Racialisation and Australia

James Beresford

Introduction

"[A]ll doctrines, policies and practices based on or advocating superiority of peoples or individuals on the basis of national origin or racial, religious, ethnic or cultural differences are racist, scientifically false, legally invalid, morally condemnable and socially unjust" (United Nations, 2008:2). Emerging from the global 'indigenous peoples movement' (Niezen, 2003, Sissons, 2005), the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People, from which this quote was taken, paints (and rightly so) a condeming image of colonial intellectuals involved in racialization processes. Such condemnation, however, is directed toward the explicit, implied to exert a single effect on 'indigenous peoples' (a somewhat homogenising term). Classification and hierarchies, however, are not always explicit, and can be multiple in their trajectories, 'intersecting' with other axis of identity and oppression. Analysing the colonial/post-conoial Australian context, this essay will critical interigate the manner in which white intellectuals have both racialized aboriginal people along gender lines, and in turn racialized themselves (Banton, 2005) through the relationally of such processes. Employing an 'interactegorical intersectional' approach (McCall, 2005) and drawing upon Gramsci's traditional/organic intellectual binary, various social mechanisms and phenomena will be analysed in a discussion structured around Frankenberg's (1997) tropological family,consisting of; the pure white woman; the pure white man; the hyper-sexual coloured women; the hyper-sexual coloured man. Here, the former two will be conceptualised as white Australians and the latter as aboriginal Australians, and despite much of the empirical evidence not strictly conforming to this fourfold typology, it will be the structure of it and emphasis on the relational which will guide the paper. However, the reader must be warned that despite "[a]ll aspects of Aboriginal society have been directly affected by the arrival of British colonies" (Bourke and Edwards, 1998:100), the analysis presented here will and could never be a comprehensive documentation of racialization from settlement (1788) onward. Rather it is a discursive exploration, linking and analysing select aspects from this period and therefore excluding a variety of extremely significant phenomena (for example, the Mabo case (Bourke and Coxs, 1998)). Beginning with a critical overview of the key terminology, the essay will construct a theoretical framework in which empirical evidence from Australia will then be situated, critically interagatting the four family members respectively to show the effect of white intellectual racialization on each.

However, before undertaking this task, some of the more ambiguous analytical tools (racialization, race, itnersectionality) must be clearly defined, preserving sociology's commitment to 'responsible speech' (Bauman and May, 2001). Racialization has been deployed in relation to the material (Banton, 2001), epistemological and even psychological (Law, 2010, Murji and Solomos, 2005, Nayak, 2005). However, this essay will, paradoxically, capitalise on such ambiguity through, as mentioned above, focusing on a specific area of racialization, discourse (Goldberg, 1993).

Whenever one can describe, between a number of statements, such a system of

dispersion, whenever, between objects, types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define a regulatory (an order, correlations, positions and functioning's, transformations), we will say, for the sake of convenience, that we are dealing with a discursive formation ….The conditions to which the elements of this division (objects, modes of statement, concepts, thematic choices) are subjected we shall call the rules of formation. The rules of formation are conditions of existence (but also of coexistence, maintenance, modification, and disappearance) in a given discursive division (Foucault, 1972:38)

Foucault work has gained increasing science in social science more broadly, but also the analysis of 'racialization' (Nayak, 2005) and colonialism (Loomba, 2005). Scholars such asSaid (2003) have noted the impact of discourse ('Orientalism') in the relationship constructing images of and distinctions between the orient and occident (Said, 2003), or West and Rest (Hall, 1992), and looking at the way discourse is racialized, one can then view the impact on other social dimensions such as the material and so on. Here the focus will be on Goldberg's (1993) conception of racialized discourse, farguing this field of discourse consists of racial expressions, both constituting and expressed from it. Discourse is thus racialized, and like all discourses, racialized discourse's expression leads to a body of discursive objects, defined by rules of implication, spawning both race and subsequently racism, both of which are shaped in relation to discursive shifts. Race and racism are thus distinct expressions (Goldberg, 1993, 2009b) and both are highly situated in terms of space and time, and thus a micro analytical focus is thus required, whilst also tying this into more general macro conditions, paticularly modernity.

Regarding our intersectional analysis, 'modernity' has been cited as the period in which both 'racism (Goldberg, 1993) and the 'two-sex model' (Lacquer, 1990) emerged, and thus is a somewhat crucial aspect in the shaping of white intellectual production, excerising a significant influence upon intellectual's racialization. Hall (1992) and Said (2003) use the 'West' or the 'Occident' in refernce not only to geographical location but also dicourse, citing it as an idealised model of what society should look like in comparison to an 'Other', the Rest (Hall, 1992) or Orient (Said, 2003). This ideal is many respects one of modernity, and in turn, 'civility' (Bauman, 2000, Elias, 2000). Civilization "sums up everything in which Western society of the last two or three centuries believes itself superior to earlier societies or "more primitive" contemporary ones. By this term Western society seeks to describe what constitutes its special character" (Elias, 2000:5). Western society thus uses itself as a standard, categorising other societies and races, an such processes can occur internally. Hechter (1975), upon analysing the manner which in conflicts between opposing groups are mediated through the state, identifies processes of internal-colonialism (Hetcher, 1975, Stone, 1993) "[f]rom this perspective the 'backwardness' of peripheral groups can only be deemed to be an internal colony" (Hechter, 1975:32). Aboriginal society das been treated like this both internally and externally. Finally, attention must be paid to the inherently racial nature of the state, which is co-articulated with race (Goldberg, 2002, 2009b), perpetuating ideas of 'racial origin' (Goldberg, 2009b), and thus can be positioned as a racialized expression.

