The 1992 Associated Pulp and Paper Mill (APPM) dispute offers a microcosm of 1990s industrial conflict, with large companies attempting to re-establish managerial prerogative through litigation and unions seeing the fight as one of survival.\(^1\) Also, the APPM dispute presents a microcosm of police-community relations during the processes and procedures of a harsh industrial conflict. It is argued that local and regional factors are vital to the relationship between police and union protesters which in turn can affect the processes and outcomes of an industrial dispute, even one with major state and federal implications. The article is not an analysis of the causes of the APPM dispute but an exploration of the police relationship with the community of striking workers and, as a corollary, with the company. The focus of this paper, the community policing of the APPM dispute at Burnie, was atypical of the traditional, aggressive and confrontational policing of major industrial disputation in Australian history. Some significant events of this complex dispute have been selected to analyse both police strategy and police-community rapport.

Police form the legitimate coercive agent of the state whose mandate is to enforce the law and keep the peace; two functions that are not always compatible in industrial disorder. O'Malley coined the term “hegemonic police" to describe a police organisation “not merely as a law enforcement agency but also and especially as an agency of the community," which supplies a broad range of services to secure social order and harmony.\(^2\) The services, including the dual tenets of law enforcement and peace-keeping, are depicted as being impartially administered, but police remain the ultimate means of state control of public protest, including industrial picketing. Traditionally, police in Australia have readily acquiesced, often aggressively and forcefully, to employer and/or government demands for police presence and action to facilitate access for company staff, non-union labour and vehicles to plants and workplaces. Police actions in the 1890s and late 1920s were particularly ruthless in the suppression of industrial unrest.

The APPM dispute was subject to “policing" performed in its broadest sense.\(^3\) The company and the unions performed much of their own “policing" of the dispute. The company through the courts, the employment of security guards and the use of lawyers to collect evidence exerted controlling “pressures" on the disgruntled workers. Union organisers via their picket captains, their “policy" standards at the strategically-located pickets and their regular liaison with the Burnie police performed their own internal control. Police, when involved in the Burnie dispute, regarded themselves as “the meat in the sandwich".

APPM, colloquially known as “The Pulp", dominated the industrial city of Burnie in 1992 (population 23,000) and was the district's largest employer of 1,100 people. Burnie had been a company town since the mill's opening in 1936 and the benevolent APPM, vital to the city's economy, was employing third generation members of local families in 1992.\(^4\) Relations between management and unions at the Burnie mill had historically been cordial and even friendly, in accord with Tasmanian history of limited industrial disputation and very few protracted strikes. Historians Robson and Roe labelled the plant as formerly "a proud site of welfare capitalism" with high production rates.\(^5\) According to local policeman Roy Fox, "it was a mill that prided itself on the loyalty generated through the years, and readily identified in the father-son working lineage that developed as time went on."\(^6\)

APPM was part of a declining pulp and paper industry in Tasmania. There was a local suspicion of mainland influence whether that be of politicians, company managers, union officials or media. As the biggest company in Tasmania and dominating the economy in the North-West, the locally based APPM was taken over by North Broken Hill Holdings Ltd (NBH) on April 4, 1984 with its headquarters and power-brokers at 476 St Kilda Road, Melbourne. By the 1990s, it was estimated that ninety per cent of shareholders were outside the state and that the parent company earned five-sixths of its net profits from mining enterprises.\(^7\) Restructuring had been occurring since 1989 and the unions claimed a significant contribution.\(^8\) For North Broken Hill-Peko, with its aggressive and competitive corporate culture, the Burnie workforce appeared too comfortable, was restructurin too slowly and its plethora of eleven unions were impeding rapid change. Unionists were fearful of possible job losses.\(^9\) The company remained adamant that there was no place for the unions in non-award talks and maintained its "right to manage" philosophy in a climate of restructuring and enterprise bargaining. Lasting over three months, the APPM dispute was divisive and protracted by Australian, and especially Tasmanian, standards.

APPM's parent company, NBH-Peko, achieved restructuring at the infamous Pilbara iron ore Robe River dispute in Western Australia in 1986, a restructuring of work reforms without mining union participation. Herbert Larratt, a key strategist at Robe River in 1986, arrived at Burnie in late 1991, much to the suspicion of workers. He had recently told a Mining Conference in Perth that "every worker should go to work each day expecting to be sacked."\(^10\) Both Robe River and Burnie disputes allegedly involved targeting of restrictive work practices and extensive resort to legal remedies by the company.\(^11\) But the "wild west" mining town of Robe River, which was an artificial and hastily constructed frontier entity, was very different from the long established and "solid" township of Burnie. The Launceston Examiner's editorials refuted the comparison of Robe River, "an artificial community where workers had developed a thuggish culture" with the community of Burnie's solid citizenry where "there is widespread respect, even affection for "the Pulp"."\(^12\) Although Burnie was partially a company town, its employees did not suffer from the harsh conditions and severe isolation of the Pilbara with its militant union leadership. APPM management and industrial strategy was in the hands of a combination of locals (Ken Henderson, John Guest) who were directed by executives from the mainland (Bill Paisley, Peter Wade, Herb Larratt). The latter were outsiders to Burnie and its mill, and this was an impediment to NBH's management reforms.

From the company's viewpoint, police in the Pilbara were effective instruments in providing personnel and vehicular access to the Robe River iron ore mines.\(^13\) When the company acted swiftly and decisively by locking out employees, police did not hesitate to disperse picket lines and make arrests.\(^14\) APPM workers did not present a clash of cultures to Burnie police; both were everyday members of the local community and neither posed...
an affront to the other. The Robe River style (calling in the police to arrest picketers, issuing writs against union officials for damages incurred during strike action and obtaining injunctions from the Supreme Court against unions to cease all action against non-union labour) was followed in the 1992 Hammersley Iron dispute at Mt Tom Price and many of its features are apparent in the planning and the execution of APPM policy during the protracted Burnie dispute.15

