence at the Oklahoma City National Memorial has resulted in them being part of the history and memory of the memorialisation of the bombing, these tributes on the Sari Club fence could also be part of the memory of the remembrance of the Bali bombings. To encourage the collection and management of some of the material from this fence, I prepared a further set of guidelines for the Australian Consul-General on the management of tributes at the memorial and the fence.\textsuperscript{814} These guidelines recommended that all the tributes should be left at the site until the end of the week at least, and when they were cleared, some of the cards and photos be kept. It was also suggested that a Balinese museum should be involved with the management of the tributes. The Australian Consul-General agreed to talk with local museums and to arrange translation of the guidelines into Indonesian for the LPM.\textsuperscript{815} However, as the Consulate-General was short-
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staffed, the discussions and translations did not occur immediately. Subsequent events in 2005, including the arrest of nine Australians for drug trafficking, \(^{816}\) and the second Bali bombing \(^{817}\), resulted in the management of tributes becoming a low priority for Australian Consulate-General staff.

However, the Balinese community group responsible for the daily management of the memorial had been concerned about the management of some of the more visible items from the official opening of the memorial. In 2005 Pak Komang, head of the LPM responsible for the daily management of the Kuta memorial, said they had collected the banner that was along the Sari Club fence at the official opening of the memorial in 2004. They have also collected a number of other banners and flags left by victims’ families, and some paintings by local artists, one of which he showed me (photo 103).

Pak Komang said that when the LPM collected the long banner from the Sari Club fence some weeks after the opening of the memorial, they just put it in a cupboard. However, it seemed to have mystic powers as it moved by itself. It is now properly kept in a ‘special place’. Pak Komang said he hoped that plans for a museum on the site of the Sari Club would go ahead, then this banner, painting and other tributes could be included in that museum. \(^{818}\) Until then, the LPM would care for these tributes.

Photo 103: Pak Komang and painting collected from the Kuta Memorial, Bali, October 2004
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\(^{818}\) Author interview with Pak Komang.
In October 2010, as referred to in the previous chapter, plans for a peace park on the site of the Sari Club were officially launched, including space for a museum. Planning for the Peace Park is to include discussions with the LPM on including some of the objects held by the LPM, including the banner from the Sari Club fence, in this museum. This collection and management of tributes by the LPM, although on a small scale, may indicate that the memorialisation of the 2002 Bali bombings now has another significance; it represents the time when the management of tributes crossed the cultural divide and similar to other western mores adopted and adapted by the Balinese, the management of tributes may in time become part of Balinese memorialisation.

8. Summing up

To remember the past we rely on stories and objects. Tributes are important objects, a reminder of a community’s reaction to unexpected and tragic death, and its history and memory. Through present management of tributes left at the sites of unexpected death we have an opportunity to influence the information and resources available to future researchers and curators. Through management of tributes we can demonstrate to our future colleagues that as heritage professionals we cared about these messages of love and grief, and ensuring that these resources were available for them to tell the stories of how a community responded to tragic and unexpected losses.

The leaving of tributes, including flowers and teddy bears and other items with personal messages, has become part of the contemporary response to unexpected death. At both the Wall and the Oklahoma City National Memorial, the private leaving of tributes and messages has become part of the public memorialisation, to be sorted and catalogued. Through museum and online exhibitions, the tributes left and collected can become part of the history and memory of these atrocities. In the early twenty-first century in the USA the leaving of, and collection of, tributes has become part of the culture of commemoration, part of the responsibilities for those who manage memorials.

Lack of a shared agreement and understanding between museum curators in Australia about the management of tributes indicates that the transition of tributes as private expressions of grief to part of the public record of that
grief is still to happen. The response to the tributes from the Port Arthur massacre highlighted that different cultures of commemoration do exist across the USA and Australia, particularly about the management of tributes and material that could be included in museum collections. The few tributes from the Bali bombings held by the national collecting institutions will contribute in a small way to the history and memory of the response to the bombings. What has been lost is the opportunity to develop and maintain a significant record of the Australian and the international community’s responses to a significant event in Australia’s recent history.
In my comparative study I have considered whether cultural differences exist in contemporary memorialisation, through examining the shared and distinctive features of memorialisation of the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing, the 1996 Port Arthur massacre, and the 2002 Bali bombings. I have considered how the competing agendas of governments and communities have been managed at these sites. I have concluded that the differing responses across the USA, Australia and Bali demonstrate cultural differences in contemporary memorialisation. Museum curators in the three countries have responded differently to the management of tributes left at the sites. Differing responses of communities have been evident in the marking of anniversaries, and how the perpetrators were acknowledged, if at all. Differing government agendas have resulted in differences in the sentences of the perpetrators, and the legislation that resulted from the atrocities. Distinctive memorial designs in all three countries have resulted from the effects of different cultures. My key findings not addressed by other scholars include the influences of the internet on memorialisation; how it became a public vehicle for private grieving, and how it influenced the timing of memorials.

1. **The internet and memorialisation**

The timeframe of my case studies, from 1995 to 2002, proved pivotal for examining the impact of the internet on contemporary memorialisation. As outlined in Chapter 3, I identified that use of the internet for remembrance began with the Oklahoma City bombing. By the time of the Bali bombings in 2002 the internet, as vehicle for both information and memory, was readily accepted across the globe as a means through which people could respond to and remember the victims of an atrocity. By 2006 the use of the internet extended beyond being employed for information about atrocities, to being used to alert people to the risk of possible atrocities.

The impact of the internet on memorialisation has been significant. It changed the timeframe for when information was available on an atrocity, and expanded the availability of information about an atrocity across the globe. This in turn affected when and how people engaged with the aftermath and memorialisation of an atrocity. It resulted in planning for a memorial, in some cases beginning before the rubble was cleared away.
The internet saw a new form of memorialisation develop — online memorialisation. Through websites, and more recently through social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter, a sudden loss could be remembered with electronic tributes sometimes before bodies were located or funerals held. With the internet the memory cycles of memorials has significantly contracted; memorialisation can happen almost immediately a loss is confirmed.

Through the internet the definitions of collective memory can now be expanded to include a global collective memory; one that develops almost immediately through the social networking sites, mobile phones and any new media technologies that develop. Global collective memorials include the tributes and memories shared across electronic media after sudden loss of life. The globalisation of memorialisation now extends beyond sharing of images and information about an atrocity, the aftermath and the memorialisation. It now includes shared electronic memorials.

