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abstract

This thesis explores the implications of colonial whiteness in the actions of communities supporting the struggles of First Peoples in Australia and Canada. Exploring how whiteness manifests itself, how it permeates as epistemic blank spots into the actions of those promoting respect and recognition, is used as a basis to reflect on social justice in contemporary society.

The emerging field of critical whiteness studies provides a solid foundation to engage with whiteness. Scholarship on the hegemony of technological discourse is drawn from to extend on this foundation. The notion of human history as a history of progress and the associated scientific hierarchisation of knowledges is rooted in relations of power|knowledge that perpetuate culturally inappropriate colonial relationships.¹ Gene Sharp’s work on consent theories of power and Jacques Ellul’s engagement with Technological Society are engaged with to explore how such hierarchisation of knowledges is maintained. The pervasiveness of this relation is explored in three case studies to reflect on the implications.

Engagement with white interpretations of the 1966 walk-out of Aboriginal

¹ Nikolas Rose, following Foucault and focussing on (self) governance and freedom, refers to the study of such changes as a genealogy (1999: 65-6).
stockworkers and their families at Wave Hill provides an historical grounding of contemporary whiteness. Interpretations of the walk-out as a strike that later shifted in focus, counter to oral historical accounts, are used as a basis to consider how manifestations of whiteness in Australia have shifted in the last 40 years. The 2001 formation of the Community Picket at Sandon Point, as a means to oppose a residential proposal, provides a focus for reflecting on whiteness in contemporary Australia. The Picket was established to offer support to the Sandon Point Aboriginal Tent Embassy (SPATE) and promote a progressive variant of ‘practical reconciliation’. Friends of the Red Hill Valley’s support for Haudenosaunee Treaty rights, in opposing an expressway proposal for the valley, is comparatively engaged with to reflect on contextual variations in how whiteness manifests itself in Australia and Canada. Exposing the actions of white supporters as counter-hegemonic and a challenge to aspects of whiteness whilst unintentionally maintaining unjust colonial relationships at the same time locates some of the challenges for both scholarship and action in the area of social justice.
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ONCE UPON AN ARSON

Smouldering ashes, charred sheets of metal and a lone Aboriginal flag were all that remained of the embassy...

In the early hours of the Sunday 19 September 2004 two men were seen running away from McCauleys Beach towards the coastal village of Thirroul, located south of Sydney in the northern suburbs of Illawarra region of New South Wales (NSW), Australia. Moments later the nearby Sandon Point Aboriginal Tent Embassy (SPATE) burst into flames. The complete destruction of the embassy’s structure and the life-threatening situation for the five people who were asleep inside marked a significant point in the ongoing dispute over the future of the Sandon Point area.

The actions of the (still unknown) assailants provide a stark contrast to those of the local community. Like many other disputes, the actions of white supporters have assisted in increasing the profile of issues of concern at Sandon Point. In a society shaped by the ongoing impacts of colonialism, and associated paternalism, what can the actions of white supporters tell us about contemporary society? The actions taken at Sandon Point have altered the nature and context of
the dispute over the area’s future, promoting respect and recognition for local Aboriginal peoples, whilst at the same time embodying remnant colonialisms. Another way to conceive this is that white perspectives are framed by persistent colonial assumptions (Dodds 1998). Such perspectives are based on ‘colonial misconceptions’ of the superiority of European culture, and permeate through contemporary perspectives as ‘colonial manifestations’ irrespective of intent (Metallic & Monture-Angus 2002: para. 6, 41).

The dispute emerged at Sandon Point following the release of a late 1990s proposal to convert the 61-hectare area into a residential estate. Community opposition based on European history, aesthetic, open-space and ecological reasons was bolstered by opposition to the proposal by local Aboriginal peoples—embodied in the establishment of SPATE. The establishment of SPATE is linked to the Aboriginal Tent Embassy in Canberra, erected in the context of the walkout of Aboriginal stockworkers and the families from Wave Hill and their struggle for respect and recognition. Consideration of white support and interpretations of the walkout provides historical grounding of the colonial context of whiteness in Australia. Unrelated, the actions of white supporters in the Red Hill Valley (Ontario), Canada, provide a means to reflect on contemporary context. The valley was under threat from an expressway proposal and, as at Sandon Point, community opposition was significantly based on European history, aesthetic, open-space and ecological reasons. Controversy increased when the Haudenosaunee exerted their treaty rights, supported by those opposing the expressway.

Engaging with the actions of white supporters at Wave Hill, Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley provides a means to reflect on the degree to which white ways of knowing and seeing, whiteness, shape how disputes involving First Peoples are perceived and framed. Whether the actions of white supporters expose and challenge colonial assumptions, or act to perpetuate them, is an important question to reflect upon for scholars and activists alike. To what degree current scholarship provides a means to assess this is an important question, alongside the level to which praxis can be drawn on to assess, expand and refine theoretical approaches. As praxis is shaped by context, particularities of whiteness at specific
locales requires engagement. Reflecting this, to what degree can these particularities inform scholarship for other case studies?

A central aspect of disputes involving First Peoples is what is accepted as valid knowledge. A Foucauldian analysis of the relationship between power and knowledge (i.e. that they are largely indistinguishable and thus should not be studied separately) provides basis from which to engage with such disputes (Hoy 1986: 129). What is considered to be valid knowledge, via ‘a scientific hierarchization of knowledges’ (Smart 1986), emanates from Enlightenment notions of rationality deeply embodied in whiteness (see Patterson 1998). The hegemony of whiteness is rooted in the demarcation of knowledges. Demarcation is ‘contextually contingent and interests-driven’ (Gieryn 1995: 393). Rooted in
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Figure 1. The collapsed embassy engulfed in flames

[Image courtesy Alex Peterson, local resident.]
power relations, boundaries are constructed between what is afforded cognitive authority and what isn’t: ‘indigenous people and their knowledge systems are subordinated to western science’ (Smallacombe 2000: 160-1).

An important aspect of exposing whiteness is engagement with the colonial demarcation of knowledges. It requires reflection given the intent of supportive campaigns. The actions of white supporters seek to transcend colonial imperialism, to prefigure. Prefigurative actions aim to have their means reflect desired ends—the actions taken being consistent with one’s goals. For one’s actions to be prefigurative, one must be/live the change. Do the actions of white supporters live up to such goals?

To consider such a question, how actions are perceived by those taking them is of import. The actions of white supporters are developed relationally—framed as counter to the inappropriate actions of others, often implied as biased. Relational framing can leave colonial assumptions and manifestations unmarked in the actions of white supporters, they can become epistemologically ignorant (see Sullivan & Tuana 2007). Describing these assumptions and manifestations as unmarked locates the hegemony of whiteness. As unmarked, the manifestations of whiteness go unseen, are not recognised, and non-considered. Charles Mills refers to the functional ‘cognitive dysfunctions’ of whiteness, via what he labels *The Racial Contract*, as a ‘consensual hallucination’—drawing from ‘William Gibson’s famous characterisation of cyberspace’ (Mills 1997: 18). The dynamics of experience can act to normalise whiteness, or expose assumptions and implications previously unmarked—whiteness is contested and context specific. The context specificity of epistemic ignorance central to whiteness is tempered by broader ‘patterns of ignorance’ (Alcoff 2007: 47).

Unmarked whiteness has implications for scholarship. Alongside being unmarked phenomenologically, scholarship on whiteness is still in its youth. This thesis seeks to add to this field of research. Emanating from Enlightenment notions of rationality, the scientific hierarchisation of knowledges’, is an aspect of whiteness that this thesis specifically engages to build on whiteness scholarship. Linda Alcoff refers to Mills’ account of white cognitive dysfunction as requiring further
explanation. She draws from the work of ‘the Frankfurt School’s critique of instrumental rationality’ and critiques of the ontologies of Western Science to assist in this (Ibid: 49-57). More explicitly, Jacques Ellul’s (1964, 1990) writings on the ideology of science as hegemonic and central to ‘modern’ society provide a source for further engaging with contemporary manifestations of whiteness. The notion of science and technology as the means for progress to be achieved is significantly unmarked in contemporary (white) society. Engagement with these aspects of whiteness, locating incommensurabilities, provide means for exploring whiteness studies ‘considerable unfulfilled potential’ (Kolchin 2002: 172).