On 3 March, Bill Paisley, indicating APPM’s fight for survival, announced that the company would withdraw above-award conditions from the beginning of April.16 The so-called rorts were to disappear: union access to workers was to confined to specified breaks; work demarcation was to be abolished; single day “sickies” would require medical evidence; contractors could be employed at the company’s discretion; and smoking bans strictly enforced. Unionists were shocked at the petty nature of the instructions relating to such issues as day workers showering after finish time, and the removal of “non-work-related newspapers and books” and canteen hours. The unions acknowledged the company’s financial plight but rejected management’s off-hand and dictatorial manner of seeking breaks; work demarcation was to be abolished; single day “sickies” would require medical evidence; contractors could be employed at the company’s discretion; and smoking bans strictly enforced.
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In April, APPM had attempted to import 6200 tonnes of unfinished American paper to be placed in storage, as “insurance to protect it from loss of market share that might arise if the Burnie’s mill pulp operations were shut down in an industrial dispute”.17 APPM admitted that it was importing a stockpile of unfinished paper on board the Anthos in the case of lengthy industrial disruption. Inspector Roy Fox, Officer-in-Charge of the North-West Division no.10 of Burnie and Penguin division, had no difficulties in supervising arrests or theicket activity on the wharf. Fox experienced no hard feelings as the result of the eight wharf arrests for offences of trespass; the unionists knew the score and accepted such.18 He met regularly with union leaders, “thus creating for myself, albeit unconsciousness at that time, a role as mediator between the opposing camps”.19 Such personal rapport and trust became significant in the policing of the APPM dispute in May and June. Sixteen days after arrival in Burnie, the Anthos was unloaded despite a 200-strong rally and march on the Anthos berth. Much to APPM management disgust, the police line of twelve, the local custodians of law and order, was easily brushed aside. This one episode of violence on the wharf highlighted police lack of numbers in north-west Tasmania and the inability to quickly add reinforcements, but also the value of developing a reasonable working relationship with union organisers.

The police at Burnie, directed by their two senior officers, determined to remain neutral in regard to the dispute, but this policy was perceived as passive and unacceptable by the company. Inspector Fox, was essentially “free” to determine police policy and action and his number two, Senior Sergeant Hank Timmerman, organised and led the operational side and conducted briefings at the front-line. Both men acknowledged complete support from Hobart Police Headquarters, but no direct instructions. Fox saw his duty as foremost one of preserving the peace in the Burnie district; the strategy was low-key and non-confrontational. He publicly stated that his “intention was to intervene only when a transgression of State laws made it necessary.” He maintained “that frame of mind” throughout the dispute and regularly insisted when interviewed that he would utilise his “discretionary powers in all circumstances where needed”.20 A small contingent of about thirty police, mainly locals, were responsible for the Burnie and Penguin district; no more than twelve were operational at the one time. Unlike mill management and union officials, police and many Burnie residents had neither foreseen nor planned for a protracted dispute of three months, including four weeks of picketing, and the national media invasion and exposure of Burnie.21

At 9.40am on 11 May, staff management contacted Inspector Fox to request police attendance immediately because “a number of unionists had entered the boiler-house and were disrupting the work procedures”.22 When the boiler operators refused to hand over the controls in the boiler-room to non-union staff, police including Fox, escorted several union representatives from the site and arrested five and enforced charges of trespass when they refused to leave the boiler-room. Timmerman, one of the senior arresting police officers, admitted that he felt that he had been deceived: “There was a prima facie case of trespass because management told us they were trespassing. So we were forced ... in a sense tricked to take action.”23 A company executive later “informed that four of them were in fact employees”. Fox expressed concern about police being needlessly involved in the dispute and inflaming the situation: “We have got to be completely sure of our grounds for being there and arresting people”.24 He subsequently became aware that some of those arrested had been working in that particular control room for years but because of the safety certificate they were effectively sacked: “you’re talking about fellows who had been there twenty years working in that one area and the next day they are not allowed, which is a nonsense”. Fox admitted ignorance and regret:

Had I known that, I would not have arrested them. This is an internal dispute between the mill and those fellows and your own unions, so sort it out. ... I didn’t know all the facts so consequently the poor fellows got arrested.25

The deception was not appreciated by Burnie police; subsequently, the police relationship with APPM management was placed on a more formal and less trusting foundation. Due to Inspector Fox’s concerns about the arrest of the five men at the boiler house, Superintendent Tom Lello sent a fax to inform APPM that police would only reply to the company and only come to the plant if the company provided a request, “in writing by facsimile or delivered by hand”, for assistance over trespass which was made setting out facts justifying a police presence.26 This stipulation incensed mill management. The misuse of local police authority tarnished the company’s image as a benevolent community employer.

By May, the battle lines were well-established with the hardline approach and tactics of NBH on the one hand and the determined resistance of the local millworkers. The over-award practices were scrapped on 3 April and the trouble escalated into a volatile strike on 12 May, when pickets were established and surrounded the mill, covering all eleven entry points (pickets remained until 11 June). Pedestrian access was limited to staff members only while other employees were refused access; vehicles were prevented from entering or leaving the plant. Picketers quickly established a routine in the “cold rain, bitter winds” of wintry north-west Tasmania. Union officials established much of their own policing. Picket captains were carefully selected; a policy of non-violence was enshrined; agitators were moved on; hygiene and cleanliness were emphasised; alcohol was banned. Many of the picket captains were ex-servicemen because “under times of stress they could accept an order and carry it out and would not get caught up with the hype of things that were happening”.27 The police left the onus on the union officials to control their own people: “we set the ground rules of what they could and couldn’t do ... but then as it started to build up it got a bit emotional on both sides”.28

Police Minister Madill, Commissioner of Police Johnson and Burnie’s Inspector Fox all wished to remain distant, if possible, from the dispute seeing it as an industrial matter to
be resolved between APPM and its employees and unions. Later, FEDFA secretary Mike Grey described the whole scenario as a “low key, boring picket”.39 Fox claimed that there was no violence at all on the picket line.38 As he had no intent to order the picket to be broken, Fox was comfortable at any time “to walk up and down the picket line and say hello”. His second in command, Timmerman always felt comfortable about walking into the union offices and saying “good-day”. His “sole purpose” was to discover their future tactics so he could inform them of any possible legal consequences.