Regarding 'race', arguments that the terminology of race is not necessary in it's articulation (Dikötter, 2008) will be embraced here, examining the 'encoding' (Hall, 1980) of racial hierarchies culturally (Dikötter, 2008) ('cultural'' racism (Solomos and Back, 2001)) as well ideas of 'born again racism' (Goldberg, 2009b). Such ideas are so enhusiastcly welcomed here due to the 'unmarked' nature of whiteness (Dyer, 1997, Frankenberg, 1997, Gabriel, 1998, Hage, 2005, Haggis, 2004, Nyak, 2005, Sandovall, 1997). Examining various representations, Dyer (1997) seminally identified the prevalence of whiteness as racially unmarked, "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). White intellectuals thus speak and think for humanity (Dyer, 1997), a phenomena

Frankenberg (1997) places as dependent on 'white' domination and hegemony. But such 'speaking' and 'thinking' is neither objective or socially divorced. Knowledge is always somewhat situated, an idea inherited from Foucaultnian disruptions of structural power models (Craib, 1992, Callinicos, 2007, Lomba, 2005), and deployed regarding gender (Harraway, 1991), race (Said, 2003) and specifically Australian racialization (Curthoys, 1993, Morten-Robinson, 2004, Nicoll, 2004). Attention must therefore be payed to 'whiteness as knowing' (Gabriel, 1998), which along with various male-centric epistemologies exert an influence upon intellectual production.

Such ideas are important regarding intellectuals, who, particularly natural sceintists (Banton, 2005, Carter, 2007, Hannaford, 1996), have actively participated in racialization throughout modernity, positioning whiteness as a norm through which (as with westerness and civility), 'others' were contrasted to (Brah, 2005, Tutton, 2007). Explicit racial language has been used here, but also more implicit recourses to race. Here, 'intellectual' is used in Gramsci's formulation, distinguishing between traditional intellectuals (reproducing dominant hegemonies) and organic intellectuals (articulating a 'counter hegemony') (Boggs, 2000, Hall, 1996, Loomba, 2005, Mouffe, 1997a, 1997b, Said, 1996, Sassoon, 1980). Despite Gramsci's analysis being both rooted in a humanist marxist analysis of the material economy, as well as focusing on ideology (an idea Focuault (who's work, along with Gramsci, somewhat structures the current enquiry) somewhat abandoned (Loomba, 2005)) the post-Marxist reformulation of such ideas by writers such as Laclau and Mouffe (1987, 2001) can be successfully used here. Class is decentered and all forms of essentialist thinking are rejected in favour of a discursive approach toward the study of hegemony (Aron et al., 2000, Laclau and Mouffe, 1987, 2001). However, the historical specificity of hegemony, which Hall (1996) cites as one of the most importance aspects of Gramsci's theoretical legacy in the analysis of 'race', is maintianed.Thus various social activists, artists, writers, and so on are considered as intellectuals, racializing without recourse to 'racial language'. For the purposes of this essay, the traditional hegemony will be positioned as somewhat constitued through whiteness, as well as gender. This allows the recognition of the specifically situated dynamics of racism (Cashmore and Jennings, 2001a, 2001b, Lee, 1995). But, the reader may protest to the validity of a focus on white intellectuals when "[t]he constructions of Aboriginality is as much a result of Aboriginals as of Australians of European origins" (Bensa, 2001:290). Aboriginal people shape their own racialized identities (Martino, 2003, Morten Robinson, 1998, 2004), performed by many organic intellectuals such as; the global indigenous peoples movements (Nizen, 2003, Sissons, 2005) as well as more localised mobilisation (Bourke, 1998b, Robert, 1998); cultural expression such as art (Alberts and Anderson, 1998) and media broadcasters such as Imparja (Mackinlay and Barney, 2008); and the rewriting of traditional Australian history (Hemming, 1998). Furthermore; the significance placed on hybridity in post-colonial studies (Loomba, 2005, Robotham, 2000); the recognition of Aboriginal people's agency in various publications (see Collman, 19980); as well Focuaultnian emphasis on resistance as axiomatic to power (Callinicos, 2007, Craib, 1992); can all be argued to undermine such a valid avoutn of Australian racialization. However, as previously mentioned, the essay is attempting to provide an analysis of certain processes, focusing on white intellectuals so as to deepen analytical, as well as addressing neglected areas, as "[t]he vast majority of studies on racialization have then tended to omit or at least underplay the racialization of ethnic majorities, especially those individuals deemed 'white'" (Nayak, 2005:147).

Finally, intersectional epistomologies critique how "dominant conceptions of discrimination condition us to think about subordination as disadvantage occurring along a single categorical axis" (Crenshaw, 1989:140). Racialization will eventually intersect with gender and sexuality, and to provide a valid analysis, one must acknowledge this and subsequent phenomena such as 'gendered racism' (Essed, 1991). However, this idea may be

taken further, with some proclaiming that even this formulation is fundamentally reductive, omitting an array of differences such as age, disability and class (Davis, 2008, Pheonix and Patynama, 2006). Responding to this, the paper, as mentioned above, the
justification surrounding the implausibility of a truly comprehensive analysis must be reiterated. The essay recognises such phenomena's existence and their intersection with racialization processes, but, working at a certain level of abstraction, ommitts rather than denies. However, there are issues surrounding intersectionality's ambiguity as an holistic tool, demonstrated through various theoretical formulations (Davis, 2008, McCall, 2005). The term will be used intra-categoricaly, focusing on the intersection of difference within one social identity (McCall, 2005), 'race's' and intersects with gender. But this will not be performed, as with initial approaches, through viewing differences and inequalities as 'add ons' (Brah, 2001). Rather, the way differences of gender and race are consituted discursively though one another and are intimately entwined as a result (Brah, 2001) will be the focus, analysing gendered expressions intersection with racialized discourse.

Australia: Setting the Scene

The significance of these theoretical elaborations for Australia is their disruption of notions of racialization as monolithic. Constituted through various discourses, racializing different subjects in varying fashions, Australian racialized expressions are highly situated. However, at a rather broad level, key themes can be identified, transformed and reshaped at the micro level. Ever since James Cook (2004) recorded an encounter with four 'natives' on 29th April 1770 in his journals, Aboriginal Australians have routinely been the victims of imposed images and identities originating from 'white' discourses (Bourke, 1998a). Early (1788 onward) settler-Aborginals contact, and the 'racial mommement' (Spickard, 2005) that followed involved two key racialized expressions, ideas of aboriginal people as; intwined with nature, emerging from thick, temperate jungles; and neither nature or human, a sort of subspecies (Yengoyan, 2001). Noble savagery was a remergent (but male) theme here, expressed in relation to various modernist ideals of rationality (Bourke, 1998a, Curthoys, 1993). Nineteenth century transformations led to depictions of humanised aboriginals subjects, but a primitive humanity (Yengoyan, 2001), linked into social darwinistic ideals and culture's equation with nature (Bourke, 1998a). What is important here is relationally. Aboriginal people were associated with nature, were half animal/human, were noble savages, sub-humans and many other things in relation to a 'white' norm, taken for granted by white intellectuals through it's invisibility. To use Bourdieu's (1997) words, whiteness became 'doxic', and such doxa fostered it's use as a scale of humanity.There are also contemporary instances and phenomena from the twentieth century echoing such ascription, including; the state's monopoly on defining who is Aboriginal since 1973 (Bourke and Edwards, 1998); the majority of contemporary 'projects' aimed at Aboriginal people (such as The Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies and The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission) (United Nations, 2002), being commissioned and run by the state or white bodies rather than Aboriginal people themselves.