Internet access is not, however, equitable across the globe. I identified that the differences in internet access across the USA, Australia and Indonesia affected whether the internet had become part of a community’s remembrance of their loss. This signified that differences may be due to extraneous factors, such as internet access, and not just to the cultural norms of a particular community.

### 2. Cultural differences in memorialisation

The cultural differences identified across the case studies include the response to tributes, the design of the memorials, what the memorials represent, and the legislation enacted after the atrocities.

**MANAGEMENT OF TRIBUTES**

The leaving of tributes may be a shared response, but not so the management of them. By the late twenty-first century the collection, curation and displays of tributes was ingrained in American memorial culture, but not in Australian, Indonesian or Balinese cultures.

As memorials have been defined as therapeutic spaces, I contend that the leaving of tributes is also part of therapeutic engagement with memorials. The leaving of tributes at memorials is part of people’s response to trauma. Conversely, not responding to, or engaging with tributes left at a trauma site can be part of the response to trauma, in not wanting to engage in the aftermath of an atrocity. The differing responses to tributes across these countries and cultures will in time be part of the history and memory of the memorialisation of these atrocities. Through the collection and display of tributes in the museum at the Oklahoma City National Memorial, they
have become part of the collective memory of the remembrance of the bombing.

Museums have been defined as ‘important places in which a society can define itself and present itself publicly’. The memorial museum in Oklahoma City highlights another difference in the cultures of commemoration across these three countries. Only in the USA is a museum part of the memorialisation of an atrocity. The memorial museum at Oklahoma City defines how this community responded to its loss; not only through graphic descriptions of the impact of the bombing, but through images and personal effects of the victims. Through the museum Oklahoma City is presenting itself as a community that suffered, recovered and survived. In 2010 neither the Port Arthur Historic Site nor the Bali memorials have any detailed interpretation or displays about the atrocities that occurred there or the aftermaths. Between the collection of tributes held at Port Arthur and those at the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery, sufficient material would be available for an exhibition of tributes and items relating to the massacre at Port Arthur Historic Site. If such an exhibition were held, it would provide further tangible evidence that the Port Arthur community had not only come to terms with the 1996 massacre but was publicly acknowledging all those who supported the victims and Port Arthur Historic Site in the months and years afterwards.

MEMORIAL FORMS AND DESIGNS

Another difference across the case study sites are the memorial designs. As at the war memorial in Margarana, Balinese Hindu symbolism is integral to the memorialisation of the atrocity in Bali. The most striking symbol is the large Kayonan, or ‘tree of life’ sculpture dominating the memorial. The dominance of Balinese Hindu symbolism contributes to the space of the Kuta Memorial being visited not only by Australian and other western tourists, but being adapted by some members of the Balinese community for their own remembrance.

A unique feature of the Kuta Memorial is that it is the only one of the three sites that has been described as having the potential to remind people of the extent of the death and destruction caused by the Bali bombings, which might help deter potential recruits from joining terrorist organisations such as Jemaah Islamiyah. In another contrast to the western responses to atrocity, in the aftermath of the 2002 bombings a number of Balinese, including shadow puppet master I Made Sidia, responded that the bombs were a reminder to the Balinese that they must always remember their
religious and community obligations first, that many of these had been put aside and that there was maybe too much focus on tourism. Although one of the aims of the curators of the memorial museum at Oklahoma City is to give visitors an understanding of the impact of violence, neither the Oklahoma City nor the Port Arthur memorials have been referred to as being deterrents to joining terrorist organisations.

The Kuta Memorial is the only one of the memorials not surrounded by gardens. This results in a different landscape of memory. In contrast to the sounds and traffic around the Kuta Memorial, at Port Arthur Historic Site the shell of the Broad Arrow Café merges with the landscape of convict ruins and gardens. The endemic Tasmanian species, including buttongrass and baëura, which now dominate the memorial, contribute to the Tasmanian landscape setting.

Similarly to the Oklahoma City National Memorial, the memorial at the Port Arthur Historic Site covers a larger area than the site of the original damaged buildings, and the site of many of the deaths. Port Arthur archaeologist Greg Jackman suggested that if the space around the Broad Arrow Café had been left for 10 years it would be very likely that the memorial ‘would be different to what we’ve got, the size and space would be quite different, it would be much more focused expression’. In reflecting on events, post-September 11 and Bali, he added: ‘the world has moved on, we're not as innocent a place as we were 10 years ago, even in Tasmania ... there's been terrible things ... terrible tragedies ... people have become more hardened to expectations that these kind[s] of things can happen in our lifetime and in our place.’

Although Jackman has neatly summed up the impact of atrocities from Oklahoma City through to Bali and including September 11 in this statement, I do not agree that the memorial at Port Arthur would have been smaller if it had been built some time later. The memorials built to Australian victims of the 2002 Bali bombings may be small in size but they are large in number; across Australia many different designs have contributed to the landscape of memory that mark the deaths of the 88 Australians in the 2002 Bali bombings.

ANNIVERSARIES

Cultural differences across the three sites extend beyond the design of the memorials. The remembrance of anniversaries highlights another difference marked each year in Oklahoma City and Bali, but not so at Port Arthur. Both cultural and economic factors influence this varying response.

822 Author interview with I Made Sidia.
823 Author interview with Greg Jackman.
At Oklahoma City the popularity of memorialisation in American culture, and the importance of the tourism at the memorial, support the marking of anniversaries each year. In Bali the anniversary services provide an event to which tourists, particularly Australians, can return. With the annual service at the Kuta Memorial being organised by the Balinese community, I concluded, following Vickers,\textsuperscript{824} that this is part of the ongoing adaptation of western traditions into Balinese culture.

At Port Arthur Historic Site, both the management and the local community have endorsed the response not to mark the anniversaries of the 1996 massacre each year. The differences between the commemoration of anniversaries at Port Arthur and at Oklahoma City are likely to be due to a combination of factors. Whereas the focus of Oklahoma City is memorialisation, at Port Arthur it is heritage tourism. The ‘popularity of memorialisation’ described by Linenthal does not exist to the same extent in Australia as it does in the USA. The lack of public ceremonies means that the Port Arthur community has been able to maintain ownership of the remembrance of the massacre and remember the victims in private.