COMMONALITIES AND CONTEXT
SPATE was established in December 2000 when coals that had burned in the sacred fire at the infamous Aboriginal Tent Embassy in Canberra, the national capital of Australia, were transported to McCauleys Beach. As the two sites, and the struggles they epitomised, were linked with the ceremonial lighting of the sacred fire, Sandon Point was renamed Kuradji by Yuin elder Uncle Guboo. Both ‘tent embassies’ were established in response to the failure by governments to appropriately recognise Aboriginal peoples. The proposed residential estate was the impetus for the establishment of SPATE. In Canberra the embassy was a direct response to then Prime Minister William McMahon’s ‘long awaited statement on Aboriginal land rights’—a rejection of land rights for Aboriginal peoples in Australia (Dow 2000). McMahon’s rejection of Aboriginal ‘land rights’ had specific implications for the actions underway at Wave Hill where Aboriginal stockworkers and their families had walked out at Wave Hill station in the Northern Territory, seeking recognition of their ancestral lands. What was to happen at Sandon Point was inextricably linked to events at Wave Hill some 34 years prior.
The Aboriginal Tent Embassy in Canberra began as a table, beach umbrella and chairs opposite Parliament House on the day following McMahon’s statement: 26 January 1972. Sue Stanton (2007) describes the 26 January national holiday, known as Australia Day, as recognising the day ‘when the first white man stepped ashore and made this country his permanent home’: with ‘the very first entry on colonialists’ journals and diaries a history of… oppression was ensured’.

Figure 2. Canberra’s Aboriginal Tent Embassy

---


4 The image itself is somewhat ironically reminiscent of the iconic Australian BBQ—a pastime that is the focus of the opening scene of the 30 minute film and ‘light hearted satire’ Barbakueria (Featherstone 1986).
After a number of relocations, the Aboriginal Tent Embassy returned to its original location 20 years to the day after its establishment and has remained as a permanent fixture ever since. It has become what many politicians, and some members of the public, refer to as an eyesore. It provides an intentionally prominent depiction of the conditions many Aboriginal peoples in Australia live with everyday, albeit not in a remote Aboriginal community or reserve hidden from view. Many others view it as an iconic part of Australia’s history (Dow 2000; 

Figure 3. Vincent Lingiari & Gough Whitlam\(^5\)

\(^5\) Image courtesy of the National Gallery of Australia, Canberra.
The actions taken at Wave Hill are similarly iconic. Two specific events are repeatedly referred to as symbolic: the day in August 1966 when Aboriginal stockworkers and their families walked off Wave Hill station; and when Prime Minister Gough Whitlam travelled to Daguragu and poured soil into the hands of Aboriginal elder Vincent Lingiari, as immortalised in Mervyn Bishop’s oft-reproduced photograph from 1975. Whitlam’s actions were a promise of the transfer of legal title of ancestral lands to the Gurindji.

The various responses to events that followed the Wave Hill walkout and the lighting of the sacred fire at Sandon Point highlight, to borrow from Jane Haggis (2004), ongoing implications for (never quite post) colonial Australian society. Haggis’ phrase challenges the notion that the English colonial project was completed and the vision of a post-colonial hybridity or post-race society is attainable. The post-modern post-colonial vision is one based on the white subject becoming comfortable in a settler-Indigenous hybrid, one that maintains colonial terms.

Exploring how colonial whiteness continues to shape white interpretations of what transpired at Wave Hill provides a solid foundation to engage with contemporary whiteness. Activists’ and scholar’s discussions and reflections on the actions taken at Wave Hill significantly are framed ‘in terms most familiar’ (Macintyre 1985: 127), often based on ‘socially constructed ignorance [which creates] epistemic blank spots that make privileged knowers oblivious to systemic injustices’ (Bailey 2007: 77). Unchallenged colonial remnants foster misrecognition, which can and do inflict harm. White Australia’s terms include demeaning and contemptible perceptions and interpretations of First Peoples’ cultures (Taylor 1994: 25). Misrecognition has many faces. It can be seen in homogenised (legalistic) constructions of land rights to fit within white perspectives (Nicoll 2002: para. 2, on Brady 2001), as opposed to an ontological relationship (Metallic & Monture-Angus 2002: para. 1), in a scientific hierarchisation of knowledges and what Aileen Moreton-Robinson (1999) has aptly labelled *Terra Knowlegius*: the theft and co-option of First Peoples’ knowledges based on a similar fiction to its namesake
An awareness of the implications of misrecognition, of epistemologies of ignorance, is necessary to expose whiteness in the actions of white supporters alongside its colonial underpinnings. A Foucauldian analysis of power|knowledge provides a means to explore how such misrecognition happens. What is relationally constructed as valid knowledge is interlinked with the colonial power relations of whiteness. The ideology of science, with science and technology as the means to progress, locates non-considered premises that shape recognition and responses to the actions of First Peoples.

Respect and cultural recognition, the politics of recognition, are explored by James Tully in Strange Multiplicities: Constitutionalism in an age of diversity. Tully frames his reflections on appropriate means for the recognition of First Peoples in referring to Bill Reid’s bronze sculpture:

*Approaching The Spirit of Haida Gwai in the right spirit does not consist of recognising it as something already familiar to us in terms drawn from our own traditions and thoughts. This imperial attitude is to be abjured. Rather, recognition involves acknowledging it in terms and traditions, as it wants to be and it speaks to us* (1995: 23).

The ‘right spirit’ requires recognition of difference, not an imposition of white terms. The terms of enquiry must, in themselves, be just—not limited to one’s own terms. Candice Metallic and Patricia Monture-Angus reflect on such imposition as one of the most significant barriers to recognition and respect in considering recent legal decisions in Canada (2002: para. 1). Fiona Nicoll (1993) has similarly explored implications in Australia, locating examples of co-option and associated marginalisation of Aboriginal lore and custom.

The Ipperwash Inquiry, held to investigate the fatal shooting of Anthony O’Brien (Dudley) George by Ontario Provincial Police after members of the Ojibway asserted their rights over part of the Ipperwash Provincial Park in 1995, stressed
the contemporary importance of treaties in Canada. Commissioner Linden described the shooting of Dudley George, in the eyes of First Peoples, as ‘symbolic of a sad history of government policies that harmed [First Peoples] long-term interests’ (Linden 2007: 671). The incident was influenced by racist comments made by the Ontario Premier and the Minster of Natural resources, and 'cultural insensitivity and racism that existed within some of the ranks of the Ontario Provincial Police force’. Acting Sergeant Ken Deane was convicted of criminal negligence causing death in relation to the shooting (Ibid: 642-69). He served no jail time.

Members of the Haudenosaunee asserted treaty rights in the Red Hill Valley preceding, and laying foundations for, the ongoing land reclamation at Caledonia. This assertion and subsequent occupation received support from local community groups opposing the expressway proposal, with the dispute stretching back some 50+ years. The actions of the Haudenosaunee in the Red Hill Valley came to have a significant impact on the lived experiences of white supporters and cultural recognition.

Susan Dodds’ examination of Justice and Indigenous Land Rights draws from Tully’s exploration of recognition with regards to Australia. What is specifically notable is the basis for the conclusion drawn:

> the question of a just response to indigenous people’s claims to land ought not to be focused exclusively on distribution of property within the state but on the legitimacy of the state’s sovereignty (Dodds 1998: 202).

The basis for this conclusion can be easily drawn from Tully’s inquiry:

---

6 Following police intervention and the fatal shooting, commemorative coffee mugs and t-shirts containing racist imagery were produced and distributed by the Ontario Provincial Police (see Linden 2007: 651-61).
The first and often overlooked step on any inquiry into justice is to investigate if the language in which the enquiry proceeds is in itself just: that is, capable of rendering the speakers their due (1995: 34).

The language referred to here is not simply different dialects, rather how such inquiries are framed and constrained within, specifically, ‘the language of the master: masculine, European or imperial’ (Ibid). Lockean notions of property, a liberal-capitalist property formation mythology, are tied to state sovereignty (Plumwood 2002: 21). The inequality in ‘effective discursive power’, demarcates and imposes western classifications, perpetuating colonial assumptions and injustice (Davis 1996; Smallacombe 2000: 160; Tully 2000: 37). Evidentiary burden is placed on First Peoples, with this also limited to white terms, and assessed by white ‘experts’ (Metallic & Monture-Angus 2002).

Whilst the contexts of these reflections are far more broad and, to an extent, generalised, the implications of terms most familiar are central. The direct questioning of state sovereignty explored by Dodds (1998) has direct relevance for white support of the actions taken at Wave Hill, Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley. Of paramount importance are unquestioned assumptions upon which state sovereignty is based and how these permeate through contemporary Australian and Canadian society. Fiona Nicoll refers to the self-legitimised assumptions of whiteness as emanating from the ‘performative assumption of perspective’ (2002: para. 18). Engaging with how these assumptions of whiteness have shaped the actions of white supporters is necessary to consider how the supportive actions should be evaluated.

The actions of white supporters are shaped by context, by history. Hindsight provides an important aid and historical grounding for engaging with published accounts of the Wave Hill walkout. Misinterpretations of what transpired also provide contemporary illustration of colonial paternalism and whiteness—interpretations inconsistent with participant accounts. The historical grounding this provides aids in reflecting on what has transpired at Sandon Point. Awareness of the context of the emergence of white support is essential to explore the
implications, and provide a basis to assess the actions of white supporters.