There are also certain discourses surrounding interacting with racialized ones. "For the Northern Hemisphere, 'Australia' was a construct of the imagination long before Europeans set foot on its soil, an idea, phantasm of utopia and dystopia. European explorations of the alien, the other, the unknown, long involved voyaging into imaginary Worlds Upside Down in order" (Curthoys, 1993:166). Australia was shaped as a discourse, subsequently interacting with whiteness. Acts of symbolic apportion such as the linguistic anglicanisation of the landscape through naming (Moran, 2002) can be argued to demonstrate the whiteness's implicit dynamics, enacting the 'elective affinity' between the nation state and race (Goldberg, 2002) and naturalising the nation-state as normative

(Spickard, 2005). Australia, therefore, was discursively positioned, in the eyes of present and future white intellectuals, as doxically white, somethingd isrupted only by the presence of Aboriginals (Moran, 2009), who have also been studied through a particular discourse. Drawing heavily upon Said (2003) 'Aboriginalism' refers "to the tendency of (largely white) scholars to use 'culture' as the key analytical tool for knowing social difference and for explaining issues in colonial contexts….Essentially they [Aborigines] will be spoken about or for but cannot speak themselves" (Mackinlay and Barney, 2008:278). Such ideas are embedded in 'whiteness as knowing', homogenising Aboriginal people through employing tropes of 'traditional culture' (Mackinley and Barney, 2008). However, here, practices of 'Aboriginalism' will be examined in relation to other discourses, creating hetrogeny though intersection with gendered ideals. All these themes are, however, shaped at the micro level through different discourses, including gender, and this hypothesis will now be explored through the four subjects.

White Australian Masculinity

Goldberg's (2009a) argues modern racist expressions to be characteristically global, undivorceable from expressions elsewhere which shape and reproduce them, and this could be no more the case concerning the construction of the white Austrlian man. Operating through various trans-national discursive networks facilitated by colonialism, Austrlian ideals of white masculinity were shaped by prominent European racial and gendered discourse, the most prominent example being 'imperial masculinity' from the eighteenth century onwards (Beynon, 2002, Krishnaswamy, 2002). Operating through the Feminization racial others and in turn idealising the white European male (Krishnaswamy, 2002), such masculinities were adopted by traditional intellectuals (anthropologists particularly)as aesthetic criteria, identifying differences between the advanced (whites) and primitives (non-whites) (Krishnaswamy, 2002, Gittings, 1996). Thus, "[e]ffeminacy represents a critical and contentious idiom through which the racial and sexual ideologies of empire are mediated" (Krishnaswamy, 2002:294). Educators also (traditional intellectuals) played key roles in such construction, with Thomas Arnold being key in the construction of 'muscular christianity', predominant between 1850 and 1900 (Martin, 1996), whilst later athletic ideas of masculinity (prominent up unit the first world war) were initiated by Thomas Carlyl (Beynon, 2002). This was echoed in boys annuals of the time, crucial in reproducing and perpetuating both of these 'hegemonic masculinities' (Connell, 1987, 2005), both corresponding to white self-racialization.

Regarding Australia, the latter's priotisation of physical over mental strength through a pro-sport emphasis grounded in social darwinistic logics, and in Australia, "[t]he notion that the Aboriginal population was bound to fade in competition with the white races" (Martin, 1996:201). White men were thus biologically superior, physically dominant in contrast to a dying race. These images were, however, not just disseminated to cultural dopes. Hall (1980), developing ideas of cultural circuitry, argued that cultural meaning can only come into being through 'decoding' upon reception, making recipients active participants within mass culture (Barrett, 2008, Hall, 1980, Maxwell, 2000). West's (1996) research demonstrates this well, documenting practices of masculinity in Penrith, emphasising how nationalistic discourses (and thus racialized (Goldberg, 2002)) present in these annuals encoding were enacted through activities such as 'empire days' (West, 1996). Thus "Penrith boys grew up as proud sons of the mighty British Empire" (West, 1996:215), willing to defend it in a military capacity, linking into the emphasis on physicality and eugenicall superiority compared to the dying Aboriginal race. The colonial network thus provided a relational framework through which to construct white masculine identities, and the images disseminated by such intellectuals can be traced through to contemporary Australia. Research into integrated education has documented racist expressions from white boys against aboriginal male and female coutnerparts (Martino, 2003). Martino's (2003) thus uncovers "how the social practices of masculinity

for some white boys are enacted through what becomes for Indigenous boys an intensification of racialised power relations" (Martino, 2003:162). Acording to Martino's (2003) participants, this mainly involved various forms of 'everyday racism' (Essed, 1991) such as antagonistic behaviour and violence, the majority of which was, echoing social darwinistic ideals, physical. However, we can also see new discourses emerging, specifically notion of unfair treatment, with and children placed as receiving special treatment (a key mechanism in minority construction (Grew, 2001)), seen to contradict myth's of Australian 'egalitarianism (Connell, 1974, Fee and Russell, 2007). This in turn "feeds the delusional construction of 'whiteness' as a signifer of the 'new disadvantaged' which is fueled….by an intensified resurgence of the New Right agenda in times of backlash politics and conservative modernisation" (Martino, 2003:163). Whiteness and white masculinity is thus constructed as under attack from a racialized other.