Only the Oklahoma City Memorial and Museum has a shop and a website where one can buy objects online. Few consumer items are available for sale on the memorialisation at Port Arthur Historic Site or in Bali. I can only conclude that responding to contemporary traumas with consumerism is a distinctive American response, not generally shared by Australian or Balinese cultures.

**SHARED HISTORIES AND RESPONSES**

The globalisation of memorialisation includes a shared history of the remembrance of war. The memorials in Magarana and in the mountains of Bali for those who died in the War of Independence illustrate that the Balinese have built memorials. The case study countries have a shared history not only of the memorialisation of war but of ‘missing’ memorialisation.

One shared response across the case study sites is contestation. This confirmed the reflections of Winter and Sivan and Sturken that memorialisation is likely to include contestation and conflict.\textsuperscript{825} What cannot be predicted is why and when this conflict will occur. The contestation at Oklahoma City has included differences on the use of the space around the memorial chairs, the engagement of the local community with the memorial,
and the exhibitions in the memorial museum. At Port Arthur Historic Site, the contestation began with the extensive media response to the massacre. It continued with debates over the future of the remains of the Broad Arrow Café and the location of the Huon Pine Cross. An ongoing concern of staff and heritage consultants is that the memorial garden covers convict remains that have yet to be excavated, an issue that is unlikely to be resolved in the near future.

Given the many countries of origin of the bombings’ victims, it was likely that there would be differing responses to the memorialisation in Bali. As the Balinese have accepted and incorporated the Kuta Memorial in their daily and annual rituals, in time when conflict over the future of the nightclubs sites is resolved, so too some Australian concerns about the appearance of these sites may also dissipate. Providing information on the Balinese symbolism of the memorial through an interpretation sign may assist Australians and other westerners to understand the Balinese symbolism of the memorial.

3. Issues for future research

My study has raised a number of issues for future research. The impact of the internet on contemporary memorialisation is a rich field for future research, especially the role of social networks such as Facebook and Twitter. One of the biggest challenges for future research is to consider how, when and if these globalised electronic memorials will be captured for future generations, future historians, museum curators and researchers.

The link between legislation and memorialisation could be further investigated, including a comparative study of the different cultural and judicial responses to the perpetrators. A collaborative project between Indonesian and Australian scholars could develop information on memorials across Bali. In the Australian context, no chronology yet exists on when memorials began to mark the sites of contemporary atrocities. Other topics for study include the more detailed analysis of the role of contemporary memorials as therapy, which could be considered through a collaboration of heritage and health professional researchers.

Further research could be undertaken on tributes in contemporary memorialisation. Given the increasing popularity of tributes, a comparative analysis in Australia of the relationship between tributes and attitudes to sudden and unexpected death could be explored by Australian scholars. In the Australian context, this could include examining what happened to the remainder of the items from the nine boxes of tributes to the Bali victims, collected in the State of Victoria, that was offered to the National Museum of Australia, after the NMA took only a few items.
Scope exists for a further comparative analysis of the response to tributes across the globe. Tributes may be collected and curated in the USA: what happens to the tributes left at memorials, for example, in the United Kingdom, or in Germany or in other countries? What is the international response of museum curators to tributes, for their collections, and for future research? Was it really 60 years after the material collected from the Cenotaph was thrown out before tributes from a memorial were collected again, or have other tributes been collected from memorials in the intervening years, awaiting cataloguing, curation and the stories to be told? Are systematic photographic records of contemporary tributes being kept? In the broader international context, we may ask, what happened to all the tributes to Princess Diana? Aside from media files, is there a comprehensive photographic record of these responses, and were any cards or objects kept? Similar to the response to the London Cenotaph, this material would be important documentation of a community’s response.

Although I have argued that the designs of the memorials reflect the countries and cultures of each of the case studies, scope exists for a more considered critique of these designs by landscape and design professionals. In considering the relevance of heritage guidelines such as the Burra Charter to atrocities, I question why, since atrocities and terrorist attacks still occur, no heritage guidelines have been produced for the management of these sites? Researchers and heritage professionals could address these issues as a collaborative project. The Burra Charter, Lennon’s work and my own draft guidelines on tributes could be used to develop international heritage guidelines for the management of atrocity sites.

Given the international dimension of the impact of the 2002 Bali bombings, and victims from 22 countries, further research could be undertaken on the memorialisation of the victims from other countries. Have these victims been remembered similarly to the Australian victims, with memorials in their home towns and countries? Have any online memorials been established in their memory? Such research could further expand the concept of the globalisation of memorialisation.

Regrettably, atrocities are still occurring across countries and cultures. Terrorist attacks and bombings have continued in Indonesia and Bali, in London and across Europe. Governments are still pondering how to remember the victims of these attacks. What governments and communities need to remember is that how the events and the victims are remembered will impact on the history and memory of the atrocity, both now and in the future.

Appendix 1:  
The 2002 Bali bombings — countries of origin of the victims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF VICTIMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 unidentified victims</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bombers*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>202</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is the only case study site where the perpetrators are included in the list of victims. However the perpetrators are not included on the memorial in Kuta, which under the list of Indonesian victims lists the names of the 35 identified victims.

---

Appendix 2:
Site visits and Interviews

Site visits

PORT ARTHUR HISTORIC SITE


OKLAHOMA CITY, WASHINGTON AND NEW YORK

I visited Oklahoma City for two weeks in April 2005 and participated in the activities to mark the tenth anniversary of the bombing. These activities included the memorial service and a number of social activities where I met with families and survivors informally. While at the memorial I assisted the curators with removing and tagging the tributes that had been left on the chairs during the anniversary for inclusion in the Conservation Store.