STRUGGLING TOGETHER
On 23 February 2001, a letter was presented to local resident Max Ackerman as a representative of the Northern Illawarra Resident’s Action Group (NIRAG). Alongside NIRAG, the letter also referred to the South Coast Labor Council (SCLC) who imposed a ‘green ban’ at Sandon Point. The content of the letter is as follows:

To Whom It May Concern,

On behalf of the Sandon Point Aboriginal Tent Embassy we grant the above named persons and their representatives permission to come onto Country to establish and staff a 24 hour-a-day Peaceful Protest Camp.

This camp has been established with the intention of preventing any disturbance to lands within the boundaries of Kuradji.

We support this move and regard the Peaceful Protest camp as an annex to the Sandon Point Aboriginal Tent Embassy that is situated on the banks of Bugeen Creek at Kuradji.

The coals for the fire at the Peaceful Protest Camp are

---

7 NIRAG was formed in the early 1980s and was successful in opposing a proposal for coal loading bins and associated infrastructure at Sandon Point.

from Sacred Fires currently burning at Aboriginal Embassies across Australia. Therefore the fire is subject to the same rules and protocols (i.e., around the sacred fire, there is to be no lighting of cigarettes, drinking of alcohol, & no spitting).

Yours in Unity, Dootch (Roy Kennedy) (Spokesperson for SPATE).

The Sandon Point Community Picket (hereafter the picket) was established following receipt of this letter. The perceived need for the picket was a proposed residential estate devised by Stockland Trust Group—a multi-billion dollar corporate entity specialising in real estate speculation. The explicit support for SPATE continues to this day.

In August 2003, members of the Haudenosaunee granted a similar permit for representatives of Friends of Red Hill Valley and the Showstoppers Union. Friends and Showstoppers were two high profile community groups that actively campaigned to protect the Red Hill Valley from an expressway proposal. The Haudenosaunee had called for recognition of their treaty rights and attempts to secure protection for the Red Hill Valley in Ontario, Canada (Great Turtle Island).

The permit gave permission for people to camp in the valley as a part of actions aimed at protecting it (Friends 2003k; McGuinness 2003e). Stipulations included:

The permit is valid only if the permit-holders abide by both Kaianara:kowa (the Haudenosaunee Great Law of Peace), and the Showstoppers "Basis of Unity" (Friends 2003k).

At Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley, the granting of permission to camp on First Peoples’ lands shaped the actions of white supporters. A significant difference between the two disputes is the ‘legal’ recognition of sovereignty and treaty rights in Canada, reiterated by Royal Commission of Aboriginal Peoples (see Metallic & Monture-Angus 2002; Tully 1998). How differing levels of official
recognition have shaped the actions of white supporters locates important considerations for comparative analysis.

THEORETICAL APPROACHES
Consideration of the actions of white supporters requires engagement with scholarship on whiteness, technological discourse, power relations and nonviolent action. A Foucauldian understanding of relations of power|knowledge is central to such an analysis. Hoy explains Foucault’s representation of the relation as power|knowledge:

> The slash suggests that for his purposes power and knowledge are not to be studied separately. From his perspective there is little point in speaking even about the relation between knowledge and power, since these are not so readily distinguishable (Hoy 1986: 129).

Scholarship on whiteness has shown that attempting to define what whiteness is, what it is constituted by and how to engage with it, is not an easy task. The pervasiveness of whiteness, its absorption of difference, its adaptability, have normalising tendencies. These aspects of whiteness can be seen as a source of what Noam Chomksy (1987) has labelled Orwell’s problem—how we can remain epistemologically ignorant of what is obvious in the world around us (Cormier 2007: 59-60). The ordinariness, normativity, humanness of whiteness precludes both an ability and a need to self-define (Brodkin 1999; Dyer 1997; Frankenberg 2001; Pratt 2003; Pratt, Elder & Ellis 2001; Riggs 2004a). As a standpoint, whiteness is context specific, and this in part presents a significant challenge in both attempting to afford a suitable definition and to critically engage with its impacts and implications.

The study of whiteness, increasingly referred to as critical whiteness studies, can effectively be defined as embodying two approaches: a USA-centric and a post-colonial. Australian scholarship on whiteness engages with British settlement and its implications, recognising that colonialism continues to shape white ways of
knowing and seeing (see, for example, Ahmed 2004; Ang 2001; Aveling 2004; Haggis 2004; Moran 2004; Moreton-Robinson 2004, 2004a, 2007; Nicoll 2000, 2002, 2004; Pratt, Elder & Ellis 2001; Riggs 2004b). The ‘American Studies approach’ has received criticism for being inward looking, messianic and embodying a perception that American whiteness is unique (see, for example, Ang 2001; Kolchin 2002; Pratt 2003; Wiegman 1999).

Gene Sharp (1973, 1980) is one of a number of scholars who have explored the role of consent in power relations. Sharp has explored power in society through a detailed empirical examination of nonviolent action. Nonviolent action is considered as a process of withdrawing consent, impacting on the ability of one to exercise power over another—with Sharp focusing on a ruler/subject dichotomy (Martin 1989). Extending the role of consent beyond the ruler/subject dichotomy, the maintenance of hegemonic discourse also requires action—the participation and thus compliance or submission of those whose actions perpetuate it. Whiteness’ efficacy is based on its hegemonic dominance.

Kate McGuiness (1993; 1994) and Lewis Lipsitz & Herbert Kritzer (1975) have considered the applicability of Sharp’s consent theory of power to patriarchal and colonial societies, highlighting perceived shortcomings. The ability of one to consent, or an inability to consent on the part of those considered as not fully constituted individuals in society, is the source of these critiques. In exploring differentiated consent McGuiness and Lipsitz & Kritzer leave unconsidered the influence of such consent on those challenging patriarchal and colonial relations of power, those who benefit from such relations. Withdrawal of consent by First Peoples, not fully constituted individuals in Australian and Canadian society, continue to play crucial roles in challenging whiteness.

How Enlightenment notions of science and technology as progress, within a broader and dominant ideology of science, influence white ways of knowing and seeing requires further engagement by whiteness scholars. The work of Ellul in exposing implications of technological society has received little attention. Rick Moore has made a bold statement that has significant implications for whiteness scholarship:
perhaps one way to add new life to any discussion of hegemony... is to pay closer attention to the prolific writings of Jacques Ellul (1998: 129).

Essential for grasping Ellul’s concepts is an awareness of his distinction between technique and technology:

The term technique, as I use it, does not mean machines, technology, or this or that procedure for attaining an end. In our technological society, technique is the totality of methods rationally arrived at and having absolute efficiency (for a given stage of development) in every field of human activity (1990: 1).

Technology does not consist of actual processes. Contrasting with contemporary usage, ‘in a strict sense technology is discourse on technique’ (Ibid: xv). Technology is discourse shaped by rationalisations of colonial whiteness, a relation of power that supports white hegemony. Ellul gives discourse on technique is afforded the title of technological bluff. It is a considered a bluff based on it’s normalising, unmarked nature, acting to reorient perspectives in its own terms.

Moreton-Robinson’s concept of Terra Knowlegius identifies one aspect of colonial whiteness that fits within Ellul’s concepts:

Students in academia are taught as though they can know everything. They are taught to believe that all knowledge is available to them for the taking and is knowable. Knowledges that exist outside the realm of white western knowledge are perceived as being available for appropriation (Moreton-Robinson 1999: 32).

Moreton-Robinson’s critique provides a challenge to the deeply held, and unquestioned, notion in academia of being able to have the answer—or at least
being able to find it, and that a single truth does exist. Cognitive authority is constructed around western knowledge, demarcating it from subjugated ‘other’ knowledges (Smallacombe 2000: 160-1). Reference and deference to archaeology by white supporters provides a clear indication of the pervasiveness of the rationalizations upon which Terra Knowlegius is based. Disrupting the status quo of Enlightenment emergent academia parallels theorising ‘how to give up power’, to undermine whiteness (Moreton-Robinson, reproduced in Nicoll 2004: para. 30).

Given the ongoing mediation of lived experiences of whiteness, how do white ways of knowing and seeing the world shape the actions of people explicitly supporting Aboriginal/First Nations peoples? To what extent do such actions overcome colonial legacies? Consideration of these questions is essential to adequately address the question of how we should evaluate the actions of white supporters.

Lila Watson’s ‘statement as an Indigenous educator in Australia’ provides a critical challenge to white supporters, a challenge that has broad implications for activists and scholars:

If you have come to help me you are wasting your time, but if you have come because your liberation is bound up with mine, let’s work together (Watson 1992: 1).  

**RECONCILIATION, CONSTRUCTED DUALISMS, UNQUESTIONINGS**

Deeply entwined within whiteness, and an extension of the scientific hierarchisation of knowledges, are constructed of dualisms. At Wave Hill, Sandon

---

Point and the Red Hill Valley, there are common themes.