However, racialized discourse has also shaped white Australian masculinities through ascription, predominantly in anti-racist expression. "[N]ow, in a common reversal in literature, film, and popular imagination, it is the Aboriginal peoples who are seen as civilised, while the mixed European-Australian population emerges, in relation to the land, history, and community, as violent, destructive, and crude" (Curthoys, 1993:166-7). Emerging from 'progressive' (Gabriel, 1998) or liberal whiteness (Haggis, 2004), these anti-racist discourses have racially signified hegemonic masculinities of the time as abusive, inhuman, and so on (Paisley, 1997). Such ideas first emerged in (white) Australian feminism and their claim to protect 'native' women from the sexual exploitation of 'white' (as well as Aboriginal) men (Paisley, 1997, 1999), twinned with expressions by intellectuals such as Bessie Rischbeieth and Mary Montgomery Bennett that they had to help raise the position of Aboriginal women as white men would not do so (Lake, 1993, Woollocatt, 1999). However, such discourses have been made in relation to the past, not focusing on the present situation where white masculinities function in similar ways, as Martino (2003) has shown, and this why such ideas have been identified as expressions of a liberal whiteness, focusing on the unsavoury acts of the past but paying no recognition at all to the power relations of the present.

White Australian Woman

Increasing recognition has been paid to white women's dual position in colonial projects, dominated through gender, dominating through racialization (Burgmann, 1982, Gittings, 1996, Loomba, 2005), an idea of significant relevance to Australian (Burgmann, 1982, Fredericks, 2010, Paisley, 1997, 1999, Wilson, 1996, Woollacott, 1999). This will be analysed here in relation to (white) Australian feminism and the various movements and schools of thought emerging from it. In their early development, such bodies of knowledge developed a dependency on global networks (Woollacott, 1999), with Australian (white) feminist's "colonial relationship to England, arguably the global centre of international feminism in the first two decades of the twentieth century, facilitated their own global connectedness and thus bolstered their politically-derived self-definition as modern" (Woollacott, 1999:49) The overseas campaigning of anti-child removal feminists and feminist groups such as the Australian federation of Women is a prominent example (Paisley, 1999), and the important point here is what this mobility was defined against, Aboriginal women's relative immobility (Woollacott, 1999). This further positioning white women as civilised (Burgman, 1982, Lake, 1993), ideas of which emerge specifcally in relation pro-family and anti-child theft feminism. Bennett, for example, emphasised the 'need' to keep Aboriginal families together, permitting humane assimilation (Paisley, 1999), as it was "tragic that the Anglo-Australian nation should perpetrate these 'unnecessary crimes and tragedies' against the Aboriginal race in the name of progress" (Paisley, 1999:136). Assimilative logics thus acted to raise Aboriginal women up to civilised standards (Lake, 1993), defined through whiteness.

The reader may have noted the bracketed word 'white consistently preceding 'feminism/t', acting to emphasise the implicitly white-centric nature of the various movements discussed and their subsequent intellectual expressions. Almost perfectly echoing Dyer (1997), practices of identity politics and 'sisterhood' have led such groups to speak holistically for women, homogenizing at the expense of various unique social positions, particularly that of aboriginal women (Burgman, 1982, Fredericks, 2010, Wilson, 1996). Through racialized discourse, inequality has been deracialized, with gender placed as the primary social antagonism. The hegemony articulated by these organic intellectuals was thus not as organic as one may think, allowing their position of race priviledge to be naturalised and thus retained. Signle-issue focus and identity were thus adopted, reducing the shear complexity of social life and disadvantage, as well as shifting focus away from their dominating position, exhibited by first wave feminist movements such as the Women's Service Guilds of Western Australia (Paisley, 1999), up until secondary ones also (Burgmann, 1982, Wilson, 1996). Empirically, this can be seen through Wilson (1996) research into a (white) feminist refuge. Despite various acts of 'everyday racism' (Essed, 1991) toward Aboriginal women and the institutionalised nature of this racism, white staff operationalised understandings of racism as an, explicit, individual phenomena, the domain of 'bigoted people'. Despite 'anti-racist stratergies' were, in theory, put in place, they were secondary to the real purpose of the institution, tokenistic even, 'gender inequality'. To use Mills's (1959) language, racism was a 'private trouble' rather than a 'public issue', condemning explicit racism through a 'progressive whiteness' (Gabriel, 1998), but ignoring the various discourses implicitly structuring an environment of racial domination. A final pint of interest in Wilson's (1996) research is her tracing of the 'importance of sisterhood' to above mentioned instances of the sexual exploitation of aboriginal women by both white and aboriginal men, which despite being of great significance, acted simultaneously to legitimate the prioritising of gender and obscure the role of women in the colonial project, again reiterating themes of relationally. 'Whiteness as knowing' (Gabriel, 1998) structured the environment, allowing white Australian feminists to construct themselves as anti-racist but minting positions of relative advantage.

Aboriginal Man

Regarding our third racialized subject, initial representations were orientated around Roussea's noble savage trope, grounded in Enlightenment principles of reason (Bourke, 1998a, Conor, 2006). Such a savage was a "primitive man existing in a state of original grace and simplicity" (Conor, 2006:198), in deficit of European Enlightenment ideals of male rationality (Conor, 2006) articulated most notably Kant (2007). Again we observe racialized discursive expressions juxtaposing civility (whiteness) against the primitive (Aboriginality), most prominently expressed in the first recorded 'encounters' of European 'explorers' with 'native men'. Bank (2004), describeing a scene on the 28th April 1770 were he and his fellow crewman were blocked from obtaining water (positioned as a reasonable, sensible act), noted the aggression of these 'natives', shouting in a 'strange' language and brandishing spears, presented as polar opposites to the rational ideal expressed by Kant (2007). Such images were supplemented in the nineteenth century with expressions of canibalism, for which the deaths of notable explorers both in Australia and the colonial context more broadly acted a catalysts (Conor, 2006). This is particularly poignant given the disdain of modernity and civility toward visible, non-state perpatrated violence, one of the key markers of a lack of civility (Bauman, 2002, Elias, 2000). From this, hyperexual constructions developed, in relation to both the trope of the 'pure white man' (Conor, 2006), but also the supposed vulnerability of white women (Frankenberg, 1997). Ideas of civility, were, however, closely linked to masculinity. Thus, through been irrational, Aboriginal men were feminized or presented as childlike (Adams and Sarvan, 2002, Benyon, 2002, Krishnaswamy, 2002). Martinez and Lowrie

(2009) document this well in a case study on male aboriginal house servants in Darwin, with "their 'racial' capacity to attain adulthood was questioned" (Martinez and Lowrie, 2009). Subsequent proliferation of phrases such as 'house' or 'native' boy further emphasised this relational femininity, a processes materially embodied in the denial of aboriginal men into certain areas of the house, or the entire house itself (Martinez and Lowrie, 2009).