BALI

I visited Bali in January and October 2004 to view the Kuta Memorial and meet with the Australian Consul and his staff to discuss the management of tributes left at the memorials at the Australian Consulate-General and at the Kuta Memorial. I attended the official opening of the Kuta Memorial in October 2004. I returned to Bali in September and October 2006 to attend the anniversary services for the 2002 and 2005 bombings. I returned to Bali in October 2010, and attended the anniversary services for the 2002 bombings, held at the memorial in the grounds of the Australian Consulate-General, and at the memorial at Jalan Legian.
People Interviewed

All those I interviewed signed letters of consent approved by the ANU Ethics Committee. I used interpreters for a number of interviews in Bali. All my interviews were recorded on tape. The interviews were transcribed both by myself and a professional transcriber.²

USA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OKLAHOMA CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Riley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Vaughn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Beck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WASHINGTON

| **Name** | **Title** | **Organisation** | **Date** |
| Duery Felton Jr. | Curator, Vietnam Veterans Memorial Collection | National Park Service | 8 May 2005 |
| Rosanna Weitzel | Regional Manager | National Park Service | 9 May 2005 |

NEW YORK

| **Name** | **Title** | **Organisation** | **Date** |
| Amy Weinstein | Curator | New York Historical Society | 11 May 2005 |

² My professional transcriber Jess Wild has previously transcribed tapes for the National Library of Australia Oral History Unit and the ANU; we discussed my topic and the interviews in detail before she agreed to undertake this work for me.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Andrews</td>
<td>Port Arthur guide and Tasman Peninsula resident</td>
<td>PAHSMA</td>
<td>11 May 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Clark</td>
<td>Manager, Interpretation &amp; Conservation</td>
<td>PAHSMA</td>
<td>2 May 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Featherstone</td>
<td>Building &amp; Works Crew Supervisor</td>
<td>PAHSMA</td>
<td>2 May 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Hood</td>
<td>Resource Centre Manager</td>
<td>PAHSMA</td>
<td>9 May 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Jackman</td>
<td>Manager, Archaeology</td>
<td>PAHSMA</td>
<td>8 May 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Stacey</td>
<td>Manager, Visitor Services</td>
<td>PAHSMA</td>
<td>2 May 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Large</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>PAHSMA</td>
<td>5 May 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Reid</td>
<td>Head Groundsman</td>
<td>PAHSMA</td>
<td>11 May 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Romey</td>
<td>Conservation Manager</td>
<td>PAHSMA</td>
<td>1 May 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Pam Fenerty</td>
<td>Tasman Peninsula resident</td>
<td>First chair of the memorial committee</td>
<td>1 May 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Fazackerly</td>
<td>Tasman Peninsula resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia &amp; James Parker</td>
<td>Tasman Peninsula residents</td>
<td>Former PAHSMA employees (now retired)</td>
<td>2 May 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jane Lennon</td>
<td>Heritage Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 March 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Young</td>
<td>Heritage consultant, former chair Port Arthur</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Site Heritage Advisory Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Gauden</td>
<td>Community member</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 May 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IN BALI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rucina Ballinger</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>YKIP</td>
<td>9 October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni Luh Erniati, with interpreter Wijana Gusti Putu</td>
<td>Balinese, widowed from the bombings, supported by YKIP</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonti Ni Ketut, with interpreter Wijana Gusti Putu</td>
<td>Balinese, widowed from the bombings, supported by YKIP</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir. I Wayan Gomudha, with interpreter Dr I Ketut Budarma</td>
<td>Balinese architect of the Kuta memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Made Sidia</td>
<td>Balinese Shadow Puppet Master</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asri Kerthyasa</td>
<td>Owner, Ibah villas, Ubud, Bali</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wijana Gusti Putu</td>
<td>University student and interpreter</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Komang Alit Ardana, with interpreter Wijana Gusti Putu</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>LPM, Kuta</td>
<td>13 October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Darma Putra</td>
<td>Balinese academic</td>
<td>Udayana University and University of Queensland</td>
<td>13 October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Couteau</td>
<td>Commentator and author</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Darling</td>
<td>Australian filmmaker</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet de Neefe</td>
<td>Australian author based in Bali Organiser of the Readers &amp; Writers Festival</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Worcester</td>
<td>Vice Consul</td>
<td>Australian Consulate-General, Bali</td>
<td>13 October 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IN AUSTRALIA

Appendix 3: Draft text: interpretation sign for Bali memorial

This memorial is to remember those who lost their lives, and to look forward to peace in the future

The memorial was designed as a special place. It includes symbols of Balinese Hinduism, the main religion of Bali.

Balinese Hinduism is about being in harmony with God, people and the environment. This is the principle of Tri Hita Karana, the three sources of happiness, prosperity and harmony.

The tree of life, kayonan, represents life in this world and the afterworld. It is a symbol of the seven levels of nature, and of time and space and desire. It is to remind us that our thoughts, words and actions should be controlled in order to achieve a better life in the future.

The altar is for all people to leave flowers, prayers and messages for their loved ones. Offerings to the spirits (sesaji) is an important part of Balinese ritual life.

The Kutakumbada fountain represents the struggle of life and the daily life in Kuta where people are expected to maintain a balance between their freedoms and their obligations as a member of the community. Water in Bali is a symbol of life and purity.

The Balinese compass rose in the pond orientates the memorial to the north, the most important direction in Bali, towards Mt Agung, the home of the gods. The lotus with eight petals inside the pond represents the eight points of compass symbolises as the dwelling (stana) of Dewata Nawa Sanga or the nine manifestations of God (Ida Sang Hyang Widi Wasa) which protects the stability of the world.

The circle of on the floor of the monument is a symbol of birth (utpeti), life (stiti) and death (pralina). It represents the constant rotation of the cycle of life with its ends that never meet. Balinese Hinduism believes in the law of Karma, that the quality of every phase of life determines life in the future.

The shrine at the north east side (kaja kangin) of the memorial is for offerings for the gods, so they will protect the memorial, and everyone who visits here.

The names of all those lost in the tragedy are embossed in gold so generations will remember them. Those from western countries are on the
left or western side of the honour board, and those from eastern countries on the right or eastern side of the honour roll.

The flagpoles are a reminder of the many countries united in their losses from this shared tragedy.

In remembering those who lost their lives, may all those who visit this memorial take on the spirits of the victims to create peace and harmony forever.

The memorial was designed by Ir. I Wayan Gomudha, MT, Architect.