There was no grand policing strategy; situations were encountered on a daily basis as they arose.31 A small number of mill employees attempted to enter the mill during the duration of the picketing. When asked how police would act when those employees willing to return to work sought police assistance, Fox reiterated that “we would escort anyone up as far as the picket line and then, we’d simply have to be dictated to whatever happened then”.32 Union organiser Grey claimed that the small Right to Work party “could have gone to work, each and every day” because, although the front gate was a “no go” area, the other entrances were not.33 The company, and a few individuals, expected police to enforce the law but Inspector Fox’s reply was forthright, practical but unacceptable to the company: “We’re only a small force and I don’t like the thought ... of having to face a large crowd, many of whom might well be hostile, but apart from that it’s not good for the town”.34 Fox’s response was as much a moral as a legal one: police were the guardians of the general interest and peace of the town. For Fox, police authority was not based solely upon the law but Inspector Fox’s reply was forthright, police were the guardians of the general interest and peace of the town. 30
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As Roy Fox protested, picketing places police in a no-win situation and condemnation is expected from one side or the other: “Damn if I didn’t; damned if I did.”36

Amidst the escalating political and industrial tension, the Tasmanian Council of Churches at its Annual General Meeting of 23 May detailed concern “for the families and those bystanders caught up in the situation and who still have to work together in schools and the local community?”. Two weeks after the mill shutdown, Inspector Fox was expressing fears about the possibility of an increase in domestic violence in the Burnie area.36 Julie Fraser, the spokesperson for the Support Pulpmill Employees Committee (SPEC), claimed that fears about workers’ jobs and home security led to SPEC’s establishment because “we can’t allow the problem with domestic violence which arose at Robe River to happen here”.37

Whereas the impetus for disputation has usually been perceived as stemming from the workers via their unions, the APPM dispute appears to have reversed that order. Throughout much of May, the mill management had orchestrated attempts to break the picket lines, including the driving of trucks by management to picket enclaves, the ordering of apprentices to work at the strike-bound plant and threatening to sack workers who failed to report for duty inside the mill.40 The human wall around the perimeter of the “Pulp” had become a concrete symbol of union resolve to remain a viable part of the mill’s industrial affairs. The aggressive company,41 prepared for a long and bitter conflict, failed to appreciate that Burnie, a tightly knit and well organised community, was not like the isolated and artificial Robe River frontier town and the APPM workers received substantial support though organisations like SPEC which evolved from a women’s welfare support group to an assertive industrial lobbyist. The activities of SPEC revealed the empathy for the strikers and the militancy and resolution of many townspeople. It was not just the unions’ dispute; it was Burnie’s. The picketers ate donated pies and warmed themselves with donated firewood. Police on night patrol drank cups of tea at the various pickets. Fox believed that in the initial stages “public opinion had been in favour of APPM” but NBH-Peko’s perceived reluctance to negotiate with the unions and its “obvious forward planning” of the paper shipment swung public opinion “heavily behind the protesters”. After the boiler room arrests, Fox believed that community opinion had hardened: “It would be true to say that at this point in time whatever support may have been evident in favour of APPM began to fade rapidly as the general public digested the uncompromising stand of the mill management”. By May, the company had been using Ken Henderson, the mill manager who had grown up in Burnie, as spokesman in an attempt to ease the uncertainty and suspicion of locals about the industrial changes. APPM had been demanding that police take action against the picketers for trespass, breaching the peace and under the provisions of the traffic regulations. The company attempted to run the picket lines on four occasions on 20 and 21 May but did not notify the police in advance of the intentions.43 Police only acted “if there was any suggestion that someone was going to get hurt by a truck trying to force” entry to the plant.44 Fox was concerned that “things could turn violent, with resolves hardening on both sides”.45 Burnie police were facing the indiscriminate and unpredictable nature of a major industrial dispute.

Inspector Fox earnestly describes himself as not a pacifist, but “when it comes to policing I think there is a pacifist role we need to take when appropriate”. Fox was not adverse to arresting offenders: he supervised the arrest of APPM employees and unionists on the wharf, on the Anthos and at the APPM boiler room. As Fox stressed, the picketing obstructed no one except people wanting to enter the mill. If the picketing had occurred in the central business district of Burnie, Fox’s strategy would have been proactive and decisive as many people would have been affected in the pursuit of their normal daily affairs.46

The Fox philosophy of policing remained consistent throughout the dispute.47 Senior Sergeant Timmerman echoed Fox’s perspective of the policing of industrial dispute:

And the mill management wanted us to intervene and get rid of the pickets and we saw our role as simply keeping the peace. It was an industrial dispute; ... it was a job between management and union to sort out their problems and issues of why the pickets were put there, not the police.48

For two months, the Burnie police maintained the peace. Fox admitted: “I simply contained the situation. I didn’t solve the situation”. In the early days of the major picketing, Fox stressed his neutrality to the union leaders, “while at the same time projecting a human image of policing in such disruptive times”. The human face of policing has rarely been the traditional posture of police at times of fervent industrial conflicts. Fox maintained a co-operative liaison with the picketers and union leaders to the dispute’s end. He saw his handling of the Burnie pickets in accord with philosophical and evolutionary changes in policing over the century:

[the] 1930s concept of going in with boots and truncheons and arresting everybody is not done in modern day policing. ... We realise that part of our trust is to maintain a cordial relationship with the public, to keep the peace. ... In the old days you had the police force and them out there. Now we are a police service; we are part of the general populace out there.49

Fox stated that APPM management, who perceived him as siding with the strikers, “thought that Roy Fox and Tasmania Police should have burst through the picket line on the first day”.50 Not all local police shared Fox and Timmerman’s viewpoint: Burnie detective sergeant Kerry Daniels expressed a contrary attitude by claiming that police would have saved themselves and others much trouble if they had broken the picket-line on day one.51 According to Fox, the fact that police would not actively break
the ranks of the picket line was the “crux of the matter” and therefore mill management thought that police at Burnie were pro-union.62 APPM’s industrial strategist John Guest described the police action, or rather inaction, at Burnie as “weak”.53 In private talks with mill management, Fox expressed the hopelessness of trying to break through about 500 or 600 picketers at the main gate when he was only able to muster about forty police personnel.54 He suggested “thinning” picketing resources around the gates by not concentrating company attempts to break the picket at the main gate but rather around four or five entrances.55 Fox suggested that willing workers could use alternative entrances, but the company insisted that employees must enter and leave by the main gate, which facilitated picketing at the plant. Fox’s stratagem was ignored. Failure to heed this advice implies that the mill management following mainland directives were intent on direct confrontation with the unions. The fact that Fox was often presented on television with the picketers and their leaders rather than mill staff, entrenched within the “Fortress”, tended to present a distorted view of his deliberations.56 Fox, Timmerman and other Burnie police came to see their role more and more as that of mediator and peace-keeper between the opposing parties, as neither adversary would talk to the other but both talked to the police.57