Therefore, many writers have positioned aboriginal masculinity as subordinate to it's white 'hegemonic' (Connell, 1987,2005) counterparts (Pease, 2004). Conell's (1987, 2005) structural account of gender is useful, detailing the specificity and fluidity of different masculinites, but also their relationally, with hegemonic masculinities transforming in relation to both subordinate ones, and feminities also. Thus links can be made between initial ascriptions of noble savagery and above mentioned imperial masculinities, but both of these changed over time, evident in Martino's (2003) above mentioned research. The racist expressions of young white males acted "to demonise and pathologise the Indigenous 'other' as having a particular propensity for violent and aggressive behaviour" (Martino, 2003:169). An implicit reiteration of savagery compared to civility can be detected, especially as "within such frames of racialised social relations and practices the Indigenous boys are constructed as the ones to be feared and as the 'trouble makers'" (Martino, 2003:170). However, these are articulated in relation to above mentioned ideas of special treatment, ideas emerging from negative attitudes towards and constructions of policies of cultural pluralism, a specific historical moment not present in previously climates. Again, the specificity of racialized discourse must be emphasised.

Aboriginal Woman

Since colonialism's initiation, indigenous women's bodies have been consistently constructed as symbolic of the land taken, put to metaphorical use in shaping images of fear and promise in the conquered territory, open to 'plunder' but also shrouded in mystery (Loomba, 2005). For Aboriginal women, the female equivalent of the noble savage, the 'native bell', was what framed the Australian colonial scene, which, "acutely attuned to appearance, invoked the native belle as a discursive shuttle between the twin tendencies of the monstrous and romantic native within Western primitivism" (Conor, 2006:198). Of course, this was relational, reemphasising modernist and Englightenment principles (civility, mastery over nature) through difference (Lake, 1993), in particular drawing upon above mentioned themes surrounding nature discussed by Yengoyan (2001), "[t]he native belle was purportedly unselfconsciously beautiful: hers was not a beauty of artifice; it was not therefore modern" (Conor, 2006:198). Such images, as with other racialized constructions, were globally disseminated through previously mentioned networks, but such initial constructions of Aboriginal women, however, differed from discourses concerning other female colonial subjects circulated at the time (Conor, 2006). The discursive convention associating dark skin with non-baeuty was broken in works of intellectuals such as the artist Auguste Earl (Conor, 2006), reemphasing the specificity of racialized expressions, but also the way in which they emerge from more macro discourses (civility, rationality). A final point of interest concerning initials representations is the meticulous documentation performed by intellectuals in their production, with traditional body markings and various other body projects being emphasised, especially in visual art (Conor, 2006), significant through ideas of cultural circuitry. Encoding of difference in these portraits, through the documenting such augmentation, reinforced constructions of modern, civilised whiteness upon their decoding as primitive principally through the inflection of pain (Conor, 2006). Such ideas inevitably transformed over time, but retained an emphasis on aboriginal female sexuality as morally inferior to that of White women, illustrated most prominently by phrases such as lubra, gin or black velvet (Lake, 193). Thus we see initial representations conforming

to the more general patterns of representation documented by Yengoyan (2001) for that period, but being somewhat constituted through gender discourses and creating localised specificity, still related, however, to more global themes.

Such expressions, however, primerily arose through a male gaze, but (white) feminists movements were also complicit in constructing images of Aboriginal when. The global dissemination of Liberal upper class (white) feminist ideals embodied by intellectuals such as Mary Wollstonecraft, and facilitated by the above mentioned international connectedness (Woollacott, 1992) of (white) feminists, lead Aboriginal women to be degendered and dehumanised. Challenging conventional irrational conceptions of femininity, Woolstonecraft positioned (white, upper class women) women as trapped in a 'gilt cage' (Budig, 2007, Conor, 2006). Perceived natural inferiority of women was social rather than dispositional, fostered through a lack of education (Budig, 2007, Conor, 2006). However, Aboriginal women were somewhat initially excluded from this potential, "[t]hese authors largely occupied positions of race privilege. They paid little, if any, attention to the operation of beauty on women of colour" (Conor, 2006:200). From this it can be inferred that aboriginal women, through racialized ideas of primitivism, were unable to achieve such rationality, a similar idea disseminated by white male intellectuals. When Aboriginal women later fell into the analytical scope of (white) feminist intellectuals, a similar approach to race was taken. Reviewing the (white) female produced anthropological literature concerning Aboriginal women, Moreton-Robinson (1998) identifies a prevalent focus on particular 'groups' of Aborginal women, those seen as more 'traditional' and those as more 'contemporary' (usually mixed-race), echoing ideas of 'Aboriginalism' (Mackinlay and Barney, 2008). Such intellectuals thus essentialized authenticity, erecting a contemporary-traditional dichotomy, ignoring the historical specificity of the female Aboriginal subject, especially regarding colonialism. Thus "[w]hat becomes operationalized and takes precedence in their analyses is an a priori essential biologism which is used to explain miscegenation and social change" (Moreton-Robinson, 1998:277). Contemporary Aborginal women's culture is, due to this racialization, constructed as ambiguous, in-between traditional aboriginal and white women culturally, and distinct from both racially. But, significantly, as aboriginal women's lives do not fit neatly into either of these two categories (Morten-Robinson, 1998), the projection of a discourse ignoring the heterogeneity of the subjects. Furthermore such practices can partly be seen as a response to to the women's movement as
an audience, focusing on issues of sexuality and marriage in order to construct parallels between their social biographies an those of white women, emphasising notions of sisterhood (Moreton-Robinson, 1998). Combined with the general structure of colonialism, "[a]s victims of their methodology, women anthropologists [therefore] suppress the experiences of Aboriginal women and provide distorted representations of their gender; representations that are explicitly linked to the ethnocentric notions embedded in their methodology and political positions on gender" (Moreton-Robinson, 1998).

