EDITORIAL: WHITENESS STUDIES IN THE AUSTRALIAN ACADEME IN 2009, SOME COMMENTS

LEIGH BOUCHER & JANE CAREY

The articles in this issue all emerged out of the intellectual and political work that took place during the 2008 Re-Orienting Whiteness Conference in Melbourne.[i] First, then, we would like to thank all the presenters and participants who made the trip to Melbourne in early December. In many ways, the following articles attest to both the vitality of whiteness studies in Australia and the political challenges that currently shape the field. The conference itself represented the fusion of two nascent conference traditions: the annual ACRAWSA conference which has, without question, provided a focus and impetus for the solidification of the field in Australia, and the *Historicising Whiteness* conference held in 2006, which brought together historians interested in the study of whiteness. In 2006, the latter – perhaps to the convenors surprise – revealed just how much work Australian historians were producing in the field (Boucher, Carey and Ellinghaus 2007). Thus, while in keeping with the best traditions of whiteness studies this collection is certainly interdisciplinary, historical perspectives are well represented. Equally, the 2008 conference was an attempt to bring whiteness studies and postcolonial theory into more careful dialogue – in part because we would suggest that elements of postcolonial theory direct scholars to the material contexts of power and imperialism (see (Boucher, Carey and Ellinghaus 2008).

In one sense, then, this issue follows on from Sara Ahmed's (2008: 1) reflections in the 2008 edition of the *ACRAWSA e-Journal* on the "politics of good feeling": how "certain bodies are seen as the origin of bad feeling, as getting in the way of public happiness". Here, Ahmed argued the continuing need for attention to "histories that hurt". Making links between the painful history of colonialism, the study of whiteness, and regimes of "productive" political feeling in the present, she explained, "The history of happiness is inseparable from the history of empire … happiness was used to justify European imperialism as a moral project … The civilising mission could be described as a happiness mission". She concluded, "We cannot let go of this history, we cannot give up labouring over its sore points … [we cannot] cover over bad feelings and the pasts they keep alive … We might need to hold on to histories of suffering, to stay as sore as our points" (Ahmed 2008: 12 & 14). History, then, as a series of stories we choose to tell about the past, is centrally implicated in the way we understand our present and the possibilities (and need) for change within it.

Historians at the 2006 and 2008 conferences – the editors of this edition amongst them – suggested that history has something specific to contribute to the field of whiteness studies; namely, an increased attention to the importance of time and place. As we (with Katherine Ellinghaus) have argued, whiteness needs to be more robustly historicized because the mechanisms that maintain its power and legitimacy are far too variable to the explained by any

ISSN 1832-3898

straightforward Manichean binary. While historians have recently incorporated the terms "white" and "whiteness" into their analytic vocabulary, "the specificities of how, historically, white identity was formed and shaped are only starting to be examined" (Carey, Boucher and Ellinghaus 2007: vii). Although the vitality of whiteness studies has been produced, in part, by its interdisciplinarity – even as historians have produced some of its crucial US scholarship – an historicised approach to whiteness differs in substantive ways from much existing scholarship. Whilst whiteness studies (alongside, we would suggest, postcolonial theory) has produced a rich theoretical and political vocabulary to interrogate racial power and privilege, historians have expressed a little discomfort with the ways in which this vocabulary often effaces the impact on and experiences of historically embedded people. If whiteness studies fundamentally asks scholars to track the unevenly relational character of racialisation (whites and their various Others), then historians' attention to empirical specificity raises a series of substantive questions. Whilst interrogating the "logics", "grids", and "structures" of whiteness is a crucial project, historical (or historicised) work suggests that the dynamic of racialisation and racial privilege are much more temporally variable than a single trans-historical theoretical vocabulary would imply. An historicized approach necessarily involves thinking about how the structures and dynamics of whiteness are always oriented by time and place. Historians thus tend to be less interested in "naming" the ways in which white racial identity has been normalised, and instead tend to track the relationship between racialising dynamics and specific historical and political processes and contexts. Thinking historically about whiteness, then, suggests that we might need to embed our theoretical assumptions about racial privilege more carefully in times and places.

This insight has substantive implications for both the critical study of whiteness (as an identity and as an oppressive relation) and the field's utility as a mechanism to interrogate our own contemporary academic context. As the accounts of pedagogy, university administration, knowledge production and university hiring in this edition confirm, the intellectually "possessive logic" of whiteness is manifesting in newly oppressive ways. On the other hand, histories of whiteness are not without their own political and theoretical problems; interrogating the operation of racial privilege in the past can, in some ways, smooth over the more politically and epistemologically challenging implications of whiteness studies in the present (and perhaps, many historians have been able to elide these implications because of the temporal distance of their subject). The recent histories of multiculturalism and racial and apology politics in Australia have, in many cases, re-oriented the power and privilege of whiteness in rhetorics of inclusion and empowerment that fail to address the normalising imperatives of white racial power. They have also, paradoxically, provided new ways to intellectually and institutionally quarantine both non-white scholars and the political implications of their work. As Aileen Moreton-Robinson remarked in the final session of the 2008 conference, historians of whiteness might similarly learn much from their disciplinary neighbours.

There is no question that scholars in the fields of sociology, political science, education and (contemporary) cultural studies have been much better at thinking about the ways in which the production of contemporary academic

knowledge needs to do more than simply "take aim" at whiteness. Taking the challenge of whiteness studies seriously in the academe requires significant epistemological and institutional transformation. We can't simply examine whiteness, add some Other subjects and "stir". Rather, as Susan Mlcek suggests in her article, whiteness studies needs to question "what is knowledge, who has it, and what can be done with it?" As Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2008: 85-6) argues, the scene of academic knowledge production – as it echoes with the wider discourses of inclusion and empowerment – "obscure[s] the more complex way that white possession functions socio-discursively through subjectivity and knowledge production". Whilst scholars in the US might look upon the continued production of whiteness studies scholarship in Australia with some envy (Roediger 2006), its apparent institutional security (indicated by the production of work, professional associations, conferences, and hiring) conceals a troubling resistance (whether intentional or patterned) to the epistemological and institutional implications of the field. As the political imperatives of whiteness studies and postcolonial theory challenge pedagogies, knowledges and institutions, the practices and patterns of the academe (and individuals within it) actively or unintentionally fail to do the necessary epistemological and structural work to address these critiques – even as, or perhaps because, rhetorics of white virtue and inclusion effectively dull the sharp edges of whiteness studies. Indeed, as Ron Hoenig's study of the representation of refugees suggests, one of the ways in which white practices and subjectivities maintain their authority is via a condescending tendency to offer incorporation to minorities. As Catriona Elder, Cath Ellis and Angela Pratt (2004: 209) point out in relation to the national imaginary:

> the management of non-white people in the white nation-space is ordered in terms of a relationship where white people assume that their place is at the centre or core of the nation, defined in relation to both internal non-white others and external non-white margins or periphery.

So too, the criticisms generated by whiteness studies in the academe, which are so frequently being left up to non-white interlocutors to articulate, are offered inclusion under the terms and parameters of the very white knowledge it purports to critique. A number of the papers in this collection attest to just how difficult securing substantive change can be – not least in the ways in which Indigenous academics and learners seem to be bearing the political and emotional weight of this transformation. As convenors of the 2008 conference, we are not unaware of the ways in which our own conference – at times – simultaneously failed to address the material, intellectual and organisational implications of two-way cross-cultural engagements (and thus marginalised non-white knowledges), demanded that non-white speakers perform the disruptive work of whiteness studies, and, perhaps, implicitly asked non-white informants to smooth white consciences. As white convenors and editors we would like to take this opportunity to recognise the emotional, political and intellectual work that non-white participants broadly and Indigenous speakers in particular performed at the 2008 conference, even as we acknowledge that our recognition will always fail to comprehend the experience and impact of this work. There are individual psychic and emotional costs to being

asked to continually articulate collective and individual histories of suffering and pain (even as we concur with Ahmed's call to maintain their disruptive presence); we need to find a way to distribute these costs more evenly.

****

The contributors to this issue take whiteness studies in some significant new directions. Vera Mackie's article makes a major new contribution to an under-explored area – how whiteness has operated in Asian contexts. Her work demonstrates how we need to think about "location" and "perspective" in our understanding of whiteness as both an historical and political endeavour. Western understandings of whiteness were not simply transported into this sphere. While some recent work has sought to "provincialise" the United States in area of whiteness (Boucher, Carey and Ellinghaus 2007 and 2009; Moreton-Robinson, Casey and Nicoll 2008), she argues "it is necessary to understand how whiteness has been seen by non-white observers, and that we need to be sensitive to local taxonomies of difference which are not always reducible to the white/non-white distinction which is hegemonic in the Euro-American centres". Mackie's analysis of literary representations in early twentieth century Japan compellingly shows how speech and dress encoded whiteness for bodies that most gazes would place outside the boundaries of whiteness. The politics and poetics of location have a substantive impact on the ways in which this plays out. More comparative studies of whiteness outside the "Anglo-Saxon" world are needed.

Joost Cote also considers Asian productions of whiteness (in comparative relation to Australia), but this time very much situated within the frame of European imperialism. Focussing on education as a key colonial response to the perceived dangers of "miscegenation", Cote seeks to develop "a comparative framework that links colonial settlements in Asia and Australia". Across these diverse contexts he suggests that education was a crucial mechanism of colonial knowledge and management, and central both to securing whiteness and defining its boundaries: "Education … evidently held the key to gaining the cultural capital in terms of which whiteness could be safeguarded and advanced". Educational strategies were developed in direct relation to anxieties about whiteness. Cote thus argues for "the universality of a linked discourse of whiteness and class across [European] Imperial Asia". Other work, however, has highlighted the multiple and often divergent tropes of whiteness in circulation throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (eg. Boucher, Carey and Ellinghaus 2007 and 2009; Carey and McLisky 2009). As Mackie suggests, "whiteness has a specific history in particular localised cultural and social contexts … the concept cannot easily be generalised beyond these contexts". These contrasting views exemplify two key currents of recent whiteness scholarship – one which emphasises the transnational dimensions of whiteness (see also Lake and Reynolds 2008) and the other which focuses on the importance of local dynamics.

Continuing the theme of "locating" whiteness, Sam Ritchie's article explores the "fluid" nature of nineteenth century conceptions of "race" in colonial Victoria, using the specific case study of the missionary Francis Tuckfield. He explicitly contrasts Tuckfield's extensive use of the term "Whites" to refer to the coloniser population with the work of Leigh Boucher and Claire McLisky, who

both found this term was rarely used by other nineteenth century Victorian missionaries and politicians. The uneven nature of this identification is intriguing. Ritchie's analysis, which focuses on Tuckfield's "sense of racial self" as a "white man", also provides a great example of the ways in which "good white men" are situated in times and places. This has consequences both for our understanding of nineteenth-century Australia, and the ways in which strategies of racialisation can ensure white privilege even as "care" is being offered.

Moving from the historical to the contemporary, Ron Hoenig continues the exploration of the "good white self", this time in the wider context of Australian political and cultural life. Examining media representation of asylum seekers, particularly in relation to the 2002 "lip sewing" protests at Woomera, he argues that they provide the cultural Other against which the text constructs an ideal audience and the reader a moral cultural self: "In both 'negative' and 'positive' representations of asylum seekers media workers and the media system construct the asylum seeker as a raced other in contrast to an 'invisible' good white Australian Self". His work provides a good example of how "well intentioned" engagements and representations of Others don't necessarily confront racial privilege. In this case, even as non-white people are represented/included, this inclusion functions to ease white conscience rather than address actual inequality.

Leora Farber's article provides a significant example of the kind of work white people need to do in order to deal with the kinds of histories, legacies and presents of the previous (and following) work. Proposing "tentative correlations" between her own position "as a white, English speaking, second-generation Jewish female, living in post-apartheid, post-colonial South Africa and debates within South African whiteness studies around what Melissa Steyn (2006) identifies as a post-1994 sense of psychological "dislocation" which certain white South Africans are experiencing", she insists that challenging racial privilege must necessarily equate to loss for whites. Particularly, "for those 'White Africans', who staked much of their identity on their privileged whiteness". She uses the specific example of her own artwork depicting "immigrant" experiences to illustrate her "lived experience of post-colonial hybridity".

The final three articles deal with the important arenas of pedagogy, curriculum, knowledge production and university administration and hiring in relation to Indigenous knowledge, students and academics. Susan Mlcek, exploring the "whiteness behaviours" currently present in curriculum delivery, asks "which pedagogical framework is most effective for Indigenous learners?" She argues that challenging oppression requires both a transformation in pedagogy and a re-conceptualization of "the subject" of knowledge, which of course is not an easy task. Mlcek too reflects on narratives of "white good":

> behaviours of good are also enacted from a deep sense of moral obligation that when we engage with Indigenous students, for example, we act from a position of thinking we know what is best for them rather than acknowledging that our benign benevolence comes rather from the "anxiety of whiteness" (Riggs and Augostinos 2004) accompanied by the need to belong, to validate, and to maintain a useful position in Australian society.

Next, Andrew Gunstone charts the broad institutional scene of Indigenous studies in the Australian academe. Similarly to Mlcek, he argues that "practices of whiteness substantially restrict the ability of universities to genuinely address the education needs of Indigenous students, staff and community members". Even as Indigenous studies centres and knowledge seem to have institutional support, Gunstone demonstrates how the material terms of this support continue to exclude Indigenous people, focussing the key areas of governance, anti-racist policies and training, Indigenous employment, research and curriculum. In all of these areas, Gunstone's research has shown that universities have both failed to appoint Indigenous people, and failed to genuinely consult with Indigenous communities. Thus, Indigenous peoples' presence in university decision-making is often as a general staff representative rather than Indigenous representative. Gunstone too notes that "Often the most substantial attacks on Indigenous cultural safety come from 'well-meaning' white university staff and students".

The final article in this edition by Bronwyn Fredericks is perhaps the most powerful. Through sharing her personal experiences as a case study, Fredericks raises, and critically addresses, issues which have far-reaching implications. Her work demonstrates "how Indigenous Studies is controlled in some Australian universities in ways that witness Indigenous people being further marginalised, denigrated and exploited". She recounts how one Australian university "invited" her to participate in a major review of their Indigenous Studies courses, but offered no payment in return for her services, knowledge and experience. They assumed they had the right to access these resources without paying for them.

Fredericks thus draws out the strong links between Indigenous studies curricula and issues of power, especially institutional power: the ways in which the field of Indigenous Studies is caught between the unequal forces of the (white) academe and the critiques of its Indigenous practitioners. This article thus suggests a substantive failure by the academe to disrupt the institutional and material formations that continue to oppress Indigenous people. At present, junior Indigenous staff are doing too much of this disruptive work, and this is having concrete emotional, psychic and intellectual consequences for those practitioners. As Fredericks observes:

> With all of this activity in universities in terms of official documents, one could be lead to believe that there has been a dramatic change in how Indigenous Studies, Indigenous epistemologies and Indigenous peoples are regarded. How is it then that, being an Indigenous person within the academy can be explained by Phillips 2003: 3) as an "on-going struggle against colonial domination" (and described by Miranda (2003: 344) as "a heartbreaking endeavour"?

Her personal case study demonstrates "how hard it can be to engage with the Academy when those within it are reproducing imperial attitudes and processes which marginalise and exclude us whilst proclaiming they want to include and involve us … Universities are not the safe places we would like to think they are". Returning to a recurrent theme in this edition, she describes the feelings of anger and surprise "when it is other academics who espouse notions of justice and equity with whom we

experience tension and conflict in asserting our rights and cultural values".

****

Discussing the recent "affirmative turn" in critical scholarship (which has argued that "we have paid too much attention to melancholia, suffering and injury and that we need to be more affirmative"), Sara Ahmed (2008: 12) has expressed a concern that this "turn" has been based on a distinction that presumes "bad feelings are backward and conservative and good feelings are forward and progressive. Bad feelings are seen as orientated towards the past; as a kind of stubbornness that "stops" the subject from embracing the future". Ahmed's observations are particularly pertinent in the context of the recent shift towards recovering more "positive" moments of interracial exchanges both historically, on the colonial frontier, and within contemporary cultural studies. If there are some common conclusions that can be drawn from across the diverse contributions to this edition it is that dynamics of racial privilege are remarkably historically malleable, and a consistent motif in their mobilisation has been (and continues to be) an interdependence between oppressive structures and "good intentions". Histories and examples of "care" and "support" all too compellingly reveal how dynamic the maintenance of racial power can be, even if they might offer neat affirmations for current day politics. So too, the (white) academe needs to acknowledge how the offer of political inclusion can simply re-orient the legacies of colonialism in newly oppressive ways.

Author Note

Leigh Boucher is a Lecturer in Modern History at Macquarie University in Sydney, Australia. He is currently working on a monograph that examines the relationship between graduated sovereignty and suffrage in the nineteenth century British settler world. Jane Carey holds a Monash Fellowship at Monash University, researching the racial population politics of British settler colonialism. She has published articles in *Gender and History* and the *Women's History Review*.

Acknowledgments

Our thanks to Katherine Ellinghaus (co-convenor) and Prudence Flowers (organiser) of the 2008 Re-Orienting Whiteness conference, as well as to all the conference volunteers. We are also indebted to Sarah Pinto for her outstanding editorial assistance in preparing this edition for publication.

References

Ahmed, S. 2008. 'The Politics of Good Feeling', *ACRAWSA e-Journal*, 4(1), 1-18.

Boucher, L., Carey, J. & Ellinghaus, K. (eds.) 2009. *Re-Orienting Whiteness: Transnational Perspectives on the History of an Identity*, New York: Palgrave.

——2007. *Historicising Whiteness: Transnational Perspectives on the Emergence of an Identity*, Melbourne: RMIT Publishing.

Carey, J., Boucher, L. and Ellinghaus, K. 2007. Historicising Whiteness: Towards a New Research Agenda, in L. Boucher, J. Carey and K. Ellinghaus (eds.) *Historicising Whiteness: Transnational Perspectives on the Emergence of an Identity*, Melbourne: RMIT Publishing, vi-xxiii.

Carey, J. and McLisky, C. (eds.) 2009. *Creating White Australia*, Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Elder, C., Ellis, C. and Pratt, A. 2004. Whiteness in Constructions of

Australian Nationhood: Indigenes, Immigrants and Governmentality, in A. Moreton-Robinson (ed.) *Whitening Race: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 208-221.

Lake, M. and Reynolds, H. 2008. *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the Question of Racial Equality*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (ed.) 2004. *Whitening Race: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.

——2008. Writing off Treaties: White Possession in the United States Critical Whiteness Studies Literature, in A. Moreton-Robinson, M. Casey and F. Nicoll (eds.) *Transnational Whiteness Matters*, New York: Lexington Books: 81-96.

Moreton-Robinson, A., Casey, M. and Nicoll, F. (eds.) 2008. *Transnational Whiteness Matters*, Lexington Books: New York.

Riggs D. and Augostinos, M. 2004. 'Projecting Threat: Managing Subjective Investments in Whiteness', *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society*, 9(2), 219-36.

Roediger, D. 2006. 'Whiteness and Its Complications', *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(45), July 14, <http://chronicle.com/subscribe/login?url=/weekly/v52/i45/45b00601.htm>, accessed 24 September 2007.

Steyn, M. 2006. 'Revisiting Whiteness in Post Apartheid South Africa, 12 Years On', Keynote Address, Revisiting Identities/Postcolonialities in an ever changing South African Socio and Geopolitical Climate, University of Cape Town.

[i] The conference title was taken from a forthcoming book: Boucher, Carey and Ellinghaus, *Re-Orienting Whiteness*, 2009.

EDUCATION AND THE COLONIAL CONSTRUCTION OF WHITENESS

JOOST COTÉ

Abstract

European imperialism spawned settlements of invasive white communities throughout Asia and Africa. Stoler and Cooper (1997: 27) argue these evolving colonial societies became subject to what amounts to an extended bourgeois project such that "we can … not understand the construction of whiteness without exploring its class dimensions". If, in terms of that project, nineteenth-century metropolitan society was deemed vulnerable to the ravages of a brutish and unruly working class, these white colonial outposts, whether constituted as settler colonies or colonies of exploitation, were even more vulnerable to the more insidious danger of miscegenation. Racial intermingling became simultaneously an issue of class and race. Imperialism therefore added a further dimension to the on-going definition of "bourgeois-ness": the discourse of whiteness transforming a national discourse into a discourse on civilisation.

In focusing on education as the colonial authorities' response to what they perceived of as the danger of mixed parentage, this article develops a comparative framework that links colonial settlements in Asia and Australia. It examines the discourse surrounding miscegenation, education and the "rising generation" in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the Dutch East Indies British India, French Indo China and (British) Australia. In so doing, I demonstrate the universality of a linked discourse of whiteness and class across Imperial Asia.

Introduction

In the cultural outposts of western societies – whether they be "settler colonies" or "colonies of exploitation" – whiteness, as a physical and cultural category, was seen to be particularly vulnerable. Far from the cultural heartland and the institutional sources of cultural values, for metropolitans white settlers were often the subject of derision (eg., Twopeny 1976 [1883]; Daum 1888). Of more immediate concern, however, was the state of European culture they embodied and the influence upon persons and culture of the proximity of the cultural "other" (N. Cooper 2005; Vann 2005; White 1981). Where in metropolitan Europe, the unruly and ill-disciplined working class masses appeared to threaten established class arrangements and the economic practices upon which these were based, in the colonies control of the reproduction of bourgeois values was seen to be directly threatened by race.

Stoler and Cooper (1997) have defined European colonialism as an extended European bourgeois project and suggest that the conceptualisation of whiteness was inseparable from this class-based dynamic in both metropolitan and colonial settings. While the colonial context made more evident and urgent broader civilisational and biological issues, such concerns were also evident in delineations of urban underclasses in a metropolitan class-based agenda (Platt 2005; Mayne 1993;

ISSN 1832-3898

Kidd et al. 1985). In both contexts anxiety was particularly predicated on the future behaviour of the offspring of the "unruly classes" and solutions suggested in terms of discourses and policies centred on education. But here it was particularly the locally-born children of the settler classes in colonial settlements who represented the most vulnerable element, given the biological and cultural "dangers" inherent in a colonial context. This ensured that schooling became a key cultural institution in safeguarding the isolated islands of whiteness in the vast stretches of empire – as indeed it was in safeguarding "civil society" in the "wastelands" of industrialised metropolitan Europe.

In colonial societies, whether settler colonies or "colonies of exploitation", great anxiety surrounded the definition of "the boundaries of identity" (Stoler 2002a; Caplan 2001: 6-10). They were "not made up of easily identifiable and discrete biological and social entit[ies]" (Stoler 2002b: 42), even within what counted as European society. Increasingly sharp distinction was made between "settlers" or "*blijvers*" in the Dutch East Indies, "*colons*" in French Indo-China, "domiciled" in India, or "Australians" in the British Australian colonies on the one hand, and "newcomers", "totoks", "French", "non-domiciled" or "English" on the other. In this contrast, settlers were already culturally and biologically defined in "shades of grey" against metropolitan, culturally white, citizens. Governor General of French Indo-China, Paul Doumer, for instance, referred to local French colonial officials as "France's flotsam and jetsam on the Indochinese shores" (quoted in Bang 1971: 33), while a post-colonial account described a "colon" as "a barbarian. He is a non-civilised person, a 'new man' … he … appears as a savage" (Dupuy 1955, quoted in Stoler 2002b: 66). Similar derogatory remarks were made about Australians by some British visitors (White 1981: 52-61).[i]

Within the settler element of colonial societies in Asia, however, the more vitriolic comments were directed at settlers of mixed parentage. In the case of British India, distinction was made between "half-breed, Chichi, East Indian, Eurasian, Indo-Britons, and ... Anglo-Indian' (Ferro 1997: 116-7). In the Dutch East Indies terms such as "*halfbloed*", "*Indo*", "*kleurling*", and "Eurasian" were employed while in French Indo-China the terms "*métis*" was universally applied to such people (Stoler 2002c). In British Australia, where demographic ratios were quite different, and attempts were made to keep people of mixed parentage strictly outside the perimeters of white society, the term "half-caste" (and other "fractions" of Europeanness!) was universally employed (Reynolds 2005).[ii]

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, keeping European settlers white provided a powerful bond linking metropolitan and colonial elites. Increasingly, efforts by cultural "gatekeepers" across Europe's Asian periphery to "whiten" (culturally and biologically) what counted as European were characterized by racial anxiety. This was so whether we examine small white colonial enclave communities in Asia proper or those on the margins of the larger settler colonial society of the British colonies on the Australian continent. While different demographic ratios of European and "native" populations undoubtedly impacted on such anxieties,[iii] these gatekeepers had to look two ways: outwards towards the unEuropean cultural environment that threatened these European enclaves, and inwards, into the heart of settler society itself, to try to bolster it against

the spread of cultural and biological contamination (Anderson 2003; Vann 2005). "Colonial control" argues Stoler, "was predicated on identifying who was 'white', who was 'native', and which children could become citizens rather than subjects, on which were legitimate progeny and which were not". (Stoler 2002b: 43). But whiteness was not merely a matter of cultural anxiety: it also had direct political and economical registers and, of no less significance, also become a question of defence.

Saving whiteness: separation by law

In Asia's European colonies, and in marginal communities in British Australia, the class and racial boundaries were constantly being undermined. Indeed, miscegenation and economic disadvantage were typically seen to correlate and the cultural outcome manifested in the culture of families and children (Bosma and Raben 2004; Hawes 1996). Generalised across colonial society, miscegenation was seen to threaten what Robert Young called a "raceless chaos" (quoted in Caplan 2001: 5), or the possibility of white imperialists being "elbowed out and hustled and even thrust aside" in the world, as Charles Pearson said in 1896 (cited in Tregenza 1974). In British India, Robert Knox (1850) believed that "separation [between the races] and purity [of race] were the sole alternative to extinction" (quoted in Caplan 2001: 4), while in the Netherlands Bas Veth (1900) wrote that products of colonial miscegenation had even begun to seep into metropolitan cities back home, and that the Netherlands' own future could only be secured by the continuing dominance there of a race of blue-eyed, blond farmers in the country's north (Coté 2005). Located discursively between these two political categories, in Australia it was predicted that "the problem" had been largely contained. Alfred Deakin, one of the architects of the new settler federation, confidently declared that "in another century the probability is that Australia will be a White Continent with not a black or even dark skin amongst its inhabitants." This was supposedly because "[t]he Aboriginal race has died out in the South and is dying fast in the North and West [while] … [o]ther races are to be excluded by legislation if they are tinted to any degree" (quoted in Anderson 2002: 90).[iv]

In all four imperial settlements under discussion attempts were made to contain the problem of "contamination" by creating laws to distinguish and establish barriers between races. Where the "racial other" formed an indispensable element of European daily life, however, achieving such separation was difficult. Colonial legislative efforts therefore largely focussed on the enactment of marriage and paternity laws intended to separate the adult "half caste" and mixed race offspring from their native roots (Stoler 2002b). Dutch colonial law distinguished three ethnic categories, Europeans, "Inlanders" and "Foreign Orientals" (Fasseur 1994), and, as in French Indo-China, defined specific legal entitlements of the differing racial communities in separate legal codes. This meant that legal category could (and did) override race (and skin colour), and no separate legal distinction was made between "pure white" and "not-so-white" and "brown" once leaglly defined as belonging to the category European (Stoler 2002a).[v] In British India, however, further legal distinction was made between "pure white" and "half white" elements of the European populaton and, unlike in the Dutch East Indies, Anglo-Indians were separately indicated in censuses (Caplan 2001).

In the Australian colonies, on the peripheries of colonial settlement, where an interdependent *ménage* of European, Indigenous and Asian settlers evolved a pioneer economy (Reynolds, 2003), "half-castes" were classed within the indigenous population. In such relatively isolated areas demographic conditions comparable to those elsewhere in imperial Asia existed (Coté 2001) and according to one observer, gave rise to the emergence of "a race of nearly white people living like aborigines" (Reynolds 2005: 124). Here statistical reports prepared by the "Aboriginal Protection" authorities distinguished between "full-bloods" and "half castes" (and other percentages of "Aboriginalness", Reynolds 2005) as a basis for further legislative action. Between 1886 and 1920 a series of parallel laws were enacted across the colonies (later states and territories of the later Federated states of Australia), and such laws became more systematic as "outback" Australian society progressed into the 20th century.[vi] Their intention, if motivated by welfare concerns for the children involved, was to separate white men and their offspring from Indigenous and mixed race partners, and from "full-blood" Indigenous communities, by both specifically targeting an existing and evolving mestizo community and proscribing further interracial relations, to "wash out" indigeneity in mainstream Anglo-Saxon society (Reynolds 2005: 115-30; Haebich 1988: 134-37).[vii]

Underlying such enactments was the apparent assumption on the part of colonial observers that the social and cultural pre-conditions that had initially encouraged cross-racial relations would be persevered in subsequent domestic environments and thus further the spread of "racial degeneracy" (Stoler 2002b: 67). This assumed also that the negative moral attributes of class were fused with those of race in the biological inheritance of settlers' children. The prospective manifestation of such attributes were seen as directly endangering the fragile nature not just of authority in the colony but, more generally, the representation of the white race and civilisation abroad, and even of undermining the imperial centre.

Saving Whiteness: separation through education

If these legal delineations went some way to define the issues and set out a basic framework for the future, they did little to resolve the immediate problem of the "rising generations". The colonial-born increasingly seemed to be slipping away from some ideal concept of civilisation that frames the discourse on whiteness in the latter part of the nineteenth century. In practice, those within the European domain with money (and thus social status) were generally able to maintain their European credentials via regular "furloughs" home. More significantly, to maintain their longer-term position, they sent their children to Europe to be educated, or educated them privately with imported governess and tutors. This renewed injection of metropolitan values contributed to maintaining the distinction between European metropolitan and colonial cultural attributes. The majority of children of poorer European families – and this category in Asia was dominated by people of mixed parentage classified European – largely remained "trapped" in the colony by their lower earning capacity. Failure to improve their own and their children's educational (and cultural) qualifications, and thus future earning capacity and status within a colonial hierarchy, increasingly also left them open to competition from

(western) educated indigenous graduates.[viii]

Education therefore evidently held the key to gaining the cultural capital in terms of which whiteness could be safeguarded and advanced. Any resolution to the problem of maintaining "whiteness" within the colonial settler society thus eventually focused on "the rising generation" – as was also contemporaneously the case for those concerned with the reproduction of dominant bourgeois values in the industrialized and rural regions of the metropole (Reeder 1985). But if local schooling for poorer settler children offered a potential pathway to a better future this also required the separation of European – and particularly poorer Eurasian – from indigenous children.

An examination of the discourse around education then, reveals much of the colonial anxiety surrounding whiteness and locates education policies as a key instrument for protecting whiteness. As in metropolitan Europe, it was in the urban centres of the colonies that the risk of "class contamination" was seen to be most concentrated, and with which discourses of degeneration were typically associated. This was, in the first place, because cities in imperial Asia represented the most significant concentrations of Europeans. But Asian cities were also the locations where inter-racial contact was historically more widespread and intimate, and the formation of extended mestizo communities an established phenomenon, even before European colonialism (Bosma and Raben 2004). (By contrast, in the Australian colonies, where anti-Indigenous and anti-Chinese policies had driven "the problem" to the peripheries of white settlement, it was only there that very similar communities evolved.) At the same time, cities were also social contexts where "the modern", the manifestation of European "civilisation", could most strikingly contrast with various forms of Indigenous and settler tradition, and where consequently "degeneration" was most readily observed.

By the 1860s, in the European Asian and Australian colonies, parallel concerns were being expressed about colonially-born youth, particularly children of mixed racial parentage. In the Dutch East Indies, from the earliest days of a school inspectorate, inspector reports commented on the "reluctant, irregular and incomplete" attendance of colonial children but blamed this on the fact that pupils typically experienced "little encouragement" and came from an environment characterized by "damaging association with slaves and servants" which included the use of "unsavoury and bastardized language" (Inspector's Report 1823 cited in *Algemeen Verslag* 1850: 9). The condition of teachers in the first half of the nineteenth century was not considered to be much better: many "demonstrated a lacklustre interest in the vocation to which they have bound themselves" (*Algemeen Verslag* 1850: 9). But it was specifically the poor intellectual and moral condition of colonial youth, the majority of whom lived in urban areas, that concerned educational authorities:

> the limited receptiveness, the extremely low intellectual and mental capacity, the lack of attentiveness, the complete dispirited nature of the children born here and then [usually] of mixed race; weaknesses and limitations which in part, no doubt, find their origins in nature but to which nevertheless bad upbringing, especially in the early years of childhood contributed to significantly (*Algemeen Verslag* 1850: 10).

In British India, where belated initiatives to found a school system for European settlers emerged after the assumption of Imperial rule in 1860, very similar arguments were being aired. As in the Dutch East Indies, a significant percentage of settler children were not attending school – in 1879 this amounted to an estimated forty per cent of European and Eurasian children of school age (between 11,000 and 12,000, Caplan 2001: 37). As in the Dutch colony, it was primarily children from relatively poorer families and mainly "Anglo-Indians" – those who might be considered the aspiring sections of the European poor – who attended, leaving a majority still unschooled. Such sentiments reflect the prominence of class concerns and sensitivity to the social divide within both the European community and the wider racial context of the discourse.

Securing lower class European and Eurasian children for a white future implied, as already indicated above, the need to separate these most vulnerable elements from indigenous claimants to access to Western education. The question of co-education – that is, of indigenous children in European schools – became more urgent towards the close of the nineteenth century, and crucial in the twentieth. In British India authorities had early expressed concern at "the spectacle of a generation of natives highly educated … side by side with an increasing population of ignorant and degraded Europeans". Such a situation, Bishop Cotton believed, "would be subversive of 'our Indian Empire'" (quoted in Caplan 2001: 55). In the Dutch East Indies, where children of Indigenous elites had traditionally been permitted to attend European elementary schools, their presence towards the end of the century came to be seen as further undermining the European environment of those "vulnerable" settler children who were already the focus of concern because of the influence of the Indonesian womenfolk who dominated their home environments.[ix] In a move presented as progressive but primarily motivated by a desire to remove the pressure of Indonesian parents to gain entry to European schools, the colonial government introduced a dual (separate races) elementary school system in 1892.[x] This provided a form of western education in Malay language, and later, a further sub-elementary village school system using a local language medium into which Indonesian aspirations for access to European culture were diverted (Ricklefs 2001: 199-203).

The same approach was employed in French Indo-China where similarly separate indigenous schools were established for Vietnamese. Initially, as in the Dutch East Indies, schools established on the metropolitan model for French and Eurasian settler children also accommodated children of Vietnamese fathers employed in the administration or who were of significant rank, "when space permitted". This practice, however, was increasingly viewed with "alarm". French authorities and *colon* representatives expressed concern about the disadvantages experienced by settler children compared to metropolitan children that resulted from overcrowded classes – by implications because of the numbers of Vietnamese children included – and about "the level of instruction [that] had fallen because of both [the resulting] large class sizes and ill-prepared Vietnamese students" (Kelly 2000: 81). Here too, a systemic separation was introduced into the school system (although not until 1917) which offered Vietnamese a dual system consisting of a watered-down Western education in

urban areas and a "reformed" traditional education for the rest.[xi] Secondary schools remained, as in the Netherlands East Indies, open to French speaking, economically able, Vietnamese, since at higher social levels, mixed schooling could be risked and had the potential advantage of promoting the assimilation of an indigenous elite with colonial interests (Ferro 1997: 136).

In a somewhat reversed but comparable process, in the peripheral regions of colonized British Australia the growing "half-caste community" was also being represented as constituting – and no doubt did in fact constitute – a pauper class. Concern about numbers, and attempts to use education to "civilize" these remnants of whiteness reflected similar sentiments in the Asian colonies. But here policies were carried out with much greater discursive and physical violence since they concerned parents legally classified as "native". In Queensland from 1865, authorities automatically deemed all children of Aboriginal and "half caste" mothers up to the age of 21 as "neglected children" and claimed the right to remove and institutionalize them. These "Stolen generations" were collected in separate Industrial Schools and care institutions to be trained to undertake domestic (girls) and technical (boys) occupations in European society (Haebich 2000: 149-50). In the Northern Territory in 1930, where this separate class was estimated to be 852 and rising (compared to a declining European population of less than 3000) it was predicted that "[i]f the existing trend continued, the half-castes would become the predominant part of the local population in fifteen or twenty years" (Reynolds 2005: 16).[xii] In the meantime, a 1930 report argued, children of mixed race needed to be removed from or limited in numbers in European schools since 'any increase in the number of half-castes among the student body would inevitably result in a lowering of the general standard of education for all children in attendance' (Cecil Cook, quoted in Reynolds 2005: 162).