Burnie police essentially saw themselves as community policing practitioners along the North-West Coast. Definitions of community policing are many and varied, as there is no standard meaning.58 What they all have in common is some notion of partnership between police and community; some notion of a closer relationship between police and community. Policing harnesses the active co-operation of both the public and various agencies. Jerome Skolnick and David Bayley depict the public as the “co-producers” with the police, of safety and order.59 The Burnie police were looking to the picketers and their supporters to be a self-disciplined body encouraging safety and order on the picket lines. The philosophy of community policing dictates that police serve all sections of the community, not just established interests against a marginalised group. With support from the three conservative Tasmanian dailies and Liberal Premier Groom, the APPM picketers, many of whom were long-standing members of the local community, were not a marginalised group. Police tactics of establishing protocols and negotiating with both unionist organisers and company management can prevent picket line violence. Police discretionary tactics necessitates that police do not enforce all laws, especially certain summary offences common to picketing. Commissioner Johnson, Fox and others did not perceive policing in a purely reactive, arresting role, but this role was strongly advocated by the company lawyers.

The assumption underlying all community policing is that there is a homogeneous community that is definable, compact, co-operative and involved. The tightly-knit Burnie citizenry would appear to fit the community model for police partnership as long as that policing followed a service rather than a reactive and rigid law enforcement mode. It is the tactics employed by police, rather than the involvement, which often determines the acceptance or otherwise of their actions by the local community. Specialist groups and paramilitary tactics are options in the policing of industrial disputation. The deployment of such “outside” forces, although effective and decisive in moving picketers and protesters, often arouse worker and local antagonism. If circumstances dictated aggressive, paramilitary policing, the cohesive nature of a community like Burnie could dissipate together with police legitimacy. The bitter conflict at the “Pulp” challenged Burnie’s policing capacity to enforce the law and safeguard community harmony. On patrol, Timmerman revealed that police would “have a cup of tea” at the picket line and engage in “small talk”. The community policing ethos emerges strongly: “What that did was put a human face on the police, and from the police point of view put a human face on the picketers. You weren’t just dealing with obstacles, you were dealing with people.”56

Inspector Fox had the full support of police command: “Commissioners were quite happy with my suggestion that, ok, I am not going to break through the line, I’ll maintain peace on the line and let the Industrial Commission sort the matter out”. Hobart hierarchy was satisfied with the strategy; “even the government of the day were happy”.57 Commissioner Johnson gave Superintendent Lello complete authority; in turn, Lello delegated that authority to Inspector Fox who regularly updated the commissioners. Police Minister Madill had “no intention of interfering in police operational matters” but left decisions to senior police officers on the spot who assess and judge and keep the government informed.58

At Burnie, police reticence to forcefully remove the picketers was a major obstacle to NBH-Peko proceeding with their reforms including the denial of union representation of APPM workers. By failing to break the picket, police were giving tacit support and pseudo-legitimacy to union rights to organise and maintain a 24-hour picket around the mill’s six-and-a-half kilometre perimeter. Tensions were increasing with a series of ugly incidents, allegations and counter-allegations of intimidation, renewed company pressure on police to intercede. Company lawyers, Michael O’Farrell and Timothy Lyons, and some staff had been active around the pickets collecting evidence and taking photographs.60 Decisively, on Saturday 23 May, the APPM management, in a surprise and unprecedented move, served a writ of mandamus on the Tasmanian Police Commissioner, John Johnson, which thereby ordered a public official or body to perform a duty. APPM management claimed that police failed to protect public property, to provide truck access and to assist workers who wished to go about their normal, lawful daily business, even to the extent of crossing picket lines.61 The writ confirmed APPM’s hardline stance against negotiation and challenged police operational independence.

Little discrepancy in evidence was expressed by either side before the Tasmania Supreme Court. The affidavits on behalf of NBH claimed considerable company losses due to the picketing, employee intimidation, verbal abuse, trespass and police inactivity.62 The police affidavits stressed the police desire to maintain stability, neutrality and peace in the north-west of Tasmania and to act in an impartial manner. Commissioner Johnson advocated a balanced and impartial approach aimed at preserving “the rights of the employer and the employees”.63 Superintendent Lello praised union officials and members who had “obeyed every lawful direction by police” but were determined to “not break ranks and permit vehicles to move to and from the mill until mill officials are prepared to hold reasonable talks with them”.64 To Lello’s knowledge, the picket line had remained non-violent —— “just a straight passive resistance”.65 Inspector Fox, the man on-the-spot, declared that the picketers had been non-violent and well controlled by the union leaders such as Shayne Murphy and Mike Grey. Fox affirmed that the picketers generally complied with police directions through the union leaders or picket captains.66

Although Justice Wright, on 3 June, refused the mandamus order sought by North Broken Hill and declined to make the order absolute, he clearly forewarned the Tasmania Police to act against the Burnie picketing. Any failure to do so would have likely eventuated in Wright upholding any further re-application by the company for the rule nisi. He upheld the APPM argument that non-striking employees and other people on lawful business should have access to the plant. The Commissioner of Police’s misconceived policy of not breaking picket lines was incorrect and “cannot be
The most damning of the judge's criticisms was that the "police cannot allow mob rule to displace the rule of law" in part due to insufficient policing numbers. Wright explicitly stated that Fox was "clearly wrong" by suggesting that "police should not interfere in a situation which had its genesis in an industrial dispute". The judgement indicated that police discretion is not unfettered and a constable cannot ignore the commission of an offence. The dispute's direction had been taken out of the jurisdiction of local authorities, including the police.

