At the southwest corner of Camperdown Park in the inner west of Sydney is a structure that bears the inscription *Sullivan RSPCA Memorial*, with attendant bronze plaques that read ‘To Honour James Sullivan who lost his life on 23rd July 1924 while trying to save his employer’s horses from death by fire.’ What the object actually is and why it occupies this space is today far from clear. Over three and a half meters in length, it is large and solid but appears to be without function or context. This article addresses several questions. Why do we attempt to remember, particularly by using physical objects? Why do we forget, and what happens to the objects over time? How important is the story attached to the object in its success or failure? Memorials usually commemorate large scale events or persons of distinguished achievement, and in such company the local memorial can easily be overlooked. His community thought enough of James Sullivan to build a memorial to him, but now seems to have forgotten him. This local memorial will be used as an example of how well memory translates across time, and what can stand in its way.

Shortly before seven o’clock on the evening of Wednesday 23 July 1924 a fire broke out at Budd’s stables in Chester Street, Camperdown. Nearby residents quickly joined workers at the stables in trying to release and save the horses. Fifty horses were saved, twenty-one were killed.1 Jack Sullivan, a 59 year old nightwatchman, died dramatically in the fire. Thirty-five firemen from four stations eventually extinguished the blaze. The story was recounted in the press the next morning in some detail, including the death scene:

> Inside the stables the screams of the fire maddened horses had given place to the crackling of burning timber. They were dead. ‘I’m burning alive I’m burning alive’ reiterated the doomed man, and at this time the flames must have been actually licking around his legs. ‘I’m done’ he then cried, and loosening his grip on the ventilator, he fell back into the flames.

Sullivan died trying to save the horses, an action that saw him described as a hero from the opening headline.2 By Friday the newspaper had received a number of letters praising Sullivan’s

---

1 *‘The Camperdown fire. Evidence at Inquest,’* Sydney Morning Herald, 6 August 1924, 14.
2 *‘Tragic Fire / Man Burnt to Death / Heroic Watchman / Horses Perish. / Distressing Scenes at Camperdown,’*
deeds and suggesting a memorial. On Saturday there was a large turn-out of local residents at the Briggs Street terrace where Sullivan lived before the coffin was transported to Rookwood Cemetery. The funeral was attended by relatives, workmates, and representatives of the Trolley, Draymen and Carters’ Union and the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA).³

The proposal for a memorial was initially raised in the Letters page of the Sydney Morning Herald on Friday 25 July 1924 by H. M. Cowdrey who suggested the Show Ground as its location, while ‘A. Citizen’ offered the first £1. RSPCA President W.G. Acoccks stated that the society had been requested to organise the funding of a memorial horse trough, the Jack Sullivan Memorial Trough. The extent to which this may have been orchestrated is unknown. The RSPCA issued a circular outlining its intentions for what it specifically called the Sullivan Memorial Trough, and negotiated with the city council for permission to erect a memorial on a public site. The memorial was funded by public subscription to the Sullivan Memorial Fund, with most of the money coming in small donations. By November £289/5/3 had been raised in more than 170 individual donations, many of them collections from schools and workplaces.⁴

The memorial was designed by Gordon Samuel Keesing, the RSPCA’s honorary architect, built by F. Arnold & Sons Ltd., Monumental Sculptors, and cost £221/0/11.⁵ The location for the memorial at the eastern corner of Parramatta Road and Pyrmont Bridge Road in Camperdown, a short distance from the site of the stable fire, was chosen by Sullivan’s work mates and replaced an existing

---

⁵ ‘Letter from G.S. Keesing to The Town Clerk, 26 November 1924,’ and ‘Letter from H. Arnold to The Town Clerk, 1 April 1925,’ City of Sydney Archives [hereafter CSA], Container 32773, Item 5293/24. For cost details see Fifty-Second Annual Report of the RSPCA: For the Year Ended June 30th, 1925, (Yagoona, NSW: The Society, 1925), 2.
trough. A key animal welfare concern at the time related to working horses in the city, including the provision of adequate clean water. The concern of the RSPCA was not with stable workers but with horses. The memorial seems to have been appropriated to this cause, with the very name of it changing from the initially proposed *Jack Sullivan Memorial Trough*, to the official *Sullivan Memorial Trough*, to the eventual *Sullivan RSPCA Memorial*.