Underlying such concerns was also the more tangible issue of security. In British India, according to one commentator, Eurasians presented "a source of present mischief and future danger to the tranquillity of the Colony" which "should they be well led and politically organized, could pose a risk to British security" (cited in Caplan 2001: 26). In the Dutch East Indies, as in the Philippines, Eurasians did indeed form cohesive and energetic political organizations that went on to claim autonomy. In the Indies, after several transmutations, a short-lived Eurasian-lead independence movement under the Eurasian leader Douwes Dekker in 1912 declared its goal to lead a combined settler and indigenous movement for autonomy. In a slightly later and more hysterical version, an Australian investigator pointed to the political implications of permitting the further development of:

> an immoral, degenerate coloured population which under the influence of communist agitators, is becoming indolent, embittered and revolutionary. The existence of the coloured community along such lines strikes at the very basis of the White Australia policy already gravely threatened here by the prolific fertility of Australian-born Chinese (Cook 1932 cited in Reynolds 2005: 166).

Saving whiteness: Commissions of inquiry

The effects of the 1880s depression, the possible threat of imperial competitors, the rise of Japan, together with growing signs of indigenous as well as settler

nationalism, all contributed to heightened concerns about the quality of these European enclaves. In this context, the moral fibre of the colonial community, and ultimately its physical and military capacity to protect and expand European civilization, became paramount considerations for imperialists and their colonial counterparts. At the end of the nineteenth century one finds an increasing number of official enquiries taking place, as more sophisticated colonial bureaucracies established more systematic investigations into the condition of the poorer classes of the European colonial communities. Like similar inquiries at the time into the condition of the urban working classes in metropolitan Europe, these official colonial investigations represented the more pronounced urgency in the desire for social reform, often bringing together the interests of political, class-conscious conservatives with more progressive, social reformers.

Characteristically, these inquiries focused on the future, investigating the likely prospects of the up-coming generation. And, as in metropolitan Europe also, the "battlefront" in the colonies by the end of the nineteenth century was gradually shifting from prevention and suppression to re-education and the introduction of welfare provisions to ameliorate economic conditions. But once again, in the colonies the issue was seen as being more urgent than in the metropole, the consequences of inaction more dramatic, and the often-unexpressed motivation was racial as much as it had overtones of class sentiment. The civilisation of whiteness was increasingly being defined in public enquiries in terms of the characteristics of the inner moral stamina of individuals, which came to be seen as the ultimate defence against "Asia". This meant "whitening" the colonial settlers of the future.

A 1902 Inquiry into the condition of European urban pauperism in the Dutch East Indies emphasized that this class of people posed a threat to the existing order "given the place which it is deemed desirable for the European element of the population here to occupy in the midst of the native population" (*Rapport der Pauerisme-Commissie* 1903: 5). In other words, it threatened the racial hierarchy upon which colonialism, and European imperialism, was founded. While manifesting itself in unemployment and poverty, the root cause of their economic condition was seen as a matter of morality: the lack of *innerlijke kracht*, of moral strength, of this community. Despite a recognition that the solution to poverty in the end had to be an economic one, the report insisted the solution "in the first place will have to be found in] those factors innate in the persons themselves" (12). Implicitly, therefore, pauperism was the legacy of the negative character traits inherited directly from the Indigenous parent, or indirectly from the Indigenous environment in which the child was raised.

A similar Inquiry in British India in 1891 found an estimated 7.9 per cent of Europeans and 22.3 per cent of Eurasians (who constituted almost half the European population of 21,000) in Calcutta were paupers (*Report of the Pauperism Commission* 1892). As in the Dutch report, this pauper class "lived in huts like natives and slept on the ground" (*Report of the Pauperism Commission* 1892: xiv) and, as the Dutch report concluded, they similarly lacked "moral fibre". The Reverend Charles Walter Jackson told the Commission:

> There are many reasons for the poor condition of these people:

> the chief are drunkenness, pride, promptness to resign … There is a great want of perseverance and absolute recklessness as to consequences. The class is utterly improvident (*Report of the Pauperism Commission* 1892: xvii).

In Australia, both in the separate colonies before federation and as a nation after 1900, a spate of similar inquiries into (primarily) urban social conditions expressed direct or indirect reference to class cultures, implicitly and explicitly in connection to the European community's proximity to its Asian and Indigenous environment. Here too, the solutions advocated were predicated on the "education" of the rising generation. In the European-dominated south, it could be argued, concerns were expressed in terms more comparable to those of metropolitan Europe. There, the physical and moral condition of the urban working classes more clearly reflected the class basis of white anxiety. However, unlike similar concerns expressed about the urban working classes in Europe, these were voiced against the background of an awareness of the isolation of the minority European community within an Asian hemisphere. Thus, as in the Asian colonies, here too commissioners and witnesses linked concerns about adult poverty, perceived moral decline, and race. Often duplicated across the legislatures of the semi-independent Australian states,[xiii] such investigations came to similar conclusions to those of leaders of European enclaves to the north. While the commissioners on the Melbourne Board of Inquiry on Unemployment (1902), for instance, similarly noted the "demoralizing effect" of unemployment giving rise to "the existence of [a] listless, helpless and idle class" (cited in McCallman 1982: 94-5), in fact it was the existence of such a "listless, helpless and idle class" on the southeastern edge of a continent located in Asia, far from the heartland of Europe, that underpinned the urgency of urban reform in Australia. Like the existence of the Eurasian poor in Calcutta or Batavia, it represented more than an economic problem: it simultaneously represented a potential threat to the robustness and prestige of the white race in Asia. In the words of one witness to the Royal Commission into the Declining Birthrate in Sydney: "on the welfare of the [Anglo-Saxon] race essentially depends the standards of a right living and right-thinking community" (cited in Hicks 1978: 25), while the Birthrate Commissioners themselves, reflecting the mood of national anxiety, concluded:

> The problem of the fall in the birthrate is … a national one of overwhelming importance to the Australian people, perhaps more than to any other people, and on a satisfactory solution will depend whether this country is ever to take its place among the great nations of the world (cited in Hicks 1978: 146).

But in metropolitan Australia, it was not just the number of white children but also the quality of their education that was of "overwhelming importance". This was not only because this befitted a "new nation", but also because this new nation represented Europeanness – and the only real representation of whiteness – in the Asian region. The Victorian Royal Commission into Technical Education, and the later parallel commission in New South Wales (as had similar Dutch and British colonial reports), advocated the provision of more practical and less academic education as the principal way to re-engage the children of the urban working classes. Each recommended varieties of agriculture, military, and technical vocational education to ensure the working class

children would not follow in the path of their nineteenth-century parents. Significantly, Australian educators could also emphasize patriotism and civic education, ideals which remained less clear to settlers in the Asian colonies. But above all, it was made clear that education – of the "inner man" as well as the "technical man" – was to protect race and the dominance of whiteness in the Asian hemisphere (at least in its British hue). In a patriotic address to school children in the state's publicly-funded schools on Empire Day in 1907, the Victorian Director of Education declared:

> So long as we share the undoubted benefits conferred by membership of the Empire, it is surely our duty to uphold it by developing at this end of the earth a sturdy, self-reliant race, able to work with brains and to use to advantage the best results of the world's knowledge … Each unit must make itself fit by education to bear its part in the world struggle. And here I would point out that although I may appear to overemphasize the industrial result of education, I do not undervalue as great forces in keeping our Empire together, wise and sane political ideal, clean social life, a high standard of justice as shown in our dealings of class with class, and of our own people with other people (Tate 1907).

It is of course not surprising that in the Australian context the discourse on whiteness was more obviously wrapped up in nationalist sentiment: the colonies had only just federated while elsewhere Asia European enclaves, although they protested the need for greater autonomy, existed in political limbo. At the same time, however, as with other outposts of Europe in Asia, imperial identity provided an essential insurance as well as assurance of "quality". To be French, Dutch or Anglo-Saxon, to be part of a greater French, Dutch or British Empire, was at once a symbol of their whiteness as much as it provided a sense of security that their society and its values would, despite adversity, and the overwhelming demographic disparities, triumph in the end.

Conclusion

In the colonial context, the metropolitan issue of class was exacerbated by the truncated nature of European society and by the imminence of race, both within the body of the European community and the broader cultural environment. Transferred to the colonies, imperial bourgeois discourses assisted to define the parameters of what was being defended as "civilisation", and thus more directly coloured by "whiteness". Colonial "white trash" represented a particular and acute problem in imperial Asia: it threatened the European entities imperialism had constructed. By linking the well-known Australian racial discourse more directly with that of other white colonial outposts in Asia, it becomes apparent, despite the evident different demographic and geographic characteristics, how much of this parallels the preoccupations, anxieties, and solutions elsewhere.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, action to safeguard whiteness in Asia increased apace, driven by the conjunction of three developments: the first stirrings of indigenous demands to participate in colonial modernity; the increasing penetration of colonialism into indigenous space; and increasing inter-imperial competition. In this context, European bourgeois anxieties developed a significant edge since these concerns directly equated with wider issues of racial domination, whether, as the Australian Charles

Pearson would have it, the continuation of the domination of the world by the "white race", or, more chauvinistically, in terms of inter-national competition.

Traditionally, social separation and a culture of colonial "unmodernity" had protected better-off colonial families both from the "contamination" of pauper classes and from discourses of respectability. However, in the face of increasingly articulate Asian demands from without, the spread of democratic agitation from within, and a broader cultural anxiety within both metropolitan and colonial bourgeois establishments, the social isolation of poorer European and Eurasian families (and children) from "respectable society" could no longer be sustained. White settlers, wherever they were in Asia, felt themselves, in an immediate or indirect sense, to be in danger. From a metropolitan perspective, colonial settlers were already "not white enough", but within their midst were those who were even less white. The problem of pauperism – or chronic economic unproductiveness – amongst a social category of Europeans in colonial Asia was represented as inappropriate in terms of their moral attributes as a social class but simultaneously as being dangerous when measured against a broader racialised canvas. The moral measure of class, then, gained its particular potency when manifested in a non-European context. Here the racial other was intimately close, and potentially overwhelming. In the optimism of the new century, protecting and advancing white supremacy meant believing in the possibility of re-whitening the immediate environment from which a new generation was emerging.

Author Note

Joost Coté teaches Southeast Asian History and Heritage Studies at Deakin University. He researches colonial cultures and modernity in early 20th century Indonesia and has published numerous articles on Dutch colonial policy and practice and translated and edited two volumes of letters by the Indonesian feminist pioneer, R. A. Kartini, and co-edited and contributed to a book on Indisch Dutch migrants in Australia (*Recalling the Indies*, 2005). His latest publication is *Realizing the dream of R. A. Kartini: her sisters' letters from colonial Java* (Ohio 2008).

References

Algemeen Verslag van den Staat van het Schoolwezen in Nederlandsch-Indië. 1850.

Algemeen Verslag van den Staat van het Schoolwezen in Nederlandsch-Indië. 1863.

Anderson, W. 2002. *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health and Racial Destiny in Australia*, Carlton: Melbourne University Press.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2008. *Australian Historical Population Statistics, 2008*, <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/subscriber.nsf/log?openagent&3105065001ds0001_2008.xls&3105.0.65.001&Data%20Cubes&ED3777A70ACA4E0DCA25749B00176970&0&2008&05.08.2008&Latest>, accessed 10 November 2008.

Bang, V. 1971. 'The Viet Nam Independent Education Movement, 1900 – 1908', University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, University Microfilms.

Bosma, U. and Raben, R. 2004. *De Oude Indische Wereld: De Geschiedenis van Indische Nederlanders, 1500-1920*, Amsterdam: Bert Bakker [2008. *'Dutch' in the Indies: A History of Colonisation and Empire 1500-1920*, Trans. Wendie Sheffer, Singapore: National University of Singapore].

Caplan, L. 2001. *Children of Colonialism: Anglo-Indians in a Postcolonial World*, Oxford: Berg.

Cooper, N. 2005. Disturbing the Colonial Order: Dystopia and Disillusionment in Indochina', in K. Robson and J. Lee (eds.) *France and 'Indochina': Cultural Representations*, Boulder: Lexington Books, 79-94.

Coté, J. 2001. 'Being White in Tropical Asia: Racial Discourses in the Dutch and Australian Colonies at the turn of the Twentieth Century, *Itinerario*, 25(3-4), 112-135.

——2005. Romancing Tempo Doeloe: The Literary Construction of 'Tempo Doeloe', in J. Coté and L. Westerbeek (eds.) *Recalling the Indies: Colonial Culture & Postcolonial Identities*, Amsterdam: Aksant, 133-174.

Een Onderzoek naar de Toestand van het Nederlandsch-Indische Leger uit een Zedelijk oogpunt beschouwd, door de Vereeniging tot Bevodering der Zedelijkheid in de Nederlandsche. 1898. Overzeesche bezittingen en de Nederlandsche Vereeniging tegen de Prostitutie.

Fasseur, C. 1994. Cornerstone and Stumbling Block: Racial Classification and the Late Colonial State in Indonesia, in R. Cribb (ed.) *The Late Colonial State in Indonesia: Political and economic foundations of the Netherlands Indies 1880-1942*, Leiden: KITLV Press, 31-56.

Ferro, M. 1997. *Colonisation: A Global History*, London: Routledge.

Haebich, A. 2000. *Broken Circles: Fragmenting Indigenous Families 1800-2000*, Freemantle: Freemantle Arts Centre Press.

Hawes, C.J. 1996. *Poor Relations: The Making of a Eurasian Community in British India, 1773-1833*, London: Curzon.

Hicks, N. 1978. *'This Sin and Scandal': Australia's Population Debate, 1891-1911*, Canberra: ANU Press.

Kelly, G.P. 2000. Schooling and National Integration: The Case of Interwar Vietnam, in D. Kelly (ed.), *French Colonial education: Essays on Vietnam and West Africa*, New York: AMS Press, 73-106.

Kidd A. and Roberts, K.W. (eds.) 1985. *City, Class and Culture: Studies of Social Policy and Cultural Production in Victorian Manchester*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

MacCalman, J. 1982. 'Class and Respectability in a Working-class Suburb: Richmond, Victoria before the Great War', *Historical Studies*, 20(78), 90-103.

Platt, H. 2005. *Shock Cities: The Environmental Transformation and Reform of Manchester and Chicago*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rapport der Pauerisme-Commissie. 1903. Batavia.

Reeder, D.A. 1977. Predicaments of City Children: Late Victorian and Edwardian Perspectives on Education and Urban Society, in D. Reeder (ed.), *Urban Education in the 19th Century*, London: Taylor & Francis, 75-94.

Report of the Pauperism Committee. 1892. Calcutta.

Reynolds, H. 2003. *North of Capricorn: The Untold Story of Australia's North*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

——2005. *Nowhere People: How International Race Thinking Shaped Australian Identity*, Melbourne: Penguin/Viking.

Stoler, A. 2002a. Rethinking Colonial Categories: European Communities and the Boundaries of Rule, in A. Stoler (ed.), *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*, Berkeley: California University Press, 22-40.

——2002b. Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Gender and Morality in the Making of Race, in A. Stoler

(ed.), *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*, Berkeley: California University Press, 41-78.

——2002c. Sexual Affronts and Racial Boundaries: Cultural Competence and the Dangers of Métissage, in A. Stoler (ed.), *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*, Berkeley: California University Press, 79-111.

——1995. *Capitalism and Confrontation in Sumatra's Plantation Belt, 1870-1979*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Stoler, A. and Cooper, F. 1997. Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda, in F. Cooper and A. Stoler (eds.), *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1-56.

Tate, F. 1907. *Empire Day*, Melbourne: Department of Education, Government Printer.

Twopeny, R. 1976 [1883]. *Town Life in Australia*, Melbourne: Penguin.

Tregenza, J.M. 1974. Pearson, Charles Henry (1830 – 1894), in *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, <http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A050471b.htm?hilite=charles%3Bhenry%3Bpearson>, accessed 12 October 2008.

Vann, M. 2005. Of Le Cafard and Other Tropical Threats: Disease and White Colonial Culture in Indochina, in K. Robson and J. Lee (eds.), *France and 'Indochina': Cultural representations*, Boulder: Lexington Books, 95-106.

White, R. 1981. *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity, 1688-1980*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Notes

[i] White is of course anxious to point out that more positive self-assessments were generated in the Australian colonies just as in the Dutch East Indies. Local spokesman, for instance, were defending colonial society and establishing metropolitan-equivalent cultural and learned institutions (Bosma and Raben 2004).

[ii] Indeterminate terms with changing meanings such as "Anglo-Indians" in British India and "Indisch" in the Dutch East Indies were often used generically to refer to long term settlers to distinguish them from temporary (European) residents.

[iii] By the 1930 census, the Dutch East Indies European population was 300,000, of whom approximately two-thirds were of mixed descent, in a total population of around 60 million; in French Indo-China a population defined as European was approximately 80,000 in a total population of 20 million. On the Indian sub-continent, British India census reports did not provide ethnic breakdown, meaning the number of Europeans in a total population of almost 319 million is unknown. In Australia in 1901 a mixed European population, largely of British origin, numbered approximately 2 million, an estimated indigenous population of about 95,000 and a Chinese population of almost 30,000, the latter two groups concentrated on the margins of European settlement (Vann 2005; Caplan 2001; Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2008).

[iv] Anderson (2002) shows, however, how settlement (and possession) of northern Australia by white people nevertheless remained a rhetorical and scientific problem.

[v] In the Dutch East Indies especially, significant numbers of non-Europeans, including children of Indonesian mothers legally acknowledged by their European fathers, were included in the census category 'European'.

[vi] Major legislation in this context includes the Victorian Aborigines Protection Law Amendment of 1886, and similar acts in Queensland (1897), Western Australia (1905), Australian territories (1912-18), South Australia (1911-23) and NSW (1918).

[vii] The Victorian legislation, known as the "Half-castes Act" (1886), was seen to promote "the process of merging" half-castes into the mainstream community to

ultimately remove evidence of the Indigenous presence (Reynolds 2005: 122).

[viii] Class structure in colonial Asia becomes increasingly complex as a new indigenous western-educated class takes its place in the colonial structure. This largely twentieth-century phenomenon cannot be adequately addressed here. Suffice to say that the evidence suggests increased rather than decreasing racial delineations in the first half of the twentieth century on the one hand, and a greater complexity surrounding whiteness on the other, as increasing numbers of "non-white" persons demonstrate its attributes.

[ix] Even where their mothers were not Indonesian, the universal practice in colonial homes was to maintain native "nannies" and a complement of native servants.

[x] This legislation expanded existing native schools, separating these into First Class and Second Class Native schools. Post-elementary schooling remained racially "co-educational" and Indigenous aristocrats continued to demand and achieve access to European schools, including Dutch universities, for their children.

[xi] As in the Dutch East Indies, government provision of schools for natives was also intended to discourage the establishment of "free schools"; that is, schools established by indigenous nationalists (Kelly 2000; M. Ricklefs 2001: 238-9).

[xii] Reynolds appears to be possibly the first modern historian to have considered "the half-caste" as a demographic entity in the Australian context. He shows that, while statistics across the various states demonstrate the steady growth of a mestizo community, legislators effectively ignored this phenomenon.

[xiii] Prominent commissions of inquiry include the Royal Commission on Unemployment (1900), Board of Inquiry into Unemployment (1902), the Royal Commission into Technical Education (1899-1901) and a series of investigations into the "living conditions of the poor" culminating in a Royal Commission in to the Housing of the Poor (1914) in Melbourne and the Royal Commission into the Declining Birthrate (1903) and Royal Commission into Public Education (1906) in Sydney.

DIS-LOCATION / RE-LOCATION: COLONIAL AND POST-COLONIAL NARRATIVES OF WHITE DISPLACEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

LEORA FARBER

Abstract

In this article, I propose correlations between my ambivalent position as a white, English speaking, second-generation Jewish female living in post-apartheid, post-colonial South Africa and debates within South African whiteness studies around what Melissa Steyn (2006) identifies as a post-1994 sense of psychological "dislocation" which certain white South Africans are experiencing. Underpinnings of white identity were and are being challenged through processes of redress; anchors which previously held whiteness in place are, arguably, shifting or have been removed, resulting in a sense of displacement for those "White Africans" who staked much of their identity on their privileged whiteness.

In proposing these correlations, I reference the artwork of the *Dis-Location / Re-Location* exhibition. The artwork draws analogies between the "immigrant" experiences of two Jewish protagonists – the colonial Englishwoman Bertha Marks, who immigrated to South Africa in 1885 to enter into an arranged marriage, and myself as post-colonial persona. Bertha's experiences of dislocation and alienation from the colony are paralleled with my experiences of displacement from a society caught in the throes of reconstruction and redress. Selected synchronic linkages between Bertha's and my subjectivities as Jewish South Africans are touched upon. Both experiences are considered as manifestations of the immigrant's need to re-locate within their new environment, entailing re-evaluations of personal and collective ideologies of gendered and Jewish whiteness.

Introduction

In this article, I propose tentative correlations between my ambivalent position as a white, English speaking, second-generation Jewish female living in post-apartheid, post-colonial South Africa and debates within South African whiteness studies around what South African sociologist, Melissa Steyn (2006) identifies as a post-1994 sense of psychological "dislocation" which she proposes certain groups of white South Africans have and are currently experiencing.[i] In proposing these correlations, I reference the artwork of my exhibition *Dis-Location / Re-Location.* The artwork draws analogies between the "immigrant" experiences of two Jewish protagonists – the colonial Englishwoman Bertha Marks, who immigrated to South Africa in 1885 from Sheffield at the age of 22 to enter into an arranged marriage with the entrepreneur Sammy Marks[ii] – and myself as post-colonial persona. Marks' experiences of dislocation and alienation in the colony are paralleled with my experiences of displacement and alienation from a South African society caught in the throes of reconstruction and redress. Both experiences are considered as

ISSN 1832-3898

manifestations of the immigrant's need to re-locate within their new environment, entailing re-evaluations of personal and collective ideologies of gendered whiteness.

The exhibition, which takes the form of photographic, sculptural, installation, performance, video and sound art, travelled to seven national South African galleries and museums between June 2007 and September 2008. The methodology which underpins it was practice-led research. During the process of producing the creative work, certain theoretical positions which I touch on in this article informed the content of the work and, similarly, my theoretical research teases out content from the creative work, effecting a cyclic, reflective integration of theory and practice. I therefore write this paper as both artist – maker of the creative work – and academic – providing a reflective explication of the artwork in theoretical terms.

In the artwork, my lived experience of post-colonial hybridity is visually paralleled to the colonial persona and historical circumstances of Bertha Marks. Marks lived an insular life in which hierarchical colonial and Victorian conventions of class, language, race and gender differences were preserved and upheld, and within which whiteness was privileged as a product of race and social class. Whilst Marks' experience was quintessentially colonial in her attempts to retain Anglicised customs, morals, behaviours and values in an alien environment, and was combined with a secularised, acculturated practice of orthodox Judaism, I, as a South African-born, white, second-generation Jewish female, explore ambivalences of "dis-placement" and "belonging" within a rapidly transforming, post-apartheid environment. Within this post-colonial framework, identity is positioned as hybrid; polyglot, heterogeneous and diverse; an unstable construction which challenges and destabilises Enlightenment and Modernist conceptions of cultural purity and authenticity.

Although marked differences lie in the two personae's colonial and post-colonial contexts, underpinning both experiences are questions related to their positions as white South African subjects, and by extension, their subjectivities as Jewish South Africans. The various complex, multifaceted, and uniquely inflected positions that Jews have occupied in South African society, particularly during the apartheid era, have informed numerous historical and theoretical studies (see for e.g., Shimoni 2003; Shain 1994; Leveson 1996; Bethlehem 2004; Sherman 2000; Mendelsohn & Shain 2008) and constitutes a complex and broad area of investigation. Whilst an in-depth engagement with the formation and enactment of South African Jewish subjectivities is beyond the scope of this article, I provide glimpses of South African Jewish subjectivities as they are metonymically represented in the two personae featured in the exhibition. Given that there is no singular South African Jewish subjectivity and that all subjectivities are inextricably bound up in their own specific cultural-historical moments, I only propose certain synchronic linkages between Marks' and my subjectivities as Jewish South Africans in this article, in a similar manner to the way in which these are suggested in the artwork. However, these will always be rendered problematic by the diachronic specificities that they necessity elide.

In the first section of this article, I outline certain key issues which directly and indirectly relate to both personae's South African Jewish subjectivities. These

hinge around questions which lie at the core of Gideon Shimoni's text *Community and conscience: the Jews in apartheid South Africa* (2003). As both Marks' and my subjectivities are inextricably linked to our respective socio-political contexts, brief contextualisation is provided for both cases in the two sections to follow. Finally, I examine how each persona's subjectivity is articulated in the artwork.

South African Jewish subjectivities

Shimoni details the political behaviours of Jews as members of the dominant white minority, focussing his discussion on the period 1948-1994, during which time apartheid was the official political order. Underpinning his investigation is the observation that "the Jews in South Africa have shared in the status of the privileged society based upon a system of legalised racial discrimination" (2003: 1). It was of fundamental importance for the socio-economic prospects of Jewish immigrants to South Africa that they had the status of being Europeans or "whites" (3), despite the ironies and complexities of being "othered" and suffering periods of anti-Semitic discrimination. Shimoni (78) comments that although Jews were outsiders in relation to the vested interests of society's state authorities, social classes, and dominant ethnic groups – and although the shadow of Afrikaner nationalist anti-Semitism was ever-present – this marginalisation differed from those contexts in which Jews were directly victimised, for instance, in czarist Russia. He argues that this kind of acute marginalisation is not applicable to South Africa, where Jews had full civic equality and enjoyed all the privileges of the dominant white population (78). From the outset, the Jewish immigrant entered into what Shimoni terms "the dominant, caste-like system" (2) in South Africa, as part of its white sector. It is from their privileged position of whiteness in a society which displayed rudiments of racial discrimination long before the official institutionalisation of apartheid in 1948, that Shimoni questions the multifaceted implications of South African Jewry's moral heritage and historical experience.

In examining the complex and often contradictory relations between community and conscience in the modern South African Jewish experience between 1930 and 1994, Shimoni (2003: 73) draws a distinction between two facets of political behaviour which characterised Jewish experiences in South Africa. He points to the extraordinary prominence of Jewish individuals in the radical and liberal streams of political opposition to the apartheid system. The political and ethical commitment of a relatively large number of South African Jews to anti-apartheid campaigns are reiterated in Nelson Mandela's words, inscribed as part of the display on contributions of South African Jewry to the apartheid struggle in the National South African Jewish Museum in Cape Town. These read: "In my experience I have found Jews to be more broad-minded than most whites on issues of race and politics, perhaps because they themselves have historically been victims of prejudice" (Fellner 2009). However, despite the salient presence of Jews within the various forms of opposition to the apartheid regime, Shimoni (2003: 73) highlights the avoidance of association with these "radical" streams on the part of the vast majority of Jews; their tendency to cluster around a position in the white political spectrum just left of centre, and most significantly to this article, their position as "silent bystanders".

Shimoni (2003: 29) outlines how this position of "silent bystander" was

instituted and reinforced by the official representative organ of the Jewish community, the Jewish Board of Deputies, from 1933 onwards. The Board steered away from any engagement with the political struggle against the government's apartheid regime, issuing policies throughout the 1950s and 1960s which stressed that "neither the Board of Deputies, as its representative organisation nor the Jewish community as a collective entity, can or should take up an explicit attitude in regard to specific policies in the political field" (Shimoni 2003: 30). By and large, the orthodox rabbinate adopted a similar attitude. Most orthodox rabbis took the view that Jews ought to recognise that they were no more than "guests" in the lands of *galut* (exile), and that they should remember that South Africa offered Jews economic freedom, as well as upward mobility and ultimate prosperity. As Shimoni observes (2003: 272), deep-seated fears of anti-Semitism underlay these attitudes and behaviours, as the Jewish community felt themselves to be hostage to Afrikaner nationalist goodwill. He sums this up as follows:

> Because the Jews were part and parcel of the privileged white minority, their welfare was unmistakably dependent on conformity with the white consensus. Within the parameters of that consensus, they were more liberal than most other whites. But to challenge the parameters of that consensus which liberally allowed equal opportunities and rights for all whites but denied them to non-whites, was perceived by most Jews – including many who deplored apartheid – as courting a clear and present danger (2003: 76).

Marks and my South African Jewish subjectivities thus hinge around our positions as Jewesses who form part of the privileged "white" or "European" sector. Marks accepted and upheld colonial prejudices and behaviours, not so much for the sake of acceptance and integration but most likely because these were accepted conventions and norms of the colonial society of which she was an integral part. Her upper-class position allowed for this, for as Shimoni (2003: 6) observes, the "lower-class" Jewish immigrant generations were "too preoccupied with basic concerns of livelihood, social adjustment and coping with new languages to be concerned with rights and wrongs of the regnant system of race relations and exploitation in the country".

My Jewish subjectivities relate to childhood experiences of growing up in apartheid South Africa during the 1960s and 1970s. My parents were first-generation immigrants from Lithuania and Latvia. As immigrants who arrived in the anti-Semitic climate of the 1930s which preceded the Nationalist party's rise to power, their modes of adaptation (and those of their parents) played out in the kinds of non-involvement with the injustices of apartheid which Shimoni points to. For them, the concerns of safety, security, family well-being and economic prosperity were paramount. They thus formed part of community of "silent bystanders" to whom Shimoni refers, whose silence might be read as tacit acceptance of the Nationalist party and its policies, yet could also be read as a mode of survival, for having fled Eastern Europe from the threat of Nazi power, they and their parents were no doubt well aware of the precarious position they occupied as immigrant Jews.

Thus, despite the differences in our socio-political contexts, and differences in the way our experiences play out in relation to these, both my and Marks' South African Jewish subjectivities are underpinned by the privileges and benefits of having been part of the

dominant white population. In certain respects, our responses to this "silent complicity" (which Marks herself enacted), are a form of my grappling with the necessity of coming to terms with my South African Jewish whiteness and the multiple racial, historical and cultural privileges that this embodies.

Alienation and displacement; integration and acculturation

In order to contextualise Marks' position as an upper-class Jewess of English origin in *fin-de-siècle* South Africa, I begin this section with a cursory sketch of selected racial positionings in South Africa at the time. Despite some fluidity in identity constructions, fundamental colonial attitudes towards race, as an ascriptive attribute signified by skin colour, were firmly in place. Those classified as "white" were dominant over the various other social groups, collectively designated as "non-Europeans". The latter groupings comprised Africans, Asiatics and mixed-race persons, termed "Coloureds" (Shimoni 2003: 2). These "caste-like" classifications were made despite the fact that economically, there was already an inextricable interdependence between whites and the other racial groups. The white racial group was further segmented into an institutionalised duality of Afrikaans and English cultures, and further sub-divisions emerged within the immigrant Jewish community.

These subdivisions were notable at the outset of the third major wave of Jewish immigration, roughly between 1890 and 1910, which brought the most impoverished Eastern European Jews to South Africa. Unlike the already assimilated Anglo-German Jewish community, these "greenhorns" were regarded by the urban gentile population as "other" – alien, impoverished, unkempt; as representing the "dirty proletariat from the Polish Russian border" (Leveson 2001: 15). Further to this discrimination by the gentile populace, their arrival caused divisiveness within the already established Jewish community. The "Litvaks", or "Peruvians" as they were disparagingly termed, were viewed as embarrassments by the established Jewish communities, as they posed a threat to their already precarious social position by inviting anti-Semitic sentiments (Leveson 2001: 18). However, Leveson (2001: 18) notes that this negative image of the Jew was counterbalanced by the many immigrant Jews such as Sammy Marks, who earned reputations for their business ingenuity and upward mobility.[iii]

As Sherman (2000: 505) notes, these Yiddish-speaking "Peruvian" Jews who came to South Africa from Eastern Europe moved from one discriminatory society to another. Sherman describes how the most contorted of all accommodations to racist norms by immigrant Jews was to be found amongst those Peruvian Jews who worked in the "eating houses" which flourished from 1903 to the 1940s. These catered to blacks along the gold-mining reef of the Transvaal and were unashamedly known as "kaffir-eating houses" or "kafferitas". Even though they were socially and politically privileged over black workers, as whites who served blacks food these Jews were doubly discriminated against – both by the white ruling classes, and by more well-established Jews who owned the eating houses and employed the socially despised "Peruvians" for exploitatively low-wages. Being anxious to become acculturated to their adoptive country, the "Kaffireatniks", as the Peruvian Jews working in the eating houses were termed, steadily developed racist attitudes (Sherman 2000: 511). This

is borne out in the Yiddish language which, as Sherman (2000: 511) points out, absorbed the country's all-pervasive racist discourse.[iv] As Sherman notes in relation to these "Kaffireatniks", "their own empowerment along a number of shifting socio-political frontiers demanded that they construct for themselves an identity exclusively defined by the parameters of racism" (2000: 507). White supremacy, racial discrimination, and social separation of the races were thus not the sole domain of the Afrikaner – these were also rooted in British colonial policies and in the practices of English-speaking South Africans, and played themselves out in perverse ways amongst the burgeoning Jewish community (Shimoni 2003: 18). It was into this "caste-like", divisive society that Marks entered in 1885.

Although her father, Tobias Guttmann, had been president and treasurer of the Sheffield Hebrew congregation, Richard Mendelsohn (1991: 197) notes that Marks' orthodoxy was an acculturated, secular one of the "lukewarm, anglicised variety so characteristic of the Jewish elite in Victorian England". Jewish dietary laws were loosely observed in her kitchen, with grocery lists including a variety of shellfish such as lobster and crayfish, which are forbidden by Jewish law, and regular deliveries from the Connaught butchery in Pretoria, which supplied only non-kosher meat (Mendelsohn 1991: 198). Like many of her Anglo-Jewish contemporaries, Marks celebrated Christmas, hosting large annual Christmas parties and concerts at the mansion, called Zwartkoppies, which Bertha's husband Sammy built for her and their eight children. The Marks family did however celebrate Passover and the High Festivals. These festivals, together with the rites of passage (such as male circumcision and *bar-mitzvahs*) were the most enduring of their Jewish observances. As Mendelsohn (1991: 198) observes: "When all else was left behind, these were retained, even if only in a modified form, perhaps more symbols of Jewish identity than for religious content. For Marks and many other Anglicised Jews, Judaism had become more a matter of personal integrity than of religious conviction".[v]

As an Anglo-Jewish immigrant to South Africa, Marks' sense of displacement, or dislocation from her new environment, was physical, social and psychological. Like the seedling roses she imported weekly from Kent to plant in her recreated Victorian English rose garden on the South African "*veld*",[vi] she herself was "transplanted" onto African soil, coming from an upper-middle class Anglo-Jewish family in Sheffield, where she had enjoyed an active social life and community support. As Mendelsohn (1991: 187) notes, Zwartkoppies was a 12-mile carriage ride away from the developing urban centre of Pretoria, and therefore trips into town were limited to special occasions. Mendelsohn elaborates on her loneliness at Zwartkoppies and homesickness for England, noting that despite the luxurious comforts of her surroundings, Zwartkoppies remained a place of emotional, intellectual and physical restriction and isolation for Marks. This sense of physical isolation and separation from her family and "home" was coupled with the intellectual, emotional, creative and psychological constraints of the patriarchal social constructs which dictated her life as a (Jewish) Victorian wife, mother and woman.

However, although physically isolated and barred from formal power, colonial women like Marks were, as Anne McClintock observes, "not the hapless onlookers of empire, but were ambiguously complicit both as colonisers and colonized, privileged and

restricted, acted upon and acting" (1995: 6) Bertha's social position as an upper-class, white, Jewish Victorian woman was not neutral, and her loneliness and isolation might have been exacerbated by her intellectual and emotional attempts to retain her Anglo-Saxon customs, morals, behaviours and values her new environment. For instance, her relations with "non-Europeans" were limited to employer-employee or domestic mistress-servant spheres. For her, blacks were invisible in social terms, and thus, her upholding the Victorian convention which dictated that it would not be "right and proper" for her to converse with the servants might have intensified her loneliness, resulting in the mansion over which she presided becoming her "gilded cage" (Mendelsohn 1991: 187).