Fox accepted the correctness of the Wright decision at law, but there were "a lot of human factors there that should have been looked at before the decision was handed down." After the Wright decision, police recognised that their discretionary power in the APPM dispute was greatly curtailed and they accepted that "an escalation into a violent confrontation seemed inevitable". A police organisation being fundamentally a conservative agency of government rarely questions a direct legal ruling, especially one of the Supreme Court. There appeared to be no hesitation in police circles about enforcing the spirit of the judge's statements. After the Wright decision, police saw their role as one of acting against the picket lines, although those picket lines remained non-violent and passive. The Wright decision placed Inspector Fox "at odds with the action I had been taking up to that point of time." According to Timmerman, the preceding weeks had heightened the irony of police breaking the picket line:

By that stage we had built such a good rapport with the picketers and union officials, when the decision came down ... they sympathised with us. They said, "OK, we know you have a job to do, you've been very good to us, and we will go along with it as best we can, we know your hands are tied." 31

Since the morning picket-line on 4 June had held firm against two police forays, local police, reinforced by more than fifty Launceston and other area police, determined to break through the picket at the 3pm shift change-over. Inspector Fox again informed the union leaders that reinforced police numbers would attempt to break the picket. He records that to the credit of the union leaders they intended to avoid violence if possible. 32 The picketers had remained well disciplined and organised for a month; these traits were again evident on 4 June. Forty-one arrests occurred for the day (all were released that night), and "others were left bruised, bloodied and emotionally distraught." 34 The charges included assault, striking, spitting and obstruction. 34 Considering the numbers involved on both sides, the bitter month long build-up to the violent climax, the eminence of picketers and mill management and the issues involved, the level of violence on 4 June was relatively low compared with major industrial clashes in Australia's history. The rapport and co-operation having evolved and been nurtured between police and picketer, both belonging to disciplined though diverse organisations, probably accounts for the limited bloodshed at Burnie. Fox suggested that the exercise of gaining entry for about twenty workers hardly justified the heavy 85-person police deployment.

The picketers did not identify the police as the enemy; clearly, the competitive, cost-driven, mainland parent-company received the full vilification of the unionists. The three daily Tasmanian newspapers featured the welfare role of SPEC, the men at the picket gates at near to zero temperature, and the families divided by the dispute. Burnie police did not stereotype the strikers as the problem. Fox and Timmerman had regularly consulted and negotiated with union organisers and leaders. After the afternoon confrontation, Fox walked amidst the picketers and "detected no recriminations against the police action at all" but they exhibited overtly a considerable show of bitterness against the company's "hardline attitude ... the sole cause of the confrontation". Sergeant Daniels concurred that there was no lasting animosity displayed towards the police. FEDFA secretary Mike Grey and PKIU secretary Ray Grundy praised Inspector Fox's "astute" handling of the whole dispute. Despite the Thursday clashes, according to newspaper reports, the Burnie police remained on good terms with the workers. This lack of recrimination against police must be unique in Australian annals of violent clashes between police and picketers.

Some tension between police and unionists was evident. Although police had ordered unionists not to place women and children in the front-line of their resistance, this generally went unheeded and thereby increased the difficulties and disquiet of police. Union organisers counter-claimed that such women were employees of the APPM Burnie. Some allegations surfaced of picketers carrying weapons to use against the police. Inspector Fox was concerned about a pair of piers on an arrested APPM worker and spurs on the boots of some picketers. The picket captains, in line with their tight internal "policing" throughout the dispute, banned any possible weapons, watches, spectacles and unauthorised picketers. Mike Grey said the additional security measures were taken to prevent people infiltrating the picket line merely to target police. Grundy's criticism was confined to the bus-loads of police from Hobart, "hyped up with adrenaline to kick arse." Grundy claimed that police from Launceston were instrumental in breaking the picket line "come what may." 35

In a Catch-22 situation, Commissioner Johnson admitted that the presence of police reinforcements had occasioned the violence: "... if the police hadn't been there, the attempt to get into the gates wouldn't have been made, so there wouldn't have been violence". Johnson regretted police involvement "in violence in a small city like Burnie, the results of which will flow into the community and be felt for years to come". Wright's warnings of "mob rule" and "the law of the jungle" were unfortunately prophetic; but also ironic in the sense that there was virtually no "mob rule" or violence until the police heeded the judge's words. The company viewed the melees as confirmation of "the law of the jungle"; unionists perceived them as the extent to which the company was prepared to go in order to break the unions. The dispute, though not the tensions, was defused early the next week through negotiations between the parties in conflict. 36

Ironically, the police were one group regarded as emerging virtually unscathed from the happenings in Burnie in 1992. Despite the criticisms of Justice Wright, Inspector Fox was depicted as the hero of Burnie in the Tasmanian press. He became well known to picketers, union officials, company management and television news' viewers. Fox argued that knowing the local people helped to defuse tense situations on the picket line. By the dispute's settlement, he knew virtually every picketer by first name. The Burnie police wanted the picketers to realise that there was a human face behind the blue uniforms and police made deliberate attempts to start conversations with workers. Fox was aware that he would be criticised for failing to enforce the letter of the law. The Mercury's Michael Smith heralded Fox's low-key, peace-keeping role during the dispute: Burnie's top cop takes the prize for his peacekeeping formula. Fox had one focus throughout the dispute; namely, to prevent violence by using discretion which "occasionally meant turning a blind eye to the law". His gravest concern "was that once a large number of workers wanted to go back, the police would have to escort them through the picket line and that would create a particularly violent clash". Fox reflected that he acted "as a kind of mediator between the unions and the company - that's what helped keep violence at a low level in police clashes with picketers". 39

Despite condemnation from the company, the violent police-picketer clashes of 4 June and the accompanying
Burnie police received commendation for their handling of the dispute, and Wright's rejection of the passive peacekeeping philosophy, Fox and the Burnie police maintained their standing in the local community and press. The Sunday Examiner credited Fox with having achieved widespread respect from picketers and unions for the handling of the dispute, but angered mill management for not arresting picketers to clear access to the mill.29 Timmerman proudly reflected that all Burnie police received commendation for their handling of the dispute, a unique achievement. He believed that this high recognition from senior police "capped off the support" from Police Headquarters at Hobart. Advocate reporter Ruth Lampard argued that Burnie police acting with a "human face" during the course of the dispute and Fox's handling of the major clashes "has boosted the police force's credibility in the community".30 This sentiment was not shared by the mainland company executives. NBH-Peko's chief executive, Peter Wade, one of the harshest critics of police inaction, claimed that APPM was "confronted with an illegal picket and an impotent police force".31