Conclusion

In conclusion, a number of key themes have emerged from this enquiry. Firstly, despite categorical division and separate analysis, it has been hard to analyse the four racial subjects as totally discrete, mutual exclusive categories. Constant reference has been made to each when discussing one another, supporting themes of the inherently relational nature of social identities (Lewis and Pheonix, 2004) and specifically racial identities (Stone and Deniss, 2003). Secondly, such relationality is reflected on the macro level, with various cross global processes, colonialism in particular, acting to shape Australian racialization through the localization of such trans-national discourses and their subsequent intersection with gendered discourses, undermining ideas that such process are either nationally confined or can be studied without recourse to other areas. Goldberg's

(2009a) methodology is thus endorsed. Thirdly, ideas of race and the role of the intellectual in racialization processes are not always explicit and the various discourses which they produce do not effect 'indigenous peoples' equally and monolithically, and thus an intersectional analysis is need to understand how such discourses. This is, in many ways, connected to the naturalisation and invisibility of whiteness, especially more progressive ones. Finally, as Brah (2001) notes, discourses must be seen as being constructed through other discourses, with gender and other axis of discrimination and oppression being not just 'add ons' but rather lens's through which race is understood, or vice versa, something that can be seen in various social constructions of noble savages and so on.

References

Adams, R. and Sarvan, D. (2002). "Empire and Modernity". *In:* R. Adams and D. Savran, (eds). *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Malden, Mass; Oxford: Blackwell.

Alberts, F. and Anderson, C. (1998). "Art: Interpreting Reality".*In:* C. Bourke, E. Bourke and B. Edwards, (eds). *Aboriginal Australia: An Introductory Reader*. St Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.

Aron, R., Frolund, J. P. and Andersen, H. (2000) "Neo-Marxist Theories". *In*: H. Andersen and L. B. Kaspersen, (eds). *Classical and Modern Social Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Banks, J. (2004). *Bank's Journal: Daily Entries, 28 April 1770* [online]. [acessed 14 April 2012]. Available from World Wide Wed: <http://nla.gov.au/nla.cs-ss-jrnl-banks-17700428>.

Banton, M. (2001). "The Race Relations Problematic". *In:* E. Cashmore and J. Jennings (eds). *Racism: Essential Readings*. London: Sage.

Banton, M. (2005). "Historical and Contemporary modes of Racialization". *In:* K. Murji and J. Solomos (ads). *Racialization: studies in theory and practice*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Barrett, M. (2008). "Stuart Hall". *In:* R. Stones, (ed). *Key Sociological Thinkers*. Bassingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press.

Bauman, Z. and May, T. (2001). *Thinking Sociologically*. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Bensa, A. (2001). "Comment". *In:* A. Burgivere and R Grew, (eds). *The Construction of minorities: Cases for comparison across time and around the world*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Beynon, J. (2002). *Masculinities and Culture*. Buckingham: Open University.

Boggs, C. (2000). "Intellectuals". *In:* G. Browning, A. Halcli and F. Webster, (eds). *Understanding Contemporary Society: Theories of the Present.* London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). *Outline of a theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourke, E. (1998a). "Images and Realities". *In:* C. Bourke, E. Bourke and B. Edwards, (eds). *Aboriginal Australia: An Introductory Reader.* St Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.

Bourke, E. (1998b). "Australia's First Peoples: Identity and Population". *In:* C. Bourke, E. Bourke and B. Edwards, (eds). *Aboriginal Australia: An Introductory Reader.* St Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.

Bourke, C. and Cox, H. (1998). "Two Laws: One Land". *In:* C. Bourke, E. Bourke and B. Edwards, (eds). *Aboriginal Australia: An Introductory Reader.* St Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.

Bourke, C. and Edwards, B. (1998). "Family and Kinship". *In:* C. Bourke, E. Bourke and B. Edwards, (eds). *Aboriginal Australia: An Introductory Reader.* St Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.

Brah, A. (2001). "Difference, Diversity, Differentiation". *In*: K. K. Bhavani, (ed). *Feminism and race.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brah, A. (2005). "Ambivalent Documents/Fugitive Pieces". *In:* K. Murji and J. Solomos (ads). *Racialization: studies in theory and practice.* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Budig, M. (2007). "Feminism and the Family". *In:* J. Scott, J. Treas and M. Richards, (eds).*The Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of the Family.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Burgmann, M. (1982). "Black sisterhood: The situation of urban aboriginal women and their relationship to the white women's movement". *Australian Journal of Political Science.* **17**(2).

Callinicos, A. (2007). *Social Theory: A historical introduction.* Cambridge: Polity.

Carter, R. (2007). "Genes, Genomes and Genealogies: The return of scientific Racism?". In: *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* **30**(4).

Cashmore, E. and Jennings, J. (2001a). "Introduction". *In:* E. Cashmore and J. Jennings (eds). *Racism: Essential Readings.* London: Sage.

Cashmore, E. and Jennings, J. (2001b). "Conclusion". *In:* E. Cashmore and J. Jennings (eds). *Racism: Essential Readings.* London: Sage.

Collmann, J. (1998). ""I'm Proper number one fighter, me": Aborigines, Gender and Bureaucracy in Central Australia". *Gender & Society.* **2**(1).

Connell, R.W. (1974). "Images of Australia". *In:* D.E. Edgar, (ed). *Social Change in Austrlia: readings in sociology.* Melbourne: Cheshire.

Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender & power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics.* Cambridge: Polity in association with Blackwell.

Connell, R.W. (2005). *Masculinity.* Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Conor, L. (2006). "'The striking ornament of nature': The native belle in the Australian colonial scene". *Feminist Theory.* **7**(2).

Cook, J. (2004). *Cook's Journal: Daily Entries, 29 April 1770* [online]. [acessed 14 April 2012]. Available from World Wide Wed: <http://southseas.nla.gov.au/journals/cook/17700429.html>.

Craib, I. (1992). *Modern Social Theory: From Parsons to Habermas.* New York; London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Crenshaw , K. (1989). "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics". *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*.