Milton Shain observes that in mid-Victorian England perceptions of Jews did have some negatively charged dimensions, but were mostly relatively benign (1994: 11). Nevertheless, the ironies of being a Jewess who might have encountered anti-Semitism in England upholding the colonial position of presumed innate, white superiority in South Africa seems to have been lost on Marks, as they were to many of her generation, position and class. Thus, it might be argued that the loneliness and isolation which she experienced as an immigrant was exacerbated by her Jewishness, which set her culturally apart from neighbouring communities, as well as by her attempts to retain the colonial avoidance of "others" of different race, ethnicity, class, language and religion.

White dislocation in post-Apartheid South Africa

My sense of displacement in post-colonial, post-apartheid South Africa is characterised by a sense of psychological *dislocation*, coupled with a need to relocate myself within this rapidly transforming environment. This process of "relocation" entails a re-evaluation of both personal and collective naturalised westernised and Eurocentric values, morals, ideologies and beliefs, embedded in South Africa's colonial past and within my consciousness. Shaping a sense of self-identity within the emerging society seems to necessitate a process of discarding and/or re-evaluating these ingrained attitudes, whilst retaining those which seem to still hold currency and value. Steyn poignantly describes this as a need to "know one's whiteness, reach into it, feel its texture, before it will let one go" – or perhaps, before one will let *it* go (Steyn 2001: 133). Whilst this re-evaluation is a personal process, it is also public, as post-1994 reformative changes in South African society have prompted a need for the reframing of cultural, racial, and political identities on new and contested political and psychological terms.

Melissa Steyn (2001) and South African historian Gerald L'Ange (2005) discuss ambivalence as a psychological state which currently informs part of the larger South African public consciousness. Both note how the demise of apartheid and its accompanying white majority rule in South Africa has prompted a need for redefinition of diverse South African cultural identities. For some South Africans, the need comes as a result of tensions between traditional customs and the influences of globalisation, westernisation, capitalist consumer culture; for others, such as white, English speaking cultural groups whose ancestry can be traced back along differing time-lines to European lineage, conception of themselves as "African" is a contested point of ambivalence, debate and/or negotiation. Although all Europeans in South Africa can trace their lineages back to European origin,

Steyn argues that it is particularly so for English-speaking South Africans who have historically tended to retain a largely Eurocentric worldview, and thus have had a more obviously bifurcated relationship to the African continent. In contrast, as Steyn points out, Afrikaner identity is predicated on being "of Africa" – a premise based on dissociation with their earliest European roots and on a long established sense of self-identification with the land (2001: 103).

Steyn and L'Ange discuss how the fall of colonialism and apartheid has left many English-speaking whites feeling severed from their European roots. Steyn (2006) comments that, post-1994, she perceives a "crumbling of the old certainties of what it meant to be white in South Africa", noting that many whites seemed to feel "dislocated" from the new dispensation. Certain underpinnings of white identity were and are still being challenged through processes of transformation and redress; anchors that previously held whiteness in place are, arguably, shifting or have been removed. The ideological thrust of apartheid denied pride in black identity, giving rise to a post-1994 societal challenge of defining what a Pan-African identity might constitute. This has lead to various post-apartheid discourses, an example of which is former South African President Thabo Mbeki's concept of an African Renaissance. The latter validates local ethnic signifiers, working to "reframe and interpret these signifiers through the example of a broader African experience" (Klopper 2000: 217). These may be located against the backdrop of global (Dyer 1997, 1998; Frankenburg 1993, 1997; Nakayama & Martin 1999; Vron & Back 2002), as well as within the emerging field of South African (Steyn 1999, 2001, 2006; Distiller & Steyn 2004; van der Watt 2003) whiteness studies. Themes of white alienation and displacement have been explored in South African literature, for instance in JM Coetzee's *Diary of a Bad Year* (1997) and *Disgrace* (2000), and in Antjie Krog's *Country of my Skull* (1997), wherein she confronts her position as a white Afrikaans woman acting as a journalist at the Truth and Reconciliation Commission hearings. Krog's position is particularly fraught, as her personal intimacies with Afrikaners, the Afrikaans language, and apartheid, are also her terms of "belonging" as a South African. Theoretical work in the terrain of South African whiteness studies has been done by sociologists such as Steyn and Natasha Distiller and in the visual arts by Liese by van der Watt. However, local whiteness studies is relatively new research terrain within South Africa. It is highly pertinent at this time, for, as Steyn observes,

> This is one of those moments in a historical process where change is so far-reaching, but also so accelerated that one may catch the process of social construction 'in the act,' as South Africans shape narratives of social identity that will provide bearings in previously uncharted waters (2001: xxii).

L'Ange (2005) controversially uses the term "White Africans" to describe those people who staked much of their identity on their privileged whiteness and who are now positioned in a country which is in the process of redefining itself as African, within the context of the African continent. This term is contested; problematics around whether some South Africans are more "authentic" South African citizens than others, who has the right to consider themselves members of the South African nation, and whether white South Africans need to "earn the right to call themselves African" – or can even call themselves "African" – constitute some aspects of

this debate. For some Jewish South Africans, these questions surrounding conceptions of South Africa as "home" and of themselves as "African" are further complicated by their Zionist affiliations. As Shimoni (2003: 5) states, settling in Israel – an act termed *aliya*, the Hebrew word for ascent – was always integral to the Zionist programme, which had its roots in interwar independent Lithuania; it is generally perceived as an act of altruistic service to the cause, or as an idealistic act of personal self-fulfilment. The concept of Israel as a secular or religious Jewish "homeland" has prompted a sense of dual loyalties for many South African Jews. Yet as Shimoni comments, "In general for Jews in South Africa, confidence in the continued viability of Jewish life in the new world lands of the Diaspora imparted a vicarious quality that enabled them to identify with the idea of a return to Zion without necessarily regarding it as applicable to themselves" (2003: 4). Thus, for many white South Africans and particularly for those Jewish South Africans with Zionist affiliations, "belonging" and "home" still seem to be contested terms.

The second-generation exploration of immigrant identity investigates how conceptions of contemporary South African cultural identities might be renegotiated in terms of hybridity. Stuart Hall's (1994) theorisation of identity as a matter of "becoming" as well as of "being" is pertinent here:

> Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialised past, [cultural identities] are subject to the continuous "play" of history, culture and power. Far from being grounded in mere "recovery" of the past, which is waiting to be found, and which when found, will secure our sense of ourselves into eternity, identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past (1994: 23).

Halls' conception of identity as a matter of "becoming" resonates with the phrase "we are in a process of becoming", currently used by certain South African cultural theorists to describe emergent South African identities. This phrase implies that stable or concretised "South African identities" are, and might indefinitely be, "in process". South African artist and academic Thembinkosi Goniwe points out that "Black people are always performing, adjusting to the system, speaking the foreign language. Black people are always 'becoming'". Goniwe suggests that these processes of becoming could, in tandem, affect white South Africans, as he urges: "Let's all become part of this process of becoming" (quoted in Kasibe 2006: 25). Within this "process of becoming", new speaking trajectories, relationships between home and elsewhere, global and local, tradition and modernity are in a state of fluidity, transforming ways in which we approach questions of subjectivity, identity and creative agency.

The *Dis-Location / Re-Location* exhibition: hybridity; grafting; cutting and hysteria

In the artwork on the *Dis-Location / Re-Location* exhibition, hybridity is considered as a product of grafting. In each of the three core narratives of the exhibition, (*Aloerosa; Ties that Bind Her; A Room of Her Own*, 2006-2007) the first incision or cut inevitably leads to a grafting of organic or inorganic materials into the protagonist's flesh. My use of the term "graft" is influenced by Colin Richards' definition of the term which, he argues, involves both contact and exchange – interactions that commonly intersect across difference

(1997: 234). When a graft takes place the boundaries crossed can be traumatically transgressive – signifying a deep incision that wounds and can leave permanent scars, even though it may also lead to productive and successful fusion.

Figure 1:
Farber, L. 2006-7
Aloerosa: Transplant
Image size: 135.8 h x 102 w cm
Archival pigment printing on Soft Textured Fine Art paper, 315 g
Editioned 1/9
Photograph by Michael Meyersfeld

I use the term "hybridity" with specific reference to Mikhail Bakhtin's literary model of "organic hybridisation" and Homi K. Bhabha's (1994) post-colonial model which allows for the emergence of a "Third Space". Mikhail Bakhtin's linguistic model of hybridity differentiates between "organic" (unconscious) and "intentional" hybridisation. Within the artwork, his concept of organic hybridisation, which produces fusion but "the mixture remains mute and opaque, never making use of conscious contrasts and oppositions" (Bakhtin 1981: 360), is operationalised. Unconscious hybridity gives rise to amalgamation rather than contestation which, like creolisation, is an imperceptible process, whereby two or more cultures merge to produce a new mode, language, world view or object (Young 1995: 21). Intentional hybridity sets different points of view against each other in a conflictual structure, which retains an elemental organic energy and open-endedness (Bakhtin cited in Young 1995: 22).

Given its correlations with the creative work, in which organic species of plants and human skin are shown to conjoin through grafting, the term "hybridity" has been chosen to refer to processes of cultural fusion. Hybridity, like the term "grafting", has a biological etymology – it was originally used to describe the outcomes of crossing two plants or animals of different species, possibly as the result of grafting. In terms of horticulture, a graft's purpose is to cultivate new orders, through actions of cutting, severing, transplanting and attaching different species to and from each other. Commonly used in post-colonial discourse to describe a range of social and cultural borrowings, exchanges and intersections across ethnic boundaries and the emergence of new cultural forms that might ensue from such mixes, hybridity and grafting refer to both biological and cultural "merging".

In the work on the exhibition, the two women's narratives are visually and phonetically grafted throughout the work, in ways that are part-fictionalised, part-autobiographic and part-historically factual. The imagery slips between the factual Bertha Marks, whose performance is based on first and

second-hand research, and her fictionalised persona, whose thoughts, emotions and actions are based on imaginative projection. South African Victorian colonialism is referenced through the period settings and Victorian styling, yet this referent is simultaneously located within the present, signified by the plastic fabric of each skirt worn, and the protagonist's short, boyish haircut. Using my body as metonym for myself and Bertha Marks – the combination of whom I shall hereafter refer to as "the protagonist" – I perform our identities as post-colonial and colonial white Jewish women in three core narratives, presented as a series of staged photographs. In certain works, the images more obviously address Bertha's experience; in others it more openly addresses mine. In these images, the protagonist is represented as dressed in contemporary forms of hybridised, Victorian/African-style clothing and often appears in the Victorian setting of the Sammy Marks Museum, Pretoria, the former home of Bertha and Sammy Marks.[vii]

Figure 2:
Farber, L. 2004-7
Aloerosa: Induction
Image size: 65 x 65 cm
Archival pigment printing on Soft Textured Fine Art paper, 315 g
Editioned 1/9
Photograph by Hannelie Coetzee

The protagonist is represented as engaged in needlework activities, typically considered as "women's work" in the Victorian era and as a signifier of "femininity" through docility and labour (Parker 1984: 4, 5). Representation of this activity is given a subversive twist in that she appears to be working on her skin as opposed to fabric. This subverted needlework activity becomes a metaphor for an Anglo-Jewish (white) woman trying to negotiate a sense of being "African" within a (post)colonial environment.

Figure 3:
Farber, L. 2006
A Room of her Own
Performance still
Photograph by Michael Meyersfeld

This conception of women's work, and the claustrophobic passivity associated with domestic labour in Victorian England, is subverted through the implication that the act of sewing can be redefined into a form of agency. Needlework becomes a means through which Marks unsuccessfully struggles to reaffirm – and I ambivalently manage to renegotiate – a sense of identity as a white Jewish woman living in (post)colonial Africa. Albeit reluctantly in Marks' case, these intimate acts of cutting and conjoining of white flesh and indigenous South African aloes, pearls and white African beads suggest

the creation of new subjectivities: grey, hybrid identities that are the product of grafting signifiers of Europe and Africa. Her various insertions into the body are shown to "take" and transform into new hybrid plants, beaded flowers or scarification markings. In the *Aloerosa* and *A Room of Her Own* series, the protagonist's pale white skin becomes a site of disfiguration – the violence of the plant's simulated growth is the outcome of a self-initiated, genteelly delicate, yet violent action of cutting and insertion. Although these actions arise from a desire to integrate or "belong", they might be read as metaphors for cultural contestation. As foreign to the body, the aloe plant signifies insertion of an indigenous, alien culture, which takes root and disfigures the body through its forceful growth under the skin. Emphasis is on contact and subsequent combination of difference through processes that imply bodily violation, abjection, disfiguration and pain. By deliberately inserting the "other" into my body, I, more so than Marks, actively invite and embrace the "stranger/other" within.

Although the "taking" of the graft is imaged as physical in the work, metaphorically this insertion of the "other" and its "taking root" is also a psychological process. My choice of the aloe plant relates to the healing properties attributed to the aloe-vera leaf. Whilst the aloe vera leaf is said to have soothing qualities, bitter-aloe leaves are used to make a purgative, which cathartically cleanses the body of toxins. Thus, the act of stitching aloe leaves into her body may be seen to suggest processes of physical healing and purging which in turn might evoke the sense of psychological trauma inherent in acculturation processes. As Steyn notes, willingness to take on the implications of one's racialisation into "whiteness" and to cooperate in dismantling the structural privilege it entails, can be a painful, lonely and alienating growth process, as she poignantly states in relation to her own experience:

> I continue to struggle through the multiple fences of white identity that my heritage constructed to define me. But bits of flesh remain caught in the barbs. A white skin is not skin that can be shed without losing some blood (Steyn 2001: xvii).

Figure 4:
Farber, L. 2006
A Room of her Own
Performance still
Photograph by Michael Meyersfeld

Berthas' bedroom in the Sammy Marks Museum forms the context for the key video work, and the subsequent photographic prints and stage set installation, *A Room of Her Own* (2006-2007). The bedroom becomes a metaphoric "transitional space" wherein the protagonist performs a series of physically and psychologically transformative acts of grafting on her body. These grafts of diverse materials and cultures are shown to give rise to new identity formations. In this series, Victorian constructs of femininity such as needlework and historically gendered psycho-logical/somatic "disorders" such as hysteria, sexual fetishisation and the

sublimation of desire, are imaged as means by which Marks and I deal with transformative physical and psychological changes in response to our respective alien/alienating environments. These "disorders", particularly hysteria, represent ways in which, historically, women feigned disease in an attempt to bring unspoken traumas into words or to draw attention to their social, intellectual, creative and emotional constraints under patriarchy. Correlations between hysteria and self-mutilation or cutting as forms of agency are suggested.

Cutting the skin to the point of releasing blood is a contemporary practice common amongst westernised teenage girls, used as a means of inflicting pain on oneself. The relief provided by the endorphins released into the body "anesthetises" the person's emotional pain. Psychologists note that cutting is a way of "speaking" when one is unable, verbally, to express overwhelming emotions or unfulfilled emotional needs; a desperate cry for help in the face of a devastating sense of alienation, lack of belonging, powerlessness, and abandonment (D'Arcy 2007; Ellis 2002: 12).

Feminist writers like Rose Ellis (2002) propose that cutting is a response to certain expectations embedded in patriarchal ideologies, rather than a symptom of individual psychopathology. From this perspective, cutting, like hysteria, might be seen as a way in which women choose to (re)negotiate patriarchal regulation over the boundaries of femininity. The protagonist's cutting is suggested as a way of voicing her anger in the face of situations in which she felt/feels powerless. For Marks, this anger might have been as a result of her being "silenced" by her position as a woman in a rigidly patriarchal society, or, speculatively, as a result of having to conform to strict colonial conventions regarding race and class. In my case, this enactment of speech might be read as compensatory for the years of generational "silences" which were part of my parents' and grandparents' survival strategies as immigrant Jews in South Africa. From this perspective, cutting, or self-mutilation, as it is used in the work, has transgressive potential – through its evocation of abjection and through its potential as an act of self-directed rebellion and anger. It could lead to liberation not only from entrenched gender roles, but also from conventional or accepted racial or religious categorisations and to reconceptualisations of identity. The representation of hysteria and the sublimation of desire associated with it, as well as the protagonist's cutting, might therefore be considered as historical and contemporary forms of agency.

In the work, analogies between these historical and contemporary psycho-logical/somatic states and those of abjection, liminality, rapture and the sublime are thus suggested. Although these states are clearly differentiated, they are commonly underpinned by a loss of ego boundaries, resulting in dissolution of clear distinctions between "self" and "other"; an ambiguous state of "in-betweenness". In the artwork, this is shown to be achieved through confrontation with and acceptance of the "other" within, in accordance with French psychoanalyst Julia Kristeva's conception of the "stranger/other/foreigner" as being positioned as within the self. As she states:

> Strangely, the foreigner lives within us: he is the hidden face of our identity, the space that wrecks our abode, the time when understanding and affinity flounder. By recognising him within

> ourselves, we are spared detesting him in himself (Kristeva 1991: 1).

For both Marks and I, this closeness to the "other" is threatening, albeit in different ways. It necessitates a coming to terms with our whiteness(es), and the multiple racial, historical and cultural privileges that this implies. For Marks, this process was fraught with fear and anxiety, given that she lived in an era in which colonial communities regarded themselves as superior to the indigenous populations they encountered in the colonies. Convinced that these indigenous groups were uncivilised, and therefore fundamentally different and inferior to themselves, they avoided any form of cultural contact and exchange. Therefore, for Marks, any contact with the "other" would have been so threatening that, if she had initiated any processes of transformation, these would have only been cautious and tentative. In my case, where physical contact with the "other" has lost some of the transgressive significance it once had, (given that "the other" has now assumed a name/identity), this struggle is symbolic and, ultimately, psychological.

However, before the protagonist can cross threatening cultural or psychological boundaries, she has to enter a liminal space of "in-betweenness" between "self" and "other". Upon entering this space, her growing closeness to the other is not only uncomfortable and unnerving, but also threatening. Yuri Lotman speaks about the criss-crossing of boundaries which leads to "a constant state of hybridity … always oscillat[ing] between identity and alterity", which in turn results in a tension that is most evident at its boundaries (Lotman cited in Papastergiadis 1995: 14). Certain correlations between Kristeva's conception of abjection and Bhabha's "third space" might be proposed. Firstly, I draw an analogy between my, and to some extent Bertha Marks', imagined habitation of this "transitional space" and Bhabha's conception of the "third space", which "displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives, which are inadequately understood through received wisdom" (1990: 221). Implicit in my use of the term is the emergence or "coming into being" of unscripted formations of expressions, positions and production. Bhabha's description of the interface between cultures as "those 'in-between' spaces that provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of self-hood – singular or communal – that initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration, in the act of defining the idea of society itself" seems to encapsulate the possibilities in hybrid, transforming conceptions of contemporary South African identities (1994: 1, 2). According to Bhabha, entering this space encourages a perception of difference as "neither One nor the Other but something else besides, in-between" (1990: 219).

Secondly, this in-betweenness might be linked to Kristevian abjection wherein the "unclean threat" of the abject puts the subject in a state of in-between-ness; a person's sense of self – the idea of having a unified, separate and distinct identity – is disrupted through the loss of ego boundaries between self and other (Kristeva 1982). As Kristeva notes, whilst "the vulnerability of the borderline is a threat to the integrity of the 'own and clean self' it can also offer a liminal space where self and other may intermingle" (53). This intermingling engenders a terror or rapture in the subject, which gives rise to and perpetuates a sense of ego dissolution. This correlation between Bhabha and Kristeva suggests that what is potentially productive can also be terrifyingly

disruptive, for, as Lynda Nead (1997) notes, in "[a]ll transitional states … it is the margins, the very edges of categories, that are most critical in the construction of … meaning" (6).

Figure 5:
Farber, L. 2006
A Room of Her Own: Redemption
Image size: 100 h x 133.2 w cm
Archival pigment printing on Soft Textured Fine Art paper, 315 g
Editioned 1/9
Photograph by Michael Meyersfeld

In the artwork, the protagonist's experience of in-between-ness is played out through references to the Victorian construct of hysteria. She is often represented as fainting and/or collapsing, losing self-control and/or self-discipline and, therefore, personal restraint and dignity. These poses mimic the release of sublimated desires recorded in Victorian representations of hysterical women. In certain images, analogies between this heightened transformative, emotional state and those of rapture and the sublime are suggested.[viii] In the ways they are imaged in the work, these ambivalent emotions seem analogous to Steyn's (2006: 114) characterisation of the attainment of hybridity with regard to that group of white South Africans who consciously and actively grapple with the "Africaness of being white in South Africa".

In what I consider to be the final image of the exhibition, *A Room of Her Own: Redemption,* the protagonist is represented as being in such a transformative, liminal state of rapture. The blood-red embroidery cotton which she used to stitch the leaves into her skin has grown within her flesh, forming both roots and veins in her calf. The aloe leaves which she stitched into her thigh have withered, and at their central core, replacing the petit-point rose which appeared to have been stitched onto her thigh, a new, succulent hybrid aloe has emerged. It is on this endnote of deep ambivalence that the exhibition is inconclusively suspended, hovering in that liminal, hybrid space of becoming which

> leaves no option but to acknowledge that one has lost one's home, the place of a "safe" homogenous identity to which one can return. (Steyn 2001: 145).

Author Note

Leora Farber holds an MA in Fine Art (*cum laude*) from the University of the Witwatersrand. She is currently a Johannesburg-based practicing artist, and Director of the University of Johannesburg's Faculty of Art Design and Architecture's Research Centre, titled *Visual Identities in Art and Design*.

References

Bethlehem, L. 2004. 'Membership, Dismemberment and the Boundaries of the Nation – Manfred Nathan's *Sarie Marais*: A Romance of the Anglo-Boer war', *African Studies*, 63(1), 95-117.

Bhabha, H. K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London & New York: Routledge.

D'Arcy, L. 2007. *Cutting*, <http://www.kidshealth.org/teen/yourmind/mental_health/cutting.html>, accessed 30 April 2008.

Dyer, R. 1997. *White*. London & New York: Routledge.

——1998. 'White', *Screen*, 29(4), 44-64.

Ellis, R. L. 2002. 'A Feminist Qualitative Study of Female Self-mutilation', Masters Thesis, Virginia Polytech Institute & State University, Virginia.

Fellner, D. 2009. 'Cruising Jewish Cape Town: Cultural Sites Underline Contribution of Influential Community', *Jewish News of Greater Phoenix Online*, 61(22), <http://www.jewishaz.com/issues/story.mv?090220+cape>, accessed 12 August 2009.

Frankenberg, R. 1993. *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hall, S. 2000. [1994.] Cultural Identity and Diaspora, in N. Mirzoeff (ed.) *Diaspora and Visual Culture Representing Africans and Jews*, London: Routledge, 21-33.

Kasibe, W. G. 2006. 'White, a Colour for Special Occasions', *Art South Africa*, 5(2), 24-25.

Klopper, S. 2000. Re-dressing the Past: The Africanisation of Sartorial Style in Contemporary South Africa, in A. Brah & A. Coombs (eds.) *Hybridity and its Discontents: Politics, Science, Culture*, London & New York: Routledge, 216-232.

Krog, A. 1997. *Country of My Skull,* Johannesburg: Vintage.

Kristeva, J. 1982. *Powers of Horror: An Essay in Abjection*, Trans. L. S. Roudiez, New York: Columbia University Press.

——1991. *Strangers to Ourselves*, New York: Columbia University Press.

L'Ange, G. 2005. *The White Africans: From Colonization to Liberation*, Cape Town: Jonathan Ball.

Leveson, M. 1996. *People of the Book: Images of the Jew in South African English Fiction 1880-1992*, Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

McClintock, A. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*, New York & London: Routledge.

Mendelsohn, R. 1991. *Sammy Marks: 'The Uncrowned King of the Transvaal'*, Cape Town: David Philip.

Mendelsohn, R. & Shain, M. 2008. *The Jews in South Africa: An Illustrated History*, Johannesburg & Cape Town: Johanthan Ball Publishers.

Nead, L. 1997. *The Female Nude: Art, Obscenity and Sexuality*. London & New York: Routledge.

Nakayama, T. K. & Martin, J. D. 1999. *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, London & New Delhi: Sage.

Papastergiadis, N. 1995. 'Restless Hybrids', *Third Text*, 32, 9-18.

Parker, R. 1984. *The Subversive Stitch: Embroidery and the Making of the Feminine*, London: The Women's Press.

Richards, C. 1997. Graft, in O. Enwezor (ed.) *Traderoutes History and Geography*, Johannesburg: Metropolitan Council and the Prince Claus Fund for Culture and Development, 234-237.

Shain, M. 1994. *The Roots of Antisemitism in South Africa*, Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Sherman, J. 2000. 'Serving the Natives: Whiteness as the Price of Hospitality in South African Yiddish Literature', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 26(3), 505-521.

Shimoni, G. 2003. *Community and Conscience: The Jews in Apartheid South Africa*, Waltham: Brandeis University Press.

Steyn, M. 1999. White Identity in Context: A Personal Narrative, in T. K. Nakayama & J. N. Martin (eds.) *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, Thousand Oaks & London: Sage, 264-278.

——2001. *Whiteness Just Isn't What it Used to Be: White Identity in a Changing South Africa*, New York: State University of New York Press.

——2006. 'Revisiting Whiteness in Post Apartheid South Africa, 12 Years On', Keynote Address, Revisiting Identities/Postcolonialities in an ever changing South African Socio and Geopolitical Climate, University of Cape Town.

Steyn, M. & Distiller, N. 2004. *The End of Blackness: Returning the Soul of Black Folk to their Rightful Owners*. New York: Anchor Books.

Van der Watt, L. 2003. 'The Many Hearts of Whiteness: Dis-investing in Whiteness Through South African Visual Culture', PhD Thesis, State University of New York, Stony Brook.

Ware, V. & Back, L. 2002. *Out of Whiteness: Colour, Politics and Culture*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Young, R. J. C. 1995. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*, London & New York: Routledge.

Notes

[i] With acknowledgement that the text I am referring to was written in 2001, and that marked changes might have taken place since then.

[ii] For biographic details on Sammy Marks, see Mendelsohn 1991.

[iii] Jewish prosperity was ambivalently regarded by the general population, and, as Milton Shain (1994: 17) notes, by the 1880s, two embryonic stereotypes of the Jew in South Africa had emerged, namely "the gentleman – characterised by sobriety, enterprise and loyalty, and the knave – characterised by dishonesty and cunning". The image of the knave correlates with the image of the avaricious Jew -- the filthy immigrant who deprived the locally born colonial of employment and exploited the local population" (Leveson 2003: 18).

[iv] Yiddish words such as '*shiksas*' (Jewish women who marry gentile men), '*chazars*' (literally translated as pigs, usually used in relation to non-Jews) and '*goyim*' (usually used in a derogatory sense to describe non-Jews) are characteristic examples of such racist parlance. The word 'kaffir' also featured strongly; serving the same derogatory function it performed in English and Afrikaans.

[v] This view of Judaism as a matter of personal integrity is borne out in Marks' concern for the difficulties of finding suitable Jewish accommodation for her daughters who were boarding in London. See Mendelsohn 1991: 200 for details.

[vi] South African colloquial term for the bush. This term, which is Afrikaans in origin, is used to describe the dry, uninhabited, uncultivated yellow-brown grasslands, common to the Gauteng province in which Johannesburg and Pretoria are located. This contrasts with the rose-garden, which represents a colonial formalising and cultivation of nature.

[vii] This site has conceptual links to the research, as Sammy Marks' background as an immigrant/diasporic Jew from Lithuania correlates with my life-history. His humble beginnings as a peddler and subsequent rise to prosperity may be likened to those of my maternal and paternal grandparents, who, as Jewish immigrants from Lithuania, were forced to start a "new life" as general dealers in South Africa. Both generations of diasporic Jews saw South Africa as the "New World", a place of "better prospects" in the form of economic and educational opportunities.

[viii] To suggest this loss of dignity I looked at the third stage of a full hysterical attack photographically documented by the French neurologist Jean-Martin Charcot (1825-1893). Charcot recorded these images while working at the Sâlpetrière Hospital in Paris from 1862-1893.

THE EPISTEMOLOGY THAT MAINTAINS WHITE RACE PRIVILEGE, POWER AND CONTROL OF INDIGENOUS STUDIES AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITIES

BRONWYN FREDERICKS

Abstract

This article represents my attempt to turn the gaze and demonstrate how Indigenous Studies is controlled in some Australian universities in ways that witness Indigenous peoples being further marginalised, denigrated and exploited. I have endeavoured to do this through sharing an experience as a case study. I have opted to write about it as a way of exposing the problematic nature of racism, systemic marginalisation, white race privilege and racialised subjectivity played out within an Australian higher education institution and because I am dissatisfied with the on-going status quo. In bringing forth analysis to this case study, I reveal the relationships between oppression, white race privilege and institutional privilege and the epistemology that maintains them. In moving from the position of being silent on this experience to speaking about it, I am able to move from the position of object to subject and to gain a form of liberated voice (hooks 1989: 9). Furthermore, I am hopeful that it will encourage others to examine their own practices within universities and to challenge the domination that continues to subjugate Indigenous peoples.

Introduction

Indigenous Studies in Australia and indeed the world has witnessed a growth across all levels of education over the past twenty years (Grieves 2008; Gunstone 2008; Moreton-Robinson 2005a). The term Indigenous Studies within this article refers to content which encapsulates Australian Aboriginal Studies and/or Torres Strait Islander Studies (Nakata 2006: 265) and studies that may include references to Indigenous peoples in other geographic localities. Once located within anthropology and history, Indigenous Studies may now be found, taught and researched within all faculties in a university and across numerous disciplines including health, education, politics, law, geography, environmental science and business (Moreton-Robinson 2005a). It is now a cross-disciplinary endeavour and seemingly is a site of collection and redistribution of knowledge about Indigenous people (Brady 1997; Nakata 2006). Andrew Gunstone (2008: xxi) in his recent discussion paper on Indigenous Studies explains that in the current climate Australian institutions are:

> urged that the teaching of Australian Indigenous Studies must involve Indigenous people in curriculum development and delivery of Australian Indigenous Studies; this involvement should not just occur for the purpose of increasing the number and diversity of the voices heard, but rather should also occur to address issues of power, governance and control of what is being studied and taught.

Martin Nakata, focusing on Indigenous scholarly involvement within Indigenous Studies, states that "[u]nderpinning

ISSN 1832-3898

Indigenous academic involvement in Indigenous Studies is a definite commitment to Indigenous people first and foremost, not to the intellectual or academic issues alone" (2006: 266). In other words Indigenous people must be involved in Indigenous Studies and the programs must address Indigenous peoples' issues and the systemic power inequalities and white hegemony in the academy. Indigenous people have been involved at a number of universities where there are initiatives to embed Indigenous perspectives in the curriculum (Hart 2003; Nakata 2004; Phillips 2003; Phillips and Lampert 2005). There have additionally been on-going discussions and forums, workshops and conference sessions on the colonising practices of western research methodologies and the call for Indigenous methodologies which challenge the imperial basis of western knowledge and the images of Indigenous "Others" (Smith 2005; 1999). In response to these discussions, presentations and papers, Aileen Moreton-Robinson (Queensland University of Technology) and Maggie Walter (University of Tasmania) have developed a Postgraduate Masterclass Program in Indigenous Research Methodologies that moves beyond critiques of Western research paradigms to defining and explaining Indigenous methodologies that are accountable to Indigenous communities. The Masterclass was offered in 2006, 2007 and 2008.[i] The suggestions and strategies put forward for Indigenous Studies and the on-going discussions across numerous Australian universities have also been coupled with the development of official university documents in the form of Reconciliation Statements, Welcome to Country or Acknowledgement to Country offerings, Indigenous recruitment or employment strategies and university wide anti-racism and anti-discrimination policies and procedures.

With all of this activity in universities in terms of official documents, one could be lead to believe that there has been a dramatic change in how Indigenous Studies, Indigenous epistemologies and Indigenous peoples are regarded. How is it, then, that being an Indigenous person within the academy can be explained by Jean Phillips (2003: 3) as an "on-going struggle against colonial domination" and described by Deborah Miranda (2003: 344) as "a heartbreaking endeavour"? Miranda in discussing the position of Indigenous academics in the United States of America states that some have become:

> disgusted and exhausted by the constant battles; some have graduated with degrees only to find that non-Native scholars fill many of the positions in Native Studies; others have simply turned their tremendous gifts and energies in other directions, discounting the university as a place with potential to make a difference.

Her position resonates with the words of Victor Hart (2003: 13 & 14), an Indigenous Australian, when he states that our lectures are "about unpacking and exorcising the everyday, garden variety racisms that the majority of white Australians bring consciously and unconsciously to learning" and that we find ourselves increasingly "in ideological wars where fidelity to the struggle is being tested by mostly neo-conservative non-Aboriginal notions of liberation". Others such as Phillips (2003) also see universities as sites of growth and change for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Personally, even though I know that our experiences as Indigenous people within universities often reflect the experiences we have as Indigenous people in broader society, I still get surprised and angry when it is other academics who espouse notions

of justice and equity with whom we experience tension and conflict in asserting our rights and cultural values.

In this article I demonstrate how the racism and the devaluing of Indigenous people is less bloody than in earlier Australian history but is still perpetuated by non-Indigenous people with privilege and power, including academics who have control of Indigenous Studies and who can demonstrate an understanding of what hooks (1994: 16) terms "book knowledge". In particular, I explore how social control and cultural dominance operate, and are deployed in inter-racial relations and subject positions within universities which continue to marginalise and oppress Indigenous peoples. This will be done through presenting an experience as a case study and analysing it utilising critical race theory and whiteness studies. I wish to name my experience and raise objection to the practices as described in this paper in an attempt to move from the position of being silent to speaking about it in an attempt to interrupt white privilege and to reject the paradigm of control and certainty (White and Sakiestewa 2003). I seek to move from the position of object to subject and to gain a form of liberated voice (hooks 1989). I encourage others to examine their own practices within universities because as Devon Mihesuah (2003: 326) asks: "if we do not take charge and create strategies for empowerment, who will?".

Setting the Scene for "Inclusion"

In September 2005 I was invited to join an academic panel that would review an Australian university's courses in the field of Indigenous Studies. Initially I said yes to the invitation thinking that it was a respectful recognition of what I could bring to the review and that it was a genuine gesture of inclusion. The following week I received a letter (dated 26 September 2005) thanking me for accepting the invitation and providing information relating to the membership of the review panel; a schedule for the two day face-to-face meeting (17-18 October 2005); copies of the course study guides and all the resource material; a copy of the university's graduate attributes guidelines; and a copy of the university's generic skills guidelines. Based on the materials and the terms of reference, I anticipated that it would take two to three days of preparation work if I was going to be actively engaged with the curriculum materials. This coupled with the two-day workshop equalled approximately five days of work.

Pamela Croft then contacted me and made me aware that she was also invited to be a member of the review panel. Pamela is another Aboriginal woman and holds a Professional Doctorate in Visual Arts (DVA, see Croft 2003). Pamela advised me that the university was not offering any payment for our work nor was it prepared to offer any other benefits that they may have been able to offer. At that time I was not employed and was a registered recipient of unemployment benefits. I was living on $220 a week. Pamela was self-employed. We could therefore not participate without personally incurring costs. The costs included declining other work that may have come up for me that week and travelling to and from that university. I made contact with the university-based academic who originally rang me and discussed the matter. I was told that no payment would be offered however, lunch, morning tea and afternoon tea would be provided each day and dinner on the first evening. I was made to feel like I was "money hungry" despite gifting my time freely in the past to a number of universities for educational activities and

events. I believed what was being asked of me in this instance was too great without attributing a remunerative value or any form of reciprocity. That is, the gift that I was asked to provide was too great to ask for considering that there was no developed relationship of hospitality or reciprocity (Kuokkanen 2003). From Kuokkanen's (2007) perspective it is also the continued taking for granted that limits the development of hospitality between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. In this case, I believe I was being taken for granted.

Turning now to the other people listed as members of the review team. Of the ten names on the review team, seven belonged to people working for the university conducting the review. From this, six were non-Indigenous people. This included two women one with qualifications in education and the other with qualifications in nursing and education. There were four men who collectively had qualifications in humanities, psychology and sociology. Among this seven, there was one Indigenous man who was working in the Indigenous centre of that university. He was also formally enrolled in a research higher degree program in that university and one of the non-Indigenous men on the review panel was one of his research supervisors. There was one Indigenous man from a university in another part of Australia also listed as a member of the review panel. He had qualifications in education and also worked within an Indigenous centre. There were additionally two Indigenous women's names on the list, Pamela's and mine.