For sometime during the dispute, police in the north-west were alarmed by the presence of the self-professed, union-busting Townsend security group. Keith Morrow, secretary of the Tasmanian Police Association, feared chaos and escalating problems with the guards "where there is no neutrality and guards carry out the order of the employer."32 Inspector Fox, stressing the neutral and calming presence of the police, had warned of the dangers of APPM relying on private guards:

If they use private security to remove people unlawfully on the premises it might escalate what is a difficult situation now. By using the police at least we can tend to diffuse the issue.33

The union movement and people of Burnie were particularly hostile towards the "Ninja Turtles", the hired security guards flown in secretly from Sydney at the beginning of June. The security guards were employed to keep protesters, APPM employees, out of the mill. The picketers viewed them as martial arts experts employed to break the strike by violence; they were viewed as the company's private army.34 Although Fox acknowledged that they were "extremely professional", he believed that these security people could spark violence, be the "flashpoint" for further battle.35 On 5 June, APPM management confirmed that the Ninja Turtles had returned to Sydney after just three days. Even company officials, such as John Guest, would later admit that the employment of these karate-boxers was a poor public relations exercise in a tightly-knit Tasmanian town preoccupied by the strike statement.36 The Burnie public appeared to be "totally against that sort of security".37

If dissatisfied with police responses, a company can employ private security and guards, who are directly under their control, direction and authority. By contrast, public police legitimacy relies on the consent of the community. APPM spokesman Chris Oldfield explained the company's distinction between police and security: "The police are there to remove people. The security guards are there to try to make the place secure within the law and the powers they have". He claimed that the police were called "as a last resort"38 Police, if they wish to be effective mediators, do not see their role as one of last resort. Modern policing ethos espouses proactivity and preventing trouble in public places. Oldfield's stated separation of powers between company guards to provide security and police to arrest circumvents the responsibility of the public police to keep the peace.

The police of Burnie rely heavily on the cooperation of the people of town and surrounds, especially in times of emergency. Although the industrial dispute would end, their policing responsibilities in the area would continue. FEDFA secretary Mike Grey, who "lived" on the APPM picket line, highly commended the local police of all ranks who "played a terrific role" and who developed trust and friendship. In an industrial town like Burnie, police cannot afford to lose local support: "Police are too tied to the community; they rely on the community for much of their information."39 The police were attempting to keep the peace not just between company and picketers but also within the community, historically dependent on the "Pulp".44 The dispute did not merely affect industrial relations but also the economic, social and psychological fabric of the township.45

Capital is a mobile phenomenon: NBH-Peko, with its eastern mainland boardrooms, was capable of withdrawing its investment from north-west Tasmanian paper manufacturing. In September 1993, the Burnie mill was sold to AMCOR. The labour force of north-west Tasmania was intricately tied to that district. Labour is far less mobile than capital in terms of employment, family, home, social and recreational links to a particular locality. Like the APPM workers, Burnie police strongly identified with the district and formed part of that entrenched community.

Historically, police have not been reticent to use coercive power in industrial confrontations. The 1992 Burnie policing approach showed an alternative path, one of consultation and compromise rather than coercion, one that is much more conducive to the community functioning of police. The 1998 national waterfront dispute occasioned the policing of the Maritime Union of Australia's "community assemblies". This dispute revealed the effectiveness of community protest and the desirability of negotiation and protocol between the union movement and police in order to maintain peaceful protest.46 The non-confrontational and non-interventionist policing of the wharves (the notable exception being the deployment of the WA tactical response unit) was welcomed by the MUA and its supporters and was drastically different from much traditional policing of industrial disputation and more in keeping with the peacekeeping function of Burnie police in 1992.

The General Manager of NBH-Peko asserted that ultimately the financial and human suffering at Burnie had been worthwhile in order to achieve restructuring gains. Inspector Fox was appalled that it took a Supreme Court case and numerous arrests to achieve a settlement that "could have been resolved in the early stages had there been a genuine desire to do so".47 Fox was stunned by the General Manager's "worth it in the end" philosophy. Two months of agitation, a total commitment of police resources and forty-one arrests "at the end of the day, I certainly don't think it was worth it".48 To police, the APPM unionists were fellow residents of Burnie and surrounding districts; workers on strike, not criminals.

Endnotes
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4 The Burnie Advocate's editorial of 14 May 1992 contended that Burnie remained largely a company town:
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14 At the Pannawonica mine, workers, who refused to obey orders, were regularly escorted by the police from the site. See M. Kaempf, “Politics and Industrial Relations: the Robe River dispute”, *Discussion Paper* 15, Department of Industrial Relations, University of Western Australia, pp.13-14.

15 Thompson, op.cit., p.151.

16 The company was announcing its intention to withdraw all overaward agreements except for the 35-hour week, a 25% overaward payment, the APPM/ACTU superannuation agreement and the voluntary retirement scheme; *Industrial Relations and Management Letter*, vol.9, no.3, pp.16-17.


18 Recorded interview with Inspector Fox, 23 October 1995, at Burnie Police Headquarters.

19 Fox, op.cit., p.7.

20 Ibid., p.16.

21 Alderman Mayor Sandra French (recorded interview, 24 October 1995) and many councillors “assumed it was going to be sorted out quicker”.