Curthoys, A. (1993). "Identity Crisis: Colonialism, Nation, and Gender in Australian History". *Gender & History*. **5**(2).

Davis, K. (2008). "Intersectionality as Buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what make feminist theory successful". *Feminist Theory*. **9**(1).

Dikötter, F. (2008). "The racialization of the globe: An interactive interpretation". In: Ethnic and Racial Studies. **31**(8).

Dyer, R. (1997). *White.* London; New York: Routledge.

Elias, N. (2000). *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations.* Oxford; Cambridge Mass: Blakwell Publishers.

Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism : an interdisciplinary theory.* Newbury Park; London: Sage.

Fee, M. and Russell, L. (2007). "'Whiteness' and 'Aboriginality' in Canada and Australia: Conversations and idenities". *Feminist Theory.* **8**(2).

Frankenberg, R. (1997). "Introduction: Locating Whiteness, Localizing Whiteness". *In*: R. Frankenberg, (ed). *Displacing whiteness: essays in social and cultural criticism.* Durham, N.C; London: Duke Univeristy Press.

Fredericks, B. (2010). "Reempowering Ourselves: Austrailian Aboriginal Women. *Signs.* **45**(3).

Gabriel, J. (1998). *Whitewash: Racialised politics and the media.* London: Routledge.

Gittings, C. E. (1996). "Introduction". *In:* C.E Gittings, (ed). *Imperialism and Gender: Constructions of Masculinity.* New Lambton, N.S.W.; Hebden Bridge: Dangaroo.

Goldberg, D. T. (1993). *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning.* London: Blackwell.

Goldberg, D. T. (2002). *The Racial State.* Malden, Mass; Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Goldberg, D. T. (2009a). "Racial Comparisons, Relational Racisms: Some thought on method". *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* **31**(7).

Goldberg, D. T. (2009b). *The Threat of Race: Reflections on Racial Neoliberalism.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Grew, R. (2001). "Introduction". *In:* A. Burgivere and R Grew, (eds). *The Construction of minorities: Cases for comparison across time and around the world.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hage, G. (2005). "White Self-racialization as Identity Fetishism: Capitalism and the Experience of Colonial Whiteness". *In:* K. Murji and J. Solomos (ads). *Racialization: studies in theory and practice.* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Haggis, J. (2004). "Thoughts on a politics of whiteness in a (never quite post) colonial country: abolitionism, esentialism and incommensurability". *In:* A. Morten-Robinson, (eds). *Whitening race : essays in social and cultural criticism.* Canbera, ACT: Aboriginal Studies Press.

Hall, S. (1980). "Encoding/Decoding". *In:* S. Hall, (ed). *Culture, Media, Language: Working papers in cultural Studies, 1972-1979.* London : Hutchinson in association with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham.

Hall, S. (1992). "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power". *In:* S. Hall and B. Gieben, (eds). *Formations of Modernity Understanding Modern Societies: An Introduction.* Cambridge: Polity Press in association with the Open University.

Hall, S. (1996). "Gramsci's relevance for the study of race and ethnicity". *In:* D. Morley and K. Chen, (eds). *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in cultural studies.* London: Routledge.

Hannaford, I. (1996). *Race: The History of an Idea in the West.* Washington, D.C; Baltimore; London: Woodrow Wilson Center Press; John Hopkins University Press.

Harraway, D. (1991). *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The reinvention of nature.* London: Free Association.

Hemming, S. (1998). "Changing History: New Images of Aboriginal History". *In:* C. Bourke, E. Bourke and B. Edwards, (eds). *Aboriginal Australia: An Introductory Reader.* St Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.

Hetcher, M. (1975). *Internal colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Inglis, D. (2009). "Cultural Studies and Everyday Life: Tapping Hidden Enrgies". *In:* M. H. Jacobsen. (ed). *Encountering the Everyday: An introduction to the Sociologies of the Unnoticed.* Bassingstoke: Palgrave McMillan.

Kant, I. (2007). "What is Enlightenment?". *In*: C. Calhoun. J. Gerteis., J. Moody., S. Pfaff., and, I, Virk, (eds). *Classical Sociological Theory.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Krishnaswamy, R. (2002). "The Economy of Colonial Desire". *In:* R. Adams and D. Savran, (eds). *The Masculinity Studies Reader.* Malden, Mass; Oxford: Blackwell.

Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. (1987). "Post-Marxism without apologies". *New Left Review.* **166**(1).

Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and socialist stratergy: Towards a Radical Democracy.*

Lacquer, T. (1990). *Making Sex: body and gender from the Greeks to Freud.* Cambridge, Mass: London: Harvard University Press.

Lake, M. (1993). "Colonised and Colonising: the white Australian feminist subject". *Women's History Review.* **2**(3).

Law, I. (2010). *Race and Ethnicity: Global debates, dilemas, directions.* Harlow: Longman.

Lee, J. C. (1995). "Navigating the Typology of Race". *In:* K. Crenshaw, N. Golanda, G. Pellar, and K. Thomas, (eds). *Critical Race Theory: The key writing that formed a movement.* New York: New Press: Distributed by W.W. Norton & Co.

Lewis, G. and Pheonix, A. (2004). "'Race', 'Ethnicity' and 'Identity'". *In:* K. Woodward. *Questioning Identity: Gender, class, ethnicity.* London: Routledge.

Loomba, A. (2005). *Colonialism/postcolonialism.* London; New York: Routledge.

Mackinlay, E. and Barney, K. (2008). "'Move over and make room for Meeka': the representation of race, otherness and indigeneity on the Australian children's television programme Play school". *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education.* **29**(2).

Martino, W. (2003). "'We just get really fired up': indigenous boys, masculinities and schooling". *Discourse: Studies in the cultural Politics of Education.* **24**(2).

Martin, J. (1996). "Turning Boys into Men: Australian 'Boys' Own' Annuals, 1900-1950". *In:* C.E Gittings, (ed). *Imperialism and Gender: Constructions of Masculinity.* New Lambton, N.S.W.; Hebden Bridge: Dangaroo.

Martinez, J. and Lowrie, C. (2009). "Colonial Constructions of Masculinity: Transforming Aboriginal Australian Men into 'Houseboys'". *Gender & History.* **21**(2).