In relation to the Indigenous Studies content, three of the non-Indigenous men had mixed responsibilities for the Indigenous courses/subjects/modules, that is, coordinating the major and individual courses or being a contact person. Two of these have received grant monies, researched and written in the field of Indigenous Studies. The Indigenous man on the review panel who was employed in that university does not have any responsibility for the Indigenous Studies courses and as already stated is based in the Indigenous centre of that university where Indigenous student support and Indigenous tertiary preparation programs are provided. This university is not, as explained by Nakata (2004: 5), a place where Indigenous Studies programs are "Indigenous run, managed and taught" or "increasingly under the nominal authority or management of Indigenous academics". It is, as Hart (2003: 14 & 15) asserts, "within the domain of mostly non-Aboriginal academics" and where they can be in a "whole series of relationships with Aboriginality without ever losing the relative upper hand". In this regard, this university has failed to do what Gunstone (2008: xxi) explains they need to do, which is "address issues of power, governance and control of what is being studied and taught". Lastly, as seven of the people were employed and based within that university and their wages were covered by that university they were remunerated while they participated in the review. Some in this group were also tenured employees.

Beginning to Dissect "Inclusion"

Within this university, non-Indigenous people are remunerated to talk about Indigenous peoples, cultures, knowledges and histories and to gauge how much knowledge and understanding others will gain about Indigenous people. As such they hold what is considered "legitimate knowledge" that underpins and maintains their power within the university (Alfred 2004; Henderson 2000; Martin 2003; Smith 1999). The people

that clearly *owned* Indigenous Studies within this university were non-Indigenous people. As will be demonstrated, the processes of the review and the terms in which Pamela and I were invited to participate excluded us from holding any form of ownership, even temporarily, and would lead to what Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2005b) would describe as a further investment in the white possession of Indigenous Studies in that university. Had I participated in the review under the conditions set down for me, it would have maintained the discrepancies of power and control between the paid non-Indigenous employees on the panel who talk about, write about and who are given authority to control information within the university about Indigenous people, and the authentic Indigenous voices of Indigenous women who were offered no value other than what Marcelle Gareau (2003: 197) calls a "targeted resource" and Shahnaz Khan (2005: 2025) terms a "native informant". We would be undertaking this position in order to legitimate the academic processes of non-Indigenous people. This amounts to a recycling of the colonial power gained through colonisation and a distinct difference between those with institutional privilege and those without. Indigenous Studies and Indigenous people are objectified and reproduced as objects within this context and are what Moreton-Robinson (2008) would term "epistemological possessions" of the non-Indigenous people involved in the review and by this university. I also noted that what was spoken of, as a form of gift or thanks by the contact person, was food, which in fact resonated as a reminder of the past as if food rations were being offered from the coloniser to the colonised (Rintoul 1993). In short, my participation without payment would have affirmed "white domination and economic success at the cost of racial and economic oppression" (Moreton-Robinson 2005b: 26).

Through my telephone discussion with the university-based academic who had originally contacted me, and on critical reflection, I knew that Pamela and I were being expected to give our knowledge, skills and abilities in Indigenous Studies for "our people" based on "goodwill", "community service" and for "white people who wanted to learn about us". The university staff involved had based our possible participation on their epistemiological framework of us as Indigenous women with doctoral postgraduate qualifications (Croft 2003; Fredericks 2003). Our possible participation was constructed through our Indigenous embodiment as racial and gendered objects and based on their desire for us to be the Indigenous "Other", albeit with doctoral qualifications: the symbols of attainment and credentials of the academy. We were defined as both subject and object through our Aboriginality and offered a positioning of subjugation and subordination. From the review team's perspective this is what would add value to the review and provide legitimacy and advantage to the university and the non-Indigenous people. The non-Indigenous people were positioned as the experts and knowers and offered the on-going positioning of authority, legitimacy, domination and control. We were being asked to perform the role of female Indigenous academics who would be used to service the non-Indigenous academics in the same way that Indigenous people were required to service non-Indigenous people in colonial history (Huggins 1989; Rintoul 1993). As explained by Moreton-Robinson (2008: 86), placing us in such a service relationship also positions our Aboriginality "as an epistemological possession to service what it is not" and

to "obscure the more complex way that white possession functions socio-discursively through subjectivity and knowledge production". It also diverts our attention from our own and community priorities to the priorities of the dominant society. The situation represented a form of identity politics that is rooted in Australian colonial history and that has contributed to the ongoing historical, legal and political racialisation and marginalisation of Indigenous peoples.

If it was only our "authentic" Aboriginality that the university wanted, then other Aboriginal women would have been asked, for example Elders, Traditional Owner representatives, leaders in specific fields or community members from the community in which that university is physically located. If it was our qualifications in terms of our disciplines then we would also not have been included because, in other circumstances, staff in that university have explained that I could not work within the field of Indigenous Studies because I did not have an "academic pedigree" (Deloria 2004: 25) in Indigenous Studies. That is, I had not undertaken an Indigenous Studies major in my undergraduate or postgraduate studies. This is despite undertaking scholarly work in the field within health and education and being recognised by the field by being granted a National and Medical Research Council (NH&MRC) Post-Doctoral Research Award in Indigenous Health (2006); a Visiting Fellow position in Indigenous Studies in another university (2007); and membership of the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS, 2008).

Saying No

What I have been told in the past, and the evidence associated with the review, is riddled with contradictions considering that not all the people currently responsible for Indigenous Studies in that university have qualifications in the field of Indigenous Studies. Somehow in this instance and in others, non-Indigenous people are able to undertake a process of metamorphosis, which allows them to teach within the Indigenous Studies domain and maintain the artificial barriers that continue the racism in academia (Galvan 2003). All the while they are able to develop and grow their academic curriculum vitaes to prove their worthiness to teach Indigenous Studies. Moreover, the whole argument that "you don't have to be one to teach Indigenous Studies" is negated when the issue of needing an Indigenous person arises for the purposes of equity, cultural diversity, representation, to sit on a committee, be a resource to assist in connecting students to community groups, or, in this case, to be a member of a review panel (Deloria 2004; Mihesuah 2004). In this there is a difference between authority and authenticity and legitimate and illegitimate knowledge.

If Pamela and I had agreed to do what was asked of us, what would have resulted is that we as the only two Indigenous women would have given our time, skills, abilities and specific knowledge in Indigenous content for free while all the other members of the review panel, including the non-Indigenous "Indigenous experts", would have been paid for their time, skills, abilities and specific knowledge in Indigenous content. It is also laden with all the other complexities that accompany messages of devaluation and disregard. Had we participated given the situation then maybe we might have found ourselves deeper within the system that marginalised us and that seeks to constantly use and

take possession of us. In this we share the experience that so many other Indigenous women experience, that of being deprecated (Moreton-Robinson 2000). The Indigenous man from that institution who participated in the review colluded in this deprecation, whether unwittingly or not, by participating in the playing out of the scenario that witnessed the reproduction of racialised and institutionalised power and privilege. I wanted to resist cooption to a position of intellectual servitude to members of the dominant society and believed that if I did participate that I would be expected to do little more than play the role that Vine Deloria (2004: 29) terms a "house pet".

I sought counsel from an Elder who explained that just because non-Indigenous people might know a lot about Indigenous affairs and Indigenous politics does not mean that they will support Indigenous people, our worldviews and our values over their own, and it doesn't mean that they will not put Indigenous people down in the process. In essence they might protect and maintain their own interests in Indigenous issues by the denial and exclusion of Indigenous people and our sovereignty (Moreton-Robinson 2004a). Aileen Moreton-Robinson's (2004b) theoretical understandings are important to draw upon at this point. She explains that the protection and investment in white values and interests is rooted in the possessive logic of patriarchal white sovereignty, and that there might be anxiety about dispossession which is "harnessed to instil hope through possessive investments in patriarchal white sovereignty" (2008: 102). As a result of their possessive investments in patriarchal white sovereignty, non-Indigenous people can act against Indigenous sovereignty claims about our being, our knowledge, our culture and our land and show no concern for our rights or empowerment. They can act in ways that insulate themselves, their disciplines and institutions in order to protect their privileges (Smith 1999) and can instate gatekeepers to guard their entitlements, creating a comfort zone and marginalising dissenting Indigenous voices (Rigney 1998; Stanfield 1993). I also came to the conclusion through my discussions with the Elder that I did not wish to reflect the image of me that was epistemologically defined by non-Indigenous people (Moreton-Robinson 2007) and enacted in the invitation.

I then wrote a formal letter detailing my concerns to the chairperson of the review panel and stated that I would not participate in the review. I asked for my letter to be circulated amongst the review team. I also sent my letter as an attachment to an email. I did not receive an acknowledgement of my communication or a reply via email or in a letter. Nor did I receive a telephone call from the chairperson of the review panel, or from anyone else on the review panel or from that institution. In not hearing anything or receiving a letter back from anyone associated with the review I came to understand that the review had nothing to do with engaging us with scholarly respect. By not telephoning and not responding to my letter or email I was further de-authorised, discarded and deprecated. I was again bluntly reminded that the invitation was on the university's terms and just how easy it is for institutions such as universities to dispossess and exclude us and for them to maintain power, and control. In not communicating with Pamela or me, the university and those within it connected to the review, endorsed their positioning, privilege, advantage and their rationalising of ownership. They didn't have to verbally say "this is mine" or "this is ours" because their actions and non-actions

demonstrated the possessive logic of white sovereignty (Moreton-Robinson 2004b).

I experienced intense frustration at the lack of response from anyone on the review panel or the university and while I struggled with trying to understand the atmosphere of silence, the academics involved in the review benefited from their "silenced position by proxy" (Lampert 2003: 23). I wondered why did they not engage with us? Why didn't anyone contact Pamela or me? Was the Indigenous man a willing accomplice to these activities? Was it about their unwillingness to engage and to give up their privilege and power and their resistance to changing the status quo? Vicki Grieves (2008) in her recent work writes of the recognisable stress that Indigenous scholars experience within environments such as universities. She draws on the work of Williams, Thorpe and Chapman (2003: 68-91), who explain how the relationship between whiteness and knowledge often creates stress on many levels for Indigenous workers. This was an experience of such stress. I was reminded of the arrogance of white privilege in that they would assume that we would be members of the review panel without payment and that we would perform the type of Aborigine that they wanted (Smith 1999). Moreover, they also assumed that perhaps we would be happy to be placed in the position of "other" and may be even in some way we might have even been grateful for their benevolence. This is in opposition to non-Indigenous academics from that university and others who repeatedly, confidently and comfortably ask for monies for consulting with community groups, including Indigenous groups, when applying for research funds to undertake research in specific Indigenous areas. In addition to this, non-Indigenous people are awarded kudos, creditability and seen as honourable (Lampert 2003) for their work within Indigenous Studies. Pamela and I were asking for no more than non-Indigenous academics would ask for in the same situation and for which they think they are entitled. We were asking for the same form of personal and institutional legitimisation and respect that they think they deserve.

Had I undertaken the role of panel member I would have fully engaged within the review panel process. I would have critically read the materials, contributed to the discussion and ensured that my participation was not "token", and that I was not positioned as "native informant". I would have been in a position to offer valuable critique, put forward suggestions for change and raised issues relevant to the content. I knew if Pamela and I didn't participate then we couldn't do any of this and that the people handling the review panel might say that they had asked Indigenous people, and that the Indigenous women they had asked didn't take up the offer to participate. It would be said as I have heard before, "Indigenous people didn't participate", rather than "the terms of the review made it difficult for Indigenous people to participate". To talk in these terms maintains the comfort of the white people in their belonging within Indigenous Studies because they were, or are, "only trying to…". This type of statement and others of "goodwill" and "benevolence" also assist in masking the power differentials (Hage 1998; Riggs 2004) and deny the truth of Indigenous poverty and dispossession and non-Indigenous privilege. It seemed that even having been through the higher education system and earning our respective pieces of paper, we were not being valued in the same way as the other people on the panel. I have no

doubts that the non-Indigenous people on the panel were all supported and congratulated for participating in and undertaking the review of the Indigenous Studies curriculum. The university and that particular faculty could tick off that job from its task list for the year and move on. We knew we risked being seen as making trouble and being too political, too critical and maybe even too personal (White and Sakiestewa 2003). Since this time we have both heard information about ourselves and the review from people within that university who had nothing to do with the review and who should not have known anything about it at all. None of the information has been flattering. We heard that we were presented as complainers and the problem, just as Indigenous people are generally presented as the problem, rather than the social or structural issues and the power and hierarchy associated with the academy (Smith 1999). Lampert (2003: 24), in discussing her experiences as a non-Indigenous academic working in Indigenous education, argues that Indigenous Studies is generally regarded as a "Black issue rather than a White issue; about 'them' rather than 'us'. It's often taken for granted that I am the good guy, or that it is even good guys and bad guys". In this case, we were positioned as the "bad Indigenous women".

Conclusion

Audre Lorde (1984: 44) states that "it is not difference that immobilises us, but silence. And there are so many silences to be broken". In breaking the silence on my experience I have attempted to highlight racism, social and cultural domination, control and white privilege as they intersect and are enacted within an Australian university. I have demonstrated how hard it can be to engage with the Academy when those within it are reproducing imperial attitudes and processes which marginalise and exclude us whilst proclaiming they want to include and involve us. In the Academy, this can be a common occurrence. Universities are not the safe places we would like to think they are (Mihesuah and Wilson 2004; Monture-Angus 1995; Walker 2003). Taiaiake Alfred (2004: 88) states that "they are not even so special or different in any meaningful way from other institutions; they are microcosms of the larger societal struggle". As an Indigenous woman and academic I know I need to face the difficult questions around obligations and responsibilities to other Indigenous peoples and our struggle for freedom from oppression and exploitation at every point of academic engagement. I also know that it takes a lot of energy to challenge and fight the status quo and sometimes it is a lot easier to just accept it because of the level of emotional, physical and spiritual damage we may incur. In this article I have shown how we can reaffirm and act from our Indigenous epistemological and ontological foundations and how we can challenge and offer resistance to the colonial forces that consistently try to silence us or make us with what Mihesuah (2004: 44) calls "window dressing". That is, they want us but not our opinions. In the process of working through this article and articulating the practices within this particular tertiary education institution, I have moved from the position of object to subject. I have been able to gain a form of liberated voice (hooks 1989: 9) and demonstrated the multi-faceted forms of domination and control that continue to subjugate Indigenous peoples within universities. Furthermore, I have shown how "goodwill" invitations can be underpinned by racism, white race privilege and racialised subjectivity which results in Indigenous peoples

being further marginalised, denigrated and exploited. I have sought to challenge the possessive logic of patriarchal white sovereignty (Moreton-Robinson 2004b) that continues to subjugate Indigenous peoples. I encourage others to do the same.

Author Note

Dr Bronwyn Fredericks is a NHMRC Post-Doctoral Research Fellow with Monash University, the Queensland Aboriginal and Islander Health Council (QAIHC) and the Victorian Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisation (VACCHO). She is additionally a Visiting Fellow with the Indigenous Studies Research Network, Queensland University of Technology (QUT).

Acknowledgments

Acknowledgement is offered to the Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, Monash University; the Indigenous Studies Research Network (ISRN), Queensland University of Technology; the Queensland Aboriginal and Islander Health Council (QAIHC); and the Victorian Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisation (VACCHO) for supporting my research; and the NHMRC for funding my Research Fellowship. Sincere thanks go to Pamela Croft for supporting me to write about our shared experience, Aileen Moreton-Robinson for her intellectual critique and on-going encouragement and Vicki Grieves for feedback on an earlier draft.

References

Alfred, T. 2004. Warrior Scholarship; Seeing the University as a Ground of Contention, in D. A. Mihesuah and A. C. Wilson (eds.) *Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 88-99.

Brady, W. 1997. 'Indigenous Australian Education and Globalisation', *International Review of Education*, 43(5-6), 413-422.

Croft, P. J. 2003. 'ART Song: the Soul Beneath my Skin', PhD thesis, Queensland College of Art, Griffith University, Brisbane.

Deloria, V., Jr. 2004. Marginal and Submarginal, in D. A. Mihesuah and A. C. Wilson (eds.) *Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 16-30.

Fredericks, B. 2003. 'Talking about Women's Health: Aboriginal Women's Perceptions and Experiences of Health, Well-being, Identity, Body and Health Services', PhD thesis, Faculty of Arts, Health and Sciences, Central Queensland University, Rockhampton.

Galvan, R. F. 2003. 'Working in John Wayne Country: Racist and Sexist Termination at a Pacific Northwest University', *American Indian Quarterly*, 27(1/2), 189-196.

Gareau, M. M. 2003. 'Colonization within the University System', *American Indian Quarterly*, 27(1/2), 196-200.

Grieves, V. 2008. 'The "Battlefields": Identity, Authenticity and Aboriginal Knowledges in Australia', in H. Minde (ed.) *Indigenous Peoples: Self-determination, Knowledge and Indigeneity*, Delft: Eburon Academic Publishers, 287-311.

Gunstone, A. 2008. Australian Indigenous Studies and Australian Universities, in A. Gunstone (ed.) *History, Politics and Knowledge: Essays in Australian Indigenous Studies*, North Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, xxi-xxvi.

Hage, G. 1998. *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*, Annadale: Pluto Press.

Hart, V. 2003. 'Teaching Black and Teaching Back', *Social Alternatives*, 22(3), 12-16.

Henderson, J. S. Y. 2000. Challenges of Respecting Indigenous Worldviews in Eurocentric Education, in R. Neil (ed.) *Voice of the Drum: Indigenous Education and Culture*, Brandon, Manitoba: Kingfisher Publications, 59-80.

hooks, b. 1994. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*, London: Routledge.

——1989. *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black*, Boston: South End Press.

Huggins, J. 1989. *Sister Girl*, St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Khan, S. 2005. 'Reconfiguring the Native Informant: Positionality in the Global Age', *Signs*, 30(4), 2017-35.

Kuokkanen, R. 2003. 'Toward a New Relation of Hospitality in the Academy', *American Indian Quarterly*, 27(1/2), 267-296.

——2007. *Reshaping the University: Responsibility, Indigenous Epistemes, and the Logic of the Gift*, Vancouver: UBC Press.

Lampert, J. 2003. 'The Alabaster Academy: Being a non-Indigenous academic in Indigenous Studies', *Social Alternatives*, 22(3), 23-26.

Lorde, A. 1984. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*, Freedom: Crossing Press.

Martin, K. 2003. 'Ways of Knowing, Being and Doing: A Theoretical Framework and Methods for Indigenous Re-search and Indigenist Re-search', *Journal of Australian Studies*, 76, 203-214.

Mihesuah, D. A. 2003. 'Activism and Apathy: The Prices We Pay for Both', *American Indian Quarterly*, 27(1/2), 325-333.

——2004. Academic Gatekeepers, in D. A. Mihesuah and A. C. Wilson (eds.) *Indigenizing the Academy Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 31-47.

Mihesuah, D. A. and Wilson, A. C. (eds.) 2004. *Indigenizing the Academy Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Miranda, D. A. 2003. 'What's Wrong with a Little Fancy? Storytelling from the (Still) Ivory Tower', *American Indian Quarterly*, 27(1/2), 333-349.

Monture-Angus, P. 1995. *Thunder in my Soul: A Mohawk Woman Speaks*, Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Moreton-Robinson, A. 2000. *Talkin' Up to the White Woman: Indigenous Women and Feminism*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

——2004a. Whiteness, Epistemology and Indigenous Representation, in A. Moreton-Robinson (ed.) *Whitening Race*, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 70-88.

——2004b. 'The Possessive Logic of Patriarchal White Sovereignty: The High Court and the Yorta Yorta Decision', *borderlands e-journal*, 3(2), 1-9, <http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol3no2_2004/moreton_possessive.htm>, accessed 23 July 2008.

——2005a. Whiteness Matters: Australian Studies and Indigenous Studies, in D. Carter and M. Crotty (eds.) *Australian Studies Centre 25th Anniversary Collection*, Brisbane: Australian Studies Centre, The University of Queensland, 38-46.

——2005b. 'The House That Jack Built: Britishness and White Possession',

ACRAWSA Journal, 1, 21-29, <http://www.acrawsa.org.au/ejournalFiles/Volume%201,%20Number%201,%202005/AileenMoretonRobinson.pdf>, accessed 9 November 2008.

——2007. *Sovereign Subjects: Indigenous Sovereignty Matters*, Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin.

——2008. Writing off Treaties: White Possession in the United States Critical Whiteness Studies Literature, in A. Moreton-Robinson, M. Casey and F. Nicoll. (eds.) *Transnational Whiteness Matters*, Lexington Books: New York, 81-98.

Nakata, M. 2004. *Indigenous Australian Studies and Higher Education, The Wentworth Lectures – 2004*, Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.

——2006. 'Australian Indigenous Studies: A Question of Discipline', *The Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 17(3), 265-275.

Phillips, J. 2003. 'Guest Editor's Introduction: Decolonising the Centre', *Social Alternatives*, 22(3), 3-5.

Phillips, J. and Lampert, J. 2005. (eds.) *Introductory Indigenous Studies in Education: The Importance of Knowing*, Sydney: Pearson Education.

Riggs, D. W. 2004. 'Benevolence and the Management of Stake: On Being "Good White People"', *Philament: An Online Journal of the Arts and Culture*, 4, <http://www.arts.usyd.edu.au/publications/philament/issue4_Critique_Riggs.htm>, accessed 1 April 2009.

Rigney, L-R. 2001. 'A First Perspective of Indigenous Australian Participation in Science: Framing Indigenous Research Towards Indigenous Australian Intellectual Sovereignty', *Kaurna Higher Education Journal*, 7, 1-13.

——1997. 'Internationalisation of an Indigenous Anti-Colonial Cultural Critique of Research Methodologies: A Guide to Indigenist Research Methodology and its Principles', *Journal of Native American Studies*, 14(2), 109-121.

Rintoul, S. 1993. *The Wailing: A National Black Oral History*, Port Melbourne: William Heinmann

Smith, L. T. 1999. *Decolonising Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, London: Zed Books.

——2005. On Tricky Ground. Researching the Native in the Age of Uncertainty, in N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (eds.) *Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 85-108.

Stanfield, J. H., II. 1993. Methodological Reflections: An Introduction, in J. H. Stanfield II and R. M. Dennis (eds.) *Race and Ethnicity in Research Methods*, Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Walker, P. 2003. 'Colonising Research: Academia's Structural Violence Towards Indigenous Peoples', *Social Alternatives*, 22(3), 37-40.

White, C. and Sakiestewa, N. 2003. 'Talking Back to Colonial Institutions', *American Indian Quarterly*, 27(1/2), 433-441.

Williams, C., Thorpe, B. and Chapman, C. 2003. *Aboriginal Workers: History, Emotional and Community Labour and Occupational Health and Safety in South Australia*. Henley Beach: Seaview Press.

[i] For details see isrn@qut.edu.au and www.isrn.qut.edu.au.

WHITENESS, INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES

ANDREW GUNSTONE

Abstract

In this article, I explore the impact of whiteness within Australian universities upon Indigenous peoples. I examine several practices of whiteness in areas such as governance, policies, cultural awareness courses, employment, research, curriculum and student support. I argue that these practices of whiteness substantially restrict the ability of universities to genuinely address the educational needs of Indigenous students, staff and community members.

Whiteness involves the marginalisation, discrimination and oppression of non-white groups and individuals and the privileging of white groups and individuals. "Although whiteness is a complex and fragmented identity, all white people in Australia benefit from racial privilege … all receive unearned social benefits as the inheritors of a racially based system of wealth and privilege" (McKay 2004: 4. See also Moreton-Robinson 2004; Nicoll 2004). In Australian universities, as in all other institutions in this country, systemic individual and institutional practices of whiteness are prevalent and impact significantly upon Indigenous peoples, whether as students, staff or community members. "Whiteness confers both dominance and privilege; it is embedded in Australia's institutions and in the social practices of everyday life" (Moreton-Robinson 1998: 11; Moreton-Robinson 2006: 388).

In this article, I explore a number of practices of whiteness within Australian universities and the impact of these practices upon Indigenous peoples. I discuss these practices of whiteness as they operate across a wide range of interrelated University areas, namely governance, policies, cultural awareness courses, employment, research, curriculum and student support. These areas have been constantly identified over the past twenty years by government reports and academics as being of critical importance in enabling Australian universities to more appropriately address the educational needs of Indigenous peoples (See DEET 1993; IEHAC 2006; MCEETYA 1995; Yunupingu 1994; Battiste and Henderson 2000; Bourke 1996; Nakata 1995; Phillips 2005; West 1995). Many of these practices of whiteness, both individual and institutional, have either been observed by me, or communicated to me by university students and staff, over the past decade of my employment at Indigenous Studies Centres at several Australian universities. I argue in this paper that Australian universities have largely been unsuccessful in addressing these, and other, practices of whiteness and have consequently substantially failed to genuinely address the educational needs of Indigenous peoples. Further, I discuss various strategies that Universities could implement that could significantly assist in reducing these practices of whiteness.

Most universities have comprehensively failed to address issues of Indigenous governance. In 2007, a survey I

ISSN 1832-3898

conducted of twelve universities (Gunstone 2008) found that universities had very few identified Indigenous positions on key University committees. No university had an identified position on their Council, only seven had an identified position on their Academic Board, and just four had an identified position on their Human Research Ethics Committees (Gunstone 2008: 104). Additionally, while I have observed a few university committees with Indigenous members, overwhelmingly these members have been elected as individuals by university staff, rather than being appointed as representatives of Indigenous Studies Centres. The consequence of this has been that even these university committees do not maintain Indigenous representation as the membership is based on individuals rather than on institutions.

Universities need to recognise this disempowerment of Indigenous peoples and genuinely address issues of power and governance to more appropriately meet Indigenous educational needs and aspirations (IHAEC 2006: 25; Whatman and Duncan 2005: 120-123). Indigenous people need to be much more involved in university governance. This involvement of Indigenous staff, students and communities can significantly improve a number of key areas, such as curriculum development, access and retention of Indigenous students, university-Indigenous collaborative research and, more broadly, Indigenous self-determination. The level of this Indigenous involvement and engagement in university governance, though, needs to be determined by Indigenous peoples themselves.

There are many examples of ignorant and racist views towards Indigenous peoples held by white university staff and students. White academics often perpetuate stereotypes, telling students that Indigenous children will not look them in the eye and that Indigenous people are not punctual. These academics also often hold simplistic views on cultural differences in learning, such as that Indigenous cultures lack mathematical understandings (Nakata 2003: 9). White staff have also advised students not to study Indigenous Studies unless they wanted to work in the Northern Territory, "where the Aborigines live". White academics generally fail to acknowledge Indigenous cultural issues regarding student assessment. These academics also largely assume that Indigenous students will be experts in all matters concerning Indigenous Studies. However, they also fail to recognise and value the broad Indigenous knowledge of Indigenous students (Nakata, Nakata and Chin 2008: 138).

Often the most substantial attacks on Indigenous cultural safety come from "well-meaning" white university staff and students. One example of this occurred when a white academic requested, within a large class setting, for any Indigenous students to identify themselves and then interrogated the students about their Indigeneity. Another example occurred when, again in a large class setting, a white academic identified an Indigenous student, and asked them to stand up so the class could acknowledge the student. In the same class, an Indigenous student of fair complexion was not identified by the academic as being Indigenous. Both academics later claimed that they were trying to "encourage" the Indigenous students.

These examples clearly illustrate that universities have largely not prioritised the need to address issues of individual and institutional racism. There are two key ways in which universities could address racism, through implementing

anti-racist policies and procedures and through implementing anti-racist training.

Universities have largely failed to implement anti-racist policies and procedures. In my 2007 survey on Australian universities (Gunstone 2008) I analysed the Strategic Plans of the twelve institutions, which outline their key policies, priorities and strategies, such as developing internationalisation and securing funding. None of the twelve surveyed universities outlined in their Strategic Plans the importance of anti-racist policies and procedures to address individual and institutional racism. Over many years in working at Indigenous Studies Centres, I have seen that the absence of these policies and procedures have made it much more difficult for Indigenous staff, students and community members to ensure that universities genuinely address their experiences of institutional and individual racism.

Universities need to ensure that they have effective policies and procedures to address issues of individual and institutional racism. One significant way in which this can be done is for universities to firstly, implement, and widely advertise, policies that condemn all forms of racism, and secondly, develop institutional procedures to address any instances of racism. These anti-racist policies and procedures are most effective when they acknowledge their own origins, explore injustices in terms of "oppression" rather than "disadvantage", characterise non-white individuals and groups as "fighting" against oppression rather than "suffering" it, and focus more on "fighting oppression" than on "issues of access and participation" (Moore 1995).

Universities have also comprehensively failed to address the need for their staff and students to develop appropriate anti-racist training. Overwhelmingly, the training offered to staff and students focuses on exploring non-white cultures and experiences and ignores or marginalises the impact of practices of whiteness within universities. The training also largely fails to interrogate complex concepts such as "culture", "power", "language" and "identity" (See Delpit 1993: 122; Henze and Vanett 1993: 119-127). Universities also generally fail to make the training compulsory which often results in the training "preaching to the converted" rather than to ignorant and apathetic staff and students. I have been involved in the organising of anti-racist training and the impact of this training, despite excellent content, is substantially diluted because university management have not made the training compulsory. This practice sharply contrasts with universities often requiring staff to attend other forms of training relating to issues such as Occupational Heath and Safety and Staff Inductions.

Genuine and appropriate anti-racist training for university staff and students, that addresses individual and institutional racism, requires a much broader focus than simply exploring non-white cultures. Rather, the training should also analyse the dominant white culture, and the racism, power and practices of whiteness that permeate throughout the structures and institutions of that dominant culture (Cowlishaw 2004; Pease 2004: 125; Phillips 2005: 15-19). To emphasise this focus, Fredericks (2007) argues training should be renamed from simply "cultural awareness courses" to explicit "anti-racism courses".

Another key practice of whiteness that universities have largely failed to address is the issue of Indigenous employment. Indigenous peoples are employed in significantly low numbers by universities,

and the substantial majority of Indigenous people who are employed at universities are employed within the Indigenous Centres and Departments of the universities (IHEAC 2006: 24; Moreton-Robinson 1999: 5). Further, many universities fail to acknowledge that Aboriginality is a genuine employment criteria for many academic and general staff positions. The impact of this failure by many universities to have genuine affirmative action employment practices is that non-Indigenous people are often appointed to academic and general staff positions that should be reserved for Indigenous people. I have also observed numerous examples of universities failing to support their Indigenous staff, such as not acknowledging the cultural and academic discipline knowledge of Indigenous staff in performance and promotion reviews and not recognising the substantial and invaluable community involvement work of Indigenous staff in Workloads policies.

Indigenous employment at universities needs to be addressed through several key strategies. These strategies are: first, the overall numbers of Indigenous people employed within universities needs to be increased; second, Indigenous people need to be employed in senior management roles; and third, the range of employment roles of Indigenous staff employed at universities needs to be broadened (IHEAC 2006: 24; Yunupingu 1994: 15). Further, Universities need to genuinely support their Indigenous staff, particularly regarding cultural safety issues (Young 2004: 111; Moreton-Robinson 2007: 86).

Research is another area in which universities are failing Indigenous peoples and communities. The majority of universities do not recognise the importance of negotiating more appropriate engagements with Indigenous peoples, organisations and communities regarding research. Further, universities largely continue to conduct research concerning Indigenous issues without appropriately negotiating with Indigenous peoples and communities concerning the research (Smith 2004: 129). I have observed many white academics develop research projects concerning Indigenous issues with a complete absence of negotiations with Indigenous researchers concerning the project. Alternatively, I have also seen many other white academics involve Indigenous researchers in their research project, predominantly to obtain funding, and, upon obtaining funds, consequently largely marginalise the Indigenous researchers from further involvement in the research project.

Universities need to genuinely negotiate with Indigenous peoples, organisations and communities regarding the appropriate level of Indigenous engagement with university research concerning Indigenous knowledge and issues. Possible engagements include: negotiating research concerning Indigenous peoples; utilising Indigenous research methodologies, such as Indigenous Standpoint Theory; challenging non-Indigenous research methodologies; developing mechanisms for assisting Indigenous researchers; addressing the relationships between research and other issues such as governance, teaching, curriculum and employment; and promoting ethical Indigenous research (Battiste and Henderson 2000: 141-144; Foley 2008: 128-132; Nakata 2006: 271-272; Moreton-Robinson 2003: 84).

Universities have also largely failed to implement curriculum that is embedded with Indigenous knowledge and issues. This lack of Indigenous curriculum

substantially restricts the relevance of universities for Indigenous peoples. Rather, Indigenous peoples are often confronted with numerous individual and institutional practices of whiteness through "commonsense" curriculum that largely excludes their cultural and academic knowledge. Further, over the past ten years, I have been involved and have observed numerous attempts to implement Indigenous curriculum. These attempts are very often met with substantial resistance from white academics who are often very "territorial" about their particular teaching area (Nakata, Nakata and Chin 2008: 141).

Universities need to genuinely negotiate with Indigenous peoples concerning the appropriate approach of Indigenous engagement with curriculum development throughout the University. One approach could be for compulsory Indigenous curriculum to be implemented, under Indigenous governance, across all disciplinary areas of the university (Battiste and Henderson 2000: 92-96; Lampert 2005: 94-96). The few projects that have succeeded in recent years in implementing Indigenous curriculum in universities have all had genuine Indigenous governance (see Phillips 2004; Phillips and Whatman 2007). Universities also need to negotiate with Indigenous peoples concerning the appropriate manner of assessing this curriculum (Christensen and Lilley 1997: xiii).

Universities have also failed to broadly address issues of academic and cultural support for Indigenous students. Apart from the overworked and under-resourced Indigenous Centres and Departments, nearly all other elements of the universities provide minimal support for Indigenous students (Anderson et al 1998: xv). Further, universities often use the existence of Indigenous Centres, notwithstanding the lack of personnel and financial resources of the Centres, as an excuse to abrogate their responsibilities to Indigenous students. For instance, I have often observed that universities have funded awareness programs for marginalised groups, but have excluded Indigenous peoples from these programs, arguing this is the responsibility of Indigenous Centres and thus ignoring possible engagements with Indigenous Centres concerning the programs. Further, this approach enables universities to then blame Indigenous Centres for low Indigenous enrolments and completions (see Nakata 2004: 2).

Universities need to provide substantial academic, cultural and personal support to Indigenous students across all areas of the institutions (Craven et al 2005: 26, 31; IHEAC 2006: 16-17, 20-21). Universities should also provide significantly more funding to Indigenous Centres and Departments, who for too long have often had to rely upon targeted Commonwealth Government funding to continue their operations. Universities should recognise the significant work that these Indigenous Centres undertake. Mainly staffed and managed by Indigenous people, the Centres have substantially assisted Indigenous people, first in enabling Indigenous people to access university courses, and second in providing academic, cultural and personal support to Indigenous students.

A number of practices of whiteness within universities that significantly impact upon Indigenous people have been discussed in this article. These practises permeate throughout a number of interrelated key areas of universities. These areas are governance, policies, cultural awareness courses, employment, research, curriculum and student

support and have been identified for over two decades by numerous government reports and academic papers as being important areas for universities to address the educational needs of Indigenous peoples.

Many of the practices of whiteness discussed in this paper, both individual and institutional, have occurred and been communicated to me during my employment at Indigenous Studies Centres at several Australian universities over the past decade. All these practices clearly illustrate the impact of whiteness upon Indigenous peoples. Indigenous staff, students and communities are marginalised and oppressed. Non-Indigenous staff and students are instead privileged and advantaged.

Further, some of the examples of individual practices have occurred despite the instigator having genuinely supportive intentions. For instance, the academic who asked the Indigenous student to stand up in class thought they were helping to improve the self-esteem of the student. Thus, motivation seems to be a minor contribution to the development of individual practices of whiteness. Rather, these practices seem to have emanated from non-Indigenous staff and students who were firstly, substantially ignorant of Indigenous issues and the impact of whiteness and secondly, hold outdated and incorrect views, such as cultural deprivation, romanticism, learning styles and "two-worlds" learning.

Overall in this article, I have argued that Australian universities have largely been unsuccessful in addressing these, and other, practices of whiteness and have consequently substantially failed to address the educational needs of Indigenous peoples. Further, I argued that universities need to consult and negotiate with Indigenous staff, students and communities concerning these practices of whiteness. Only through such a process can Australian universities address the key areas such as governance, employment and research and ensure that universities for the first time become genuinely responsive to the educational aspirations of Indigenous peoples.