The text for this draft sign was prepared by Rosemary Hollow in consultation with Ir. I Wayan Gomudha via the Australian Consulate-General in Bali, and with assistance from Dr Darma Putra.
Appendix 4:
US NPS guidelines for the collection of objects left at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial

These collection guidelines developed by the NPS are set out below:

The following types of artifacts will be collected, preserved, interpreted, and reserved for potential future exhibits that supports the general and specific themes:

1. artifacts directly related to the construction of the Memorial, the “Three Servicemen” statue, the Flag and the Vietnam Women’s Memorial including their planning, design, and installation;

2. artifacts directly related to VVMF’s involvement in the planning, design, and execution of the memorial and statues, including editions of The Directory of Names;

3. artifacts directly related to the individuals whose names are engraved on the “Wall”;

4. artifacts directly related to the designer Maya Ying Lin’s involvement in the design and construction of VVM;

5. artifacts directly related to Joel Meisner Foundry’s involvement in the design, construction, and installation of the “Three Servicemen” statue; as well as the

6. artifacts directly related to the foundry’s involvement in the design, construction, and installation of the “Vietnam Women’s Memorial; as well as the

7. artifacts directly related to historic events which took place at VVM since its construction, including its dedication ceremony; and

8. artifacts directly related to the daily phenomena of commemoration by visitors.

---

4 Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund
Appendix 5:
Oklahoma City National Memorial: Policy for Removing Items left on Memorial Site

1. CHAIRS
   a. Items left on the chairs are to be removed daily except at April 19 each year, when items may remain for 72 hours.
   
   b. Only plastic ties or materials that will do no damage to the bronze chair may be used to attach items to the chairs. If assistance is needed for ties or the safe way to attach an item to the chairs, see the Park Ranger.

2. SURVIVOR CHAPEL
   a. Items left along the wall in Survivor Chapel are to be removed daily except at April 19 each year, when items may remain for 72 hours.

3. SURVIVOR TREE
   a. Nothing is to be left around Survivor Tree. Items left here may be removed immediately.

4. ANY OTHER LOCATIONS ON SITE
   a. Any items left at any other location on the site may be removed daily.

5. FENCE
   a. All items are left on the fence a minimum of 30 days.
   
   b. After the minimum requirement has been met, items are removed:
      · Based on durability
      · Based on space needed
   
   c. Items directly referencing a victim, survivor, or impacted agency are not removed unless:
      · Specific permission is granted by the family member, survivor, or agency representative
      · Items become detached from the fence and are blowing around on the ground

   The fence is photographed at regular intervals to document the length of time items have been on the fence.

---

5 Oklahoma City National Memorial Trust, ‘Scope of Collections Statement,’ (Oklahoma City: 2002).
Appendix 6:
Draft Guidelines: Management of material relating to 28 April 1996 at the Port Arthur Historic Site

1. SUMMARY

- This paper covers draft guidelines for the collection and management of ongoing tributes to the events of 28 April 1996 left at the Memorial Garden and other areas at the Port Arthur Historic Site.
- There is no set timeframe for this task, it should be included as part of the ongoing activities of the management of PAHSMA.
- A photographic record and accompanying details of place, time and location should be kept of all tributes left at the site.
- The details on the cards accompanying any tributes should be recorded as soon as possible after the tributes are received.
- The cards accompanying these tributes should be collected before they deteriorate and stored using appropriate archival techniques.
- Any other tributes that are sufficiently durable should also be collected and stored using appropriate archival techniques.

2. BACKGROUND

The impetus for the development of these guidelines was the presentation of a paper by Rosemary Hollow entitled ‘Massacres, memorials and memory’ at the ‘Islands of Vanishment’ conference at Port Arthur in June 2002. This paper considered issues that impact on the management of massacre sites. The ongoing management of the memorials at these sites was discussed, including tributes left at the memorials. An illustration was given of how the US Park Service collects and curates the tributes left at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, and at the site of the Oklahoma City bombing.

Discussion with Port Arthur staff at the conference elicited the response that there were no guidelines for the recording and collection of the tributes left at the site, on the anniversary of the massacre and at other times during the year. These guidelines have been developed as a response to these discussions. These are preliminary guidelines, to be further developed following comments from PAHSMA staff including the Conservation Section and the Library.

It is important that ongoing records be kept of any flowers and tributes left at the Memorial Garden site including the Broad Arrow Café and at the Memorial Cross. Although the majority of tributes are likely to be left around
the time of the anniversary, flowers and tributes may be left at other times of the year.

These records will contribute to the future understanding of people’s responses to the event in the short and long term. These records will be important not only to the history of Port Arthur, but for the broader scholarship of knowledge on the management of contemporary massacre sites.

3. **TIMEFRAME**

The timeframe in which people are likely to leave tributes is difficult to define at this stage (April 2003). Seven years after the event people are continuing to leave tributes. The recent Anita Cobby exhibition in NSW indicated that 17 years after her murder the memory of events was still very strong for many people connected with the event. The increasing popularity of Anzac Day and associated activities indicates that the length of time after an event will not necessarily decrease the interest in memorialisation of the event.

The scale of the massacre at Port Arthur and the continuing interest in the memorial site indicates that it is likely that people will continue to leave tributes at the site, particularly around the 28 April anniversary of the atrocity. The recording and management of these tributes should be an ongoing component in the management of the site. It would be appropriate for either the Conservation Section and/or the Library to incorporate the recording and management of these tributes as part of their regular duties.

4. **RECORDS TO BE KEPT**

To provide a comprehensive record of tributes at the Memorial Site, a photographic record of the tributes should be made. Where possible the tributes should also be kept. The cards from floral tributes should be kept also.

4.1 **PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORDS**

With digital imagery the photographic record could form part of a database of material on the ongoing responses to the events of 28 April 1996.

4.1.1 **Location**

Although the majority of tributes are likely to be left at the base of the Memorial Cross, there may be tributes left elsewhere. For example in April 2001 tributes were also left on the memorial brass plaque mounted on a stone cairn within the Memorial Garden. Around the time of the anniversary,
tributes may also be left within the remains of the Broad Arrow Café, and near the Mikac brass plaques. These sites should be checked during the anniversary week and any tributes recorded.

### 4.1.2 Timing

For ease of recording, it may be appropriate to consider taking photos at the Memorial Garden at a set time each week or month — for example at 10.00 am each Monday morning — or during the quieter winter months on the first Monday of each month.

Up to two to three weeks before and after the 28 April anniversary, it would be appropriate for photographs to be taken each week. During the anniversary week photos should be taken every day. Again, for ease of administration and recording it is suggested that these photos be taken at the same time each day — such as at 10.00 am or 3.00 pm. The photos taken should be a general overview and close-up views of the tributes left.

With all the photos, the details of date, time, location and subject matter should be recorded and kept on a database with the digital images.