In relationally framing the actions of others as inappropriate, white supporters construct a good white anti-racist/bad white racist binary. This constructed binary has normalising tendencies, covering over deep-rooted colonial implications central to whiteness. The second is the construction of good and bad archaeology that is, in part, an outcome of the anti-racist/racist dualism, and falls directly within what Thomas Gieryn (1983, 1995) has labelled *boundary work*. Gieryn’s concept entails the construction of boundaries between *good* and *bad* (or pseudo, non-) science. The construction of boundaries between what is considered good and bad archaeology by white supporters leaves the colonial implications of science unquestioned (Davis 1996; Simpson 2000; Smallacombe 2000).

The notion of reconciliation and a construction of good/bad actions provide commonalities and distinctions with white support. What form reconciliation takes requires reflection. Is it reconciliation ‘to’, imposed on white terms, or is it reconciliation ‘with’, based on a more mutual approach? (see Nicoll 1993) Common themes exist with the ‘southern do-gooders’ at Wave Hill, (re)constructions of ‘practical reconciliation’ at Sandon Point and good/bad representations of archaeology and leaving ‘science’ unquestioned as at the Red Hill Valley and Sandon Point. Comparative analysis provides a means for considering the implications of each in the context of the others. For example, hindsight provides substantial benefits in considering the (white) interpretations of what happened at Wave Hill. Whereas what has happened at the Red Hill Valley differs in context to Sandon Point given the differing legal status and treaty rights (recognition) of First Peoples in Canada. Comparative engagement with these and other themes that draws these threads together in this thesis.

**THESIS STRUCTURE**

The following chapter details theoretical approaches to consider the actions of white supporters, and to reflexively consider the limitations of existing scholarship. A Foucauldian understanding of knowledge/power with a critical whiteness studies
lens forms the backbone of the chapter. Boundaries and limitations of critical whiteness studies and its own prescriptions are unpacked. The role of consent and unmarked colonial assumptions in shaping whiteness in Australia and Canada, alongside Ellul’s concept of technological bluff, are engaged with to reflect on the implications of these under-theorised aspects of whiteness for the actions of white supporters.

Chapter three engages with accounts of the 1966 walkout of Aboriginal stockworkers and their families at Wave Hill station in the Northern Territory. The common misinterpretation that what happened was a strike that later shifted in intent to control of ancestral lands is afforded critical attention. In considering white interpretations, oral-historical accounts are heavily drawn from. The pervasiveness of whiteness and its ability to continue to shape contemporary reflections on what happened, via remnant colonialisms, is exposed.

Chapter four documents and unpacks implications of community actions at Sandon Point in offering respect and recognition to SPATE. The pervasiveness of Enlightenment notions of science and technology as progress provides is contrasted with the often counter-hegemonic context of community actions. Challenges to official (anthropological and regulatory) non-consideration of the areas significance to local Aboriginal women provide a contrast to these unmarked colonial implications: in a context of deferring to the cognitive authority of archaeology, and seeking to demarcate ‘good’ from ‘bad’ archaeology. Chapter four provides a foundation for comparative analysis with the support afforded the Haudenosaunee.

A detailed introduction to what has happened at the Red Hill Valley forms the first task of chapter five. In documenting the expressway dispute, extending back more than 50 years, focus centres on the more recent support afforded the Haudenosaunee’s calls for protection. ‘Speaking with’ predominates in actions of white supporters, contrasting with the prevalence of ‘speaking for’ at Sandon Point—both based on respect and recognition relationally framed to the actions of proponents and government authorities. The shift in how respect and recognition was manifested over time illustrates the experiential nature of praxis and the
benefits of the spaces created by activism. This is seen in the legacy of the struggle.

Drawing all of the threads together, to comparatively consider the actions of white supporters forms the first task of chapter six. Reflections on the implication of praxis on theory, and vice versa, are explored. These provide an empirical basis for an answer to the question of how we should evaluate the actions of white supporters. Some of the challenges for scholarship and communities wishing to support First Peoples in their struggles for social justice are outlined.
two

WHITENESS, CONSENT AND TECHNIQUE

Ultimately the aim of critical whiteness theory should be to unsettle white subjectivity rather than create opportunities for individual confession, catharsis and redemption.

The hegemony of whiteness in Australia is contingent upon the negation of Indigenous sovereignty.
Riggs (2004)

Remnant colonialisms continue to have impacts on contemporary Australian and Canadian societies. These colonial manifestations persist in the actions of white’s supporting First Peoples’ struggles. A critical question arises concerning such actions—how we should evaluate this support? Amongst the emerging scholarship on whiteness, a number of white scholars have considered their own, at times unmarked, complicities in the maintenance of white hegemony. Such considerations often grapple with the implications for whiteness studies, at other times with regards to exposing and challenging the lived privileges of whiteness. Consideration of theoretical engagement with whiteness in the context of its hegemonic influences on community actions at Wave Hill, Sandon Point and the
Red Hill Valley offers significant potential to further the aims of whiteness studies. Alongside aiding in determining how to destroy its object of study (i.e. whiteness), this engagement sheds light on aspects of whiteness unmarked phenomenologically, and contributes to existing scholarship by considering the role of consent in the perpetuation of whiteness and how technologies of whiteness are manifested.

Describing whiteness as ‘unmarked’ posits it as neither conscious nor unconscious. What is unmarked is unacknowledged, unseen and non-reflected upon. This, in part, emanates from whiteness being a relational and socially constructed standpoint, largely defined by what one is not. Mills refers to white people as being ‘brought into existence… by the Racial Contract’ (1997: 63). The racial contract is constituted by a ‘set of formal or informal agreements’, which have the general purpose being

the differential privileging of whites as a group with respect to the nonwhites as a group, the exploitation of their bodies, land and resources, and the denial of equal socioeconomic opportunities to them (Ibid: 11).

Richard Dyer locates the normativity and universality of whiteness (to whites) in its representational paradoxes (see Kutcha 1998). There is a tension with universality in that whiteness varies with context, particularities. In Australia and Canada whiteness is colonial. It is founded on a denial of First Peoples’ sovereignty. Colonial whiteness also embodies assumptions about First Peoples knowledges that Moreton-Robinson (1999) has aptly labelled Terra Knowlegius. This theft and co-option of First Peoples’ knowledges is based on a similar fiction to its namesake Terra Nullius.

A Foucauldian analysis of power|knowledge as interdependent, with the scientific hierarchisation of knowledges, provides means to produce further understandings of the mechanisms of whiteness. As Moreton-Robinson states,

…use of Foucault’s idea of biopower to explicitly address
the context of a ‘postcolonizing’ nation (Moreton-Robinson 2003) will produce a new understanding of how Whiteness operates through the racialized application of disciplinary knowledges and regulatory mechanisms, which function together to preclude recognition of Indigenous sovereignty (Moreton-Robinson 2001: 387).

White possession is linked to, and reinforces, the scientific Hierarchisation of knowledges, that are central techniques of whiteness. Boundaries are constructed between the asserted cognitive authority of western knowledge and knowledges that exist outside the realm of white western knowledge. What knowledge is valued, proven or appropriated via scientific rationalisations promotes white ways of knowing and seeing. Ellul explored how such rationalisations have become central to contemporary western understandings, and the unmarked implications and challenges they pose. What is most troubling, and indicative of the roots of the problem, is how science and technology are viewed not only as progress, they are considered the sole means to progress. Is the ideology of science a soteriology—perceived as the sole means for progress, inevitable—as Ellul (1990) has postulated? A detailed exploration of notions of ‘progress’ will add to existing whiteness studies scholarship.\textsuperscript{10} Enlightenment notions of science and technology as progress are deeply engrained in white ways of knowing and seeing. Tully identifies this in his exploration of constitutionalism, respect and recognition in ‘modern’ society. We have

the non-European ‘other’ who is defined as lower in development and earlier in time: in a state of nature, primitive, rude, savage, traditional or underdeveloped… drawn… entirely from a European and masculine point of

\textsuperscript{10} This is not to suggest that a ‘belief in science and progress’ has not been linked to whiteness (Patterson 1998).
Such techniques of whiteness, ‘produced by disciplines dedicated to the sciences of “man”’, are central to white possession, a denial of Indigenous sovereignty. The positioning of different cultures as inferior, in a lower, earlier, stage of development, functions to reproduce procedures of subjugation that are tied to racialized and racializing knowledges’ (Moreton-Robinson 2006: 389 on Goldberg 1993: 149). Irene Watson, in speaking as a survivor, describes the arrival of white colonizers to Australia as an act that ‘imposed violence, in all its forms, rendering our life and our laws pre-historic, invisible, un-evolved in time, in presence terra nullius’ (2002: para. 14).