22 Fox, op.cit., p.14. On 11 May, the boiler operators’ confrontation surfaced when the company evicted four boiler operators and one union safety officer for refusing to attend a TAFE training session, which the IRC ordered to be cancelled until a further commission hearing was held about the training of white-collar staff in the operation of boilers. Control of the boiler room, by company or unions, was a crucial element in the expanding dispute.
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27 Grey interview, 26 October 1995. Grey, an ex-Vietnam veteran himself, believed that these ex-servicemen “could keep the calm, even when we had the problems with the police, keeping some sort of calm was very important”. Unionists attempted to impose their own order on the picket lines. The vehicle of Peter Higgins, Paper Mill Operations Manager, had been damaged in the Yacht Club Car Park on 12 May. Union representatives raised funds by a collection to pay for the damage and placed “a responsible person” on duty in the car park to prevent a recurrence. See cross-examination of Peter Higgins, 29 May 1992, *R v Commissioner of Police ex parte NBH Ltd*, pp.28-32.
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31 Timmerman interview, 27 October 1995.
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35 John Alderson in *Principled Policing* (Winchester, 1998) p.43, argues on utilitarian principles that the objective of policing “is not to enforce the law and coerce the people for its own sake, but to do so for the common good”.

36 Fox interview, 23 October 1995. As Fox emphasised: “If I eventually force a way through the picket line, I’m assisting the mill management in continuing business. If I don’t break through the picket line, I’m assisting the unions and isolating a viable industry.”


38 Fox interview, 23 October 1995. He stated that many workers started to become worried as the “mill management had not moved an inch”. A number of local doctors informed that there had already been a sizeable increase in the number of stress-related illnesses and problems associated with domestic violence.
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48 Timmerman interview, 27 October 1995.

52 Fox interview, 23 October 1995.

42 Fox, op.cit., pp.11-12, 15.

44 Fox interview, 23 October 1995.
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51 Daniels interview, 23 October 1995.

41 Other aggressive companies in the 1990s have been prepared to encounter intense industrial conflict in order to introduce individual contracts and to de-unionize the workforce. Timo and McDonald examine how CRA has assaulted trade unionism at its New Zealand and Australian sites by its sustained anti-union propaganda, tactics impeding union membership and a climate of insecurity. At the Weipa bauxite mine (far north Queensland) and Bell Bay smelter (Tasmania), CRA sought to remove all third party bargaining and implant union-free individual contracts. See N. Timo and J. McDonald, “Killing the Union? Individual Contracts and CRA”, paper presented to NKCIR Conference, Monash University, 12 July 1996, pp.13-26.

54 Fox normally had a total strength of seventy-three, but he had to utilise forty-three on two consecutive days “and that has stripped the Burnie watch out completely”. The normal Burnie police shift was eight or nine. Cross-examination of Fox, R v Commissioner of Police ex parte NBH Ltd., 1 June 1992, pp.220. Senior Sergeant Timmerman (interview 27 October 1995) attested that “Inspector Fox was calling the shots from the start”.

43 APPM continued to test the picket line “with no real success at breaching the picket being achieved”; APPM’s “Daily Industrial Relations Summary”, dated 11am, 22 May 1992.

55 Ibid.; and Fox interview (2), 25 October 1995. Fox’s alternative suggestion (op.cit. p.18) to mill management in relation to truck access “was that I would clear a path through whatever obstructions had been placed in their path, but I would not instruct police officers to physically break through the human cordon”. Police had observed the impasse, but declined to intervene. The company vehemently attacked the police for failing to clear the picket lines to allow truck access to and from the mill. Police policy was to ensure that roads were clear and people could drive past and through the vicinity of the mill.

56 Fox, op.cit., p.17. Fox (interview, 23 October 1995) alleged that all his media interviews occurred at the pickets “once mill management went behind four walls and virtually became prisoners in their own castle”. According to Fox (interview [2], 25 October 1995), Henderson informed him that the NBH-Peko mainland general manager instructed him not to talk or negotiate with the union leaders.

57 Senior Sergeant Timmerman echoed the police intermediary role: Both parties weren’t talking to each other but they were talking to us, so we were relaying messages .. that put us on a very good stead, particularly with the unions and not only with the officials, but with all the people involved and on the picket lines .. so they were very friendly and cordial relations .. All we did was patrol and monitor the situation.

58 Robert R Friedmann, Community Policing: Comparative Perspectives and Prospects (St. Martin’s Press, New York, 1992) p.4, attempts to provide a conglomerate definition of community policing:

Community policing is a policy and strategy aimed at achieving more effective and efficient crime control, reduced fear of crime, improved quality of life, improved police services and police legitimacy, through a proactive reliance on community resources that seeks to change crime-causing conditions. It assumes a need for greater accountability of police, greater public share in decision-making and greater concern for civil rights and liberties.

The imprecise and nebulous term, “community policing”, inspires positive connotations. It is politically acceptable and creditable to the Left because it theoretically involves all peoples in the policing partnership; to the Right, it is a cost-saving strategy in the fight against crime. The humanitarian can applaud community policing as the means of changing a brutal system; the pragmatist sees the deficiencies in the present system and looks to improvement. However, community policing is not the panacea for the policing of all disorder as the very existence of grievance indicates divisions within society.


60 Timmerman interview, 27 October 1995.

61 Fox interview, 23 October 1995.

62 ZRR News transcript, 5.00pm, 14 May 1992.

63 A logging supervisor, Geoffrey Angel, gave evidence to the Supreme Court that he, in accordance with company direction, accompanied logging contractors to take photos of the picketers preventing the contractors’ entry. See R v Commissioner of Police ex parte NBH Ltd, 29 May 1992, pp.35-36. Similarly at the company’s behest, Michael Boardwell, manager of APPM Pine Products and Michael O’Shea, an APPM surveyor, photographed unsuccessful attempts by timber-loaded trucks to enter the mill. Police were not present on these occasions; the “photographers” provided reports to the company solicitors; and they made no statements to police. See ibid, pp.38-41, 47-53.

64 See Age, 25 May 1992.

65 The applicant produced affidavits of five employees claiming intimidation of “verbal abuse and jostling” when attempting to enter the mill site; see “Originating Application” filed on 22 May 1992 on behalf of North Broken Hill Limited by Dobson, Mitchell and Allport, in the Supreme Court of Tasmania, for the five statements).

66 Examination of Johnson, R v Commissioner of Police ex parte NBH Ltd, 1 June 1992, p.184. Under cross-examination, Johnson expanded his instructions to Assistant Commissioner Le Fevre: I told him that the incident at Burnie was to be treated like any other police operation and that police were only to intercede where there was a breach of the peace or an apprehended breach of the police and to otherwise enforce the law in accordance with their duty.