In all the documentation located for 1924-5, the only mention of the final inscription occurs in the order book of F. Arnold & Sons. Handwritten in pen and ink this outlines what was ordered, and what was paid and charged. While much of it is indecipherable, it clearly shows the inscription and its cost, twenty-one six inch letters each costing five shillings. It is not clear who instructed the change in inscription or when, but so prominent is it that the nature of the memorial itself was altered. While the new name was not used at the time, over the years it has become the standard title. The extent of the appropriation becomes apparent at the unveiling on 18 April 1925. While Sullivan is always referred to with respect, he is dealt with relatively briefly. We know that the Lord Mayor was unable to attend and that his Deputy, Alderman English, officiated and appropriately praised Sullivan’s courage. However, the much longer address by RSPCA President Acocks was primarily about animals and the role of the RSPCA. While Sullivan was honoured as one of ‘The Deathless Army’, the everlasting trough seems more to honour the workaday horses he was seen to have served. At least thirty-one horses attended – the prize winners in the competitive procession. The reports of the event do not tell us if any of Sullivan’s family or friends attended. There is no mention of workmates or the union, although Mr. W.H. Budd, the stable owner, is thanked as one of the judges and the representative of the Master Carriers Association.

It may be that Sullivan did not match the hero that the RSPCA originally had in mind. In the 1920s Camperdown was a solidly working class area, a far cry from those running the RSPCA. This was a gap not just of wealth, but of education and attitude. At the very least they found themselves dealing with a union man at a time when the view of the establishment was strongly anti-union. Not far from the stables in the great strike of 1917 a member of the union, Mervyn Flanagan, was shot and killed trying to stop strike breakers. Several thousand people formed a procession at that funeral, stopping business and traffic.

By utilising the criteria of groups, sites, and individuals, the story of the memorial can be used to demonstrate the role of memory and its relationship to our understanding of history. The idea that memory was created within and by groups is most closely associated with French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs. Groups form from people with common interests, are subject to group
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6 ‘Memorial to James Sullivan,’ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 31 July 1924, 11.
9 ‘Funeral of M.A. Flanagan,’ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 3 September 1917, 8. It is not known if Sullivan lived in Briggs Street in 1917. Flanagan lived in the next street.
dynamics, and can form temporary alliances with other groups for specific purposes. Commonality becomes the basis for identity and tends to reinforce its own image to ensure continuance of that identity.\textsuperscript{11} The commonality in the social formation of groups could be based on locality, or on characteristics such as class, occupation, or beliefs, but groups based on economic or value characteristics inevitably subdivide those based on locality.\textsuperscript{12}

The groups identifiable following Sullivan’s death are relatives, friends, workmates and the union, and the RSPCA. The RSPCA is unique among these groups in that their relationship with Sullivan commenced after his death. Over time groups, or their interests, change or die out. What amounts to an evolution of disassociation takes place – the memory is lost as people move away or pass on, the groups dissipate and reform to new centres. The social make up of the community changes. Key aspects of forgetting commence as relevance diminishes and new memories replace old. This fits with the overall upgrade of community identity in Camperdown from its working class base. In the Camperdown of the 2006 census less than 10% of occupations could be classified as blue collar, while 57% were professional or managerial.\textsuperscript{13} For the RSPCA, priorities changed as the role of working horses diminished and the urban horse trough became an anachronism.