### 4.2 Tributes

Personal observations over a number of years have shown that the majority of tributes left are floral. However, other items are sometimes left, including for example, wine from Moorilla as a tribute to Jason Winter. Guidelines for the collection and management of these tributes are suggested as follows:

#### 4.2.1 Floral tributes

There are two components to the floral tributes: the flowers/arrangements and the accompanying cards. The issue of how long the tributes should be left at the site is one for further discussion. In June 2002, for example, there were still tributes at the site from the April anniversary. The issue of concern here was that the accompanying cards, including the card accompanying the tribute from Dunblane, had deteriorated.

There are three parts to the recording and management of floral tributes:

- Photographic record of the tributes
- Written record of the card accompanying the tribute. The location of the tribute (Memorial Cross, Café etc.) should be included, the date of recording, and the date the tribute was received (if known)
- Collection of cards accompanying the tributes. These should be collected while the messages can still be read, and before the cards deteriorate from exposure. The cards should then be catalogued and stored using appropriate archival techniques.
4.2.2 Other tributes

The collection and storage of other tributes should be on an ‘as identified’ basis. Part of the management of other tributes should be a checking the Memorial Garden area during the anniversary weeks to see if other tributes have been left in the vicinity.

As with the floral tributes, there are three parts to the recording and management of these tributes:

- Photographic recording
- Recording a description of the tribute (e.g. Moorilla wine, and details of the label) date of receipt if known, and date of recording
- If the tribute is an item that can be stored, cataloguing and storing of item using appropriate archival techniques.

4.3 OTHER ISSUES AND THE FUTURE

There are related issues not covered by this paper, including the compilation of records of material previously left at the site, and the management of tributes already collected by the site. These are issues to be discussed with the Conservation and Records Management Staff at the site in further development of this paper.

As outlined in the Introduction, these are draft guidelines, to be further developed following discussions with PAHSMA staff.

In addition to specific guidelines for the management of tributes relating to the 28 April 1996 atrocity at Port Arthur, it is appropriate to consider the development of generic guidelines for the future management of contemporary massacre sites, including tributes left at these sites. The author has discussed the development of such guidelines with staff of the Australian Heritage Commission, members of Museums Australia and the Interpretation Australia Association, who have all expressed interest in the topic. When the specific guidelines for the management of tributes at Port Arthur are developed, they are likely to be used as a basis for the development of more generic guidelines on the management of contemporary massacre sites both in Australia and of interest to Australia.

ROSEMARY HOLLOW
April 2003
Appendix 7: Guidelines and notes prepared on tributes left at the memorials in Bali

Appendix 7.1: Draft guidelines for tributes left at the Bali memorial at the Australian Consulate-General

These guidelines are in draft form pending discussion and feedback with family members. They have been developed in consultation with the Department of Family and Community Services, and with the assistance of the Oklahoma City National Memorial. It is suggested that tributes left at the Consulate memorial should be managed as follows:

- Tributes directly referring to a victim or survivor are left at the memorial for three months.
- Flowers and items that have deteriorated due to weather conditions are removed each week and discarded.
- Tributes that are still intact after three months such as T-shirts, toys and framed photos will be collected and sent to Canberra for assessment for consideration for inclusion in the Bali collections of the national institutions.
- The Consulate should be notified if families do not wish for any of these items to be collected. Discussions are being held with the Bali museum about including some items left at the Bali memorials in their collection.

Appendix 7.2: Draft guidelines: notes for families

Many of you have left flowers, photos, toys and a range of other items at the memorials at Jalan Legian and the Australian Consulate in memory of your loved ones. The Australian Consulate has asked for advice for Consulate staff and the local Balinese community, who look after the memorial at Jalan Legian, on how to honour your tributes. These memorials have become special sites in Australia’s history. Your tributes at these memorials are part of the story of how Australians responded to the tragedy.

We would appreciate your feedback on how you would like your tributes left at these memorials to be respected. Would you like them left in Bali,
returned to Australia, or do you not have any preference? Would you mind if your tributes became part of a collection to be held in Canberra, or would you not want them collected? Are there any other matters we should be thinking about in regard to your tributes?

The Department of Environment and Heritage has prepared some guidelines, with the assistance of the Oklahoma City Memorial. These will remain in draft form until we have comments back from the families. The draft guidelines are attached, with a form you can fill and send back, or just email your comments to: Rosemary.Hollow@deh.gov.au

Appendix 7.3:
Issues Paper: the Bali bombings, the memorials and Australian government collecting institutions

KEY ISSUES:

· the Australian Consulate in Bali and DFAT in Canberra has collected material from the memorials and services for the victims of the 2002 Bali bombings

· DFAT in Bali and Canberra would like advice on where these items should be deposited

· a number of collecting institutions in Canberra have some material relating to the Bali bombings

· there is no one collecting institution with responsibility for collecting items relating to Australian deaths overseas from contemporary tragedies

· a key issue is how should Australian government agencies respond: should there be a coordinating agency or a shared collection among the major collection institutions?

1. BACKGROUND

On 12 October 2002 two bombs exploded in two nightclubs on Jalan Legian, Bali, resulting in the deaths of 202 people, including 88 Australians. This incident resulted in the greatest number of deaths of Australians overseas in peacetime.
2. THE MEDIA AND COMMUNITY RESPONSE

There was a huge media response to this incident. A number of the Australians killed and injured were footballers both from well-known AFL teams and country teams from NSW and WA, who were in Bali for their end of season celebrations.

It was some weeks before the final number of Australians who died was known. The Australian daily newspapers imitated the response of the American media to September 11, and ran columns with photos and biographies of those killed, missing or injured. These columns ran for some weeks after the bombing.

As well as the extensive television coverage of the bombing and the aftermath, there was a broad cross-section of media coverage in current affairs journals and magazines such as the Australian Women’s Weekly and New Idea. Books on the bombings and the aftermath have been published by an ABC journalist who was in Bali at the time of the bombings, and by footballers who were injured in the bombings. There have also been books published on the Balinese bombers by Australian journalists.

3. THE ANNIVERSARIES AND THE MEMORIALS

In April 2003 a memorial was opened in the grounds of the Australian Consulate in Bali. The consulate was relocated after the bombing of the Australian Embassy, Jakarta in September 2004. Prior to the relocation of the Australian Consulate, Australian families had left items at this memorial.