Author Note

Dr Andrew Gunstone is a Senior Lecturer in the Centre for Australian Indigenous Studies in the School of Humanities, Communications and Social Sciences at Monash University. His research interests are in the politics of reconciliation and the contemporary and historical political relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Australia.

References

Anderson, L., Singh, M., Stehbens, C. and Ryerson, L. 1998. *Equity issues: Every University's Concern, Whose Business – An Exploration of Universities' Inclusion of Indigenous Peoples' Rights and Interests*, Canberra: DEETYA.

Battiste, M. and Henderson, J. 2000. *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage*, Saskatchewan: Purich Publishing.

Bourke, C. 1996. F*actors Affecting Performance of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Students at Australian Universities: A Case Study*, Canberra: DEETYA.

Christensen, P. and Lilley, I. 1997. *The Road Forward? Alternative Assessment for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Students at the Tertiary Level*, Canberra: DEETYA.

Cowlishaw, G. 2004. Racial Positioning, Privilege and Public Debate, in A. Moreton-Robinson (ed.) *Whitening*

Race: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 59-74.

Craven, R., Tucker, A., Munns, G., Hinkley, J., Marsh. H. and Simpson, K. 2005. *Indigenous Students' Aspirations: Dreams, Perceptions and Realities*, <http://www.dest.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/29442B6D-9D5D-4519-A92B-9A7D32F1F7CD/7459/EIP0501PDF.pdf>, accessed 16 July 2007.

Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET). 1993. *The National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Policy*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Delpit, L. 1993. The Silenced Dialogue: Power and Pedagogy in Educating Other People's Children, in L. Weis and M. Fine (eds.) *Beyond Silenced Voices: Class, Race and Gender in United States Schools*, New York: State University of New York Press, 119-39.

Enemburu, I. 1989. *Koori English*, Melbourne: State Board of Education.

Foley, D. 2002. An Indigenous Standpoint Theory, in A. Gunstone (ed.) *History, Politics and Knowledge: Essays in Australian Indigenous Studies*, Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 113-33.

Fredericks, B. 2007. 'The Need to Extend Beyond the Knowledge Gained in Cross-cultural Awareness Training', Indigenous Studies and Indigenous Knowledge Conference, Sydney.

Gunstone, A. 2008. 'Australian University Approaches to Indigenous Policy', *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 37S, 103-108.

Henze, R. and Vanett, L. 1993. 'To Walk in Two Worlds - or More? Challenging a Common Metaphor of Native Education', *Anthropology and educational Quarterly*, 24(2), 116-134.

Indigenous Higher Education Advisory Council (IHEAC). 2006. *Improving Indigenous Outcomes and Enhancing Indigenous Culture and Knowledge in Australian Higher Education*, Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Lampert, J. 2005. The Teaching that Matters: Merging our Personal Beliefs with our Professional Practise in the Classroom, in J. Phillips and J. Lampert (eds.) *Introductory Indigenous Studies in Education*, Frenchs Forest: Pearson Educational Australia, 83-100.

McKay, B. 2004. Making Whiteness Visible, in B. McKay (ed.) *Unmasking Whiteness: Race relations and Reconciliation*, Nathan: Centre for Public Culture and Ideas, Griffith University, 3-6.

Ministerial Council for Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA). 1995. *A National Strategy for the Education of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples: 1996-2002*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Moore, B. 1995. 'Colonising Social Justice: An Interrogation of Australian Policies in Education', *South Australian Educational Leader*, 6(6), 1-8.

Moreton-Robinson, A. 1998. 'Witnessing Whiteness in the Wake of Wik', *Social Alternatives*, 17(2), 11-14.

——1999. 'Unmasking Whiteness: A Goori Jondal's [Aboriginal Woman's] Look at some Duggai [White] Business', *Queensland Review*, 6(1), 1-7.

——2003, 'Researching Whiteness: Some Reflections from an Indigenous Women's Standpoint', *Hecate*, 29(2), 72-85.

——2004. Whiteness, Epistemology and Indigenous Representation, in A. Moreton-Robinson (ed.) *Whitening Race: Essays in Social and Cultural*

Criticism, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 75-88.

——2006. 'Towards a New Research Agenda? Foucault, Whiteness and Indigenous Sovereignty', *Journal of Sociology*, 42(4), 383-395.

——2007. 'Witnessing the Workings of White Possession in the Workplace: Leesa's Testimony', *Australian Feminist Law Journal*, 26, 81-93.

Nakata, M. 1995. 'Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Youth: Cutting a Better Deal for Torres Strait Islanders', *Youth Studies Australia*, 14(4), 29-34.

——2003. 'Some Thoughts on Literacy Issues in Indigenous Contexts', *Australian Journal on Indigenous Education*, 31, 7-15.

——2004. 'Ongoing Conversations about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research Agendas and Directions', *Australian Journal on Indigenous Education*, 33, 1-6.

——2006. 'Australian Indigenous Studies: A Question of Discipline', *Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 17(3), 265-275.

Nakata, M., Nakata, V. and Chin, M. 2008. 'Approaches to the Academic Preparation and Support of Australian Indigenous Students for Tertiary Studies', *Australian Journal on Indigenous Education*, 37S, 137-145.

Nicoll, F. 2004. Reconciliation in and out of Perspective: White Knowing, Seeing, Curating and Being at Home in and Against Indigenous Sovereignty, in A. Moreton-Robinson (ed.) *Whitening Race: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 17-31.

Pease, B. 2004. Decentring White Men: Critical Reflections on Masculinity and White Studies, in A. Moreton-Robinson (ed.) *Whitening Race: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 119-132.

Phillips, G. 2004. *Committee of Deans of Australian Medical Schools Indigenous Health Curriculum Framework*, Sydney: CDAMS.

Phillips, J. 2005. Indigenous Knowledge: Making Space in the Australian Centre, in J. Phillips and J. Lampert (eds.) *Introductory Indigenous Studies in Education*, Frenchs Forest: Pearson Educational Australia, 11-26.

Phillip, J. and Whatman, S. 2007. 'Decolonising Pre-Service Teacher Education – Reform at Many Cultural Interfaces', in *Conference Proceedings The World of Educational Quality: 2007 AERA Annual Meeting*, Chicago: AERA, 1-15.

Smith, L. 2004. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.

West, E. 1995. *Review of Aboriginal Education Strategies of Victorian Higher Education Institutions 1994-1995*, Townsville: James Cook University.

Whatman, S. and Duncan, P. 2005. Community Participation in Indigenous Education: Learning from the Past, in Policy and Practice, in J. Phillips and J. Lampert (eds.) *Introductory Indigenous Studies in Education*, Frenchs Forest: Pearson Educational Australia, 117-38.

Young, S. 2004. Social Work Theory and Practice: The Invisibility of Whiteness, in A. Moreton-Robinson (ed.) *Whitening Race: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 104-118.

Yunupingu, M. 1994. *National Review of Education for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

READING ALIEN LIPS: ACCENTUATING THE POSITIVE? AN ANALYSIS OF SOME POSITIVE MEDIA DEPICTIONS OF ASYLUM SEEKERS

RON HOENIG

Abstract

The absence of the racial and cultural Other in mainstream media is noted by many scholars. In this article, a number of newspaper articles about asylum seekers in lip sewing episodes at Woomera in 2002 are examined using critical discourse analysis and drawing on critical race and whiteness studies. While many news articles depict asylum seekers negatively, most of the selected texts provide a positive depiction of asylum seekers. A combination of discourse analysis and literary exegesis demonstrates how journalists draw on existing discourses in the cultural imaginary to shape their depictions of cultural and racial Others. The suggestion is made that different narratives and rhetorical formations are deployed not merely to depict the asylum seeker as an abject Other to be pitied or reviled, but also to construct different versions of Jennifer Rutherford's "good (white) Australian" reader. These constructions of the reader form a subtext beneath the reporting of news and reveal the extent to which the representation of the Other involves white projections, desires and imaginings of the cultural Other. Rather than providing information about and insight into the cultural/racial Other, such texts may be better understood as interventions in an ongoing discourse within the White "mainstream" about Our national identity.

Introduction

> As they head off into the city for another encounter with the bureaucracy, they make a weird mob, all shapes and sizes with no apparent dress code. Some educated, some not. But somehow you just know they're going to fit in (Kremmer 2002a).

> Hatred for the other has always been located, in the telling of white history, in the wings, off centre-stage, peripheral to the real life of a good white Australia (Rutherford 2000: 18).

The contest of responses to those seeking asylum has been bubbling in the national consciousness and the media since long before the first boats bearing asylum seekers arrived in the mid-1970s. While it is all too easy to find news stories in Australian print media which negatively position asylum seekers, there are also reports which appear to challenge this discourse of negativity. In this article I use critical discourse analysis influenced by Bell (1991, 1997, 1999), van Dijk (1991, 2000b, 2001) and others to analyse some newspaper articles about lip sewing by asylum seekers at Woomera Detention Centre in January 2002 which take a more sympathetic perspective on the asylum seekers. Taking a critical race and whiteness perspective, I suggest that in both "negative" and "positive" reporting, "othering" of asylum seekers takes place. Although some texts draw on an

ISSN 1832-3898

openly exclusionist narrative and others draw on a liberal progressive human-rights posture, the asylum seeker remains a shadowy and opaque alien figure. In both "negative" and "positive" representations of asylum seekers, media workers and the media system construct the asylum seeker as a raced other in contrast to an "invisible" good white Australian Self.[i]

This article draws on my doctoral work examining the depiction of lip sewing by asylum seekers, particularly in the period 2000-2002, in four Australian newspapers. In that study I have been concentrating on "hard news" articles in two broadsheet and two tabloid newspapers in which lip sewing is mentioned and which demonstrate a range of attitudes to the asylum seekers:

- the *Age* (Fairfax, broadsheet, Melbourne);
- the *Australian* (Murdoch, broadsheet, national);
- the Adelaide *Advertiser* (Murdoch, tabloid, Adelaide, close to Woomera and Baxter), and
- the *Daily Telegraph* (Murdoch, tabloid, Sydney, lowest socio-economic demographic)

In this article, I draw examples from the coverage of lip-sewing at the Woomera Detention Centre in January 2002. I am seeking to explore how a textual analysis of any newspaper article provides an insight into cultural narratives that are processed in "factual" reporting and, in particular, how the structure and text of the news article manifest, maintain and shape attitudes to racial, ethnic and religious others. In the first section below I demonstrate how a news article is shaped to construct a narrative and how two different news articles construct different narratives out of the same event. I then provide a critical race and whiteness theorisation to explore the larger context of racialised self-definition in which the Australian journalistic project is positioned. Finally I look at three news articles in which the text takes a more positive stance towards the asylum seekers and demonstrate the ways in which these texts construct and define both a different asylum seeker and, more importantly, a different Australian reader, but within the dominant racial and cultural paradigm.

Narratives of exclusion and inclusion: barbarous parents and child removal

In January 2002, detainees at the Woomera Detention Centre, (or Woomera Immigration Reception and Processing Centre, as it was formally known) who had been awaiting the resolution of their request for asylum for many months, dramatised their plight using lip-sewing, a hunger strike and lying in graves they dug for themselves in the baking sun. Unlike the first Australian episode of lip sewing at the Curtin Detention Centre in Western Australia in February 2000 (Debelle 2000; O'Brien 2000; 'Detainees sew lips in protest' 2000), this event dominated the front pages of the nation's newspapers for about a week. I have selected two news articles to demonstrate how different racial narratives and racialised nation self-definitions drive the construction of print articles. The first article, entitled "Children freed from Woomera 'barbarism'" (Ahwan 2002), appeared in the News Limited Sydney tabloid the *Daily Telegraph*. The second report entitled "Ruddock removes children" (Taylor 2002) appeared in the Fairfax-owned Melbourne broadsheet the *Age*. Both news stories appeared on January 24 2002, following a press conference in which Federal Immigration Minister Phillip Ruddock and South Australian Deputy Premier and Human Services Minister Dean Brown accused asylum seekers of

forcibly sewing the lips of children and promised to remove children from harm's way.

> **Children freed from Woomera 'barbarism'**
> 1. EIGHT children are to be removed from the Woomera detention centre to protect them from having their lips sewn together by protesting asylum seekers (Ahwan 2002).

The "barbarism" of the (adult) asylum seekers is emphasised both in the headline and the lead (Sentence 1, S1). The article frames the event as decent Australians, in the person of the minister and authorities, taking action to "free" children from the depredations of protesting asylum seekers. The report reinforces the distinction between the "innocent" children and the "barbarous" asylum seekers by directly reporting that the children need to be rescued from the adults who are about to sew their lips. It is worth noting the "de-othering" or normalisation of the children, who were of course also asylum seekers and detainees. A "bad parent" narrative about the asylum seekers reinforces the way in which the government and the community (and, by implication, the reader) takes on the mantle of the rescuing "good parent".

The *Age* headline, "Ruddock removes children", constructs the Federal Government less as liberators or good parents than as "removers":

> **Ruddock removes children**
> 1. The Federal Government will remove at least five children from the Woomera detention centre to prevent their involvement in hunger strikes and lip-sewing, Immigration Minister Philip Ruddock said yesterday.
> 2. Five children without parents or guardians at the centre will be removed as soon as possible and placed in community foster care to stop them being coerced into protest actions by adult detainees, Mr Ruddock said. Those being removed are aged under 14, and Mr Ruddock said more may follow.
> 3. The move came on the eighth day of the protest at the troubled centre in outback South Australia. More than 30 detainees at the Maribyrnong detention centre in Melbourne have begun a hunger strike in solidarity (Taylor 2002).

The *Age* is meticulous about its attribution, distancing itself from the minister by using his name three times in two paragraphs. It carefully avoids endorsing the minister's claim that asylum seekers were sewing children's lips. Instead, the reason for removing the children is rendered in much more abstract terms: "to prevent their involvement in hunger strikes and lip sewing" (S1). Moreover, S1 depersonalises "their involvement in hunger strikes and lip-sewing" so that the contrast between adult and child asylum seekers is not drawn as strongly as in the *Daily Telegraph* story, nor does the story call on a good parent/bad parent dichotomy to the same extent.

The narratives of the two articles then diverge even further. In order to build the narrative of "us" rescuing the children, the *Daily Telegraph* report focuses in S3-5 on the background of lip sewing:

> 3. More than 200 detainees have staged a hunger strike at Woomera, including 50 who have stitches in their lips.
> 4. Mr Ruddock said two children had their lips sewn together by adults, who said they would do it again. One child is recovering in hospital after having stitches removed.

5. The action by immigration authorities follows the poisoning last night of seven Woomera detainees who were rushed to hospital after drinking shampoo or detergent.
6. Detainees' protests have also spread to Melbourne's Maribyrnong Detention Centre, where about 25 detainees were last night refusing to eat or drink (Ahwan 2002).

It is now clear that it is Mr Ruddock who has accused asylum seekers of sewing the children's lips. The next sentence (S4) appears to confirm and elaborate the Minister's claim and link it to the increasing number of asylum seekers who have stitched their lips. S5 links back to the lead (S1) "the (authorities') action", although there is only a hazy link between the (self)-poisoning, the lip-sewing and the removal of the children and a possible suggestion that there were children among the detainees who drank shampoo. In S7 we pick up on the rhetoric of "bad parenting" in the mention of "concern" by the South Australian State Government, which introduces Minister Brown's use of the word "barbaric":

3. The decision to remove the children followed growing concern in the South Australian Government, which said some children had been victims of 'barbaric' mutilation (Ahwan 2002).

This is reinforced in S14 and S15:

14. South Australian Human Services Minister Dean Brown said he was disgusted with the treatment of some children.
15. "Any adult who inflicts that sort of pain and suffering and treatment on a child I think is barbaric and totally unacceptable within our community and [I] would want to see action taken and further investigation of the people that carried out such offences," he said. (Ahwan 2002)

The description of lip-sewing as "barbaric" and "totally unacceptable within our community" summons a register of condemnation that would not be as readily available to the Minister if those said to be undertaking the act were not racially and culturally other. Thus, while there is no specific reference in this particular article to the ethnic or religious background of these asylum seekers, the article is part of broader coverage that rehearses the opposition of a criminalised and racialised other and a non-racialised, normalised "community" so the contrast between "their" barbaric act and "our" community acts to further distance the reader, assumed to belong to a homogenised "our" community, from the asylum seeker.

Just as sub-plots in narrative reflect and refract the main plot, so in news, sub-narratives are drawn in to serve a similar purpose (Bell 1991, 1999). In contrast to the *Daily Telegraph*'s narrative of the rescuing of children from barbaric "bad parents", the *Age* article develops a counter narrative (starting at S3) of growing powerful support for the detainees' protest at the "troubled" outback centre:

3. The move came on the eighth day of the protest at the troubled centre in outback South Australia. More than 30 detainees at the Maribyrnong detention centre in Melbourne have begun a hunger strike in solidarity.
4. It also came after Neville Roach, a key adviser to Mr Ruddock, resigned this week in protest at the government's hardline stance on asylum seekers.

5. Mr Roach, chairman of the Council for Multicultural Australia and the Business Advisory Council on Migration, said last night the government needed to process asylum claims more quickly to prevent protests by detainees.
6. The Woomera detainees say they are protesting over the conditions at the centre and visa processing delays (Taylor 2002).

The *Age* gives the resignation of the Minister's key advisor on multicultural issues, Neville Roach, strong news value, placing it high in the story (S4). This, together with the reference to the Maribyrnong protest as "in solidarity" (S3), helps to builds a textured story of a government under attack, as detailed in comments by refugee advocates later in the article. The *Daily Telegraph* only mentions the Roach resignation in a final paragraph, isolated from the article's dominant narrative of the government rescuing asylum seeker children. The *Age* narrative suggests that ordinary decent Australians are not at ease with "the hardline stance" of the Government and that the government is increasingly embattled over the Woomera situation.

While the asylum seekers are the focus of attention, they are curiously passive. They play no active role in the telling of the narrative. The lip-sewing asylum seeker is marked as radically other. However, as an object of attention, the asylum seekers play a significant role in what we might call the drama of the reader's cultural self-definition. They provide the cultural other against which the text constructs an ideal audience and the reader a moral cultural self. The *Daily Telegraph* story of rescue constructs the reader as a "good Australian" repelled by the "barbarism" of the lip sewing and horrified by the asylum seekers' abuse of children and therefore supportive of the Minister's attempt to save them. The *Age* story constructs a "good Australian" reader who is repelled by the barbarism of the treatment of the asylum seekers, suspicious of the government's claims to represent compassion in its hardline stance and uneasy about the regime of mandatory detention. While the latter article presents a more positive view of the plight of the asylum seekers, both use the asylum seeker as an opaque mirror reflecting a different "good Australian" reader. For one, the lip sewer is a touchstone of "barbaric" radical otherness. For the other, the lip-sewer is a touchstone of "our" compassion towards a despairing radical other. In both cases, the asylum seekers remain the *object* of attention – spoken about but unspeaking – the mirror in which the reader defines him or herself as part of an act of national self-definition.

National identity and the Muslim other

Scholars in a range of disciplines adopt a "relational" definition of national identity, arguing that defining an other is an integral part of constructing a national identity. Nasser (2003) holds that:

> identities (gender, race, ethnic, national, etc.) do not stem from an intrinsic essence rather they are constructed in difference from others. The sense of who we are develops in relation to an excluded Other … In many cases, the "Other" is constructed as a negating and differentiated collective from the "We" (Nasser 2003: 1).

Some Australian scholars and commentators (Anti-Discrimination Board of New South Wales 2003; Manning 2004; Poynting & Noble 2004; Poynting et al. 2004) attribute anti-

asylum seeker media rhetoric to Islamophobia, defined by the Runnymede Trust as the "dread or hatred of Islam [leading] to the fear and dislike of all Muslims, and discrimination against Muslims by excluding them from the economic, social, and public life of the nation" (1997). Some vituperative political and media commentators appear to justify Said's (1992) remark that:

> Malicious generalisations about Islam have become the last acceptable form of denigration of foreign culture in the West: what is said about the Muslim mind or character or religion or culture as a whole cannot now be said on mainstream discussion about Africans, Jews, Other Orientals and Asians (1992: xii).

Certainly, themes "othering" Muslims abound in the anti-terrorist and citizenship rhetoric of former Howard government ministers. Former Prime Minister John Howard (Duffy 2006), former Education Minister Brendan Nelson ('Minister Tells Muslims' 2005), and former Treasurer Peter Costello (Gordon & Topsfield 2006), for example, all mobilised narratives of threat and distrust about Muslim communities by focusing on Muslims' supposed unique inability and unwillingness to "integrate" with other Australians. In February, 2006, for example, John Howard said of Australia's Muslim community:

> there is a fragment which is utterly antagonistic to our kind of society, and that is a difficulty … You can't find any equivalent in Italian, or Greek, or Lebanese, or Chinese or Baltic immigration to Australia. There is no equivalent of raving on about jihad, but that is the major problem (Megalogenis 2006).

The Howard government skilfully utilised anti-Muslim feeling in its anti-terrorist rhetoric to demonise asylum seekers in 2001, particularly in the post-September 11 climate. Poynting, Noble, Tabar and Collins commented: "We have seen the emergence of we might call 'the Arab Other' as the pre-eminent folk devil in contemporary Australia" (Poynting et al. 2004).

However the pervasive fear and hatred in negative media constructions of asylum seekers extends far wider than the Muslim other and further back into Australian history. Racial antagonism has traditionally focused on Indigenous Australians and immigrant Chinese and, later, in the late twentieth century, Asian immigration (Gale 2004). Rutland (2003) found parallels between rhetoric describing Muslim asylum seekers in the early twenty-first century and Jewish refugees post-1945. Moreover, the anti-asylum seeker rhetoric of the late twentieth century initially targeted not Muslim but Vietnamese and Cambodian asylum seekers. Goodall and Jakubowicz (1994) show how media use of such rhetoric in depicting Cambodian asylum seekers reinforced hegemonic views of white Australia:

> they allow "us" to say what "we" are not: not them; we are not Asian, not refugees not scared to the edge of insanity, not driven to flee through exhaustion into the totally unknown, lost, without location or place … we are clean uniformed, white, human, ordered, placed, our territory neatly defined (1994: 73).

Critical race and whiteness studies is a useful tool to examine and contest texts across a range of xenophobic and "othering" perspectives, including Islamophobia, anti-Semitism and anti-Asian sentiment. Using this theoretical tool, media constructions of asylum

seekers and their actions can be deconstructed and contextualised.

What is whiteness?

Whiteness is a characteristic both of individuals as embodied subjects and of the economic, social, political, legal and cultural institutions in which power and territory is sought, maintained and defended on the basis of the social construct of race. A constitutive aspect of such a regime is the power to define, represent, include or exclude the other. Whiteness is more about "the power to include and exclude groups and individuals" (Frankenberg 1997: 13) than racial phenotypic characteristics or the practices of excluded groups.

Historically, especially in settler colonies such as Australia, South Africa and the United States, discourses of white racial dominance became a vital technology in the invasion of indigenous peoples and the dispossession from their lands. Frankenberg states "the formation of specifically white subject positions has in fact been key, at times cause and at times as effect, to the socio-political processes inherent in taking land and making nations" (cited in Henderson 2007: 19). Thus Schech and Haggis describe whiteness in the Australian context as "a terrain of structural advantage as well as a standpoint of race privilege" (Schech & Haggis 2004: 180). This spatial metaphor echoes the specific idea of having and holding physical territory and developing a facilitating ideology of possession and governmentality. It can be seen as a strategy of "owning" the nation, described by Ghassan Hage as the right to "worry about the state of the nation and to decide who the strangers are" (cited in Schech & Haggis 2004: 180).

Hostile and unequal relationships between white Australians and racialised others both within and outside the nation-space have been a significant feature of the construction of the culturally dominant conception of the Australian national identity (Gale 2004, 2006). Moreton-Robinson analyses the white regime of power as driven by "the possessive logic of patriarchal white sovereignty [which] naturalise[s] the nation as a white possession" (Moreton-Robinson 2004a: 1). Political, social, economic and cultural domination has been and is exercised with more or less self-consciousness in order to maintain white hegemony. The practical expression of white hegemony is racial and cultural privilege and the ability of white people, purely because of entrenched race privilege, to create and shape institutions, such as the media, which "circulat[e] a coherent set of meanings about white possession as part of common sense knowledge and socially produced conventions which are in accord with, and operate to maintain and strengthen, white cultural hegemony" (Moreton-Robinson 2004a: 1).

As a regime of power, whiteness operates by its epistemological dominance. For Moreton-Robinson, the ability of whiteness to define itself as the norm and the other not only as different, but as threatening or perverse or transgressive gives whiteness its capacity to construct itself as an ontological and epistemological *a priori*. "[W]hiteness is defined by what it is not (animal or liminal) thereby staking an exclusive claim to the truly human" (Moreton-Robinson 2004b: 77-78). Dyer (1997) focuses on de-mystifying white representations of the "other" by racialising white cultural producers, demonstrating their racial privilege in the power to define the other and naturalise whiteness:

> white people create the dominant images in the world

> and don't quite see that they thus construct the world in their own image; white people set standards of humanity by which they are bound to succeed and others bound to fail (Dyer 1997: 9).

Beneficiaries of white racial privilege have been able to racialise a diversity of others, but naming whiteness places all Australians – including researchers such as myself and media workers – in the system of racial privilege. "To speak of whiteness … recognise[s] that all subjects are raced and gendered. Concentrating on whiteness obstructs the potential for people to stand outside of racism" (Wadham 2003: 25).

The whiteness of the media

Media workers and the media system operating within a white regime of cultural power construct the asylum seeker as a raced body in contrast with an "invisible" and normalised white Australian Self. Textual markers of religious, racial or cultural otherness define the asylum seeker as "other", and equally construct the journalist – and the reader – as belonging to the category of "not-other". As Elder, Ellis and Pratt comment, citing Widders and Noble (1993):

> The effect of discursively positioning non-white people in this way is that "their" inclusion in the nation – in both real and metaphorical terms – is then restricted by the parameters of the white "national will"; that is, they are included but only in the dominant group's terms (2004: 210).

The following analysis of news articles does not hinge on a psychological view of racism – whether or not an individual media worker or organisation is "racist" in the sense of antipathetic towards people of another "race", cultural background, or religion. Rather, it acknowledges the social, political, cultural and institutional reality of race privilege and white dominance in Australia's culture and examines the impact of that institutional reality on the way in which news narratives are constructed. I argue that this structural, ontological racism is a significant factor in both negative and positive representations of asylum seekers in the Australian print media.

Speaking for the Other

Journalists structure their reporting around the main narrative of conflict between specific and easily identifiable social actors (Bell 1991, 1999). Silencing asylum seekers by depriving them of publicity was a matter of policy for both the government and the detention centre operators (Kremmer & Banham 2002). But it was also the result of institutional ways in which non-white minorities tend to be under-represented in the media as an out-group (see, for example, Teo 2000; van Dijk, Teun A. 2000a & 2000b; Garcia 2002; Anti-Discrimination Board of New South Wales 2003; Dreher 2003). Despite some exceptions I will discuss below, asylum seekers were effectively "de-voiced" (Teo 2000: 41).

Many news stories therefore focus on what might be seen as surrogate conflicts. For example, a number of the stories focus on conflicts between the Howard government and representatives of civil society – opposition politicians, church leaders, doctors and lawyers, and refugee advocates in non-government organisations. Thus, while asylum seekers' discontents are the precipitating factor for the conflict, the most sharply articulated conflict is within "mainstream" white Australia about

managing national identity through the appropriate treatment of asylum seekers. For example, in Rebecca Di Girolamo's story in the *Australian* of January 24 2002, "Pool visit fails to cool desert", the dominant voice is that of the refugee advocate, lawyer Paul Boylan. As a lawyer, Boylan is a sufficiently "authorised" voice to represent the asylum seekers. In fact when the journalist refers to the asylum seekers as the lawyer's "clients", she elevates their status within the article. They are now not defined only by their outsider (racialised) status as "detainees", but as persons worthy to be represented (by one of us).

The muted voice of the asylum seekers

Articles sympathetic to asylum seekers and giving them "voice" appeared in publications at the time. In the *Age*, an article reported a surreptitious telephone conversation with two of the asylum seekers entitled "Woomera strikers accuse guards of beatings, duress and racism" (Kremmer 2002b). The two asylum seekers referred to by pseudonyms "Aziz" and "Jalil" refute accusations of asylum seekers of sewing children's lips, and indeed compare the minister unfavourably to the Taliban:

> When I came to Australia I didn't know that Philip Ruddock was our enemy. I prefer the Taliban, who only kill people. Here they torture you (Kremmer 2002b).

However, the asylum seekers' authority to represent their concerns rests only in their own individual experience. Unlike the minister or even the refugee advocates, they have no institutional authority. They are described by their place of origin, the length of time they have spent in Australia and their ability to speak English (Kremmer & Banham 2002). Kremmer's commentary locates his sympathies with regard to the asylum seekers. For example, he refers to the "torment of detention" (S15) and says that "the ordeal has crushed Jalil's hopes of freedom in Australia" in S16 (Kremmer 2002b). Kremmer is anxious to help the reader towards a very positive view of the experience that Aziz and Jalil describe, but when it comes to a more journalistically credible "authoritative" insight into the situation in Woomera, the journalist is more or less forced to back up the asylum seeker's voice with one of "our" representatives – in this case, Australian Democrats "distressed" leader Natasha Stott Despoja:

> 14. "There are clearly hundreds of lives on the line in there, people who are lying, some in sun, some in shade, people who are fainting regularly, according to reports to delegates and there are clearly people who have inflicted a degree of self-harm which we have seen. I was shocked" (Kremmer 2002b).

DiGirolamo's article mentioned above also gives some "voice" to asylum seekers. It begins with this lead:

> 1. WHILE Woomera detention staff invited the media to film happy child detainees at the local swimming pool yesterday, the mood remained tense inside the desert compound (DiGirolamo 2002).

Representing detention staff as involved in minor media manipulation decentres their authority to make pronouncements about the nature of the asylum seekers and problematises the media politics involved in representing the situation. The government and, more particularly, the detention centre management is revealed as one of a number of players in the media construction of the asylum

seekers and their actions. The phrase "happy child detainees" (S1) discursively opens up the fact that the children are indeed detainees (that is, racialised) and are being used as exotic "talent" in a media show. Yet this opening allows a very neat reversal to give the detainees and their children "voice". The asylum seeker children (and their parents) are later represented as wrongfooting attempts by the Woomera guards to control them. The "Iranian children", no longer complicit smiling brown faces, manage, despite attempts by detention centre management to foil communications with the media, to sneak a note out to reporters at the swimming pool:

> 14. "Every day we are seeing the people who are trying to kill themselves and we are trying to do this also because die is better than staying here. Please help us. Nobody is listening to us. Please, please, please" (DiGirolamo 2002).

It might be objected that this reading discounts the extent to which the article itself makes use of the "innocence" of the detainee Iranian children to present a counter narrative to that being offered by the Woomera authorities. It is certainly extraordinarily affecting and effective that the note implores the reader and does so with just a hint of an "accent". However, the children's ruse is also an indication of some intelligent and deliberate organisation behind the events. Too often, the asylum seekers are represented as barbaric and unthinking or merely abject and deserving of compassion. It is only rarely in the reporting of the Woomera events that we see indications of the intelligent planning that was necessary to develop a successful campaign by asylum seekers to achieve the resumption of assessments for visas.

In general, however, articles tend to focus on the politics of immigration detention, in which the fate of the detainees appears secondary. The dominant white culture arrogates to itself the sense of "owning" and defining the nation and takes upon itself the right to "worry" about the state of the nation and to decide who the strangers are. From the perspective of the press, the news issues are about the white subject, and the expression of, and the limits to, white generosity. Elder, Ellis and Pratt suggest that:

> the management of non-white people in the white nation-space is ordered in terms of a relationship where white people assume that their place is at the centre or core of the nation, defined in relation to both internal non-white others and external non-white margins or periphery (2004: 209).

They're a weird mob

Positive articles, too, reflect this management of national identity. For example, Christopher Kremmer's colour piece "Asylum seekers encounter new world outside fences" (*Age*, January 22, 2002) about asylum seekers' first days of liberation from Woomera turns on the theme of belonging and "fitting in" as an Australian.

The article begins with a metaphorical re-birth moment:

> 1. They emerged yesterday into the blinding glare of an Adelaide summer's day, a handful of Afghans, Iraqis and Iranians, after being released on Wednesday from Woomera detention centre on three-year temporary protection visas (Kremmer 2002a).

Kremmer is a compassionate observer, inviting the reader to see the Australian world through the gaze of the asylum seeker. The polarities of difference are marked in the contrast between "Adelaide" and the "Afghans, Iraqis and Iranians" (S1). Summarising the asylum seeker's "voyage" into the welfare bureaucracy as "the drip feed, just enough to keep people going", Kremmer provides an insight into the way "we" treat the asylum seekers. The response of the "ordinary Australian" is provided in comments, both harsh and kind, by "Brett Heath, 30, a long-term guest from Port Pirie", a regional industrial city in South Australia. Kremmer describes his "matey praise mixed with dour reserve" as "very Australian":

> 9. "We can't have a flood of refugees breaking down the walls and getting into Australia. It'll put too much pressure on our infrastructure," he says.
> 10. But in the next breath he informs us that "from what I've seen these people would make ideal migrants. They're intelligent, well-dressed and unfailingly polite and considerate" (Kremmer 2002a).

The discourse of appraisal and judgment that permeates the text is not one way. Kremmer gives us brief glimpses of the asylum seekers also making judgments of their new land, the drunks and garishness of the street, assessing the possibilities in their future. Constructing asylum seekers through a lens of domestic life, Kremmer portrays them as "ordinary", cooking and eating, coping with money – the same as "us".

Yet their marginality is manifest. They are confronted by a capricious and all-powerful "we" – an entire Australian nation – the bureaucracy, Woomera, the narrator and the reader – perhaps in uneasy, unwilling alliance. Kremmer's use, then, of the expression "weird mob" in S17, his last paragraph, is surprising:

> 17. As they head off into the city for another encounter with the bureaucracy, they make a weird mob, all shapes and sizes with no apparent dress code. Some educated, some not. But somehow you just know they're going to fit in (Kremmer 2002a).

The term may be an ironic reference to the iconic book *They're a weird mob* (Culotta 1958) produced by Irish-Australian John O'Grady under the *nom de plume* of Nino Culotta, a northern Italian journalist. Culotta praises Australians as a "weird mob" into which it is right and appropriate that immigrants should assimilate. The words "they", "them" and "their" are prominent in Kremmer's article. The repetitions of the third person plural tend stylistically to distance the asylum seekers from the reader. The sudden use of the word "you" in the informal sense to mean "I" or "one" draws the reader into a semantic alliance with the narrator in defining the group as an acceptable other and assuring us that they will "fit in".

bell hooks underlines the attachment of white people to the normativity of whiteness. She cites the "deep emotional investment in the myth of sameness even as their actions reflect the primacy of whiteness as a sign of who they are and what they think" (cited in Dyer 1997: 2). Kremmer's intention appears as advocacy. But in effect, he invites the reader into exercising the decision Prime Minister Howard proposed. The article offers "them" to "us" for compassion and judgment. "We" too are deciding "who comes here and the circumstances in which they come". The decision Kremmer prefers may be different, but implicit in the context is a reinforcement

of the white reader's privileged position of being able to make the choice about national belonging.

In Kremmer's article, asylum seekers become exemplars in the national debate about the nature of an Australia produced by those positioned as being able to make those choices. While the focus is on "sameness", the significant difference is overlooked. The question *not* posed is what will they "fit in" to and how. As "Third-World looking" immigrants, they may be compelled to join us as what Hage describes as "the tame and domesticated animal whose will has been subjugated as the very condition of belonging to the domesticated space of the Australian national will" (Hage 1996). Will they "fit in" in the sense that they too will become a minority on the margins like the "internal non-white others and external non-white margins or periphery" (Elder, Ellis & Pratt 2004: 209)?