The site of the fire was one of several commercial stables in the section of Camperdown north of Parramatta Road. A photograph of Budd’s stables in 1922 shows a level site next to Chester Street which is sloping downwards to Johnston’s Creek.\textsuperscript{14} While the street still does this, the site has been altered to the extent that it now slopes upwards. In the 1920s local people literally had their way of life exposed in the demolition of their houses in the program of straightening the streets, while the anti-plague drives of the same period concentrated attention on the accumulation of waste, particularly from stables. James Sullivan was likely to have frequented the oasis of Camperdown Park, but at the time the park had an unsightly neighbour: Fowler’s Tip. It is easy to romanticise a horse drawn past, but the reality of 1920s Camperdown life was not necessarily a time and place that would be remembered fondly. For Pierre Nora memory is spontaneous and real while history is a representation.\textsuperscript{15} While an insistence on identity reflects a search for tradition and meaning, society has been ‘de-ritualised’ and has an inherent bias to the new, the young and the future.\textsuperscript{16} But place retains importance - there are still \textit{sites of memory} that have material substance, symbolic representation, and the function of blocking the process of forgetting.\textsuperscript{17}

The structure was made to last, but memorials at street level tend to compete for space against the constantly increasing demand of privatised transport. The Bradfield traffic survey of 1923

\textsuperscript{11} Halbwachs, \textit{The Collective Memory}, 84-5.
\textsuperscript{12} Halbwachs, ‘Space and the Collective Memory,’ 5-7
\textsuperscript{14} Photographer unknown, ‘Budd’s Stables,’ black and white photographic print, 1 June 1922, CSA, ArchivePix, Citation CRS 51/3999, <http://photosau.com.au/Cos/scripts/home.asp>, viewed 1 October 2010.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 12.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., 18-19.
indicated that while motorised transport as a whole was more numerous than horse traffic, the number of horses on the road still outnumbered cars, and outnumbered trucks by a significant margin.\textsuperscript{18} As late as 1933, a majority of the Trolley, Draymen and Carters’ Union were still working with horses.\textsuperscript{19} By 1966 the demands of traffic and commerce required the space of the original memorial, and the decision was taken to move it to its current site in nearby Camperdown Park.\textsuperscript{20} That proved problematic for its new neighbours, thirty-one of whom complained that as the duel troughs were used as rubbish bins and filled with rainwater, they constituted a health hazard and petitioned to have it removed. While the common solution to this problem would be to fill the troughs with dirt, for reasons that are not clear Marrickville Council (who had inherited the memorial when Camperdown shifted from Sydney City Council to its jurisdiction in 1968) had the troughs filled with concrete.\textsuperscript{21} In 1925 people would have known who Sullivan was and why he was being remembered. By 1970 he was known only by the text on the memorial inscriptions, with significance noted only by an outdated function.

Individual memories interact with social memory – the social identity of shared event and experience based on an acceptance of values, and on its reinforcement by ritual and ceremony.\textsuperscript{22} Rather than the organic growth of memory into record and history, there is a feedback in operation where our identity is influenced and altered by group experiences that are outside our personal lives. This can include elements that might be incorrect, or that from the outset were fiction.\textsuperscript{23} For Susan Crane, neither group nor site can be said to have the ability to collect or remember. The recollection of an event or moment from the past requires the action of individuals, and the past is itself reinforced by the act of individuals learning about it.\textsuperscript{24} While memory may be unstable, a large piece of granite clearly is not. The central message of any memorial is always clear – remember this. The problem is that an ambiguity of text can confuse exactly what it is that is being remembered. The wording on the bronze plaques seems slanted. The dedication ‘while trying to save his employer’s horses’ is technically correct while being misleading. It implies an importance of ownership and property that had nothing to do with the event. People risked injury to save living creatures, not equipment or property. The memory of the memorial producers intervened over what should have been its subject. The empathy generated by melodramatic contemporary coverage faded as the poorly worded memorial text gained currency. The reinforcement of the past that Crane says can be generated from the simple act of learning has not taken place as it is not clear what we would be learning about.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{21} ‘Horse and Buggy relic a victim of litter-louts,’ \textit{Free Weekly}, 24 September 1970, unpaginated. ‘Petition of H. McDonald & 30 others,’ Marrickville Council Minutes of Ordinary Meeting, 15 September 1970, Correspondence number 5721.
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Permanent memorials are meant to resist time, but are subject to everything from erosion by weather to competition for the space they occupy. There are several reasons why they can be forgotten. They can be physically destroyed, either by intention or accident. They can decay over time, deteriorating from neglect, vandalism or inherent flaws in construction. They can be moved, being disconnected from the associations of community and the place of the memorialised event. They can lack the appreciation or attention of an audience, by not being understood (possibly not ever) or by becoming less relevant. If seen to be an anachronism, they face the potential danger of updating. For all their strength of construction, monuments and memorials of stone can still be referred to as ‘illusions of eternity’. Ultimately people have to care about what it is and why it is there and often the memorials seem incapable of explaining themselves to us.