How are rationalisations that enabled this perpetuated? Engagement with the role of consent locates a means to consider the disciplinary nature of whiteness. Sharp’s (1970, 1973, 1980) praxis-based research on nonviolence has explored the role of consent in power relations. For whiteness to be hegemonic the consent of whites is required. Consent can be differentiated, even unmarked, yet it locates a means for challenging whiteness via its withdrawal. Reflecting on how the actions of white supporters should be judged requires an engagement with the lived experiences of whiteness, its study, and how it can be challenged.

Engaging with the study of whiteness requires awareness that there are essentially two main approaches: a post-colonial approach as typified by the works of Australian scholars, and a USA-centric approach. The self-perceived uniqueness of the American Studies approach, its messianic superpower view, provides clear distinction between the two (see Ang 2001). Differences aside, whiteness scholarship has faced significant criticism. A significant implication of these criticisms is a re-centring of attention on the oppressive (i.e. white)

---

11 Moreton-Robinson (2007) has outlined how the use of traditional, with respect to land, locates a means to position First Peoples as in the past whilst also providing a reminder and a denial of sovereignty.
majority (Ahmed 2004; Ahmed 2005; Ang 2001; Frankenberg 1997; Guterl 2004; Haggis 2004; Harris 1993; Kolchin 2002; Nicoll 2005; Pratt 2003; Riggs 2004b; Shaw 2001; Warren 1999). Contrasting with such criticisms, a focus on the oppressive majority echoes the sentiments of Lila Watson’s (1992) ‘statement as an Indigenous educator in the context of Australia’: challenging whiteness has benefits for both First Peoples and whites, though whites should be doing so for their own sake rather than based on paternalist notions (Riggs 2004a).

Australian scholars continue to engage with colonial whiteness and its manifestations, with significant emphasis on how good intentions actively perpetuate rather than challenge whiteness. Given the prefigurative intent of scholars and activists in working towards a more socially just society, the dualistic construction of the good white antiracist is problematic (Hage 1995; Riggs 2004b). To recall, to prefigure one’s actions is to act consistently, having one’s means reflect desired ends. One’s actions must be socially just in themselves, they must challenge whiteness, complimenting the aim of a just society. One must be the change.

For white supporters involved in the ongoing dispute at Sandon Point, and the aftermath of what has transpired at Wave Hill and the Red Hill Valley, how their actions challenge and at the same time act to entrench whiteness provide empirical material to reflect on scholarship. Whiteness studies provides theory to reflect on praxis. Grounding a post-colonial approach with a Foucauldian understanding of power|knowledge, including the role of consent, and incorporating Ellul’s writings on technological society counters provide means to expose and challenge unmarked rationalisations that continue to shape white support. Engagement with these diverse theoretical approaches, how they compliment each other, aids in understanding of the support provided First Peoples, and the implications of unmarked whiteness. A detailed exploring the concept of whiteness provides a necessary foundation.

WHAT IS THIS CONCEPT CALLED WHITENESS?
Outlining a definition of the term whiteness is inherently problematic. The many
and varied attempts to do so, either definitively or generally, have often met with significant, even self-, criticism. Critical discussions that have resulted range from concerns about affording focus (re-centring attention) on the privileged through to the problems of universalising in attempting to define the social construction that is whiteness. Whiteness is partly defined by the absence of specific qualities, or qualities not possessed by the other (see, for example, Warren 1999: 187). One challenge is to consider whether it is possible or useful to define whiteness universally. Tensions between universality and particularity have led to discussions of the role context, whether there exist whitenesses (see Moran 2004: para. 18).

Neither of the two (loosely) distinct schools of scholarly engagement with whiteness provide definitive answers. They do, however, indicate that consideration of the universality or context-specificity of whiteness is crucial. Ien Ang provides an example of how these two schools can be further defined:

antipodean whiteness, so different from (post) imperial British whiteness or messianic, superpower American whiteness, inscribe and affect the way in which white Australia relates to its non-white ‘others’ (Ang 2001: 189).

For Ang whiteness is context specific and there is room to further refine and provide more specific categorisations of whiteness. The lack of ‘discuss[ion of] the relationship between the establishment of whiteness as a system of power and the process of colonisation’ is a locus of criticism of ‘North American Whiteness Scholars’ (Pratt 2003: 27 on Harris 1993). Peter Kolchin identifies exceptionalism:

One of the most striking features of the whiteness studies works is their assumption—sometimes asserted and sometimes unspoken—that the racism they describe is uniquely American and that American whiteness can be understood in isolation, without considering anything abroad (2002: 170-1).

Context has a crucial role on the lived experiences of whiteness, with appreciation
of this being a minimum requirement for understanding what constitutes it. Reflecting this, Ruth Frankenberg has developed ‘one contribution to the marking of whiteness’ (Wiegman 1999: 123). Her definition of whiteness, transformed and refined through more than a decade of research and publication on whiteness is provided in eight points. Whilst providing broad and generally applicable universalising definitions or categorisations, Frankenberg’s North American centrism requires noting. Such centring is clearly visible in a non-consideration of colonialism or its implications on whiteness:

1. Whiteness is a location of structural advantage in societies structured in racial dominance.

2. Whiteness is a “standpoint,” a location from which to see selves, others, and national and global orders.

3. Whiteness is a site of elaboration of a range of cultural practices and identities, often unmarked and unnamed, or named as national or “normative” rather than specifically racial.

4. Whiteness is often renamed or displaced within ethnic or class namings.

5. Inclusion within the category “white” is often a matter of contestation, and in different times and places some kinds of whiteness are boundary markers of the category itself.

6. Whiteness as a site of privilege is not absolute but rather cross-cut by a range of other axes of relative advantage or subordination; these do not erase or render irrelevant race privilege, but rather inflect or modify it.
7. Whiteness is a product of history, and is a relational category. Like other racial locations it has no inherent but only socially constructed meanings. As such, whiteness's meanings are complexly layered and variable locally and translocally; also, whiteness's meanings may appear simultaneously malleable and intractable.

8. The relationally and socially constructed character of whiteness does not, it must be emphasized, mean that this and other racial locations are unreal in their material and discursive effects (Frankenberg 2001: 76).

As the first point implies, Frankenberg's contribution was developed in reference to, and located within, societies that are structured in dominance 'rather than seeking to name [whiteness] in cultural terms' (Ibid: 75). Each of these eight points can and should be considered as indicators of aspects of whiteness. They provide a basis for engagement, a basis to the applied to particular contexts.

Context is central to these eight points, having a crucial role in the applicability of what descriptions of whiteness are considered. Kolchin explicitly supports this perspective:

…the matter of context becomes crucial. Simply put, in making whiteness omnipresent, whiteness studies authors risk losing sight of contextual variations and thereby undermining the very understanding of race and whiteness as socially constructed (2002: 160).

The introduction to Bridget Rasmussen, Eric Klineberg, Irene Nexica and Matt Wray's widely cited anthology *The making and unmaking of whiteness* recognises that context and specificity are crucial in the study of whiteness:
One of the problems with studying whiteness is that no one who does it has an easy time determining what authors and texts should be included in the inquiry (2001: 1).

The recognition of context implicit in Rasmussen et al’s introduction emerged in reflecting on ‘what exactly constitutes an appropriate intellectual genealogy for critical whiteness studies’ (Ibid). The problem referred to has implications for the study of whiteness and what has emerged from past explorations. This can be seen in a number of dualisms Kolchin has described in produced definitions of whiteness:

[it] appears as both real and unreal, transitory and permanent, ubiquitous and invisible, everywhere and nowhere, everything and nothing (2002: 160).

Contrasting with these polarised representations, Frankenberg, in explicitly referring to some of the challenges central to identifying whiteness, provides what may appear to be a more fluid account. ‘Race, as a social construct, is transformable, malleable’ and ‘a constellation of processes and practices rather than a bounded entity... firmly rooted in that process’ (Frankenberg 2001: 73). The apparent fluidity is firmly grounded by race and gender theorist Lisa Bloom, on referring to scholarship on situated knowledges (standpoints), and yet again highlights difficulties in defining whiteness.12 Such scholarship is described as taking

into account the geography of colonialism and the complex workings of how power/knowledge is racialized. In dealing with the intersection between these terms, an analysis of

the concept of “whiteness” has seemed crucial, even if it has proven difficult to ground in an analysis. Much current scholarship on colonial discourse argues that race is hard to define because it lacks cultural specificity, since it is not a marker of actual skin color (1994: 18).

“White” as a social construct raises problems for defining whiteness as discussed by Todd Kutcha (1998) in “The Dyer Straits of Whiteness”. He focuses specifically on Dyer’s (1997) book White, which followed Dyer’s (1988) essay of the same name and is described as ‘among the first sustained inquiries into the ubiquitous yet invisible character of whiteness’ (Kutcha 1998: 1):

Dyer’s disrobing of whiteness is… lucid and deft. For him whiteness is fraught with paradox. As a racial designation, white describes people whose skin color is not literally white—and because ‘white’ skin presumes the absence of ethnicity, whites rarely consider themselves racially marked… Dyer claims such paradoxes offer whiteness its representational power, inoculating it against stereotypes by suggesting that whites are both infinite in variety yet representative of humanity per se (Ibid).