Conclusions

Taking a critical race and whiteness perspective, this article argues that a structural, ontological racism operates in Australian culture, including its print media. I have suggested that the figure of the asylum seeker functions as a device through which news texts celebrate particular kinds of Australian-ness. In both the positive and the negative narratives, the opaque asylum seeker reflects another character: the constructed "good white Australian" reader reflected and refracted through these different constructions. The depictions of asylum seekers are an exchange of white projections and imaginings about the racialised other. These depictions give the imagined white reader the opportunity to be reflected as compassionate and decent in either supporting or opposing the stance of the government. What the reader sees in the asylum seeker other is what we/they desire and fear in them/ourselves. Readers may construct them/ourselves as tough and unwilling to be "suckered" into offering succour to "barbarians" – generous to those who deserve out generosity but firm in their stand against those who would invade "our" territory. Or readers may construct them/ourselves as cosmopolitan and appalled at the bureaucratic insensitivity and ruthlessness of the government's stand.

Only fleetingly is the voice of asylum seekers heard in these texts. And never is that voice unmediated. Marginal even among the most marginal, the voice of the asylum seeker other plays a secondary role in a mediated national conversation about ways of being "good" Australians. The implicit definition of this Australian reader lies within a narrow range permitted in the hegemonic narrative. In fact, many actual readers – Indigenous, non-white, culturally diverse, in other ways marginal – may find themselves interpellated by these texts only obliquely, as when a stranger hails us mistakenly as a friend. "Who, me?" For the hegemonic narrative only prevails over multiple silencings. The asylum seekers' act in sewing their lips was disruptive and unsettling not only because it symbolised the truth of the silencing they experienced, but also because it was a token of other equally violent silencings necessary to maintain the dominant white song.

Author Note

Ron Hoenig is a PhD student in journalism and cultural studies at the University of South Australia. His doctoral research focuses on the Australian print media's depiction of asylum seekers. Ron has a background in the arts and multiculturalism, is involved in interfaith

activity and has worked as an editor and journalist in the South Australian education department.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the organisers of the Re-orienting Whiteness Conference, and especially the Post Graduate Symposium for the opportunity to present the first version of this paper. In particular, I would like to thank Aileen Moreton-Robinson for her sympathetic reading and even more sympathetic questioning and an anonymous referee who helped me to structure a sharper and I hope more incisive final paper. I would also like to acknowledge the work of Susan Annetay Henderson, whose Masters thesis, entitled "Terror in the Streets?: Whiteness and Media Reporting on Aboriginal Crime in Adelaide", has helped me to solidify my thinking on whiteness theory and Othering in the media.

References

Ahwan, L. 2002. 'Children Freed From Woomera "Barbarism"', *Daily Telegraph*, 24 January, 9.

Anti-Discrimination Board of New South Wales. 2003. *Race for the Headlines-Racism and Media Discourse Full Report*, Sydney: Anti-Discrimination Board of New South Wales.

Bell, A. 1991, *The Language of News Media*, Oxford: Blackwell.

——1997. The Discourse Structure of News Stories, in A. Bell and P. Garrett (eds.) *Approaches to Media Discourse*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 64-104.

——1999. News Stories as Narratives, in A. Jaworski and N. Coupland (eds.) *The Discourse Reader*, London: Routledge, 236-251.

Culotta, N. 1958. *They're a Weird Mob*, London: Kaye.

Debelle, P 2000, 'Behind the Wire at Curtin', *Age*, 3 May, 3.

'Detainees Sew Lips in Protest'. 2000. *Sunday Times*, February 6, 305.

DiGirolamo, R. 2002. 'Pool Visit Fails to Cool Desert Protest - THE REFUGEE HUNGER STRIKE', *Australian*, January 24, 4.

Dreher, T. 2003. 'Speaking Up and Talking Back: News Media Interventions in Sydney's "Othered" Communities', *Media International Australia incorporating Culture and Policy*, 109, 121-137.

Duffy, C. 2006. 'PM Stands by Muslim Integration Comments', *ABC News Online*, <http://www.abc.net.au/news/newsitems/200609/s1730918.htm>, accessed 11 November 2008.

Dyer, R. 1997. *White*, New York: Routledge.

Elder, C., Ellis, C. & Pratt, A. 2004. Whiteness in Constructions of Australian Nationhood: Indigenes, Immigrants and Governmentality, in A. Moreton-Robinson (ed.) *Whitening Race: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra, 208-221.

Frankenberg, R. 1997. *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Gale, P. 2004. 'The Refugee Crisis and Fear: Populist Politics and Media Discourse', *Journal of Sociology*, 40(4), 321-340.

——2006. 'Fear, Race and National Identity', *Dialogue*, 25(3), 36-42.

Garcia, A. 2002. 'Anti-immigrant Racism and the Media', *Media Alliance*, <http://mediaalliance2.live.radicaldesigns.org/article.php?id=433>, accessed 11 June 2009.

Goodall, H. and Jakubowicz, A. 1994. *Racism, Ethnicity and the Media*, St Leonards: Allen & Unwin.

Gordon, J. and Topsfield, J. 2006. 'Our Values or Go Home: Costello', *Age*,

24 February, <http://www.theage.com.au/news/national/our-values-or-go-home-costello/2006/02/23/1140670207642.html>, accessed 7 June 2008.

Hage, G. 1996. 'Ethnic Caging in a Multicultural Nation', Boat People Symposium, Centre for Research in Culture and Communication, Murdoch University, <http://wwwmcc.murdoch.edu.au/ReadingRoom/boat/Hage.html>, accessed 13 June 2009.

Henderson, S.A. 2007. 'Whiteness and Media Reporting on Aboriginal Crime in Adelaide', Masters Thesis, Department of Women's Studies, Flinders University.

Kremmer, C. 2002a. 'Asylum Seekers Encounter New World Outside Fences – WOOMERA', *Age*, 26 January, 5.

——2002b. 'Woomera Strikers Accuse Guards of Beatings, Duress and Racism', *Age*, 25 January, 6.

Kremmer, C. and Banham, C. 2002. 'Hunger Strikers Deny Stitching Children's Mouths', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 January, 4.

Manning, P. 2004. *Dog Whistle Politics and Journalism: Reporting Arabic and Muslim People in Sydney Newspapers*, Broadway: Australian Centre for Independent Journalism.

Megalogenis, G. 2006. 'PM Hits at "Jihad" Muslims', *Australian*, 20 February, 1.

'Minister Tells Muslims: Accept Aussie Values or "Clear Off"'. 2005. *ABC News Online*, <http://www.abc.net.au/news/newsitems/200508/s1445181.htm>, accessed 11 November 2008.

Moreton-Robinson, A. 2004a. 'The Possessive Logic of Patriarchal White Sovereignty: The High Court and the Yorta Yorta Decision', *Borderlands*, 3(2), <http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol3no2_2004/moreton_possessive.htm>, accessed 11 June 2009.

——2004b. Whiteness, Epistemology and Indigenous Representation, in A. Moreton-Robinson (ed.) *Whitening Race: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 75- 88.

Nasser, R. 2003. *Othering and Identity: Exclusion Practices in Israeli and Jordanian School Textbooks*, Atlanta: Atlanta Hill Hotel.

O'Brien, N. 2000. 'Court Hits Out at "Nerve" of Protesting Detainees', *Australian*, 8 February, 7.

Poynting, S. and Noble, G. 2004. L*iving with Racism: The Experience and Reporting by Arab and Muslim Australians of Discrimination, Abuse and Violence since 11 September 2001*, Canberra: The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.

Poynting, S., Noble, G., Tabar, P., Collins, J. & Sydney Institute of Criminology. 2004. *Bin Laden in the Suburbs: Criminalising the Arab Other*, Sydney: Sydney Institute of Criminology.

Runnymede Trust. 1997. *Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All: Summary*, <http://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/islamophobia.pdf >, accessed 11 June 2009.

Rutherford, J. 2000. *The Gauche Intruder: Freud, Lacan and the White Australian Fantasy*, Carlton: Melbourne University Press.

——2003. 'Cutting Ordinary: An ABC True Story', *Australian Humanities Review*, 28, <http://www.australianhumanitiesreview.org/archive/Issue-Jan-2003/rutherford1.html>, accessed May 30 2009.

Rutland, S.D. 2003. 'Postwar Anti-Jewish Refugee Hysteria: A Case of Racial or Religious Bigotry?' *Journal of Australian Studies*, 77, 69-79.

Said, E.W. 1992. *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine*

How We See the Rest of the World, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Schech, S. & Haggis, J. 2004. Terrains of Migrancy and Whiteness: How British Migrants Locate Themselves in Australia, in A. Moreton-Robinson (ed.) *Whitening Race: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 176-191.

Taylor, K. 2002. 'Ruddock Removes Children', *Age*, 24 January, 1.

Teo, P. 2000. 'Racism in the News: A Critical Discourse Analysis of News Reporting in Two Australian newspapers', *Discourse and Society*, 11(1), 7-49.

van Dijk, T.A. 1991. *Racism and the Press*, London: Routledge.

——2000a. Ideologies, Racism, Discourse: Debates on Immigration and Ethnic Issues, in J. ter Wal and M. Verkuyten (eds.) *Comparative Perspectives on Racism*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 91-115.

——2000b. New(s) Racism: A Discourse Analytical Approach, in S. Cottle (ed.) *'Race', Racism and the Mass Media*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 33-49.

——2004. 'Knowledge and News', *Revista Canaria e Estudios Ingleses*, 49, 71-86.

Wadham, B. 2003. 'What is Whiteness? Authenticity, Dominance, Identity', Paper presented at the Placing Race and Localising Whiteness Conference, Flinders University, Adelaide.

Notes

[i] I use the term "good (White) Australian" as Rutherford has to describe the way highly valued moral qualities in the (white) Australian sense of self – a fair go, egalitarianism, the democratic refusal of visible hierarchies, the cult of the battler, of everyman – have been "the constant accompaniment to acts of aggression in Australian history: the genocide, the White Australia policy, the Stolen Generation and now the desubjectivisation and incarceration of refugees". Influenced by Lacan and Freud, Rutherford argues that "we cannot understand these acts of aggression and restore them to cultural memory unless we recognise the central role that morality plays in their perpetuation" (Rutherford, 2003).

THE TAXONOMIC GAZE: LOOKING AT WHITENESS FROM EAST TO WEST

VERA MACKIE

Abstract

In this article I consider representations of whiteness which emanate from outside the Euro-American centres. I argue that it is necessary to understand how whiteness has been seen by non-white observers, and that we need to be sensitive to local taxonomies of difference which are not always reducible to the white/non-white distinction which is hegemonic in the Euro-American centres. I consider the works of some artists and writers from early twentieth century Japan who are sensitive to their positioning in international hierarchies and who attempt to place themselves in a position of power in these gendered, classed, ethnicised and racialised hierarchies through their deployment of what I call the "taxonomic gaze". I argue that the concept of whiteness needs to be historicised and provincialised, and that the field of whiteness studies itself also needs to be historicised.

Introduction

> In 1921, I left Japan and headed for France. The ship had hardly docked in Shanghai before my fellow passengers, from curiosity to know a Western woman, went to visit the white-walled western building with the red light. There they were taken by the golden hair of the Polish Jewish women and the Russian refugee women, enchanted by the charm of blue eyes, and returned to the ship singing paeans. I was the only one who celebrated the beauty of the slender bamboo-like figures of the Chinese women, and did not listen to their stories. It was the same when we docked in Hong Kong. To them, the Malay and Indian women just seemed like *sauvages.* For me, however, they gave me a sense of *aesthetiquement beauté* (Fujita 1984: 57).[i]

This account comes from Fujita [Foujita] Tsuguharu's essay on the "Women of the World", and provides a relatively rare example of a man from outside the Euro-American centres exercising a powerful gaze on the peoples of the world. Foujita is an artist who travelled from Japan to Paris in the 1920s, where he was also able to exercise the powerful gaze of a painter.[ii] The passage above reflects a taxonomic attitude which places all of the peoples in the world in hierarchies of value, in this case in gendered hierarchies of beauty. In this article I will explore manifestations of this attitude in the writings of selected cultural producers from Japan in the 1920s. However, in order to situate this particular taxonomic gaze, we first need to locate this study within recent developments in the field of whiteness studies.

Provincialising Whiteness

In his pioneering book, *White*, Richard Dyer commented that the study of "race" had hitherto meant the study of "any racial imagery other than that of

ISSN 1832-3898

white people" (1997: 1). Dyer conceptualised his own project as being about

> the racial imagery of white people – not the images of other races in white cultural production, but the latter's imagery of white people themselves. This is not done merely to fill a gap in the analytic literature, but because there is something at stake in looking at, or continuing to ignore, white racial imagery. As long as race is something only applied to non-white peoples, as long as white people are not racially seen and named, they/we function as a human norm. Other people are raced, we are just people (Dyer 1997: 1).

Over a decade later, Dyer's comments about the racialisation of white people probably seem quite self-evident. Dyer first commented on representations of racialised others by those who spoke from a dominant and unmarked position. He then extended this discussion to consider how these "white" people had represented themselves, and produced their own "whiteness" in opposition to a series of racialised others. It is also, however, necessary to consider how those positioned outside that sphere have critiqued the self-representations of those positioned as "white". (Lake 2007; hooks 1981; Gates 1981; Fujikawa 2005). A further development might involve readings of how "whiteness" has appeared in the texts of those who have been positioned as "non-white". We need to historicise whiteness and to provincialise it:[iii] that is, to demonstrate that the concept of whiteness has a specific history in particular localised cultural and social contexts, and that the concept cannot easily be generalised beyond those contexts. Similarly, the field of whiteness studies itself needs to be historicised and placed in its specific academic and intellectual context in the (mainly) Anglophone Euro-American academy at the turn of the twenty-first century.

In reading texts which have been produced outside the Euro-American sphere where whiteness acts as a privileged signifier of difference, we can not assume that the concepts, discourses and debates around racialisation can simply be translated into another sphere. The dynamics of difference will be expressed in very specific terms in particular local contexts. For example, in South Asia, there has apparently been a valuing of paler skin which was quite independent of the encounter with Europe (Robb 1995: 1–76). Or, in Japan, there is a form of white facial make-up which is associated with specific professions or theatrical performances, with nothing to do with racialisation (Kazami 1997).

In specific contexts, racialised meanings may be attributed according to the shape of facial features, the relative presence or absence of body hair, specific bodily odours, or the proportions of the body, rather than just skin colour. These features interact with dress, adornment, deportment, the dressing of hair, and the modification of bodies through such practices as shaving, piercing, or tattooing. Similarly, the semantic field encompassed by the signifier "white" cannot be expected to translate neatly across languages. In each language, the local equivalent of the colour "white" will have specific associations and connotations.

In this article, I consider some representations of whiteness from the early decades of the twentieth century in Japan. By this time, intellectuals in Japan had been exposed to the ideologies of racial hierarchy which

emanated from Europe and the United States. These had particular relevance in Japan, which had faced the threat of colonisation by Europe and the United States. By the 1920s, the Japanese government had managed to renegotiate the unequal treaties with the United States, Britain and other European powers; had forged an alliance with Britain; and had acquired its own colonies in East Asia. In the First World War, Japan had been allied with the Anglophone powers, but nevertheless was unsuccessful in its campaign for a racial equality clause in the Charter of the newly-formed League of Nations. Japanese national identity was always, then, defined with reference to both the Euro-American powers and other Asian countries. These international geopolitical hierarchies were naturalised according to the discourses of racialisation, and ideologies of racial hierarchy were given local inflections in Japan (Morris-Suzuki 1998; Oguma 2002). As Dyer has commented, with respect to more recent manifestations of hierarchical thought, race was "never not a factor, never not in play" (Dyer 1997: 1).

In early twentieth century East Asia, cultural representations were integrated into international circuits which referenced the circulation of signs, products, practices, finance and capital which have been associated with the condition of "colonial modernity". Tani Barlow has emphasised the "interrelatedness of colonizing powers and colonial regimes" and has drawn our attention to the "colonial commodities (e.g. opium, tea, labour), reordered styles of governmentality, juridical norms (e.g. international laws and treaties), administrative innovations (e.g. customs, extraterritoriality, treaty ports), and colonial trade in ideas that characterize colonizers … as well as colonial regimes" (Barlow 2004: 7; see also Barlow 1997: 1–20).

In this article I explore some cultural representations whereby artists and writers trained in early-twentieth century Japan gazed on whiteness and thereby constituted their own gendered, classed, sexualised, racialised, and ethnicised positionings in the taxonomies of difference in East Asia and beyond. The three case studies involve male artists whose work ranged across the literary and the visual: Tanizaki Jun'ichirô (1886–1965), a novelist with an intense interest in visuality (See Lamarre 2005); Koide Narashige (1887–1931), an artist and essayist who collaborated with Tanizaki; and Fujita Tsuguharu (1886–1968), another painter who used the essay form to reflect on his artistic practice. In the works of these artists, the themes of gender, visuality and racialisation intersect. Their works are characterised by what I call a "taxonomic gaze", a gaze which classifies, categorises, and produces hierarchies.

Naomi, the Modern Girl

Novelist Tanizaki Jun'ichirô published an essay some time after the Great Kantô Earthquake of 1923. In this essay Tanizaki set out his hopes for the renewal of Tokyo, which included the rebuilding of the physical infrastructure of the city, and a vision for the wholesale renovation of Japanese culture, with a particular focus on the figure of the Japanese woman.

> The change will be so great it will be almost as if they belonged to a different race. Their figures, the color of their skin and of their eyes will become like those of Western people, and even the Japanese they speak will have the ring of a European language (Tanizaki 1934; trans. in Keene 1984: 751).

This faith in the power of culture to transform the very bodies of the people seems surprising to modern readers. Notwithstanding the scientific and sociological debunking of the category of "race", we are used to thinking of "race" as a property of bodies, something which cannot easily be modified by culture. It is implicitly assumed that the meanings attached to bodies are infinitely malleable, albeit within specific regimes of power, but that the bodies themselves cannot so easily be transformed. Tanizaki's statement, is, of course, the rhetorical flourish of a novelist-turned-essayist, and does not stand up to excessive scrutiny. Nevertheless, when read in conjunction with his novel, *Chijin no Ai* (*A Fool's Love*, 1985[1925]), it does suggest an engagement with some more fluid and unstable discourses of racialisation.

A Fool's Love focuses on a white-collar salaried worker, Jôji, and his relationship with the café waitress Naomi. Jôji marries Naomi in the expectation that she can be trained as a suitable companion, and he provides her with lessons, in English conversation, singing and social dancing. They live together in the former studio of an artist and his model. Naomi has been described as the archetypal example of the *moga*, or "modern girl". The *moga*, in turn, has been seen as one of the symbols of artistic modernism and of early twentieth century Japanese modernity (Sato 2003, *passim;* Mackie 2007; Mackie in press). In the first half of the twentieth century in disparate places around the world, attention was focused on modern girls like "Naomi". They challenged mainstream representations of domesticity and femininity; were characterised by distinctive dress and commodities; experimented with alternative romantic relationships outside the sphere of the marital home and the nuclear family; and ventured into the public spaces of the city, where they could be seen by others and return the gaze (Conor 2002: 53–4; Conor 2004; see also Barlow 2006: 26–8).

Naomi wears a bricolage of Japanese *kimono*, western dress and Indian fabrics. Her style is reminiscent of the women described by the Modern Girl Around the World Research Group, women who "occupied the liminal space conjoining the indigenous and the imperial, the national and the international", and who "combined and reconfigured aesthetic elements drawn from disparate national, colonial and racial regimes to create a 'cosmopolitan look'" (2005: 246). In a similar vein, Thomas Lamarre has described such women in Tanizaki's novels as "an overdetermined image of transgressive intercourse … a site where so many different tensions or contradictions are condensed and materialized … a literal place of intercourse between different races, cultures and nations" (2005: 135).

One of the attractions of Naomi is that she cannot be placed comfortably either inside or outside the category of Japanese. This starts with her very name. Although the name "Naomi" is well-formed as a given name for a Japanese woman, particularly when written in Sino-Japanese characters, it is also a common-enough name in the English-speaking world. This suggestion of indeterminate linguistic genealogy is emphasised in the narrator's choice to write Naomi's name in the *katakana* script reserved for foreign words rather than any of the other choices available (Tanizaki 1984[1925]: 8).

Vernacular Taxonomies

Naomi is placed in a shifting hierarchy shaped by class, gender and racialisation. There is a taxonomy of

different types of women in the novel, from the most refined of middle-class Japanese women, to the Russian countess and dance teacher, Madame Shlemskaya. There is also a more localised taxonomy of women in the theatres and dance halls of urban Tokyo. Naomi is a long way from the refined middle-class ladies and the "white countess" Madame Shlemskaya, but may be placed precisely in a hierarchical relationship with the other women in the dance halls. The actress, Kirako, for example, seems a charismatic and refined figure in the world of the dance hall, but as an actress, she would be beyond the pale for respectable middle-class families. Kirako's beauty references elite consumer products, appropriate for a woman who is herself a commodity, a spectacle to be consumed by the patrons of the theatre.

> Kirako … gave the impression of a precious object that's been scrupulously polished with the highest art … when she sat down at the table and picked up her cocktail glass, her hand, from the palm to the wrist, looked wonderfully slender, so light it could barely support the weight of her softly draping sleeve … If they'd been flowers, Naomi would have bloomed in a field, and Kirako indoors. How thin, almost transparent was that little nose on her firm, round face! Not even a baby – only a doll made by the greatest master – could have such a delicate nose! Last of all, I noticed her teeth; Naomi had always been proud of hers but Kirako's were rows of pearls (Tanizaki 1986: 92).

Naomi can, however, look down on another woman, Mâ-chan, who presents the spectacle of an unsuccessful racialised masquerade, a monstrous and carnivalesque image of mismatched colours.

> Her cheeks were red, her eyes large, and her lips thick, but the oval outline of her face, with its long, thin nose, was in the pure Japanese style of the ukiyoe prints. I pay close attention to women's faces, and I'd never seen such an ill-assorted face as this. It occurred to me that the woman was probably distressed by her Japanese face and had worked overtime to look like a Westerner [*Seiyô-kusaku*]. She'd whitened [*o-shiroi ga nutte ari*] every bit of exposed skin until she looked like she'd been dusted with rice flour, and applied shiny, blue-green pigment around her eyes. The bright red on her cheeks was obviously rouge. Unfortunately, with that ribbon twisted around her head, she looked like a monster (Tanizaki 1986: 83-4).

Naomi suffers, however, in comparison with Madame Shlemskaya, who is associated with the whiteness of fabrics such as georgette and precious stones such as diamonds.

> She had the grave dignity and firm features of a born aristocrat; and her dignity was enhanced by her pale, limpid complexion – so white [*sôhaku o obita*] it was a little frightening. Seeing her authoritative expression, her tasteful clothes, and the jewels glittering on her breast and fingers, I found it hard to believe she was as poor as I had been told (Tanizaki 1986: 60-1).

A meeting between Madame Shlemskaya and Naomi allows for further comparisons and further refinement of the taxonomy.

> Naomi flushed bright red and shook hands furtively without saying a word. I was even worse when my turn came. To tell the truth, I couldn't look at the

> countess's pale [*aojiroi*], sculptured face. Her hand glittered with countless tiny diamonds as I touched it silently. I didn't raise my eyes (Tanizaki 1986: 66).

The narrator's comments on Madame Shlemskaya's body odour reflect commonly-held views of racialisation at this time. Non-Japanese bodies were thought to have a distinctive smell, due to the consumption of animal products, such as milk, butter and meat. Indeed, one epithet used to describe Europeans and Americans was *batâ-kusai*, "smelling of butter". In addition, the application of perfume directly to the body, rather than the use of incense to perfume clothing, was a cultural practice which distinguished Japanese and non-Japanese (Adachi 2006: 19-38). We can also see the closely linked attitudes of anxiety and fascination, fear and desire, which are evoked by whiteness in the novel.[iv]

> What's more, [the countess's] body had a certain sweet fragrance … I'm told that Westerners do have strong body odor, but to me, the faint, sweet-sour combination of perfume and perspiration was not at all displeasing – to the contrary, I found it deeply alluring. It made me think of lands across the sea I'd never seen, of exquisite, exotic flower gardens.
>
> "This is the fragrance exuded by the countess's white body [*shiroi karada*]!" I told myself, enraptured, as I inhaled the aroma greedily (Tanizaki 1986: 69).

The most interesting feature of the novel, however, is the shifting racialisation of Naomi herself. She is said to look like someone of "mixed blood", although there is no specific question raised in the novel about her parentage (Tanizaki 1986: 10).[v] Rather, her body shifts in categorisation through her skilled manipulation of dress, deportment, demeanour, gesture and cosmetics. After a trip to the beach, the narrator watches the progress of sunburn, suntan, peeling and finally once again the paling of the skin as the effects of the sun wear off. Naomi's appearance on the beach in her swimsuit causes a lyrical reflection on the beauty of her body. The narrator expresses delight at the physical proportions of her body, the straightness of her limbs, the deportment which she has learned from watching Hollywood movies, and the added aura of the Hollywood-style swimsuit, purchased on the Ginza, the place most closely associated with the gendered and commodified modernity of the modern girl:

> my heart cried out, "Naomi, Naomi, my Mary Pickford! What a fine, well-proportioned body you have. Your graceful arms! Your legs, straight and streamlined like a boy's!" And I couldn't help thinking of Mack Sennett's lively "bathing beauties", whom I'd seen in the movies (Tanizaki 1986: 28).

The following passage not only suggests the importance of deportment in racialised categorisations, but also a process of training to achieve specific forms of deportment.

> Apparently she studied the actresses' movements when we went to the movies, because she was very good at imitating them. In an instant she could capture the mood and idiosyncrasies of an actress. Pickford laughs like this, she'd say; Pina Menicheli moves her eyes like this; Geraldine Farrar does her hair up this way. Loosening her hair, she'd push it

> into this shape and that (Tanizaki 1986: 37).

At times, Naomi wears Japanese dress – *kimono* – with the particular form of white make-up which was applied at that time by women. This make-up (*o-shiroi*, or "white") is sometimes translated as "powder", but is, in fact, a paste. Furthermore, the meaning of this white make-up shifts according to context. When Mâ-chan, above, wore such make-up with western dress, it was seen as an unsuccessful attempt to masquerade as "white". When Naomi wears this make-up with her *kimono*, it takes on different connotations, for this white make-up is perfectly appropriate with japanese dress.

> "Well? A good choice don't you think?" Dissolving white powder [*o-shiroi*] in her hands, [Naomi] patted it vigorously on her steaming shoulders and nape as she spoke.
>
> To tell the truth, the soft flowing material [of the *kimono*] wasn't very becoming on her full shoulders, large hips, and prominent bust. Muslin or common silk cloth gave her the exotic beauty of a Eurasian girl [*ainoko*], but a more formal kimono, like this one, only made her look vulgar. And when she wore a bold pattern, she looked like a chophouse woman in one of those places in Yokohama that cater to foreign sailors (Tanizaki 1986: 80–1).

It is rather Naomi's classed positioning which is the source of incongruity. For a vulgar woman like Naomi to wear the *kimono* of a respectable woman results in a dissonance which, nevertheless, has racialised connotations. Here, racialised anxiety is a matter of contagion rather than an essential property of the body. There is an anxiety about Japanese women who provide sexual services to non-Japanese customers in former treaty ports like Yokohama. Naomi can also be connected with the former treaty port of Yokohama through her consumption of imported goods. At home, she dresses her body in exotic imported fabrics, and their house is decorated in bohemian style with cheap Indian cotton and calico.

White Nights

Most fascinating and challenging, however, is that Naomi's very body is transformed in the course of the novel. The narrator keeps a diary where he records the transformations of her body from adolescence to adulthood, as they share their life in the "culture house".[vi] The diary and photographs seem like a parody, or perhaps a vernacularisation, of the scientific and medical discourses whereby the truth of racial difference is thought to be something that can be defined and captured through testing, measuring and documentation (Anderson 2002: *passim*). However, the very transmutability of Naomi's body provides a challenge to these discourses of racialisation.

> *At 8 p.m. I bathed her in the washtub. She still has her tan from the beach. She's very dark, except under the bathing suit. I'm dark, too, but Naomi has such a light complexion, the contrast is sharper. Even when she has nothing on, you'd think she was wearing a suit. "You look like a Zebra," I said. She laughed.*
>
> About a month later, on October 17, I wrote:
>
> *Her tan is fading and her skin doesn't peel any more. It's even smoother and lovelier than before* (Tanizaki 1986: 33).

In a pivotal scene, the narrator contemplates Naomi's sleeping body. This is no longer the suntanned body of the bathing beauty, but a wholly new vision of whiteness.

> Taking care not to waken her, I sat by her sleeping pillow, and stealthily gazed at her sleeping form … A book lay open at her nose … My eyes moved back and forth between the pure white Western paper [*junpaku na seiyôshi*] in the book and the whiteness [*shirosa*] of her breast (Tanizaki 1986: 120).

The reference to the whiteness of paper is perhaps unsurprising for a literary figure who grew up in a household of printers. The association with paper might also suggest, however, the literary reference points for Tanizaki's explorations of whiteness.[vii] The chimerical and chameleonic nature of Naomi's body reaches its ultimate expression in this scene. Naomi's skin shifts from yellow (*kiiroi*) to white (*shiroi*), but this whiteness has a distinctive quality. Naomi's whiteness is displaced from discourses of racialisation, but also problematises the association of whiteness with purity. Her whiteness is "wrapped in tatters, amid soiled, dusty quilts", a necrophiliac whiteness associated with death and melancholy, a paradoxical whiteness which is associated with the darkness of night-time rather than the light of day.

> Naomi's skin looked yellow [*kiiroku*] one day and white [*shiroku*] another; but it was extraordinary limpid when she was fast asleep, or had just awakened, as though all the fat in her body had melted away. *Night* is usually associated with *darkness*; but to me, night always brought thoughts of the whiteness [*shirosa*] of Naomi's skin. Unlike the bright, shadowless whiteness of noon, it was a whiteness wrapped in tatters, amid soiled, dusty quilts; and that drew it to me all the more … her face, too, radiant and kaleidoscopic by day, now wore a mysterious cast, a melancholy frown, like that of one who's just swallowed bitter medicine, or of one who's been strangled. I loved her sleeping face … "Her death-face would be beautiful, too", I often told myself (Tanizaki 1986: 120-121).[viii]

Under Western Eyes

Thus far I have explored the shifting, chimerical and chameleonic properties of the body of Naomi in the eyes of the narrator. The narrator's view of the shifting racial categorisation of Naomi's body suggests a fluid, non-essentialist view of racialisation. There is, however, a limit to this fluidity. In the end, Naomi is a Japanese woman. The narrator's relationship with Naomi is a way of managing his fascination with and fear of whiteness.

> Though I had no sense for such things, my tastes ran to the chic and up-to-date, and I imitated the Western style in everything. My readers already know so much. If I'd had enough money to do whatever I pleased, I might have gone to live in the West and married a Western woman, but my circumstances wouldn't permit that, and I married Naomi, a Japanese woman with a Western flavour. Even if I had been rich, I would have had no confidence in my looks. I'm only five feet two inches tall; I have a dark complexion, and my teeth are snaggly. I'd be forgetting my place if I hoped for a wife with the majestic physique of a Westerner. A Japanese should marry a Japanese, I concluded, and Naomi came closest to meeting my needs. I was satisfied (Tanizaki 1986: 67).

For most of the novel, the narrator and protagonist, Jôji, has been the bearer of the gaze, casting his powerful taxonomic eye over a series of women, and placing them in a strict hierarchy according to racialised standards of beauty. In a scene reminiscent of John Berger's (1977) discussion of women who constantly imagine themselves under the gaze of a man, Jôji imagines himself under the gaze of a Western woman. In the taxonomy of difference, his masculine gaze cannot quite meet the European gaze on equal terms.[ix] He is conscious of his height, his skin colour, and his teeth.

The Taxonomic Gaze

The character of Jôji in *A Fool's Love* is constantly classifying women into categories according to class, according to racialised gradations and according to physical beauty (Tanizaki 1984[1925]: 92; 102; 105–6; 127–8; 142). In his essays, too, Tanizaki repeatedly reflected on the different kinds of beauty to be found in women of different countries.[x] Tanizaki's close contemporary, the artist Koide Narashige, also reflected on different kinds of beauty in his essay "Rafu Mandan" (Idle Thoughts on the Nude Woman, 1987[1926]: 9–14).[xi] Koide, like Tanizaki, has a taxonomic gaze, and constantly makes connections between the act of painting a woman, and taking such a woman as a lover.

> Japanese women do not have beautiful bodies, and no matter what you say, everyone agrees that only a Western woman will do for a nude; moreover, when you look at the shape of the women who appear in Japanese oil paintings, you just want to laugh at their lack of shape. But if you were to ask the one laughing whether he had made love to a Western woman, the answer would be no. They would, after all, be walking out with a broad-faced Japanese woman (Koide 1987 [1926]: 9).

Koide's essay is populated by waitresses, models, and inaccessible European women. He also reflects on the spaces which are the most suitable settings for the depiction of the nude. In a similar fashion to Tanizaki's fictional musings, Koide finds Western-style rooms to be superior to Japanese-style rooms for this purpose:

> in Western art, there are paintings of women connected with various natural scenes from everyday life: bathing scenes, seated women, scenes of women at their toilette, and so on. In Japan, however, even if one attempts to find motifs of nudity in everyday life, it's rather difficult. Even if one were to find such a scene, it would be the site of things which one would hesitate to introduce. For example, if one were to paint a scene of a woman standing by a bed and translate it into a Japanese context, it would not be a very pleasing composition … Beds look right in Western-style rooms. There's nothing uncomfortable about the sight. Often, beds are more of a decorative element in such rooms. In Japan, there is something suggestive about seeing a bed in broad daylight (Koide 1987 [1926]: 8–9).

Koide's essay is symptomatic of some prevalent attitudes in the art world of early twentieth century Japan. He clearly makes connections between "Westernised" spaces, artistic spaces, and sexualised spaces, in a manner similar to the logic of Tanizaki's novels. He goes on to describe the "dressing" of artist's studios with Indian cloth and Western furniture, in a manner similar to

Tanizaki's novel. These scenes suggest the international dissemination of the bohemian style (Koide 1987 [1926]: 9; Tanizaki 1984 [1925]: 30; Nicholson 2003: *passim*).

Koide can be placed in a lineage of artists who engaged with European styles of painting. By the time Koide was writing, the art world in Japan was polarised into two styles known as '*Nihonga*' (Japanese-style painting) and '*Yôga*' (Western style painting). From the 1890s, artists in Japan travelled to Paris to experience the art schools of Montmartre and Montparnasse (Bryson 2003: 101–118). Those who could not travel to Paris studied with college art teachers who had returned from Europe. They learned the practices of drawing and painting from live models, the practices which are referred to in Tanizaki's novelistic references to studios and art schools. They also learned a series of gendered, classed and racialised power relations.

Tanizaki's novel suggests that the constitution of racialised difference is not an inherent property of bodies. Rather, racialisation involves the reading of bodies for evidence provided by dress, deportment, gesture, cosmetics, adornment and a whole range of embodied practices. Racialised positionings are constituted through a series of gazes between actors in the modern scene, embedded in complex relations of power amid the circulation of signs, symbols, bodies, commodities, finance and capital.

Gazing on Whiteness in the Metropolis

While Tanizaki and Koide were gazing on and classifying various types of women in the urban areas of Japan, Fujita [Foujita] Tsuguharu took his brush, paints and inks to the centre of the visual arts – Paris. Foujita lived in the Paris of Hemingway and Gertrude Stein, Amedeo Modigliani and Chaim Soutine, Man Ray and Jean Cocteau, Colette and Kiki de Montparnasse. It was the town of bohemians, writers, artists and models, new women, modern girls and *garçonnes*.[xii]

Foujita has become known for a particular technique for rendering white skin. Although using oil paints, he adapted techniques from Japanese brush painting to achieve a profound, milky whiteness in his paintings. He first covered the canvas in a special white paint of his own recipe, then produced outlines with a fine, dark brush, before finally filling in with paint (Birnbaum 2006: 5–6; 96–98). While drawing on the techniques of Japanese brush painting, Foujita also achieved effects which had not been attempted by his forebears in Japan.

> I suddenly realised one day that there are very few paintings of nudes in Japan. In the paintings of Harunobu or Utamaro, there are merely glimpses of part of an arm or a small area around the knee. I realized that they conveyed the sensation of skin only in those places. For the first time I decided to try and represent that most beautiful of materials – human skin (Fujita 1984, trans. Birnbaum 2006: 6).