In October 2003 then Prime Minister John Howard unveiled a memorial at Parliament House, Canberra to the 88 Australian citizens and three Australian residents who died in the bombings. Memorials to Australians who died in Bali have been built around Australia, including Perth, Sydney (at Coogee), Melbourne, Adelaide, Brisbane, Forbes and Darwin.

This response represents the greatest number of memorials built in Australia to Australians who died in a single peacetime incident.

In October 2002 a memorial, built by the Balinese community to all those who died, was unveiled in Jalan Legian, on a site between where the two nightclubs had been located.

4. ISSUES

There is no one collection agency that has responsibility for recording events or collection of items that relate to acts of terrorism, impacting on Australians overseas or in Australia.
As identified below, the 2002 bombings in Bali and the aftermath are significant in Australia’s history. The NMA has collected a number of items, and had donated to them items relating to Bali. Some of these items are on display. The NLA, through their Collections Officer based in Jakarta, have also collected some material. Copies of official programs and videotapes have been lodged with the National Archives of Australia.

The AFP Museum also collected a large amount of material relating to the forensic investigations, and subsequently organised an exhibition of this material, held at Old Parliament House, Canberra in 2003 under the title ‘When the roof became stars’.

5. RELATED COLLECTIONS, AND GUIDELINES

There are no Australian guidelines for the collection of items from contemporary Australian tragedies. Draft guidelines have been developed for tributes left to the 1996 massacre at Port Arthur Historic Site, based on the guidelines developed by the Oklahoma City Memorial. The Oklahoma City Memorial guidelines were in turn based on the guidelines developed by the US Park Service for items left at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington.

Attachment A is a summary of information received from the Oklahoma City Memorial. The Memorial site includes a Museum and Conservation Store. Attachment B is a background to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Collection.

The Department of the Environment and Heritage, in preparing the guidelines for the Port Arthur material and Bali, has considered the preparation of guidelines for the collection of material from Australian tragedies and would like to discuss this issue further with the NMA and other collecting institutions.

6. CONSULTATION

Discussions on the collection of items relating to the Bali bombings have been held with the NMA, DFAT, PMC and FACS and other agencies since 2003.

A key issue raised by the Oklahoma City tragedy and the US NPS is consultation with those affected. Centrelink was, and still is, the main government agency responsible for contact with Australian families affected by the bombings. This issue was raised with Centrelink staff in 2004, who indicated that they would be happy to assist with consultation with families about the collection of some items, either through an email or newsletter. No further action has been taken on this issue.
SIGNIFICANCE

In *Significance: a guide to assessing the significance of cultural heritage objects and collections* (Heritage Collections Council, 2001) the following definition of ‘significance’ is given:

> Significance means the historic, aesthetic, scientific and social values that an object or collection has for past, present and future generations.

Some of the key issues raised around the definition of significance are:

- there are primary and comparative criteria, however objects may be highly significant if only one or two criteria apply (p. 11)
- significance may change over time (p. 13)
- significance assessment should involve people who were connected with the event/object (p. 13)

Based on the extensive media coverage and the memorialisation that followed, including services and memorials built, the Bali bombings and the aftermath could be defined as a major event for Australians in the early twenty-first century. The bombings could be identified as the defining event where Australians recognised that their country and their people were targets of international terrorism.

A number of key Australian government agencies, including the Australian Federal Police and Centrelink, were involved in the response to the bombings, through forensic investigations and in providing support to affected families. Using their Bali experiences both agencies were subsequently involved in the immediate response to the 2004 Tsunami. Based on these experiences, Centrelink has since identified processes for responding to tragic events overseas in which Australians are involved. This adds another layer of significance to the event, in that it had a direct impact on Australian government responses to events overseas where Australians are involved.

The items that DFAT collected in Bali include items left at the memorial at the original Australian Consulate at Kuta. The items left at this memorial now have additional significance, as the consulate was moved for security reasons following the bombings at the Australian Embassy, Jakarta in 2004. The consulate was moved to a temporary hotel location initially, and then to another temporary location while a new consulate was being built. The memorial pond and cross were relocated to the grounds of the new consulate.

The resort area of Kuta, where Australians have been holidaying in significant numbers since the 1970s, is one of the areas overseas that Australians have claimed as their own.
Section 3.1 of the Gallery and Development Plan refers to the proposed *Australian Journeys* gallery, where the stories of Australians who have made history around the world will be told. This section makes specific reference to Bali as one of the places that has been incorporated in the national imagination.

The Bali bombings and subsequent impacts on Australian political and community life, including increased security at airports and other areas, the impact on Australian embassies and consulates overseas, the subsequent bombings at the Australian Embassy, Jakarta, and the ongoing media interest in the trials of the Bali bombers, are all evidence that support the bombings being a major event in Australian history. As such it would be appropriate to be part of the story told and interpreted at the NMA.

8. **DFAT MATERIAL**

The list of items and photos sent to the NMA from the Australian Vice-Consul in Bali includes:

- Items left at the consulate memorial, closed pending re-location.

- Photographic records of the opening of this memorial by former Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade, Alexander Downer and installation of the memorial by former Prime Minister Howard.

- Photographs of the six-month commemoration at the bombsite by former Australian Ambassador, David Ritchie.

- Photographs of the wreath-laying following the conclusion of the joint AFP/Bali police investigation, and return of the site to the Balinese.

- Various assorted cards and letters, and also a handmade visitors book left at the memorial cross at the Consulate.

- Items from the first anniversary service in Kuta, including photoboards, glass candle covers and holders; T-shirts and hats worn by the Australian government officials at the service.

- A number of items left at the Memorial at the consulate, including teddy bears and T-shirts. (I have photos of most of these items in-situ, taken at the consulate in January 2004).


If you look at the newspapers reports covering the bombings and the first anniversary services in Bali, this is indeed a very small collection of material to illustrate the on-site Australian and international responses to the tragedy. There are no items from the second Bali anniversary Bali in October 2004, when the Kuta memorial was officially opened by the Balinese, preceded by a short service led by the Australian Ambassador. There were large
numbers of tributes, flowers, banners, T-shirts, photographs, poems and a plethora of responses from the Balinese and the international community at the memorial site, including tributes to those killed in the bombing of the Australian Embassy, Jakarta in September 2004. It seems now that the only record of that anniversary are the media records and the photographs I took — DFAT did not have a photographer there on that day.