Dyer’s ‘claim’ provides a very clear indication of the pervasiveness of whiteness based on its construction of normativity. Whiteness is exposed as socially constructed as opposed to biological, a relational category. One that perpetuates itself:

Whites are everywhere in representation. Yet precisely because of this and their placing as the norm, they seem not to be represented to themselves as whites but as people who are variously gendered, classes, sexualised and abled. At the level of racial representation, in other words, whites are not of a certain race, they’re just the human race’ (Dyer 1997: 3).
The position these excerpts describe is accurately labelled by Frankenberg’s second point: *Whiteness is a “standpoint”*. It provides a position from which all others are seen, judged and considered against—whiteness is relational. Whiteness, as a standpoint, is not explicitly visible to those who fall within and benefit from the category white. An assumption of whiteness is there can be a position-less interpretation, with white ways of knowing and seeing considered as position-less (Haraway 1991: 189; Turnbull 2000).

The paradox of the ethnic category white as describing people ‘whose skin color is not literally white’, and its contextual and contestable definitions, is illustrated via reference to the shifting boundaries of what and who (temporarily or otherwise) fall into the this category—and the process of how this comes into being. For example,

the Irish moved from being perceived as colored in the early nineteenth century in the United States to quite white in Boston’s school busing struggles in the 1970s… U.S. Jews have been ascribed white status more or less stably after WWII, while Arabs continue to be written as colored in the daily news (Haraway 1989: 401-2, note 15).

Kolchin refers to ‘Benjamin Franklin’s remarkable classification of the worlds population in 1751’ to illustrate, albeit in a limited manner, what he refers to as ‘perhaps the most striking example of the arbitrary and changing nature of race’:

> All Africa is black or tawny; Asia chiefly tawny; America (exclusive of the newcomers [that is, the English]) wholly so. And in Europe the Spaniards, Italians, French, Russians, and Swedes are generally of what we call a swarthy complexion; as are the Germans also, the Saxons only excepted, who, with the English, make the principle body of white people on the face of the earth (Benjamin Franklin reproduced in Kolchin 2002: 158).

Suvendrini Perera, for example, has considered the reworking of ‘racial and class categories… into a racialised scale of desirability’ in response to changes in migration in Australia (Perera 2005: 31). In disagreeing with Robert Manne’s 2001 Deakin lecture, Perera notes that the positioning of ‘immigrants from Britain and Ireland, from Europe, the Middle East and Asia’ is ‘constitutively and continually unequal, [providing] asymmetrical access to the institutions of citizenship and civility’. Homogenising or collectivising a category of migrant renders non-considered ‘the foundational violence of colonisation and federation and the complex ways in which processes of racialisation have constituted categories such as “whites”, “blacks”, “natives”, “aliens” and “citizens” ever since’ (Ibid: 34-5). A similar basis to Perera’s critique of Manne’s reflections on his personal journey as a child of World War II Jewish refugees has been noted by Kolchin (2002) within the American Studies approach to whiteness, with an

emphasis on representation, identity shifting, and political advocacy [that] is coupled with an unwillingness to consider seriously political economy or historical specificity. The end result is an interpretive paradigm that rips the making of “race” from its historical context (and historiography) and reduces it to nothing more than a transhistorical process of differentiation (Guterl 2004: 441
Non-consideration of the role of context contrasts, to a degree, with Australia-specific engagement with whiteness. The Australian Critical Race & Whiteness Studies Association:

ACRAWSA was formed in 2003 by a group of Australian intellectuals committed to discussing, describing and disrupting the lived privileges of whiteness (ACRAWSA n.d.).

The prescriptive aims of the association are embodied in the work of members. Damien Riggs has addressed context informing such work—in itself an indicator of the definitions of whiteness embodied and/or adopted—with scholarship being ‘explicitly informed by’

a recognition of the impact that colonisation continues to have upon the lives of all people in Australia, whether it be through disadvantaging Indigenous people or accruing unearned privilege to non-indigenous people (2004: para. 3).

Assertions of what constitutes and perpetuates whiteness—including its ongoing colonial impact on both Aboriginal peoples and those who have arrived more recently (including those who fall within the ethnic category white)—are implicit. This includes the privileging of certain types of knowledge whilst at the same time devaluing others.

Riggs highlights a number of implicit assertions within the nature and aim of critical whiteness studies, in referring to the work of Morrison (1992: 90), as

draw[ing] attention to the raced status of non-indigenous people, and thus turn[ing] the gaze "from the racial object to the racial subject; from the described and imagined to
the describers and imaginers; from the serving to the served” (Riggs 2004a: para. 3).

Definitions of whiteness have emerged that shift in focus from the oppressed towards to oppressive: from, in this instance, First Peoples to whites. Given this context and understanding, the study of whiteness in Australia is seen as a thoroughly racialised project that aims to legitimate the authority of certain groups over others by drawing on the legacy of ‘biological’ explanations of race... Whilst this approach starts from an understanding of race as a social construction, it also acknowledges the very concrete ways in which race shapes experiences of oppression and privilege (Ibid).

Riggs’ reference to whiteness as a project, despite explicit colonial understandings, is open to many criticisms. Aside from what can be considered ‘paint[ing] with a very broad brush’, use of the term project tends towards implying organisation and universalism, that the production and promotion of whiteness is a clearly explicit act with both a set agenda and prescriptive goals (Kolchin 2002: 192). Does such a description merely ‘reify a monolithic whiteness’? (Jacobson 1998: 163 reproduced in Kolchin 2002).

Considering whiteness as a project clearly contrasts with the centrality of context to one’s lived day-to-day experiences of whiteness and the specificity and particularisms of such experiences. This overgeneralised and reductionist account may provide for base understandings of broad experiences of whiteness, yet what depth can this approach be afforded?

The challenges to defining whiteness within the specific contexts of contemporary Australia and Canada is explicit in a description provided by Alison Saxton (2004), with reference to Brodkin’s (1999) *Studying whiteness: What’s the point and where to from here*?:
While whiteness prescribes normative behaviour in Australian society, it is difficult to define just what constitutes whiteness, as its boundaries are fluid. For example, whiteness has evolved to be inclusive of who at one time have been considered non-white (Saxton 2004: 18).

The fluid boundaries of whiteness indicate more than just the difficulty in defining whiteness. Efficacy and pervasiveness, recalling Dyer’s disrobing (Kutcha 1998), are essential to enable such changeability. The lack of specificity, as discussed by Bloom (1994), of whiteness can further problematise attempts to define what constitutes it. Robyn Wiegman, also a race and gender theorist, provides a critical contrast to overgeneralisations and the broad brush from/with which definitions of whiteness can be constructed:

To the extent that critical race theorists have assumed that the power of whiteness arises from its appropriation of the universal and that the universal is opposed to and hence devoid of the particular, we have failed to interpret the tension between particularity and universality that characterizes not simply the legal discourse of race (where early documents enfranchise the “white person”) but also the changing contours of white power and privilege in the last three centuries (1999: 117).

Riggs, in critically engaging with the potential of whiteness studies, furthers this and provides a contrast with his description of whiteness as a project. Whiteness can be understood to be far more nebulous than it may at first appear. In other words, whilst terms such as ‘whiteness’ and ‘white culture’ may appear to suggest that the construct ‘white’ is only ever one and the same thing, it is important to recognise that ‘whiteness’ achieves its
semblance of normality and universality precisely because of its ability to absorb difference, or to adapt itself so as to appear to always be the same (2004: para. 5).

Given the adaptability of whiteness, there is a need to define context. It is the particularism and its embodiment of everyday lived experiences (whether marked and/or visible or otherwise) that is central to any attempts to consider what actually constitutes whiteness.

The context specific nature of whiteness is explored in the critically titled ‘Benevolence and the Management of Stake: On Being ‘Good White People’:

whilst whiteness is *painfully* visible to those people who have been dispossessed and rendered objects of genocidal practices, whiteness—or more specifically white race privilege—continues to be routinely ignored as a site of power in Australia that is based upon the denial of Indigenous sovereignty (emphasis added, Riggs 2004b: preface).

Alongside whiteness being ‘routinely ignored as a site of power’, the rare awareness ‘which we as white people’ have ‘of our racialised subject positions, and how this works to justify the hegemony of whiteness in Australia’ is inextricably tied to the denial of Indigenous sovereignty (Ibid). Many scholars, including founding members of ACRAWSA, consider this denial as at the core of whiteness in Australia, and the essential issue that needs be addressed before necessary change can be made (Moreton-Robinson 1999, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2004; Nicoll 2000, 2002, 2004, 2005; Perera 2005; Riggs 2004a, 2004b).