As an artist in Paris, Foujita could literally gaze on the women of the world, and, through his paintings, make the spectacle of these women available to other viewers. His paintings have come to be hung in major international galleries, and thus could be said to express a gaze of power, contributing to the artistic culture of Paris and the world. In focusing on the beauty of "human skin", however, he was touching on one of the privileged signifiers of racialised difference. It is also, of course, important

to note that it was the skin of the woman's body which most interested him, thus placing him in the position of powerful masculine observer. A similar positioning has been described with reference to Foujita's predecessors.

> It is through a focus on the bodies of women rather than men that proximity to and intimacy with the West are evoked. Such a high degree of assimilation into European visuality cannot have been easy for any of the Meiji artists to achieve. Yet in a sense there was always a place carved out for them in advance, by virtue of the fact that the European visual regime they were embarked on entering was centered squarely on the masculine subject of vision – one had only, so to speak, to step into his shoes (Bryson 2003:108).

One of Foujita's celebrated paintings of whiteness is "Nude with Jouy Fabric" from 1922, a portrait of Kiki de Montparnasse reclining on a pale brocade fabric.[xiii] Foujita's third wife, and one of his models, was Lucie Badoud. He called her "Youki" (Snow) in honour of her milky white skin. In this act of naming, he demonstrates a fascination with whiteness, but also assimilates whiteness into his own cultural sphere by giving her a Japanese name. Foujita and Youki were photographed lounging in his studio, both wearing Japanese *kimono*. His painting, "Youki, Goddess of the Snow" was exhibited at the Salon d'Automne in 1924 (Birnbaum 118–126; Klüver and Martin 1989: 100–101).

Skin colour also took on gendered meanings in Foujita's paintings. In the 1920s, Foujita completed two massive and rather fanciful murals. They have only recently been restored and put on public display (Satô et al 2008: 70–89). One is called *Lutteurs* (Fighters, 1928) and the other takes the form of two *Compositions*: *Composition au lion* (Composition with Lion) and *Composition au chien* (Composition with Dog, 1928). Both wall-sized paintings are composed of a series of carefully arranged naked male and female bodies, some in repose, some embracing, and some in combat. In the *Compositions*, the human bodies are interspersed with animals. What is interesting about the male and female bodies is the gradation of colour. Generally, the female bodies are paler than the male bodies, unless they are specifically racialised as Indian or African. The figures in the murals are largely divorced from a specific place and time, and thus the use of colour to delineate gendered and racialised differences is all the more striking.

In Foujita's essays, the impulse to classify and categorise appears, just as strongly as in the writings of Tanizaki and Koide. In one essay, on "Women and Cats", he describes the experience of having been a judge at a cat show in Paris. In fact, the essay has little mention of women at all, but the title prompts the reader to wonder what analogies are being drawn between cats and women. He explains at the end of the essay that when he did not have access to a woman as model, he would draw and paint cats. Indeed, Foujita became famous for paintings which feature cats, which finally became equivalent to the artist's signature (Fujita 2005: 54–56).

In the abovementioned essay on the "Women of the World", Foujita recounts his experiences with women from various countries. Travel, it seems, provided Foujita and other tourists with an excuse to purchase the sexual services of women from all over the world. Let us take another look at Foujita's account.

> In 1921, I left Japan and headed for France. The ship had hardly docked in Shanghai before my fellow passengers, from curiosity to know a Western woman, went to visit the white-walled western building with the red light. There they were taken by the golden hair of the Polish Jewish women and the Russian refugee women, enchanted by the charm of blue eyes, and returned to the ship singing paeans. I was the only one who celebrated the beauty of the slender bamboo-like figures of the Chinese women, and did not listen to their stories. It was the same when we docked in Hong Kong. To them, the Malay and Indian women just seemed like *sauvages.* For me, however, they gave me a sense of *aesthetiquement beauté* (Fujita 1984: 57).

Foujita displays none of the anxiety about European women which we can discern in the writings of Tanizaki and Koide. He places himself in a position of power which allows him to categorise the women of the world. He appears to privilege women from Asia, his own part of the world. However, he displays his access to European cultural capital through the sprinkling of French words through his text. He goes on in other essays to provide anecdotes of the various women he came to know in the bohemian circles of Paris.[xiv] While in Paris, Foujita was able to access the privileges of the male artist, and exercise a gaze of power on the women who posed as models for himself and other artists.

Nevertheless, Foujita himself was also subject to the taxonomic gaze, and could not always transcend his positioning as an exotic "oriental". In English language accounts of the artistic world of early twentieth century Paris, he comes across as something of a curiosity. He provided judo demonstrations; performed Japanese folk songs and dances; and dressed in idiosyncratic costumes of his own design and fabrication (Birnbaum 2006: 63–71; 95; 128–129). Phyllis Birnbaum has commented on the popular view of Foujita, that "he was simply seen as a Japanese artist without nuances, reaching toward caricature, always effervescent and sociable, with endless silly costumes at the ready" (2006: x). While it is true that Foujita often played on this exoticism and was a tireless self-promoter and manipulator of his own image, a somewhat more sophisticated picture emerges from his writings (Fujita 1984). His essays reveal someone who was disciplined in his work habits, thoughtful about his art, and able to conjure a picture in words just as skilfully as he does with his brush on canvas or silk.

Conclusion

All of these case studies demonstrate that those who grew up in the cultural milieu of early twentieth century Japan had been exposed to hierarchical notions of "race". European racial taxonomies interacted with local taxonomies which depended on much more than just skin colour. Bodies were "read", not only for physical differences (skin colour, hair colour, body size and proportion, body hair, bodily odours) but also for clues based on deportment, dress, gestures, posture and voice which could be used to make judgments about class, gender, ethnicity, racialised positioning and sexuality. Local taxonomies interacted with, but were not identical to, Eurocentric categorisations. Writers and artists explored these racialised taxonomies and at times were able to subvert them. These racialised hierarchies also interacted with gender in interesting ways. These male artists could exercise a

dominating, masculine gaze on the women of their own and other countries. However, in the racialising gazes which emanated from Europe, the Japanese male was often positioned as exotic "other", an otherness which sometimes trumped his ability to exercise a powerful gendered gaze.

Author Note

Vera Mackie is Australian Research Council Australian Professorial Fellow in Historical Studies at the University of Melbourne, where she is researching the Cultural History of the Body in Modern Japan and the Politics of Visual Culture in Modern Japan.

Acknowledgments

Research for this article was conducted as part of an ARC-funded research project on the Cultural History of the Body in Modern Japan. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer and the editors for comments which have informed the revision of this article. Thanks also to Tomoko Aoyama, Adrian Carton and Toshiko Ellis for advice and support.

References

Adachi, M. 2006. 'Shashi to Modan Gâru: Shiseidô to Kôiri Sekken' [Luxury Goods and the Modern Girl: Shiseidô and Perfumed Soap], *Jendâ Kenkyû* 9,19–38.

Anderson, W. 2002. *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health and Racial Destiny in Australia*, Carlton: Melbourne University Press.

Barlow, T. E. 1997. Introduction: On 'Colonial Modernity', in T. E. Barlow (ed.) *Formations of Colonial Modernity in East Asia*, Durham: Duke University Press, 1–20.

——2004. *The Question of Women in Chinese Feminism*, Durham: Duke University Press.

——2006. 'History and the Border', *Journal of Women's History*, 18(2), 26-8.

Berger, J. 1977. *Ways of Seeing*, Harmondsworth: Pelican.

Birnbaum, P. 2006. *Beauty in a Line: A Life of Foujita – The Artist Caught between East and West*, New York: Faber and Faber.

Bryson, N. 2003. Westernizing Bodies: Women, Art, Power in Meiji Yôga, in J. S. Mostow, N. Bryson and M. Graybill (eds.) *Gender and Power in the Japanese Visual Field*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 101–18.

Chakrabarty, D. 2000. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Conor, L. 2002. 'The City Girl: Appearing in the Modern Scene', *Lilith*, 11, 53-72.

——2004. *The Spectacular Modern Woman: Feminine Visibility in the 1920s*, Bloomington: Indiana.

Dyer, R. 1997. *White*, London: Routledge.

Fujikawa, T. (ed.) 2005. *Hakujin to wa Nanika? Howaitonesu Sutadiizu Nyûmon* [What is 'White'? Introduction to Whiteness Studies]. Tokyo: Kensui Shobô.

Fujita, T. 1984. Sekai no Onna [Women of the World], in *Bura Ippon, Pari no Yokogao – Fujita Tsuguharu Essê Sen* [One Arm, Profile of Paris, Selected Essays of Fujita Tsuguharu], ed. K. Fumito, Tokyo: Kôdansha.

——2005. Onna to Neko [Women and Cats], *Bura Ippon, Pari no Yokogao – Fujita Tsuguharu Essê Sen* [One Arm, Profile of Paris, Selected Essays of Fujita Tsuguharu], ed. K. Fumito, Tokyo: Kôdansha Bunko, 54–56.

Gates, H. L. Jr. (ed.) 1992. *"Race", Writing and Difference*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hamilton, A. 1990. 'Fear and Desire: Aborigines, Asians and the National Imaginary', *Australian Cultural History*, 9, 14-35.

hooks, b. 1981. *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*, Boston: South End Press.

Kazami, A. 1997. *Iro no Bunkashi* [The Cultural History of Colours], Tokyo: Kôgyô Chôsakai.

Keene, D. 1984. *Dawn to the West: Japanese Literature in the Modern Era*, New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Klüver, B. and J. Martin (eds.) 1996. *Kiki's Memoirs*, trans. S. Putnam, Hopewell, New Jersey: The Ecco Press.

Koide, N. 1987 [1926]. Rafu Mandan [Idle Thoughts on the Nude Woman], in *Koide Narashige Zuihitsu Shû* [Koide Narashige Collected Essays], Tokyo: Iwanami, 9–14.

Koide, R. 2006. *Koide Narashige to Tanizaki Jun'ichirô: Shôsetsu 'Tade Kuu Mushi' no Shinsô* [Koide Narashige and Tanizaki Jun'ichirô: The Secret of the Novel *Some Prefer Nettles*], Tokyo: Shunpûsha.

Lake, M. 2007. 'The Discovery of Personal Whiteness is a Very Modern Thing': W. E. DuBois on the Global and the Personal, in L. Boucher, J. Carey and K. Ellinghaus (eds.) *Historicising Whiteness: Transnational Perspectives on the Construction of an Identity*, Melbourne: RMIT Publishing.

Lamarre, T. 2005. *Shadows on the Screen: Tanizaki Jun'ichirô on Cinema and 'Oriental' Aesthetics*, Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan.

Kawabata, Yasunari. 1972 [1952] *Yukiguni*, [Snow Country] Tokyo: Iwanami.

Mackie, V. 2007. The Moga as Racialised Category in 1920s and 1930s Japan, in L. Boucher, J. Carey and K. Ellinghaus (eds.) *Historicising Whiteness: Transnational Perspectives on the Construction of an Identity*, Melbourne: RMIT Publishing.

——in press. Shanghai Dancers: Gender, Coloniality and the Modern Girl, in D. Ghosh and B. Leigh (eds.) *Shadowlines: Women and Borders in Contemporary Asia*, Newcastle on Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press.

Modern Girl Around the World Research Group (T. E. Barlow, M. Y. Dong, U. G. Poiger, P. Ramamurthy, L. M. Thomas and A. E. Weinbaum). 2005. 'The Modern Girl around the World: A Research Agenda and Preliminary Findings', *Gender and History*, 17(2), 245-94.

Morris-Suzuki, T. 1998. *Reinventing Japan: Time, Space, Nation*, New York: M. E. Sharpe.

Nicholson, V. 2003. *Among the Bohemians: Experiments in Living 1900–1939*, London: Penguin.

Oguma, E. 2002. *A Genealogy of 'Japanese' Self-Images*. trans. D. Askew. Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.

Robb, P. 1995. South Asia and the Concept of Race, in P. Robb (ed.) *The Concept of Race in South Asia*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1–76.

Sand, J. 2005. *House and Home in Modern Japan: Architecture, Domestic Space and Bourgeois Culture, 1880–1930*, Cambridge: Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center.

Sato, B. 2003. *The New Japanese Woman: Modernity, Media and Women in Interwar Japan*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Satô, Y. et al. (eds.) 2008. *Léonard Foujita Ten*, Sapporo: Hokkaidô Shimbun Press.

Selz, J. 1981. *Foujita*, trans. S. Jennings, New York: Crown Publishers.

Tanizaki J. 2005 [1917]. 'Ningyo no Nageki' [The Mermaid's Lament], *Chûô Kôron* [Central Review]. in T. Lamarre, *Shadows on the Screen:*

Tanizaki Jun'ichirô on Cinema and 'Oriental' Aesthetics, Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 34–53.

Tanizaki, J. 1985 [1925]. *Chijin no Ai* [A Fool's Love], Tokyo: Chûô Kôron Shinsha.

——2005 [1922]. 'Onna no Kao'[A Woman's Face], *Fujin Kôron* [Women's Review], in T. Lamarre, *Shadows on the Screen: Tanizaki Jun'ichirô on Cinema and 'Oriental' Aesthetics*, Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 264–5.

——2005 [1931]. 'Ren'ai oyobi Shikijô' [Love and Sexual Desire], *Fujin Kôron* [Women's Review], in T. Lamarre, *Shadows on the Screen: Tanizaki Jun'ichirô on Cinema and 'Oriental' Aesthetics*, Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 319–55.

——1934. 'Tokyo o Omou' [Thinking of Tokyo], *Chûô Kôron* [Central Review], January–April.

——1947 [1928–30]. *Manji*, Tokyo: Chûô Kôronsha.

——1986. *Naomi*, trans. A. H. Chambers, Tokyo: Tuttle.

Notes

[i] Translations my own unless indicated otherwise. In this passage, the italicised words appear in the original passage in Sino-Japanese characters, with a French reading provided alongside. I have tried to convey this in the translation with the use of French words in italics. As in the original, the French words may not integrate smoothly into the grammar of the sentence.

[ii] Foujita's family name was variously spelt as "Fujita" or "Foujita", and his given name was sometimes read as "Tsuguharu" and sometimes "Tsuguji". He also adopted the name "Léonard". As he is most well-known in European languages as "Foujita", I will use this spelling hereafter, except where citing Japanese language sources. On Foujita's life, see Birnbaum, 2006.

[iii] Here, I am drawing on Dipesh Chakrabarty's (2000) discussion of "provincialising" Europe.

[iv] Hamilton (1990: 14–35) has characterized this structure of feeling, when faced with racialised difference, as "fear and desire".

[v] Tanizaki uses the word, "*Ainoko*", which refers to someone of mixed parentage, and in the novel is written with Sino-Japanese characters which specifically mean "mixed-blood-child".

[vi] On the "culture house" (*bunka jûtaku*), see Sand 2005. The artist's studio figures as a particularly sexualised space in the popular culture of the time, and performs a similar function as a sexualised space in Tanizaki's novel, *Manji* (1947[1926–8])

[vii] In another work, *Ningyo no Nageki* (A Mermaid's Lament) for example, Tanizaki tells the fantastical story of a white mermaid figure which clearly draws on European mythology and fairy tales. See Tanizaki 1917, trans. in Lamarre 2005: 45–6.

[viii] See also Tanizaki's (1917) story, *Ningyo no Nageki* (A Mermaid's Lament), where the mermaid's skin "was of such whiteness that it recalled the glow of moonlight" (trans. in Lamarre 2005: 45–46). Readers of Kawabata Yasunari's (1972[1952]) novel *Yukiguni* (Snow Country) may also think back to the white nights of Tanizaki's novel. The opening sentence of *Snow Country* is: "The train emerged from the long tunnel into Snow Country. The depth of the night turned white" (1972: 5, my translation).

[ix] See also the anxiety about comparisons between Japanese men and European men expressed in Tanizaki's essay "On Love and Sexual Desire": "Questioning the prostitutes in the ports open to foreigners in the Yokohama and Kobe areas supports this fact; according to these women, relatively few Japanese have such appetites, in comparison with Westerners" (Tanizaki 1931; trans. in Lamarre 2005: 333).

[x] See, for example, Tanizaki Jun'ichirô's essays, "Tokyo o Omou" (Thinking of Tokyo, 1934); "Onna no Kao" (A Woman's Face, 1922, trans. Lamarre 2005: 264); and "Ren'ai oyobi Shikijô" (Love and Sexual Desire, 1931, trans. Lamarre 2005: 331; 345).

[xi] Koide provided illustrations and book design for one of Tanizaki's novels (see Koide Ryûtarô 2006).

[xii] See Foujita's ink and watercolour drawing of a woman doing the Charleston, from the album "Le Journal de Youki", reproduced in Selz (1981: 19).

[xiii] Kiki de Montparnasse was one of the names by which Alice Prin (1901–1953) was known. She was a painter, actor and artist's model, who appears in many of Man Ray's photographs, and is featured in the surrealist film, *Ballet Mécanique* (see Klüver and Martin 1996).

[xiv] See also Foujita's (1929) essay in the *Paris-Montparnasse Review* (trans. Selz 1981: 21).

BEING CULTURALLY COMPETENT OR CULTURALLY INDULGENT: WHAT IS AN EFFECTIVE PEDAGOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR WORKING WITH INDIGENOUS LEARNERS?

SUSAN MLCEK

Abstract

This article presents a discussion of ideas about whiteness behaviours that are present in curriculum delivery. While culturally appropriate curriculum purports to address both content and delivery considerations relevant to Indigenous learners, there are planes of engagement that encapsulate white subjectivities which are both visible and invisible, and represent just one chronology of whiteness. That is, consciously and unconsciously patterned behaviours of delivering curriculum, no matter what the discipline area, have the potential to produce accessibility and achievement, but do they also reproduce inequalities? One view put forward as part of this discussion is that whiteness is the erasure of inequality because it presents as the norm in many adult education teaching situations; quite often manifested as indulgent practice, but one that also reinforces the hegemony of normativity.

Current research directions about effective pedagogies that relate to Indigenous learners now espouse the term "culturally competent". Like "culturally appropriate", the inclusive element behind the concept "culturally competent" practice is designed to address the divide between acceptance that Indigenous learners already have knowledge of how they want to learn, and the exclusion of these same learners for not knowing how they "ought to learn". Tensions arise around what is knowledge, who has it, and what can be done with it. An interesting comparison can be made to the way that practitioners embrace non-English speaking background (NESB) or culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) students by reinforcing identity development and demonstrating knowledge through sharing aspects of culture such as food, dress and habits, with the way that Indigenous learners are included, or not, in curriculum studies. The indulgent practice shown to the first group could also be seen to be culturally competent because of the implicit and explicit respect shown for identifying and celebrating cultural difference. Given the whiteness behaviours within such practice, however, which pedagogical framework is most effective for Indigenous learners?

Introduction

In regards to effective pedagogies, Paulo Freire (1972: 66) suggests that "authentic education" should not ignore the concrete, existential and real-life present situations of learners who participate in education programmes. As an educational practitioner, I know that these learners come with anxieties, hopes, expectations, and sometimes hopelessness on several different levels, and to deliver curriculum in a "banking style" that provides only a one-way construction of knowledge is to ignore the diversity of students' ability to influence, mediate, and engage with

ISSN 1832-3898

the world around them. Unwittingly, there are many educators who ignore meaningful dialogue that results in critical reflection, and instead continue to encourage passivity amongst learner recipients to accept the programmes the former have planned and organised, because that appears to be their exclusive right, and not necessarily what learners want or think important to their own lives. Providing access and equity for learners, or seeking to include them in facets of programmes, is the kind of "universal" practice that plays into the hands of the "culturally competent" rhetoric that actually denies the recognition and acceptance of cultural diversity amongst different ethnic groups.

A part of the above rhetoric is embedded within a multiculturalism discourse. Through a discursive theoretical lens, whiteness theory forces this discourse to name its social construction and recognition of the inclusiveness of people from diverse languages and backgrounds. And while also a social construction, "whiteness", on the other hand, is made more complex through layers of recognition of another kind; recognition of acknowledgement. That is, whiteness is about all that is normalised, taken for granted and therefore invisible, privileged and therefore depending on the devaluation of non-whites (Thompson 2001), and therefore natural.

My ideas form a personal/professional collage about whiteness behaviours that impact curriculum delivery that not only seeks to enable "cultural competence", but also facilitate ongoing oppression and powerlessness, for both the recipient and quite often the facilitator as well. Layers of a picture tableau take the discussion from the personal situation to the professional, and then back to the personal, so that three stories evolve into one; into an epistemic image whereby educational practitioners constantly move through revolving doors to try to bypass the limit-situations of their positions by engaging in limit-acts that transcend boundaries of "nothingness" to possibilities of "being more" (Vieira Pinto, cited in Freire 1972: 71). The task is not overwhelming but at times inculcated with "normalised" behaviours of mediocrity that serve to maintain the "whiteness as goodness" visibility (hooks 1997: 169). This recurring image, however, can be one that represents power, domination, and imposition through benevolence.

To unpack those ideas further, in the abstract this article is referring to "cultural positionings" – about how whiteness is performed by people – whereby whiteness is revealed to be "universal". It is difficult to express the powerlessness I personally still feel when I look back at my own part in perpetrating a voice of silence in relation to the powerlessness of others. In this respect, the problem is not about the colour "white", but, from a whiteness theoretical perspective, that being "white" is about position, power, and control. I am referring to my time as a literacy and language teacher in an access education division at a local technical and further education institute in Australia. I realise now, after years of critical reflection on practice that being an Indigenous teacher with knowledge of my own Maori people's dispossession and that of others, brings no guarantee of exposing the inadequacies of curriculum. Critical race theory (Dudziak 1995; Hayman 1998) provides a potential lens through which to view certain educational practices as coming not just from individual acts of supremacy or prejudice, but as an endemic part of life, deeply ingrained in the education system through historical consciousness and ideological choices about race

(Parker & Lynn 2002), and also about the tendencies of educational institutions to reproduce the dominant role in knowledge promulgation (Nakata 2001: 100).

Whiteness-as-privilege operates at the crossroads of a variety of social encounters that include spaces for a celebration of race, ethnicity and gender; all markers of identity. In prefacing the next part of my personal narrative, I take on board the correlation that Westcott makes regarding whiteness studies: "(1) the relationship between rhetorical form and introspective utterance and (ii) the political implications of enacting the personal as a gesture of atonement or even reconciliation" (2004: 1). To this end, I feel I must first note my own racial situatedness. Looking back on my years as a student of a Maori native school in New Zealand in the 1950s and 1960s, I can reflect on the situation of constantly trying to identify as Indigenous – as Maori-Indigenous – as if I must justify a place within society today; within my profession, my work, with colleagues, and no matter their ethnicity. Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2000: 87) suggests that "whiteness reduces the Indigenous other to being a function, and a means, of knowing and defining itself through representations". So the journey of definition for me has been never-ending and serves to highlight the reification of whiteness discourse that is perpetuated in "normalising" language even today. When I attended the New Zealand Maori primary school – some fifty years ago – I was constantly trying to justify my "Maori-ness" to my darker-coloured first cousins. "But I'm more than a quarter-caste", I would say, "and if I'm quarter, then I'm Maori". "No you're not!", they would retort back. *If primary school kids at that age could articulate denial and exclusion through doing the crude calculations of race-marker-as-blood-fractions, then how easy must it be to reinforce the dominant discourse?* There is no doubt that from an early age we are influenced by "social practices that maintain cultural dispositions within groups" (Moran 2004: 1). Martin Nakata (1995: 40-61) realises that Indigenous people are captives of certain discourses, particularly where certain knowledge assumptions make continuous claims about the inadequacies facing Indigenous learners. Unfortunately these assumptions give rise to at best privileged indulgent, or at worst negligent practices of engagement towards Indigenous learners. Privilege is manifested through ideology and performative processes that can identify as "indulgent practice", and these ideas require some further exposition.

The obvious question then, is: *what are whiteness behaviours*, and *how are they explained as "moments of indulgence"?* These behaviours are embedded within curriculum through particular worldviews that are encapsulated in the values, structures and narratives about whiteness. Certain qualities survive from colonialist and imperialist domination – notably ideas about intelligence, resilience and virtuous activity, and being privileged, self-restrained, and "critically reflective" on the outside – but seem removed from the underlying tensions implicit in practice. These qualities provide different nuances of visibility depending on the socially semiotic context of a particular situation, but the invisible nature of practice is the extent to which these qualities provide an ongoing visible expression of indulgence-as-superiority, or even more bluntly, competence-as-racism. Benevolent behaviours from practitioners can take the form of allowing students to share cultural practices such as food, clothing, and life stories. With some groups of CALD

students, the educational practitioner with a perfect command of the English language and management of the Western-orientated curriculum is powerfully positioned to uphold the dominant discourse of equity, access, participation and human rights. In other ways, these same behaviours exclude the role of white Australia as the source of exclusion of Indigenous voice to protest against uninformed appropriation of symbols, language, rituals, songs and dance of Indigenous learners' communities. To do so – that is, allow too much of a strong Indigenous voice – could result in the "cultural power of Indigeneity" challenging "mainstream society's inherent whiteness" (Gargett 2005).

In further regard to whiteness behaviours, in any class society, only the ruling class can be truly said to have privilege and there is little doubt that even in these contemporary times, we continue to live in a classed society. In the study of identity development, privileged white identity develops from a position of domination whilst culturally diverse individuals, such as those from CALD communities, develop their identity from a position of oppression (Sue 2006: 92; Sue and Sue 2003: 214). Those who rule or govern determine the conditions under which everyone exists, even in educational institutions. Institutionalising such social relations maintain and expand control over wealth, power, and knowledge management. The ruling class structures these relations in such a way that the survival of the exploited classes depends upon their continued participation in *the reproduction of these relationships*, thus guaranteeing the continuation of classed societies. Therefore, through hegemonic processes, it can be said that the dominant class structures social relationships in such a way that the continued reproduction of society will always privilege the ruling class and its needs, in particular the type of knowledge that it needs or is inclined to promote.

Whiteness can be understood through multiple lenses including domination, race, and privilege, but the white class that dominates does not impose itself upon wholly passive communities. Our *lifeworld* – an environment that involves the familiar, everyday practices around us – is more complex than being just diverse. That is, there is more consideration and understanding required of the layers within relationships, rather than a call for just a flexible pedagogical approach to teaching curriculum. Educators, like other members of society, are continually being colonised through economic and politico-administrative interruptions that lead to what Jürgen Habermas refers to as a sociocultural crisis or legitimation crisis (Gregory 2000: 131; Habermas 1987). In particular, in relation to the way education programmes are delivered, the involvement of governments in mediation and managing our social systems has allowed the prevalence of ever-changing cultural models of engagement, as well as unfamiliar bureaucratization practices, to drive changes in the profession (Gregory 2000). The resulting dilemma is that while governments may have approached concerns about education from a mainly instrumental angle, the legitimation crisis for practitioners continues to include situations that are not just technical matters to be decided on a purely rational basis, but ones that require a measure of "moral-practice consciousness" to produce favourable outcomes for individuals and communities (Gregory 2000). Producing these outcomes requires a hefty dose of leadership as well as management skills and wisdom, but unless an educational practitioner is in an autonomous position

of being able to make decisions about program development and delivery, content and modes of delivery quite often follow the ensuing dominant discourse.

Implicit in the above ideas, therefore, is the ever-increasing "colonisation" of the lifeworld through the rationalisation of systems (Habermas 1987). This idea of colonisation is contained in the regionalisation dimension of time-space routinisation that presents another means to articulate the way that social life is channelled into and out of the site of education program delivery. When "whiteness" is identified as the erasure of inequality (Derrida 2002, 1976) because it presents as the norm, the history of class struggle – and the exploited trying to give order back to their lives – and the social conditions under which they have existed is largely ignored. For example, in examining meanings of whiteness, we need to look at the circumstances of their construction, as well as critique how certain knowledges are presented and taught as though they do not have an epistemological connection to whiteness.

In relation to the subjectivity of the actor in his or her own construct, we often hear that in contemporary societies like ours today, both black and white people think that racism no longer exists. This notion is a form of mythical "erasure", whereby feelings of inadequacy are being constantly reinforced, and where whiteness is a construct or identity that is almost impossible to separate from racial dominance (Frankenberg 1997: 9). Again, from the foundations of critical race theory comes the maxim that "racism is pervasive" (Watson 2005: 4), and that race may be a social construct but it has material effects on real people (McDonald 2003).

Damien Riggs' (2004b) indication that all non-Indigenous people are implicated in practices of oppression and that the task is to develop ways of exploring this complicity leads me to my professional story. I currently teach social work and human services curriculum and have just spent the last semester lecturing in issues of social policy. I spoke about the visibility and absence of "self-determination" for indigenous people in social policy design and implementation, and the history of how self-determination was put into policy-making with the Whitlam government and then deleted through the Howard government's term. For one third-year Indigenous student, the "penny finally dropped" – as an Indigenous patient advocate for one of the rural hospitals she just could not work out how Indigenous people were still being disadvantaged; they were no longer empowered to make decisions for themselves, but under the "benevolence of whiteness", they were given opportunities to "become empowered". *If Indigenous learners can tell the difference between "determination" and "empowerment", then why the persistence by governments, to maintain a position of whiteness indulgence?*

The above idea of language use in Australian social policy shows a model of engagement that mimics the whiteness rhetoric of inclusivity, diversity, and pluralism, answering the vague platitude of trying to achieve "the means to an end rather than the end in itself" (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commissio*n*, 1998). The Australian Government's response to Indigenous policy is stark and imbued with racism: "Government policy does not acknowledge the applicability to Indigenous people of the right to self-determination. In 1997 the government actively rejected self-determination as

the basis of Indigenous policy" (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission*b*, 2002). Riggs (2004b: 5) suggests a need to not only provide "an explanation of what whiteness is, or what it 'looks like', but rather that we need to focus on how whiteness is practised and to what end". In this ongoing practice of curtailing Indigenous communities' right to self-determination, there are just too many spaces for assimilationist thought, forgetfulness, and/or indulgence.

Rethinking suitable pedagogical frameworks for working with Indigenous learners

At the very outset of rethinking how we construct useful and relevant pedagogical frameworks for any of our learners, adopting a postcolonial perspective helps to name and challenge the legacies of colonialism and their continuation through neo-colonial practices. That is, one person's humanitarian objective could quite well be another's impression of neo-colonialism (Samson 1998). This postcolonial perspective therefore investigates the assumptions underlying discourses of Eurocentrism as well as "whiteness", and explores approaches for constructing alternatives (Hickling-Hudson and Ahlquist 2003: 4). During these explorations, the notion of whiteness-as-invisible is quite often juxtaposed with whiteness-as-hypervisible as "either a preferred or threatened status" (Thompson 2001: 1). That is, when we feel we are losing control of parts of a curriculum, for example how different literacies are marked and delivered, we also feel that our privilege will somehow be undermined. For any practitioner like me, who has worked with CALD and Indigenous students for a number of years, it is very easy to become involved in eschewing the above kinds of practices and believing that one is doing good work in furthering the progress and well-being of "others".

The narratives of "white good" however, are situated in discourses of benevolence (Riggs 2004a: 4), and as such can also be understood as sites for the operation and management of whiteness because they are "implicitly aimed at managing the agency of those people positioned as the racialised other". Furthermore, behaviours of good are also enacted from a deep sense of moral obligation that when we engage with Indigenous students, for example, we act from a position of thinking we know what is best for them rather than acknowledging that our benign benevolence comes from the "anxiety of whiteness" (Riggs and Augostinos 2004) accompanied by the need to belong, to validate, and to maintain a useful position in Australian society. These good and useful acts appear to be removed from the anti-racist discourse surrounding whiteness privilege because they endeavour to address oppression and disempowerment. But they actually help to shape the hegemony of whiteness just because they are implicated in systems of oppression. That is, this type of hegemony represents "white blindness" (Hickling-Hudson and Ahlquist 2003) to the difference race makes in people's lives and how the phenomenon has a powerful effect on teaching and learning situations within our education institutions. For example, it prevents practitioners from engaging in learning about how practice that comes from a foundation of privilege impacts personal and institutional racism.

Given those whiteness behaviours implicit in benevolent and indulgent practice, which pedagogical framework is most effective for Indigenous learners? Considerations for appropriate

curriculum for Indigenous learners range from needing to place Indigenous standpoints at the centre of Indigenised curriculum (Carey 2008), to recognising Indigenous culture as a positive resource (Durie 2006). There are institutional Indigenous educational strategies that are constructed within a cultural competence pedagogical framework designed to enhance the development of student graduate attributes and to prepare students for active citizenship and engagement in reconciliation and the achievement of social justice for Indigenous Australians (for example see Charles Sturt University 2009). They are strategies that are explicit about the need to "Indigenise curriculum"; to make it more "culturally appropriate" and in doing so, to develop "cultural competence". In many cases they have also become codified instruments within institutional policy implementation. In the delivery of such considerations, and regardless of whether the focus is a vocational or general academic one, Indigenous researchers and practitioners ask for an awareness of the transformative effects of Indigenous knowledge(s), and the support not only of a "post-colonial" dialogue, but an "anti-colonial" dialogue (Langton 2005) to preserve Indigenous ways of knowing against pressures from other narrow directions. All too often, Indigenous people have been pushed to the margins of education (Hickling-Hudson and Ahlquist 2003) that has continued from an historical legacy of assimilationist and racist acts of oppression to a continued "revolving door-type" engagement. And all too often, they have been forced to make do with pedagogical crumbs that have their genesis in a lack of appropriate recognition of how to employ different teaching strategies (Groome 1994; Groome and Hamilton 1995; Spring 2001). The call from Indigenous educators, who want to make or maintain a difference, is that research goes hand-in-hand with ways of learning. Durie (2005) posits ideas about Indigenous knowledge:

> While it is often valued because of its traditional qualities, the perception of indigenous knowledge and culture as applicable only to the distant past ignores the thrust for development that is part of the indigenous journey. Arising from the creative potential of indigenous knowledge is the prospect that it can be applied to modern times in parallel with other knowledge systems (2005: 304).

Further considerations related to a suitable pedagogical framework for Indigenous learners are those that include the underlying principles of "learning and research at the interface" which relate to mutual respect, shared benefits, human dignity and discovery (Durie 2005: 307). Durie's ideas continue to inform the binary of Indigenous learning and research at the "interface" by expanding students' educational experiences and the dimensions of their understanding whilst ensuring cultural safety, as well as capacity building.

Addressing racism and inequity

In regard to whiteness behaviours, there are three recognised dimensions to the reproduction of racialised inequality. Ruth Frankenberg sees these links as the socio-cultural terrain of whiteness constituting a "location of structural advantage", a particular white standpoint that privileges a white worldview or perspective of self, society and other, and a "set of cultural practices that are usually unmarked and unnamed" (1993: 1). In order to avert racism and inequity, the question of critiquing practice becomes more not

just of repositioning one's sense of subjectivity to that of the other, but it is, as bell hooks says, "about decolonising one's mind and imagination" (1997: 178). Teaching ought to be a deconstructing process (Derrida 1985; 1976), as well as a recognition process that acknowledges exemplary pedagogical practice with different ethnic groups as well as Indigenous students. Helen McDonald (2003) notes the diversity of Indigenous groups to contribute to determining exemplary pedagogical engagement by providing a stunning variety of backgrounds and experiences, as well as layers of identity from which to plan relevant educational programs that are more meaningful for Indigenous communities. Additionally, the following observations about comparing western worldviews with Aboriginal and Indigenous worldviews provide a new basis for "re-orienting whiteness" behaviours that inform not only professional but personal behaviour as well.

A personal encounter with the work of Cindy Blackstock, a Canadian First Nations social worker, provides further confirmation of how to raise social work students' awareness of different behaviours required for the work that is done with culturally diverse communities. The process starts with culturally appropriate curriculum content that affirms students' lives and cultural experiences, recognises their values, and incorporates their cultural heritage, behaviours and knowledge. In tandem with drawing on knowledge from students' own life experiences, they are also introduced to the notion of *dialogic praxis* (Ife 2008) and intentional engagement to reflect on their views and actions to bring about positive change in communities. This is done to reiterate hooks' idea (1997: 178), that the experience may also be a "decolonising" one whereby biases are revealed, as well as prejudices and potentially negative racialisation of different groups (McDonald 2003).