The material collected and recorded by DFAT in Bali provides some insight into Australian and other responses in Bali. With the significance of the bombings in Australia’s twenty-first century history, it would be appropriate for an Australian institution to collect and curate this material, and to have it available in the future for both interpretive and research purposes. It would complement the material the NMA has already collected. If the NMA is unable to take on responsibility for this material, other institutions may be able to assist — for example the NLA may be interested in the collection of Balinese magazines.

To supplement this material, it may be appropriate for the NLA to build up a photographic record of the responses in Australia and in Bali to the bombings, through media and other sources.

ATTACHMENT A: OKLAHOMA CITY NATIONAL MEMORIAL COLLECTION

The purpose of the Oklahoma City Memorial collections is exhibition, education and research. The policy for removing items left on site was developed in meetings with family members, survivors and rescue workers. It is their policy and this is a very important point. They abide by the policy because it is their policy, not one imposed upon them by Memorial staff.

Items directly referencing a victim, survivor or agency are not removed unless specific permission is granted by the family member, survivor or family member; or items become detached and are blowing on the ground.

Items left around the site are removed daily, except on the anniversary. Items left on the fence are left for a minimum of 30 days.

The fence is photographed at regular intervals to document the length of time items have been on the fence.

The Oklahoma City Memorial staff collect material relating to the history of the site (the Murrah Building and the surrounding 12 buildings that were damaged) and documents from the incident, such as logs, response records, photographs, etc.

Public offerings left at the site are handled in a number of ways:

- If they are dedicated to particular people they are preserved
- Items left on the fence, not specifically dedicated to any
deceased, survivor or Murrah occupying agency, are dedicated to outreach. The items are cleaned. If they might be used as part of our educational materials, they are catalogued and stored.

- The other location on our site where offerings are left is on the individually dedicated chairs for the deceased. These items are carefully documented and then are removed, cleaned, catalogued and stored.

We consider ourselves preservers of the deceased's stories and memories. This is a deliberate effort on our part because we don't ever want our deceased to become just a number. We want them to always be individuals and to be remembered as individuals. We took this as a page from the Holocaust Museum in Washington, DC. They have gone to great lengths to assure that those killed in the Holocaust are treated and remembered as individuals and not numbers.

ATTACHMENT B: VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL COLLECTION

**From US NPS: draft scope of collections statement December 2003**

Neither the enabling legislation (for the construction of the Wall), nor the Vietnam Veterans Memorial fund made provisions for the acquisition of museum collections. The daily phenomenon of visitors leaving objects at the Wall was not envisaged by any of the individuals and groups responsible for its planning, construction and installation. Nor had it happened before at any American memorial. All items left at the Wall are unsolicited and uncensored. They are considered by the NPS to be abandoned property, i.e. property left intentionally at the Wall without an exchange of documents.

The general interpretive theme for collecting, researching and interpreting artefacts is the potential historical significance and unusual origin of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Collection, which was later duplicated at the sites of disaster such as Oklahoma City, Columbine, New York City, the Pentagon and Shanksville.

The purpose of the collection is to preserve a portion of the nation's cultural and social history and to increase the knowledge among present and future generations through interpretation, research and exhibit programs.

**Summary:**

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Collection, international in scope, is comprised of objects that have been abandoned at the Memorial Wall. The collection includes objects directly related to military activities (dog tags, patches, uniforms and military clothing, combat boots, c-rations, discharge papers, photographs, and metals); framed and unframed materials (letters, poems, birth announcements, birthday cards, personal dedications, newspaper obituaries, books, Bibles, family photographs, and Vietnam snap-shots); patriotic-to-protest objects (artificial flowers and wreaths,
flags, Missing-in-Action and Prisoner-of-War bracelets, clothing, canes, high school diplomas, records and tapes, teddy bears, liquor bottles and beer cans, cigarette lighters). The collection also includes objects related to the designer Maya Ying Lin’s involvement in the design and construction of the monument; objects related to Joel Meisner Foundry’s involvement in the design, construction, and installation of the Three Servicemen (sometimes called the Three Soldiers) statue.

Rosemary Hollow
August 2006

Appendix 7.4:
Notes on Jalan Legian memorial after official opening of memorial 12 October 2004

· Suggest wreaths and flowers and items with cards be left at least until weekend of 12 October — perhaps cleared Monday morning if they are looking untidy

· Then flowers and items with cards cleared when they are not looking good

· Photos be left there until they are not looking good (perhaps one week or more) and then given to Australian Consulate

· When items with cards are cleared, suggest cards be collected — to be given to Australian Consulate or Bali Museum?

· If any white candles left, perhaps give one or two to Consulate and Bali Museum.

BANNER AND OTHER ITEMS ON FENCE

· As with memorial, suggest flowers and items with cards, if they are looking okay, be left on or around fence until Monday.

· When flowers and other items with cards cleared, suggest cards be given to Australian Consulate, or Bali Museum?

· This does not include big signs and tributes from businesses — we have photo of these for record

· T-shirts and photos — also left until not looking good — perhaps one to two weeks — and then given to Australian Consulate
BANNER

· To be left on fence for at least a month — or until decision is made on what will happen to site — and then when removed to be given to Australian Consulate. Might be good idea to remove before wet season starts. Suggest it be kept in Bali Museum, with Australian assistance for conservation and display.

GENERAL NOTES ON MEMORIAL SITE

· Would be good if flowers and other items with cards were left for at least one week in case those who left cards are still in Bali, so check dates on cards before clearing.

· Useful if when flowers and other items cleared, cards are kept and given to Australian Consulate, while cards can still be read.
Map 1: Location of Oklahoma City National Memorial and bomb site in downtown Oklahoma City

From: OKC Convention and Visitors Bureau. 'Oklahoma City Visitors Guide.' Oklahoma City: Oklahoma City Convention and Visitors Bureau, 2005
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Map 3: Sites of deaths around Port Arthur Historic Site, 28 and 29 April 1996

Map 4: Location of 2002 Bali bombings in Kuta: Jalan Legian

Map 5: Oklahoma City National Memorial: site plans before and after the bombing

Map 6: Port Arthur Historic Site: 1996 site plan

From: Visitor Guide, Port Arthur Historic Site. PAHSMA. nd. Reproduced with permission from the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority
Map 7: Port Arthur Historic Site: site plan including the memorial garden 2002
Map 8: The 2002 Bali bombings: location of the nightclubs and the memorial

Map courtesy of Mr Gomudha
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