The linkages between whiteness in Australia and the denial of Indigenous sovereignty are not necessarily clear. In many scholarly accounts such linkages as not well articulated. This can be considered as clearly an impact of whiteness—both on the reader and in the ability of the writer to articulate this in a way that is clear to the reader. Riggs provides one clearly articulated account. In addressing
some concerns raised after the presentation of earlier versions of his paper, with specific reference to the published work of Nicoll ‘and her suggestion that we need to recognise and understand our relationship to Indigenous sovereignty’, the clarifications provided significantly transcend this vague abstractness:

whilst it may appear that white people have no relation to Indigenous sovereignty, this is much the same as the belief that race is a problem for only non-white people. As people living in a country that is founded upon acts of dispossession and genocide, we as white people cannot escape our relationship to both Indigenous sovereignty and racialised practises: our location is predicated upon the disavowal of the two as structural factors (Riggs 2004a: para. 20).

Riggs’ aim of deconstructing the good white anti-racists/bad white racists dualism draws on and extend Ghassan Hage’s (1995) The Limits of ‘Anti-racist Sociology’ to explore the mutuality of good versus bad. Hage’s reflections on anti-racist sociology identifies similarities to the boundary work as outlined by Gieryn (1995):

It is as if both sociologists and racists share an equal desire to explain for the sake of explanation, the only difference between them being that racists ‘have’ bad explanations while sociologists generate good ones. The whole aim of the sociological exercise becomes that of showing how ‘wrong’ the explanation of the racists is, as if the sociologist is in competition with the sociological object over ‘who can explain best’ (Hage 1995: 68).

Hage defines a variant of anti-racist sociology he refers to as governmental. It is governmental in the sense that it has a ‘practical orientation’ and provides prescription. He identifies a tendency of having a ‘political ethic that over-imposes itself... lead[ing] to a friend/enemy logic’ that acts to construct dualistic boundaries upon which claims are staked, rather than ‘foster[ing] argumentation,
painstaking reasoning and the primacy of the desire to understand and explain (Ibid: 71). Much like the more general construction of bad racists Riggs refers to, such characterisations render the protagonist, the good racist, ‘unable to develop an ethic of understanding… becoming perturbed by a wish to condemn and deplore and even detest’ (Ibid: 72). What is at stake is legitimacy, attempting to position oneself to avoid, or associate others with, the stigma of being racist. Paul Kivel similarly notes this in *Uprooting Racism: how white people can work for racial justice*, his ‘book about racism for white people’. He refers to the construction of such division as ineffective, being predicated on a notion of superiority (2002: 13-4).

In relationally constructing the good as oppositional to the bad, white supporters limit the ability to ‘recognise how all white people are implicated in the systems of oppression that shape the white Australian nation’. They subsequently do not recognise structural factors and ‘that our engagement with whiteness must necessarily be approached through our relationship to Indigenous sovereignty’ (Riggs 2004b: para. 3). The good/bad dualism has a normalising tendency that does little to challenge the hegemony of whiteness in Australia. Thus white people’s relationship to Indigenous sovereignty is crucial to an understanding of what constitutes whiteness in Australia, and needs to be considered in any definition of what actually constitutes whiteness in this context. Through engagement with specific acts of the good white (anti-racist) person, this concept will be further unpacked and will continue to increase in clarity.

As white people’s relationship to Indigenous sovereignty is central to whiteness in Australia, the work of the prominent scholar Moreton-Robinson in her stinging critique of what she terms ‘patriarchal white sovereignty’ and its possessiveness, requires consideration. Patriarchal white sovereignty is a complex phenomenon and constitutes a ‘regime of power that derives from the illegal act of dispossession… most accurately reflected in the form of the Crown and the judiciary’ (Moreton-Robinson 2004: para. 5). This ‘foundation of the nation state… confers patriarchal white sovereignty on its citizens through disproportionate means, with this unbalanced ability to exercise power being circumscribed
through marked categories of ‘[r]ace, class, gender, sexuality and ableness’. The ‘possessive logic’ of patriarchal white sovereignty is based on exclusion, being a ‘rationalisation rather then a set of positions’ that results in a perpetuation of ‘control and domination’ (Ibid).

Ideas of ‘egalitarianism, equity and equal opportunity’ are inscribed within the ideals of democracy deployed via the possessive logic of patriarchal white sovereignty, which also functions to define was/is and thus who was not/is not afforded status as white. Moreton-Robinson describes this as being ‘operationalised to circulate sets of meanings... [that invoke] common sense knowledge, decision making and socially produced conventions’ that justify and reify its existence despite its ability ‘to remain transparent and invisible—two key attributes of its power’ (Ibid: para. 5-6). The implication of common sense, in itself, invokes the hegemony of whiteness, its pervasiveness and effectiveness in perpetuating established power relations, whether intentional or otherwise. Alcoff, draws from and extends Harding’s argument that

Members of oppressed groups have fewer interests in ignorance about the social order and fewer reasons to invest in maintaining or justifying the status quo than do dominant groups (Harding 1991: 126)

to explain how and why white people have vested interests in maintaining an ignorance of whiteness. For white people to become aware of their own ignorance and stake in perpetuating whiteness, irrespective of marked intent—to radically question their ‘beliefs or belief sets’—requires some type of crisis (Alcoff 2007: 43-5).

The actions of Riggs’ good white people are central to the maintenance, perpetuation and reinforcement of patriarchal white sovereignty. These good white people, partly unintentionally as their actions can be unmarked, naturalise and normalise (i.e. reduce racism—as in bad racism—to irregularity) possessive and paternalistic approaches to concepts such as reconciliation. It is the implications of the possessive logic of patriarchal white sovereignty, as embodied in whiteness
in Australia and expressed through the actions of good white people, the requires
Critical engagement. An awareness that patriarchal white sovereignty can be at the
Same time ‘omnipresent, but invisible, unnamed and unmarked’ and appearing to
Be ‘disinvested’ is essential to understand what actually constitutes whiteness in
Australia (Moreton-Robinson 2004: para. 24).

As Ang notes, whiteness acquires its meanings from the ‘concrete network of
Social relations within which it is embedded’ (2001: 188). Within the multiple
Formations of Australian whiteness, differences and similarities between white and
Non-Indigenous are worth noting. Perera (2005) and Moreton-Robinson have
Identified how both white and non-white colonizer/migrants are founded and
Positioned, with an incommensurable difference to the ‘Indigenous sense of
Ontological belonging’ (Moreton-Robinson 2003: 23). As Perera notes

…as someone who migrated here what I was doing was
Consenting to, and literally signing on to, a system of
Colonisation (2005: 33).

It is here that the root of commonality between white and non-white
Colonizer/migrants are located, somewhat of a universality in the spectrum of
Australian whiteness. Both the ‘white and non-white postcolonial subject [are]
Positioned in relation to [First Peoples] not through migrancy but possession’, a
denial of sovereignty (Moreton-Robinson 2003: 37). Ang’s On not speaking
Chinese—living between Asia and the West engages with how Australian
Whiteness manifests itself in relation to Australia’s non-Indigenous non-white
Others. One specific, yet all to common, example is indicative:

A while ago I bumped into a middle-aged white women in
The supermarket. Such small accidents happen all the time;
They are part of the everyday experience of sharing a
Space, including national space. But she was annoyed at
Started calling me names. “Why don’t you go back to your
Own country!” she shouted. I am familiar with this
Exhortation: it is a declaration of exclusion racialized and
ethnicized people have to put up with all the time (2001: 189).

As Perera (2005) notes, the positioning implicit in such exhortations in Australia ‘actively erases the history of Aboriginal dispossession (Ang 2001: 190). White Australians are the new natives through the mobilisation of patriarchal white sovereignty (Moreton-Robinson 2004).

There are clear similarities between the former British colonies of Australia and Canada, alongside significant distinctions in relations between First Peoples and those who arrived subsequent to European settlement. Many of these differences exist on paper—the presence of treaties and the 2001 changes to the Canadian Constitution are specific examples. In this sense, recognition exists at an official level. What are the implications of this for the concept of patriarchal white sovereignty? Does it apply to the Canadian situation given the presence of such recognition? How does whiteness manifest itself? Whilst relations to the sovereignty of First Peoples in Canada embodies respect and recognition at an official level not present in Australia, non-acceptance and denial of sovereignty continues to exist. Responses to the land reclamations at Ipperwash and, currently, Caledonia—directly linked to the dispute at the Red Hill Valley—are specific examples. Moreton-Robinson’s concept of patriarchal white sovereignty is applicable. Respect and recognition has shaped the actions of white supporters at the Red Hill Valley, and how they relate to sovereignty. Context has direct implications of on lived experiences of whiteness—it is experiential. The spaces created by activism have fostered an increased awareness (Simpson 2000: 117). This, however, should not be used as a basis to assert whiteness as explicitly unique and something that can be understood in isolation.