In "reorienting whiteness", I make a case to social work students for the reorientation of worldviews, and in so doing, I re-enforce my own epistemological stance. By comparing a western/whiteness worldview to that of an Indigenous worldview, I am actually resituating "whiteness", after orientation to the western/whiteness worldview, and then re-orientation to the Indigenous worldview that is more in keeping with the idea of "cultural perpetuity" (Blackstock 2008). Cindy Blackstock suggests using questions related to comparing worldviews that privilege individualism (the more universal western/whiteness view) or collectivism (the more Aboriginal/Indigenous view) in order to determine the kinds of behaviours and systems that each view generates. She also uses and compares the self-actualisation motivational model made popular and famous by Abraham Maslow – Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs – to a First Nation's model whereby the hierarchy is "turned on its head". Instead of the individual rising through at least five stages of motivation to reach the level of "self-actualisation", the Indigenous worldview shows self-actualisation as the beginning of questioning *who am I, where do I come from, what is my community, who are the elders I can go to for help, what is the knowledge I need to survive?* In striving for "cultural perpetuity" at the top of the Indigenous worldview model, the individual-with-community helps develop "community actualisation" and an expansive concept of time plus multiple dimensions of reality, but most importantly, an identity that whiteness privilege has too often tried to devalue

Conclusion

Indulgent and benevolent practice serves little purpose for meaningful engagement with Indigenous learners. Neither is this practice effective for CALD students, despite the best intentions of wanting to celebrate cultural difference. This latter idea is premised on a universal theme of inclusion and access that is at times included commendably, on several different levels, into the discourse on multiculturalism, but often used unknowingly to promote whiteness behaviours that at best demonstrate indulgent practice, and at worst racialisation of people to maintain their marginalised status. Practitioners cannot practise "unknowingly", otherwise they perpetuate racist behaviours. They require attention to a more participatory model that recognises the life experiences of individuals, but also the knowledge of individuals-with-communities to effect a more culturally appropriate and effective pedagogical framework in order to deliver real educational equity for Indigenous students.

Author Note

Susan Mlcek is Indigenous – Maori New Zealander – a member of the Ngaiterangi Iwi (tribe) and Ngaitukairangi Hapu (sub-tribe), from Matapihi, Tauranga, in New Zealand. Her teaching experience includes teaching across a broad range of discipline areas (foundational studies, adult education, communication and cultural studies, vocational education and training, management, literacy, language and numeracy, TESOL, general education, and social work) in TAFE NSW, the University of Western Sydney, Charles Sturt University (CSU), and Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi in New Zealand. Currently, she lectures in social work and human services at CSU, and is heavily committed to providing learning opportunities to Indigenous learners. Her research areas include: Indigenous student support; foundational studies; social work and human services, and rural community welfare service delivery. Qualifications include: PhD, MComm, MA (Communication & Cultural Studies), & BAdEd.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the support of my colleagues at the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Faculty of Arts, Charles Sturt University.

References

Blackstock, C. 2008. 'The Breath of Life: A First Nations Alternative to Western Social Theories', Seminar, University of New South Wales, <http://www.nu.ac.za/ccs/files/South%20Africa%20%5BCompatibility%20Mode%5D.pdf>, accessed 12 August 2009.

Charles Sturt University. 2009. Indigenous Education Strategy, <http://www.csu.edu.au/faculty/educat/cfis/docs/csu-indigenous-education-strategy.pdf>, accessed 12 August 2009.

Carey, M. 2008. 'Indigenisation, Interdisciplinarity and Cultural Competency: Working the Dialogic Space between Indigenous Studies and Other Disciplines at Curtin University', in *Psychology and Indigenous Australians: Teaching, Practice and Theory, Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference*, Adelaide: University of South Australia, <http://www.unisanet.unisa.edu.au/Resources/tcc/Integrating%20Austral

ian%20Indigenous%20content%20and%20pedagogies%20into%20psychology%20education/Workshops%20and%20conferences%20-%20Psychology%20and%20Indigenous%20Australians/2008%20Conference%20Proceedings.pdf>, accessed 12 August 2009.

Derrida, J. 1976. *Of Grammatology*, Trans. G. C. Spivak, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Derrida, J. 2002. *Who's Afraid of Philosophy? Right to Philosophy I*, Trans. J. Plug, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Dudziak, M. 2000. [1995.] Desegregation as a Cold War Imperative, in R. Delgado and J. Stefancic (eds.) 2nd ed. *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 110-121.

Durie, M. 2005. 'Indigenous Knowledge within a Global Knowledge System', *Higher Education Policy*, 18, 301-312.

——2006. 'Measuring Maori Wellbeing', New Zealand Treasury Guest Lecture Series 2006, New Zealand Treasury, Wellington.

Frankenberg, R, 1993. *White Woman, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness*, London: Routledge.

Freire, P. 1972. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, London: Penguin Books.

Gargett, A. 2005. 'A Critical Media Analysis of the Redfern Riot', *Indigenous Law Bulletin* (ILB 18), 6(10), 8-11.

Gregory, D. 2000. Critical Theory, in R. J. Johnston, D. Gregory, G. Pratt and M. Watts (eds.), *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, 4th ed., Melbourne: Blackwell Publishing, 129-133.

Groome, H. 1994. Education: The Search for Relevance, in C. Bourke, E. Bourke, and B. Edwards (eds.) *Aboriginal Australia: An Introductory Reader in Aboriginal Studies*, St. Lucia, Australia: University of Queensland Press.

Groome, H. & Hamilton, A. 1995. *Meeting the Educational Needs of Aboriginal Adolescents: Commissioned Report No. 35,* Canberra: National Board of Employment, Education and Training.

Ife, J. 2008. *Human Rights and Social Work: Towards Rights-Based Practice*, Rev. ed., Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

Johnston, R. J., Gregory, D., Pratt, G. & Watts, M. (eds.) 2000. *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, 4th ed., Melbourne: Blackwell Publishing.

Habermas, J. 1987. *The Theory of Communicative Action, Vol. 2: Lifeworld and Systems: The Critique of Functionalist Reason*, Trans. T. McCarthy, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Harslett, M., Harrison, B., Godfrey, J., Partington, G. & Richer, K. 2000. 'Teacher Perceptions of the Characteristics of Effective Teachers of Aboriginal Middle School Students', *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 25(1), 37-45.

Hayman, R. L. Jr, 1998. 'Race and Reason: The Assault on Critical Race Theory and the Truth About Inequality', *National Black Law Journal*, 16(1), 1-26.

Hickling-Hudson, A. & Ahlquist, R. 2003. 'Contesting the Curriculum in the Schooling of Indigenous Children in Australia and the USA: From Eurocentrism to Culturally Powerful Pedagogies', *Comparative Education Review*, 47(1), 64-89.

hooks, bell. 1997. Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination, in R. Frankenberg (ed.) *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 165-79.

Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commissiona. N.d. 'Self-determination', Submission to the

United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, <http://www.hreoc.gov.au/pdf/social_justice/submissions_econ_social_cultural/self_determination.pdf>, accessed 12 August 2009.

Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission*b*. N.d. 'Indigenous Disadvantage and Self-determination', Submission to the United Nations Human Rights Committee, <http://www.hreoc.gov.au/word/social_justice/submissions_un_hr_committee/3_indigenous_disadvantage.doc>, accessed 12 August 2009.

Langton, M. 1993. *Well I Heard it on the Radio and Saw it on the Television…*, Woolloomooloo: Australian Film Commission.

McDonald, H. 2003. 'Exploring Possibilities Through Critical Race Theory: Exemplary Pedagogical Practices for Indigenous Students', New Zealand Association for Research in Education and Australian Association for Research in Education (NZARE/AARE) Joint Conference, University of Auckland, Auckland.

Moran, S. 2004. 'White Lives in Focus: Connecting Social Praxis, Subjectivity and Privilege', *borderlands e-journal*, 3(2), 1-8, <http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol3no2_2004/moran_lives.htm>, accessed 12 August 2009.

Moreton-Robinson, A. 2000. Whiteness, Epistemology and Indigenous Representation, in A Moreton-Robinson (ed.) *Whitening Race: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, <http://www.aiatsis.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/588/wrace_samplechapter.pdf>, accessed 12 August 2009.

Nakata, M. 1995. 'Culture in Education: A Political Strategy for Us or for Them', *Ngoonjook: Journal of Australian Indigenous Issues*, 11, 40-61.

——2001. Difficult Dialogues in Indigenous Domains, in M. Kalantzis & B. Cope (eds.) *Reconciliation, Multiculturalism, Identities: Difficult Dialogues, Sensible Solutions*, Australia: Common Ground, 109-114.

Parker, L. & Lynn, M. 2002. 'What's Race Got to Do With It? Critical Race Theory's Conflicts with and Connections to Qualitative Research and Epistemology', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 7-22.

Riggs, D. 2004a. 'Benevolence and the Management of Stake: On being "Good White People"', *Philament: an Online Journal of the Arts and Culture*, 4, <http://www.arts.usyd.edu.au/publications/philament/issue4_Critique_Riggs.htm>, accessed 12 August 2009.

Riggs, D. 2004b. '"We Don't Talk About Race Anymore": Power, Privilege and Critical Whiteness Studies', *borderlands e-journal*, 3(2) 2004, 1-6, <http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol3no2_2004/riggs_intro.htm>, accessed 12 August 2009.

Riggs D. & Augostinos, M. 2004. 'Projecting Threat: Managing Subjective Investments in Whiteness', *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society*, 9(2), 219-36.

Samson, J. 1998. *Imperial Benevolence: Making British Authority in the Pacific Islands*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Spring, J. 200l. *Deculturation and the Struggle for Equality*. Sydney: McGraw Hill.

Sue, D. W. 2006. *Multicultural Social Work Practice*, New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons Inc.

Sue, D. W. & Sue, D. 2003. *Counselling the Culturally Diverse: Theory and Practice*, 4th ed., Canada: John Wiley and Sons Inc.

Thompson, A. 2001. 'Summary of Whiteness Theory', Whiteness in Cross-Race Classroom Relationships, Department of Education Culture and Society Unit, University of Utah, <http://www.pauahtun.org/Whiteness-Summary-1.html>, accessed 12 August 2009.

Watson, N. 2005. 'Racism in Legal Education Special – Indigenous People in Legal Education: Staring Into a Mirror Without Reflection', *Indigenous Law Bulletin* (ILB 1) 6(8), 4-7.

"NO WHITE MAN ON THE STATION BUT MYSELF": WHITENESS AS A CATEGORY OF ANALYSIS FOR THE REVEREND FRANCIS TUCKFIELD

SAM RITCHIE

Abstract

In 1840, the Reverend Francis Tuckfield (1808-1865) wrote to his supervisors in London lamenting that because of pastoralism, "a serious loss has been sustained by the natives ... [their] territory is not only invaded; but their game is driven back, their ... valuable roots eaten by the White man's sheep and their deprivations, abuses and miseries are daily increasing." Earlier in the same letter, however, he had celebrated that "454,260 head of sheep ... are already grazing" in Port Phillip. Three years later, Tuckfield became a pastoralist himself. Recent historiography on missionary endeavour in Australia has used the writings of Tuckfield to assess "failure", "life", and "education" on mission stations. In this article I evaluate whiteness as a category of analysis for Tuckfield, in particular as a window into the apparent contradiction between his humanitarian beliefs and his views on the necessity, inevitability and benefit of pastoralism. To the evangelical Tuckfield, whiteness entailed a settled, cultivation-based and thus "civilised" existence. Moreover, his notions of whiteness were formed in contrast to the "wandering habits" of "savage barbarity" which defined the "blackness" of those to whom his missionary endeavour was targeted.

This article has arisen as a response to the call from the 2006 Historicising Whiteness conference (Carey et. al. 2007: vii) that whiteness studies needs to be included among other approaches to understanding "race". At that conference, the convenors Jane Carey, Leigh Boucher and Katherine Ellinghaus (2007: xv) proposed that "the construction of a racial other requires a concept of a racial self". The presence of whiteness in the initial period of European settlement in the Port Phillip district of New South Wales (1835-1845) is explored in this article, with specific reference to the evangelical missionary Francis Tuckfield, his concepts of whiteness, and his sense of racial self. For much of the nineteenth century, European concepts of "race" were relatively undefined and fluid; European concepts of "the other", however, were the forerunner of more concrete notions of "race".

Calling for a distinction between "analytically invoked" and "empirically specified" whiteness, Leigh Boucher (2007: 21 & 14) has argued for "some historical specificity" in the study of racial difference in the initial four decades of European settlement in Port Phillip (later Victoria). Furthermore, Boucher (2005; quoted in McLisky 2007: 410) has concluded that the defining of the settler-colonial self permeated depictions of race in nineteenth-century European observations of life in Victoria. In her 2006 Historicising Whiteness conference paper, "All of one blood?", Claire McLisky applied Boucher's arguments to her discussion of the missionary Daniel Matthews, who worked on the Maloga Mission during the period 1874-1888. McLisky (2007: 410)

ISSN 1832-3898

argues that Matthews' principal category of self-identification was Christian virtue rather than race. Matthews contrasted this category of Christian virtue with the categories of "the suffering and sunken blacks" and "wicked white men". This conforms to Boucher's argument that in the early nineteenth century whiteness was inferred rather than explicit; a consciousness of racial difference did exist during this period, however, it was an underlying one.

Francis Tuckfield arrived in the Port Phillip district of New South Wales as a missionary to the Aboriginal peoples of the area in 1838. He ministered to the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip until 1850, when the Bunting Dale mission station was closed. Tuckfield subsequently ministered to several churches in Victoria, New South Wales, and Tasmania before being appointed to the Wesleyan Methodist church in Portland, Victoria in 1864. On 21 October 1865, Tuckfield died aged fifty-seven, having contracted pneumonia and bronchitis while officiating at the funeral of a young child at the Portland cemetery a few days earlier. Through an examination of Tuckfield's observations during the first three years of the Bunting Dale mission (1839-1841) – as recorded in his personal journals, his official letters to his Wesleyan Missionary Society (WMS) supervisors in London, and his private letters to his parents in Cornwall – whiteness in nineteenth-century south-eastern Australia is explored in this article. At the time the Bunting Dale mission was established, the Port Phillip district had only very recently been settled by Europeans; the Batman Treaties, which signalled the beginning of European settlement in the district, had been signed only four years previous.[i] An examination of whiteness as a category of analysis for Tuckfield thus provides us with an interesting insight into what it meant to be white in the understanding of an evangelical missionary in the Port Phillip district in a period which historian Richard Broome (2005: 54) has labelled "one of the fastest land occupations in the history of empires".

Francis Lee Tuckfield was born in Germoe, Cornwall, in the southwest of England in 1808 and spent his early working life as a miner and seasonal fisherman.[ii] At the age of seventeen Tuckfield converted to Wesleyan Methodist Christianity and following a period of active local preaching, he was accepted as a candidate for the ministry. In November 1837, having attended the Theological Institute at Hoxton, London for two years, Tuckfield departed England bound for Australia to commence his role as missionary to the Aboriginal peoples of the Port Phillip district. After spending over three months at Hobart Town planning the mission with the Reverend Joseph Orton, the Chairman of the Van Diemen's Land district of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Australia, Tuckfield arrived in Port Phillip in July 1838. By late-1838 Tuckfield had selected an area for the mission station on the Barwon River, approximately fifty-five kilometres south-west of Geelong. The station was named "Bunting Dale" in honour of the zealous Wesleyan Methodist Jabez Bunting, the "chief architect" of the WMS (Piggin 1980: 19) and Tuckfield's London supervisor. The object of the mission – which began proper in mid-August 1839 – was "to induce the natives to abandon their erratic habits and settle near the Mission Establishment in order that we may teach them the arts of civilized life, and that by the blessing of Almighty God they may become ... acquainted with the doctrines and duties and privileges of our most holy religion" (Cannon 1982: 148). In other words, Tuckfield sought to "civilise" and

Christianise the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip.

Tuckfield's concern for the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip was evident before his arrival in the district. Less than a week after sailing out of sight of his native Cornwall, Tuckfield (23 November 1837: 18) reported in his journal that he "felt much liberty last night in praying for the natives of New South Wales". He expressed both interest in those he intended to convert, and the personal gain he believed he experienced through his desire to "save" the heathen. Tuckfield's choice of language here is also significant. Prior to arriving in the colony, and thus prior to having met any Aborigines, Tuckfield referred to those among whom he was soon to live as "natives".

In the early period following the establishment of the mission Tuckfield continued to refer to the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip as "natives", both in his official letters to his WMS supervisors in London and in his letters to his parents. In his letters to the WMS Tuckfield also labelled the Aboriginal peoples of the district "the comparatively unknown tribes of this extensive territory", "savages", "untutored barbarians", "half starved barbarians", "rude barbarians", "the aboriginal race", "aborigines", "wild hordes", "heathen", and occasionally "blacks". In his private journals and in his letters to his contemporaries located within Australia, however, the term Tuckfield most frequently used when describing the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip during this period, was "blacks".[iii]

In his letters to the WMS during the early period of the mission Tuckfield most often referred to Europeans who had emigrated to Port Phillip as "Whites", while he occasionally referred to them as "civilised man" and "Europeans". Tuckfield, furthermore, labelled the European "convict shepherds & stockmen" as "the outcasts of England" in his official letters. In his journal he identified Europeans living in the district most often as "Whites", although occasionally he labelled them "Europeans". This use of the coloured terms "blacks" (always lowercase) and "Whites" (always capitalised) perhaps indicates Tuckfield's adoption of the language of other Europeans in the colony. Tuckfield's use of the language of colour, however, also encompassed his notion of "the other", which was derived from his expanding knowledge of the local Aboriginal peoples' belief system and ways of life, and how these were in stark contrast to his own convictions.[iv]

Tuckfield's usage of the term "White" is perhaps unusual in the context of Port Phillip in the first half of the nineteenth century. Leigh Boucher (2007: 19) has noted that in the "various writings and speeches" of his subject Thomas McCombie, "there is an almost complete absence of the designation 'white'" and that "[m]oving between 'Britisher', 'Englishman', 'settler', 'colonist', 'man', and 'mankind', the racial specificity of the coloniser population [of nineteenth century Victoria] was surprisingly vague". Thomas McCombie, a Scotsman from Aberdeenshire, arrived in Port Phillip in April 1841. During his time in Port Phillip, McCombie worked as a journalist and later as a politician after initially having been a squatter (Farrow 1974). In the writings of McCombie and his contemporaries, Boucher (2007: 17) argues, "the category of whiteness itself had little purchase". While Francis Tuckfield too used a variety of labels for the European population of the district, he differed from McCombie and Boucher's other case studies in that he often used the term "Whites" when

discussing the coloniser population. Claire McLisky's study of the missionary Daniel Matthews shows that, although whiteness had not yet emerged as a category of analysis in the late nineteenth century, Matthews regularly used the term "white" to describe men of European descent whom he believed were responsible for the degeneration of Aboriginal peoples. Matthews never labelled himself or his family as "white"; he used the term in the context of expressing disapproval of others (McLisky 2007: 410). Francis Tuckfield, on the other hand, perceived himself and other Europeans living in the district as "Whites".

Tuckfield's sense of identity as a "White man" was formed by his perceptions of the relationship between blackness, savagery and danger. One month after founding Bunting Dale, Tuckfield left the station to sit his ordination examinations and attend the Wesleyan Methodist District Meeting in Hobart Town. He lamented in his journal: "I left my dear family to day [sic] on the Mission Station surrounded by the natives and only two Whites and a female for the district Meeting. This seems, to be one of the trials of a Missionary to be obliged to leave his family in an unprotected state" (Tuckfield 18 September 1839: 81). Four months later Tuckfield recorded in his journal his concern at there being "no White man on the Station but myself" (10 January 1840: 107). Three days following that he reported that he had "spent the day in teaching the blacks" and concluded that "Mrs. T. & myself feel it rather lonesome to be left in this distant part of the World among Savages who scarcely know anything of the value of human life" (13 January 1840: 109). Later that week, after announcing that "[t]he dray has just arrived and another man with [the overseer] Williamson", he wrote: "[w]e are three Whites now which is a very great relief to our minds to have company when there are so many blacks" (15 January 1840: 111). The blackness of the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip was, for Tuckfield, associated with savagery, barbarism and a potential threat to the safety of his family; the presence of whites, on the other hand, encompassed security.

It is important to note that Tuckfield described himself not only by the coloured term "White", but also in the gendered term "White man". Furthermore, when describing his relief at the arrival of two additional white men on the station, Tuckfield indicates that protection and safety are part of his understanding of whiteness and masculinity. Tuckfield's concern as a "White man" included a fear of leaving his family among the Aboriginal peoples who frequented the mission station; he feared those whom he was in the colony to Christianise. This is a reflection of what he understood to be his required role as a husband and a father – his duty to protect his family. It also signals his belief that women and children were vulnerable and thus needed protecting.[v]

Tuckfield, furthermore, saw paternalism as common between the Aboriginal peoples of Australia and Europeans; he perceived his notion of his own role as a husband and father as a duty to protect his family to be present in Aboriginal gender relations. Tuckfield noted that often when Aboriginal men approached what they perceived might be a dangerous situation they left their women and children behind, away from the perceived danger in an effort to protect their families (e.g., Tuckfield 14 December 1839: 94; 12 December 1840: 178-79). The Christianisation and "civilisation" Tuckfield sought to convert the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip to, however, was based on a particular form of domestic and familial

arrangements. Tuckfield, therefore, also perceived Aboriginal women to be subjugated in a way which European women were not. When an Aboriginal man named Karn Karn built a European-style house on the mission station, several other Aboriginal men also expressed interest in building on the station. They told Tuckfield, however, that "as they *have three wives* each they should require a larger house than Karn Karn". Tuckfield "told them, they might have as large houses as they were disposed to build; but if they intended to imitate the White man in one thing they should in another viz in the disposal of two of their wives out of the *three*" (11 May 1841: 226; original italics). The Aboriginal men in turn informed the missionary that as it was appropriate for Europeans to strive to own a number of horses and bullocks, so too was it proper for Aboriginal men to have a number of wives, because, the men said, "we have no other animals to do our work". "Good Lord", Tuckfield later wrote, "when will this day of oppression pass away" (cited in Le Griffon 2006: 169). "Civilisation" and Christianity – here amounting to monogamy and the appropriate use of domestic animals – would, Tuckfield believed, improve Aboriginal gender relations by making them resemble European ideals.

In his pioneering work on whiteness studies, *The Wages of Whiteness*, David Roediger (1999) explored the definition of "civilisation" in opposition to "savagery" during the European colonisation of North America. Roediger (1999: 22), who uses whiteness as a category within labour history, asserts that "white" attitudes toward land use were influenced by perceptions of Amerindians. This is also true of the European colonisation of Port Phillip – and across Australia more generally – where European perceptions of whiteness and its links with the privilege "civilisation" were defined in opposition to the perceived "savagery" of the Aboriginal peoples of the district. Roediger (1999: 21) has also argued that in the United States, "[s]ettler ideology held that ... 'lazy Indians' were failing to 'husband' or 'subdue' the resources God had provided them and thus should forfeit those resources. Work and Whiteness", Roediger concludes, "joined in the argument for dispossession". Again this holds true for the European invasion of the Port Phillip district and wider Australia, where it was argued that because the Aboriginal peoples of the area failed to use the land which they occupied, they had no ownership of nor right to the land. Tuckfield's concepts of whiteness were constructed in opposition to his understandings of the blackness of the Aboriginal peoples to whom he was in the colony to preach the gospel. "[B]lacks", he believed, were to be feared, while the presence of "Whites" provided him with a sense of security. Moreover, the "blacks" use of the land which they occupied was perceived by Tuckfield to be "uncivilised".

Tuckfield was not only afraid of the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip, he was also afraid of their becoming extinct; he believe the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip to be dying out. In 1840 Tuckfield reported to his London supervisors that it was "not at all infrequent" for tribes who regularly came and went from Bunting Dale to return to the station each time "fewer in number than they were when they left", and lamented that the site of Bunting Dale was once the "haunt of a small tribe but now with the exception of one family is depopulated" (Tuckfield 31 June [sic] 1840: 140-41, 155). Writing in 1842 to his Adelaide-based fellow missionary the Reverend B.J. Tiechelmann, Tuckfield noted that Bunting Dale was "central for four tribes or rather the remnants of" those tribes,

as there were "not more than 260" surviving members (17 March 1842: 321-322).

Tuckfield blamed pastoralism for causing much depopulation among the Aboriginal peoples of the Port Phillip district. While he acknowledged that many Aboriginal deaths were caused by inter-tribal fighting, Tuckfield blamed what he perceived to be an increase in this on the "exterminating progress of the white man" – European encroachment into Aboriginal lands (Le Griffon 2006: 205). Not only did Europeans deny the Aboriginal peoples access to their traditional lands, Tuckfield believed, but sheep – which had been introduced by Europeans – ate food that traditionally sustained the game animals which were vital to Aboriginal sustenance. This concern was seemingly contradicted by his belief in the necessity, inevitability, and benefit of the introduction of pastoralism to Australia. Less than a year after the establishment of the mission station Tuckfield wrote to his WMS supervisors in London lamenting the negative effects of pastoralism. He reported that the "introduction of the numerous flocks", had meant that "a serious loss has been sustained by the natives". "[W]ithout an equivalent being rendered", Tuckfield continued, "there [sic] territory is not only invaded; but their game is driven back, their ... valuable roots eaten by the White man's sheep and their deprivations, abuses and miseries are daily increasing." The "appalling result" of this "contest between the feebleness of untutored barbarism, and the skill and power of civilized man", Tuckfield concluded, would be "the final and utter extinction of the aboriginal race" (Tuckfield 31 June [sic] 1840: 139-140). "[T]he blood of the black man", Tuckfield continued later that year, is "pouring forth and reeking up to heaven while the evils which the European intrusion has inflicted are daily increasing" (Le Griffon 2006: 145). Tuckfield, therefore, blamed "White man's sheep" and their drovers for causing much depopulation among the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip.

Earlier in the same letter in which he had lamented the devastating effects pastoralism was having on the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip, Tuckfield had celebrated that Port Phillip's "physical aspect is of the most favourable character". This was, he believed, because it "enjoys from its position a genial climate, and an abundance of moisture" which had allowed for:

> 454,260 head of sheep and 35,000 head of cattle [to be] already grazing on its fertile plains … If this is the state of things, with in [sic] the comparatively narrow limits of Australia Felix & within the short period of about three years, what a magnificent empire may Australia yet become. Let the capabilities of her geographical position be judiciously improved and the ... influence of the Christian religion be diffused, and Australia may be a happy home for millions of the family of man (31 June [sic] 1840: 129, 137-138).

Furthermore, upon learning that his brother Joseph had emigrated to North America in 1841, Tuckfield wrote "with surprise and regret" to his parents, lamenting that Joseph had not instead moved to Australia, where "those who wish to better their circumstances very materially should emigrate" (25 March 1841: 204).[vi] Tuckfield's humanitarian beliefs – expressed in his concern that pastoralism was driving the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip to extinction – appear, therefore, to be inherently contradicted by his belief in the

necessity, inevitability, and benefit of the introduction of "White man's sheep", and, by implication, white men.

Tuckfield was concerned for the welfare of the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip; he was, after all, in the colony to "save" them. For Tuckfield – as for the vast majority of nineteenth-century evangelical missionaries – "saving" the heathen involved "civilising" and Christianising them. The nineteenth-century evangelical understanding of "civilising" is perhaps best defined as "Europeanising". As the historian Richard Broome (1994: 32) has noted, "the missionaries sought to make Europeans out of their black brethren". A major aspect in Europeanising the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip was encouraging them to replace their hunter-gatherer lifestyle with the settled existence of Europeans. Pastoralism was intended to encourage this by enabling them to live in a settled manner; allowing food to be provided for them without their having to travel in a nomadic fashion. Although Tuckfield suggested that the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip had managed "to subsist previous to our coming among them" and that it would therefore "be a disgrace to the British character, were our presence to doom them to starvation", he considered "civilising" and Christianising them to be the solution (31 June [sic] 1840: 143). Pastoralism and "the Gospel", Tuckfield believed, were "the means of raising these wild hordes to the rank of civilised man" (31 June [sic] 1840: 146). Tuckfield's notions of what it was to be white, then, included a belief that the privileged benefits of being "civilised" were enabled by pastoralism. Although he thought that pastoralism was driving the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip to extinction, Tuckfield also believed that it was pastoralism which could save them from extinction by enabling them to live in the "civilised" manner of whites.

Upon his arrival in Port Phillip Tuckfield had immediately noticed the differences between the Aboriginal peoples of the district and himself. Tuckfield categorised the Aboriginal peoples' traditional beliefs and lifestyle as savage and marked their differences from himself and other Europeans with the term "blacks", which he determined to be a marker of barbarism and danger. In opposition to this, Tuckfield perceived and categorised himself and other Europeans residing in Australia as "Whites", a term which for Tuckfield encompassed civilisation and superiority.

Although Thomas McCombie did not use the term "white", and the missionary Daniel Matthews used the label only in reference to Europeans whose behaviour he disapproved of, Francis Tuckfield defined himself as a "White man". This examination of whiteness as a category of analysis for Tuckfield does, however, conform to Boucher and McLisky's findings that in southeast Australia during the nineteenth-century, the presence of whiteness as a racial category was inferred rather than explicit. Tuckfield's notions of himself and others as "Whites" were constructed in opposition to his ideas about what constituted blackness; whiteness, for Tuckfield, encompassed the security of his family and the markers of "civilised man", to which he endeavoured to raise the Aboriginal peoples of the Port Phillip district. In investigating the feasibility of establishing a mission on the Goulburn River in 1842, Tuckfield had reported that he believed that pastoralism would reduce the cost of the mission (Le Griffon 2006: 205). Furthermore, in 1843 Tuckfield opened a subscription list to purchase sheep in order to help enable Bunting Dale to be self-supporting. By 1844 he believed that Bunting Dale's quantity of sheep and wheat were large enough, not only to allow the mission to become

self-supporting, but also to provide enough surplus to assist other mission stations. (Greenwood 1956: 15-16). Tuckfield believed that the privilege of whiteness – civilisation – was to be bestowed upon the Aboriginal peoples of Port Phillip by pastoralism.

Identifying, labelling, and exploring Tuckfield's concepts of what whiteness entailed has shown that these concepts were constructed in opposition to his ideas and experiences surrounding blackness. Exploring whiteness as a category of analysis for Tuckfield has strengthened our understanding of what it meant to be white in the perceptions of an evangelical missionary in the Port Phillip district of New South Wales during the period of initial European colonisation. These notions, and the links between them, were predecessors to the more concrete European perceptions of "race" which developed at the close of the nineteenth century.

Author Note

Sam Ritchie is an MA student at the Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. His research interests concern European perceptions of Māori and the Aboriginal peoples of Australia in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Acknowledgments

I am indebted to my supervisors Charlotte Macdonald and Adrian Muckle for their comments on drafts of this paper, and to my wife Michelle, without whom none of my academic pursuits would be possible. The archival research upon which this paper is based was conducted in the State Library of Victoria, Melbourne and was, along with financial assistance to attend the Re-Orienting Whiteness conference at which an earlier version of this paper was presented, enabled by a Victoria University of Wellington FHSS research grant.

References

Attwood, B. 2009. *Possession: Batman's Treaty and the Matter of History*, Melbourne: Miegunyah Press.

Boucher, L. 2007. 'Whiteness' before 'White Australia'?, in L. Boucher, J. Carey and K. Ellinghaus (eds.) *Historicising Whiteness: Transnational Perspectives on the Construction of an Identity*, Melbourne: RMIT Publishing, <http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=8282722451170-10;res=IELHSS>, accessed 28 October 2008.

Boucher, L. 2005. 'Unsettled Men: Settler Colonialism, Whiteness and Masculinity in Victoria 1851-1886', PhD thesis, Department of History, University of Melbourne.

Boys, R.D. 1935. *First Years at Port Phillip: Preceded by a Summary of Historical Events from 1768*, Melbourne: Robertson & Mullens Ltd.

Broome, R. 1994. *Aboriginal Australians: Black Responses to White Dominance 1788-1994*, 2nd ed, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

——2005. *Aboriginal Victorians: a History since 1800*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Cannon, M. (ed.) 1982. *Historical Records of Australia, Volume 2A: The Aborigines of Port Phillip 1835-1839*, Melbourne: Victoria Government Printing Office.

Carey, J., Boucher, L. and Ellinghaus, K. 2007. Historicising Whiteness: Towards a New Research Agenda, in L. Boucher, J. Carey and K. Ellinghaus (eds.) *Historicising Whiteness: Transnational Perspectives on the Construction of an Identity*, Melbourne: RMIT Publishing, <http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=828216346203236;

res=I- ELHSS>, accessed 28 October 2008.

Farrow, F. 1974. McCombie, Thomas (1819-1869), in *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, < http://www.adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A050154b.htm>, accessed 5 November 2008.

Greenwood, G.W. 1956. 'Reverend Francis Tuckfield's Magnificent Failure at Bunting Dale', *Heritage: A Journal of the Methodist Historical Society of Victoria*, 6, 3-21.

Hall, C. 1992. *White, Male and Middle Class: Explorations in Feminism and History*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lake, M. and Reynolds, H. 2008. *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the Question of Racial Equality*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Le Griffon, H. 2006. *Campfires at the Cross: An Account of the Bunting Dale Aboriginal Mission at Birregurra, near Colac, Victoria 1839-1851*, Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing.

McCallum, C. A. 1967. Tuckfield, Francis (1808-1865), in *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, <http://www.adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A020494b.htm>, accessed 11 March 2008.

McLisky, C. 2007. "All of one blood"? Race and Redemption on Maloga Mission, 1874-88, in L. Boucher, J. Carey and K. Ellinghaus (eds.) *Historicising Whiteness: Transnational Perspectives on the Construction of an Identity*, Melbourne: RMIT Publishing, <http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=863637624565074;res=IELHSS>, accessed 28 October 2008.

Mitchell, J. 2004. 'A City on a Hill' Aboriginal Missions and British Civilisation, 1830-1850, in K. Darian-Smith, P. Grimshaw, K. Lindsey and S. Macintyre (eds.) *Exploring the British World*, Melbourne: RMIT Publishing, <http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=872344908332788;res=IELHSS>, accessed 30 June 2008.

Piggin, S. 1980. 'Halévy Revisited: The Origins of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society: An Examination of Semmel's Thesis', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 9(1), 17-37.

Roediger, D. 1999. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*, 2nd ed, London: Verso.

Tuckfield, Francis. 1837-1842. Journal, MS7667, Box 655, State Library of Victoria, Melbourne.

Woollacott, A. 2009. 'Frontier violence and settler manhood', *History Australia*, 6(1), 11.1-11.15.

Notes

[i] Private entrepreneurs such as Edward Henry had been visiting shore across the Bass Strait from Van Diemen's Land from 1834. In May 1835 John Batman arrived in the area. On 6 June 1835 the first of the two Batman Treaties – which involved the lease of land around Melbourne and Geelong – were signed (Boys 1935: 39; Broome 2005: 11. See also Attwood 2009). While the Batman Treaties were later nullified, on 9 September 1836 New South Wales Governor Sir Richard Bourke issued a Government Order authorising the settlement of Port Phillip under the Crown Lands Regulations of New South Wales (Boys 1935: 51).

[ii] Biographical information concerning Tuckfield found outside his letters and journals has been sourced from Greenwood 1956, Le Griffon 2006 and McCallum 1967.

[iii] While Tuckfield's journals were forwarded to his WMS supervisors in London – as were most if not all nineteenth-century evangelical missionary journals – missionary journals often contain a more personal and less filtered account of events than do official letters and reports.

[iv] Jessie Mitchell has explored the identifying and labelling of different populations in Australia during this period, noting that it is "possible that missionaries considered the division between 'white' and 'black' the most fundamental one on the Australian frontier" (Mitchell 2004: 224).

[v] Angela Woollacott (2009: 11.1) has noted that "[i]n the settler colonies of the British Empire, frontier expansion added new tests and definitions of manliness". In arguing that Englishness has been constructed as a national identity through the recognition of themselves in relation to others, Catherine Hall (1992: 205-254) has also explored whiteness and gender within nineteenth-century British missionary cultures – specifically within Baptist missionaries in Jamaica in the 1830s and 1840s. Masculinity and whiteness has further been explored by Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds in their recent book *Drawing the Global Colour Line* (2008).

[vi] Tuckfield also wrote to his older brother William seven months later encouraging him to move to Port Phillip (14 October 1841: 305, 314). Interestingly, Tuckfield actively discouraged his sister from emigrating to Australia unaccompanied because her doing so might have caused scandalous gossip (Greenwood 1956: 14).