According to John Gillis both memory and identity are subjective representations capable of constant revision and reconstruction. The concept of collective memory itself came into being as part of the construction of new societies following the revolutions of the eighteenth century. Before this, the popular memory of the day tended to be narrow and shallow, reflecting the limited outlook available and a comparatively unchanging environment. Today, the increasing pace of change and emphasis on the new appears to be returning us to a similar state, with people incapable of remembering a past only a few decades old. Gillis describes this as ‘collective amnesia’.

Contemporary focus is often so clear that the community can take it for granted that the message it leaves is self explanatory. But the nature of the message, expressed in words or in symbolism, is subject to the same influences and contests as other expressions of memory or aspects of history. Public monuments and memorials occupy public space, and to that extent are official and their message to remember is almost an authorised instruction. While public subscription often pays for these memorials, sectional interests tend to guide the form and the messages. A memorial can be seen as a site of memory, and the background details of why and how it was created can demonstrate the comparative influence of the individual and the group in the formation of memory. Public monuments and memorials are meant to last, usually in a form and position that ensures an audience, a continuous act promoting remembrance and identity. These memorials require not only approval, but the finance to design and build them. In comparison to memorials to soldiers and pioneers, memorials to workers are marginalised both in form and location. They tend to be on the outskirt rather than the centre of vision, and are more modest in scope. More likely to be a drinking than a decorative fountain, they are rarely grand or in the form of statues. In death, working class heroes rarely rise above their station or move out of the neighbourhood. Workers tend to act as symbols of a romanticised past, but their actual details are not usually remembered.

There remains little detail available of Sullivan as an individual, whether from family sources or
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elsewhere about his life rather than his death. We can find the name of his parents and siblings and locate his grave, but there is no photograph and little detail of how he lived. It seems strange that no contemporary source recorded the basic facts of the life of a man hailed as a hero.

The forgetting of events and people does not occur deliberately or from indifference, according to Halbwachs, but because the groups who keep the memories pass away. Memory that rests in people – individuals or groups – simply fades over time. So too can the memory of place, as the physical alteration of landscape can cause disconnections and the disappearance of visual reminders and prompts such as sounds and smell. Time changes landscape and our relationship to it. The nature of local community was different when people lived near where they worked and travelled mainly by foot. Nora points to the earlier example of the collapse of peasant culture – the end of an entire way of life and its collective memory. While forgetting is usually seen as a negative, the reality of our lives is that the present imposes on the past, insisting on change. In his essay, Seven Types of Forgetting, Paul Connerton points to the way we actively forget by discarding memories we no longer want. We make room for the new by discarding the old, abandoning elements of the past (including earlier versions of ourselves) to suit new roles and status. At the community level this could see an upgrading of class or perceived increase in sophistication. Allied to this is the concept that we have an inherent bias in what we remember and forget. We tend to remember what is socially important to us. Consciously or unconsciously, we select memories from the past in order to build or reinforce the present that we want. As Edward Said points out, in this process memory does not have to be authentic to be useful.

Collective memory shifts into historical memory when we attempt to deal with the issue of reliability of memory by creating records. Memory is based on lived experience and therefore has an expiry date which we overcome by selecting and recording it as history. Collective self-image and identity are formed, a cultural heritage that is the result of selection and contest in the process of memory being formalised. The resulting cultural identity and heritage becomes the way we see ourselves, and the way we portray ourselves to others. The past we choose is reflected in the values and identity that are revealed. To succeed in the process of remembering, a memorial needs an audience, an understandable story and an assessment of its value. Without the story an audience that understands is unlikely.

Increasingly, that story is framed in the context of heritage values. Memory is lost over time and if this is to be recovered it is usually by using archived sources. This would include official records but is not limited to that. The sources of information depend on quantity (existence and amount) as well as quality (veracity). Official sources are more likely to survive and be indexed. For Halbwachs, the defence against the loss of memory was clear – the writing and preservation of coherent memories.