Maxwell, R. (2000). "Cultural Studies". *In:* G. Browning, A. Halcli and F. Webster, (eds). *Understanding Contemporary Society: Theories of the Present.* London: Sage.

McCall, L. (2005). "The Complexity of Intersectionality". Signs. **30**(3).

Meekosha, H. (2006). "Where the Hell are You? An Intercategorical analysis of Race, Ethnicity, Gender and Disability in the Australian Body Politic". *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research.* **8**(2-3).

Mills, C. W. (1959). *The Sociological Imagination.* York: Oxofrd University Press.

Moran, A. (2002). "As Australia decolonizes: indigenizing settler nationalism and the challenges of settler/indigenous relations". *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* **25**(6).

Moran, A. (2009). "What Settler Australians talk about when they talk about Aboriginals: reflections on an in-depth interview study". *Racial and Ethnic Studies.* **32**(5).

Morten-Robinson, A. (1998). "When the Object Speaks, A Postcolonial Encounter: anthropological representations and Aboriginal women's self-presentations". *Discourse: Studies in the cultural Politics of education.* **19**(3).

Morten-Robinson, A. (2004). "Whiteness, Epistomology and Indigenous Representations". *In:* A. Morten-Robinson, (eds). *Whitening race : essays in social and cultural criticism.* Canbera, ACT: Aboriginal Studies Press.

Mouffe, C. (1979a). "Introduction: Gramsci Today". *In*: C. Mouffe, (ed). *Gramsci and Marxist Theory*. London; Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mouffe, C. (1979b). "Hegemony and Ideology in Gramsci". *In*: C. Mouffe, (ed). *Gramsci and Marxist Theory.* London; Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Murji, K. and Solomos, J. (2005). "Introduction: Racialization in theory and practice". *In:* K. Murji and J. Solomos (ads). *Racialization: studies in theory and practice*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Nayak, A. (2005). "White Lives". *In:* K. Murji and J. Solomos (ads). *Racialization: studies in theory and practice*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Niezen. R. (2003). *The Origins of indigenism: Human rights and the politics of identity*. Berkley; London: Unversity of California Press.

Nicol, F. (2004). "Reconciliation in and out of perspective: white knowing, seeing, curating and being at home in and against Idigenous sovereignty". *In:* A. Morten-Robinson, (eds). *Whitening race : essays in social and cultural criticism.* Canbera, ACT: Aboriginal Studies Press.

Paisley, F. (1997). "Race and Remembrance: Contesting Aboriginal Child Removal in the Inter-War Years". *Australian Humanities review.*

Paisley, F. (1999). "'Unnecessary Crimes and Tragedies: Race, gender and sexuality in Australian policies of Aborginal child removal". *In:* A. Burton, (ed). *Gender, Sexuality and Colonial Modernity.* London; New York: Routledge.

Pease, B. (2004). "Decentering white man: reflections on masculinity and white studies". *In:* A. Morten-Robinson, (ed). *Whitening race : essays in social and cultural criticism*. Canberra, ACT: Aboriginal Studies Press.

Pheonix, A. and Pattynama, P. (2006). "Intersectionality" In: *European Journal of Women's Studies.* **13**(3).

Roberts, D. (1998). "Self determination and the Struggle for Aboriginal Equality". *In*: C. Bourke, E. Bourke and B. Edwards, (eds)*. Aboriginal Australia: An Introductory Reader.* St Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.

Robotham, D. (2000). "Post-colonialism and beyond". *In:* G. Browning, A. Halcli and F. Webster, (eds). *Understanding Contemporary Society: Theories of the Present.* London: Sage.

Said, E. W. (1996). *Representations of the Intellectual: the 1993 Reith Lectures.* New York: Vintage.

Said, E. (2003). *Orientalism*. London: Pengiun.

Sandoval, C. (1997). "Theorizing White Consciousness for a Post-Empire World: Barthes, Fannon and the rhetoric of love". *In*: R. Frankenberg, (ed). *Displacing whiteness: essays in social and cultural criticism*. Durham, N.C; London: Duke Univeristy Press.

Sassoon, A. S. (1980). *Gramsci's Politics*. London: Croom Helm.

Sissons, J. (2005). *First peoples : indigenous cultures and their futures.* London: Rektion.

Solomos, J. and Back, L. (2001). "Conceptualizing Racisms: Social Theory, Politics and Reaserch". *In:* E. Cashmore and J. Jennings (eds). *Racism: Essential Readings*. London:Sage.

Spickard, P. (2005) "Race and Nation: Identity and Power: Thinking Comparitively about Ethnic Systems". *In:* P. Spickard, (ed). *Race and Nation: ethnic systems in the modern world.* New York; London: Routledge.

Stone, J. (1996). "Internal Colonialism". *In:* J. Hutchinson and A.D. Smith (eds). *Ethnicity.* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Stone, J. and Dennis, R. (2003). "Introduction: Race Against Time - The Ethnic Divide in the Twentieth Century". *In:* J. Stone and R. Dennis. *Race and Ethnicity: Comparative Theoretical Approaches.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Tutton, R. (2007). "Opening the white box: Explaining the study of whiteness in contemporary genetic research". In: *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* **30**(4).

United Nations. (2008). *United Nations Decleration on the Rights of Indigenous People.* United Nations.

United Nations. (2002). *Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and all forms of discrimination.* United Nations.

West, P. (1996). "Sons of the Empire: How Boys Became Men in one Australian Town 1900-1920". *In:* C.E Gittings, (ed). *Imperialism and Gender: Constructions of Masculinity*. New Lambton, N.S.W.; Hebden Bridge: Dangaroo.

Wilson, T. J. (1996). "Feminism and Racism: Inclusion and Exclusion at an Australian Feminist Refuge". *Feminist Review*. **52**.

Woollacott, A. (1999). "White Colonialism and Sexual Modernity: Australian women in the early twentieth century metropolis". *In:* A. Burton, (ed). *Gender, Sexuality and Colonial Modernity.* London; New York: Routledge.

Yengoyan, A.A. (2001). "Essentialism of Aborginality:Blood/Race, history and the State in Australia". *In:* A. Burgivere and R Grew, (eds). *The Construction of minorities: Cases for comparison across time and around the world*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.