67 Lello affidavit, p.10, paragraph 30.


Ibid.

Fox interview, 23 October 1995.

Fox, op.cit., p.22. An imminent feeling of confrontation engulfed Burnie after the Supreme Court decision. The *Mercury*’s Rod McGuirk, 4 June 1992, reported that the situation was still unclear as to whether “police would maintain a peace-keeping stance or act against what they have tolerated as picketers’ passive and non-violent resistance”.


Timmerman interview, 27 October 1995.

Fox, op.cit., p.23. The police incursions proved to be a test of brute strength against the picketers. There had been 38 police at the morning confrontations, all from the north-west coast. Reinforcements from Launceston and other areas increased the numbers to 85 (state strength was 960).


Age reporter Andrew Darby, 6 June 1992, presented a harrowing account of the clash:

Last Thursday there was a low, locomotive howl from hundreds of picketers’ threats as they pushed against police. Their roar was mixed with screams and cries of people being trodden on, being squashed and infuriated. Burly strikers were flung away from a police wedge protecting a handful of strike-breakers. Push came to shove in the APPM dispute.

See the * Examiner*, 5 June 1992, p.1. Fox acknowledged that the picketers’ behaviour was “generally still not provocative” but the union leaders had “lost control” of picketers, which culminated in arrests and injuries. Senior Sergeant Timmerman (interview; 27 October 1995), when describing “crunch time” described police pushing persons out of the way, “it got a bit violent, it got a bit ugly; simply because of the numbers of people involved”.

Fox, op.cit., p.23. Fox reported to the media: “It was amazing. Five minutes after the major 3pm. clash I was able to go in amongst the picketers, which culminated in arrests and injuries. Senior Sergeant Timmerman (interview; 27 October 1995), when describing “crunch time” described police pushing persons out of the way, “it got a bit violent, it got a bit ugly; simply because of the numbers of people involved”.

Fox, op.cit., p.23. Fox reported to the media: “It was amazing. Five minutes after the major 3pm. clash I was able to go in amongst the picketers, which culminated in arrests and injuries. Senior Sergeant Timmerman (interview; 27 October 1995), when describing “crunch time” described police pushing persons out of the way, “it got a bit violent, it got a bit ugly; simply because of the numbers of people involved”.

Fox, op.cit., p.23. Fox reported to the media: “It was amazing. Five minutes after the major 3pm. clash I was able to go in amongst the picketers, which culminated in arrests and injuries. Senior Sergeant Timmerman (interview; 27 October 1995), when describing “crunch time” described police pushing persons out of the way, “it got a bit violent, it got a bit ugly; simply because of the numbers of people involved”.

Quoted in the *Mercury*, 5 June 1992, at 6.30pm, 8 June 1992, expressed the hostility and lack of trust of the company “that’s lied and cheated and brought in ninja turtles – quote – hit men from the other side of this island, to bash their own work people”.

Guest interview, 24 October 1995. Guest claimed that these security guards belonged to the Sydney-based Torqguard Security company. NBH had employed security from that company to ensure access to a site of Vista Paper Products on the outskirts of Sydney during an eight-week picket. Unlike Burnie, police had acted at the Vista site and the private security was directed to maintain at least one open access to the mill.

Fox interview, 23 October 1995. Fox, op.cit., p.23. Fox reported to the media: “It was amazing. Five minutes after the major 3pm. clash I was able to go in amongst the picketers, which culminated in arrests and injuries. Senior Sergeant Timmerman (interview; 27 October 1995), when describing “crunch time” described police pushing persons out of the way, “it got a bit violent, it got a bit ugly; simply because of the numbers of people involved”.

Fox, op.cit., p.23. Fox reported to the media: “It was amazing. Five minutes after the major 3pm. clash I was able to go in amongst the picketers, which culminated in arrests and injuries. Senior Sergeant Timmerman (interview; 27 October 1995), when describing “crunch time” described police pushing persons out of the way, “it got a bit violent, it got a bit ugly; simply because of the numbers of people involved”.

Fox, op.cit., p.23. Fox reported to the media: “It was amazing. Five minutes after the major 3pm. clash I was able to go in amongst the picketers, which culminated in arrests and injuries. Senior Sergeant Timmerman (interview; 27 October 1995), when describing “crunch time” described police pushing persons out of the way, “it got a bit violent, it got a bit ugly; simply because of the numbers of people involved”.

Guest interview, 24 October 1995. Guest claimed that these security guards belonged to the Sydney-based Torqguard Security company. NBH had employed security from that company to ensure access to a site of Vista Paper Products on the outskirts of Sydney during an eight-week picket. Unlike Burnie, police had acted at the Vista site and the private security was directed to maintain at least one open access to the mill.

Fox interview, 23 October 1995. Fox, op.cit., p.23. Fox reported to the media: “It was amazing. Five minutes after the major 3pm. clash I was able to go in amongst the picketers, which culminated in arrests and injuries. Senior Sergeant Timmerman (interview; 27 October 1995), when describing “crunch time” described police pushing persons out of the way, “it got a bit violent, it got a bit ugly; simply because of the numbers of people involved”.

Fox, op.cit., p.23. Fox reported to the media: “It was amazing. Five minutes after the major 3pm. clash I was able to go in amongst the picketers, which culminated in arrests and injuries. Senior Sergeant Timmerman (interview; 27 October 1995), when describing “crunch time” described police pushing persons out of the way, “it got a bit violent, it got a bit ugly; simply because of the numbers of people involved”.

Guest interview, 24 October 1995. Guest claimed that these security guards belonged to the Sydney-based Torqguard Security company. NBH had employed security from that company to ensure access to a site of Vista Paper Products on the outskirts of Sydney during an eight-week picket. Unlike Burnie, police had acted at the Vista site and the private security was directed to maintain at least one open access to the mill.

Fox interview, 23 October 1995.
105 One example of the divisions created by the APPM dispute was the story of the Bellchambers brothers. David, a millworker, was arrested by police; his brother Craig was a local traffic policeman. Fox was “a bit perturbed at one stage that one of the traffic officers might be involved in the arrest of his own brother”. (Quoted in the Sunday Tasmanian, 6 August 1995, p.5.)
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