31 Halbwachs, The Collective Memory, 82.
32 Halbwachs, ‘Space and the Collective Memory,’ 2.
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34 Paul Connerton, ‘Seven Types of Forgetting,’ Memory Studies, Number 59 (2008), 63-4.
36 Halbwachs, ‘Space and the Collective Memory,’ 10.
narrative, a term that implies context as well as recording. Memory could be lost completely if it lost support and there was no narrative preserved to allow recovery. Such a narrative would still be part of the contest for understanding. However, the approach of authenticating objects by heritage listing presents additional problems. Listing does not just indicate preference but becomes an ‘ultimate endorsement’.

Lisa Murray has looked at how memorials fit into the assessment criteria of Heritage Registers. She points out memorials, as part of the public or collective memory, are made legitimate by inclusion. But there is little sympathy or understanding in the criteria for the reality of memorials – why they were created, by whom and what for. The essence of what they were intended to do, and how that significance or community understanding has changed, is not captured in the heritage process. Decisions on community and cultural value and significance are made by administrative process. Once listed as a heritage item the information on the register increasingly becomes the official version, gaining greater legitimacy by repetition. If the information is incomplete, misleading, or simply wrong, it still gains legitimacy by repetition.

At the present time there are two sources of information about the memorial available locally. The first is the Marrickville Heritage Study compiled by Fox & Associates in 1986. There are three basic errors recorded: that it was erected in the 1930s, made of sandstone, and had the top section which bears the inscription added later. All of these statements are incorrect, but from the original report they have gained legitimacy by being repeated in other Heritage databases. Importantly, Sullivan is excluded from the Significance section, which deals only with the historic relevance of horse transport and this memorial as a relic of it. The second is a university assignment by Caroline Plim in 1994 which used the limited archival information then available. Unlike the heritage study, it recognised the social significance of the memorial in that it relates to a worker in a working class area. The fifteen year difference between then and now has been marked by the dramatic increase in indexing that allows us to access past records, including design blueprints and specifications. The memorial was in place just nine months after the fire. The exposed faces are of trachyte, while some of the construction is concrete. The structure was intact from the outset, the six inch lettering incised precisely and gilded with gold leaf. Built as a watering station for horses, dogs, men and even motorists, this was a comparatively expensive item in this community, unveiled with some fanfare.
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While we commonly understand the past as what we remember, it is determined as much by what we have decided to forget. We often describe our society as classless, but there was no question as to the class structure of 1920s Camperdown, either for the people who lived and worked there or for those who visited long enough to unveil memorials or give speeches. We remember individuals primarily because of what they have done – an identity that is built on action or achievement. The place of an individual in the hierarchy of social memory rests on the level of significance we give to those actions and achievements. The attention we pay, based on that level of significance, gives detail to the figure and fleshes out the identity of the person. The Sullivan RSPCA Memorial shows that the message and the memory in memorials can be distorted at the outset to the extent that collective memory does not successfully translate into historical memory. The transmission of memory took place only to the extent of recording what one group imposed, and there was no coherent narrative to correct it. The site of memory is divorced from its original scene, and acts of commemoration are absent. Redevelopment has altered the landscape, leaving some areas barely recognisable. The social landscape and identity of those who lived and worked in the area increasingly changed to the point of becoming radically different from the 1920s. The memorial has been vandalised, but at the request of the public and by official direction.

James Sullivan was the Camperdown Hero, but of a Camperdown no longer recognisable. His time and place seem to hold no relevance and have been forgotten. We do not remember James Sullivan because we hardly know who he was. The attempt to recover the past at the local level is increasingly a struggle to understand the story of an area via individual sites, objects, people and events. Just as more information becomes accessible in archives, the physical environment and objects it relates to continues to be modified or removed. The RSPCA spoke of a block of granite that would be imperishable, and its presence has indeed been maintained. But they left behind the person who gave it meaning. Because of this the memorial does not easily prompt remembrance to a hero and his time, but rather to a convoluted story in which he disappears.