To summarise, it is clear that Frankenberg’s (2001) eight point ‘contribution to the marking of whiteness’ provides a basis from which to engage with whiteness—albeit one that does not engage with colonialism. Whiteness is a relational social construct and a standpoint. It is a situated knowledge (Bloom 1994) and, rather than a monolithic whiteness, there exist whitenesses (Moran 2004). The implications of attempts to define whiteness as, and subsequently making it
appear, monolithic or omnipresent were articulated by Kolchin (2002). The role of context, however needs to be considered alongside commonalities—how ignorance is contextual, yet patterns of ignorance exist (Alcoff 2007: 47). Wiegman (1999) refers to this as ‘the tension between particularity and universality’ and this parallels criticism of USA-centric whiteness studies.

The contrasting, yet somewhat complimentary, particularity and universality of whiteness relies on its normativity. Extensions of this, which further reinforce its pervasiveness, are other dualistic characteristics explored by Kolchin: real-unreal, transitory-permanent, ubiquitous-invisible, everywhere-nowhere, everything-nothing (2002). These characteristics are central to the unseen and/or unmarked nature of whiteness to those who benefit from its lived privileges. These are clearly linked to general non-awareness of patriarchal white sovereignty and its implications.

The implications of the denial of Indigenous sovereignty in lived experiences of whiteness are deeply tied to the false dichotomy of good white anti-racists/bad white racists. Exploring the pervasiveness of this dualism provides a significant empirical basis to consider the extent of, and effective means available/practiced that challenge, the impacts of the subject position good white person. The implications of this are inextricably linked to Lila Watson’s (1992) critical challenge to the basis of white support—for what reasons is support offered/provided? Recalling this challenge provides an appropriate basis for shifting in focus from the question of what actually constitutes whiteness to consider its study.

THE STUDY OF WHITENESS
As the many and varied concerns and difficulties with providing a definition of whiteness explored indicate, the study of whiteness has many issues to address. These emanate from whiteness being a social construction and resulting tensions between universality and particularity. With context playing a crucial role in shaping standpoints, there are many and varied accounts as to how whiteness should be studied and what the implications are for adopting specific approaches. There are also many critiques of the differing rationales and approaches professed and
adopted for the study of whiteness. The aim of studying whiteness, in the context of white support at Wave Hill, Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley parallels that expressed by Riggs:

the study of whiteness in colonial nations (and within a context of Indigenous sovereignty)... represents one mode for critiquing white hegemony. Whilst this approach starts from an understanding of race as a social construction, it also acknowledges the very concrete ways in which race shapes experiences of oppression and privilege (Riggs 2004a: para. 3).

The study of whiteness requires a reflexive approach and consideration of the universal/particular. Kolchin has detailed a specific concern, identifying how the American approach to whiteness studies has, at times, entailed little more than a repackaging of prior inquiry:

In some ways, what is newest in the historical works on whiteness is a new language, a new way of saying something that is not all that different from what many historians have been saying for some time. Indeed, despite appearances, whiteness studies represent less a radical new departure than an evolution of a historical scholarship that has long been preoccupied with the changing ways of making race. The focus on whiteness represents a new way of addressing old questions, but the central concern of the new scholarship—how, under diverse conditions, Americans conceptualized and reconceptualized race—is very much in line with the historical literature of the past four decades.

As it builds on the old history of race, the field of whiteness studies has—despite its current limitations—considerable unfulfilled potential (2002: 172).
With regards to the post-colonial approach to whiteness studies, Perera has identified ‘conceptualizing, theorizing and historicising work that remains to be done in the unpacking of Australian whiteness’. Australian scholarship has mostly focussed on ‘relationships between Indigenous and Anglo-Australians, passing over the interlocking racial and ethnic hierarchies and multiple spacialities that structure and produce Australian whiteness’, whiteness that is ‘derived and asserted in relation to its multiple racial others’ (Perera 2005: 31-2).

Riggs has reflected on challenges associated with the choice of authors and texts to include in any inquiry:

critical studies of race and whiteness require a range of approaches to both epistemology and ontology in order to prevent the subject areas from solidifying into a homogenous, institutionalised subject area, an outcome that would thus only serve to reinforce the hegemony of whiteness (2004a: para. 5).

This thesis seeks to consider the implications of Riggs’ identification of requirements. Whilst focussing on ‘relationships between Indigenous and Anglo-Australians], differences in Australian Whiteness are noted (Perera 2005). In drawing from scholarship outside the realm of current works on whiteness, the boundaries of whiteness studies as a subject area are challenged to further explore the hegemony of whiteness. Kolchin refers to the potential problems raised by Riggs, and attempts to identify a definition of omnipresent whiteness in a number of works (Kolchin 2002: 160). Contrasting with Riggs' prescription, Nicoll describes whiteness theory as addressing some of these specific issues, challenging a universalised or omnipresent whiteness:

it is this commitment to understanding the complex and dynamic character of power relations that makes whiteness theory ‘critical’ and distinguishes it from a neo-liberal identity politics… (Nicoll 2004: para. 8).
An earlier work of Wiegman’s describes whiteness as encompassed within ‘three trajectories of inquiry’. In referring to ‘the emergence of the academy’s latest and—in nearly everyone’s opinion—rather confounding antiracist venture, whiteness studies’, the trajectories of this critical project all… take social constructionist renderings of race as their theoretical assumption: the race traitor school (which advocates the abolition of whiteness through white disaffiliation from race privilege), the “white trash” school (which analyzes the “racialization” of the permanent poor in order to demonstrate the otherness of whiteness within), and the class solidarity school (which rethinks the history of working-class struggle as the preamble to forging new cross-racial alliances) (Wiegman 1999: 121-2).

Wiegman describes one text as crucial to all of three trajectories, the outcomes of which were introduced above in commenting on the shifting boundaries of what and who falls within the category white. This ‘groundbreaking’ text is Roediger’s (1991) study of the creation of the white working class in the nineteenth century, *The Wages of Whiteness*, which rehearses the history of the “whitening” of Irish immigrants as a kind of paradigmatic case for understanding whiteness as a social construction (Wiegman 1999: 123).

Wiegman’s describes Roediger’s text as being quite specifically a rearticulation of class struggle as an antiracist project, [with] this historical account of white racial formation ha[ving] come to define the political horizon of whiteness studies by imagining for contemporary white people a political (as opposed to biological or cultural) identity beyond the conflation of power and privilege with
This description appears to provide credence to Kolchin’s description of whiteness studies as a re-packaging of historical analysis. However, Wiegman expands on this further and contrasts with such an analysis. In referring to this ‘social constructionist project of whiteness studies’ as comprising ‘the foundational gesture of whiteness studies’, a basis is provided to both challenge Kolchin’s description whilst at the same time indicating that it is forming (at least in part) its ‘considerable unfulfilled potential’ (2002: 172). This foundational gesture, whilst being a ‘historical retrieval of not-yet-white ethnics’, is characterised as an engagement with the experience of *becoming*, in contrast to *being*, white. This provides a significant and clear distinction with the historical studies referred to by as ‘very much in line with the historical literature of the past four decades’ (Ibid).

The clear contrasts between the critical engagement with whiteness studies of Wiegman and Kolchin illustrates a basis for criticism of ‘North American Whiteness Scholars’ as inward looking, engaged in isolation and ignoring links with the process of colonisation. Whiteness in Australia has at its core what Moreton-Robinson (1999) refers to as patriarchal white sovereignty. This is different from Wiegman’s notion of whiteness studies based on an engagement with *becoming*, in contrast to *being*, white. Haggis (2004) critically reflects on aspects of such hybridity in drawing from the work of Ang (2001). Based on the incommensurability of white ways of knowing and seeing and the Indigenous ontology of being expressed by Moreton-Robinson (2003), there cannot be an in-betweenness of First Peoples and colonizers. (Haggis 2004: para. 21-2). For non-Anglo migrants, in-betweeness exists in-so-far as how they benefit from a denial of sovereignty, tied to the ongoing process of colonization, yet are positioned as outsiders with respect to belonging (Perera 2005). Whiteness studies, in recognising this incommensurability, provides a means for ‘critiquing white hegemony’ (Riggs 2004a: para. 3).

As is indicated by such seemingly contradictory constructions, the study of whiteness is a relatively new and emerging site of academic inquiry. John Warren describes this development as follows:
Researchers have created (discovered) a whole new site of investigation, which is designed not to gaze outward at the margins but critically examine what lies at the centre of racial institutional power: whiteness. This research derives from the desire to examine the location of privilege granted to people simply because they appear white, rather than to theorise about those populations that are already outside of the racial centre (1999: 185-6).

Warren contrasts the emergence of research on whiteness undertaken by those who themselves are afforded status, privilege and power via their falling within this racial category with—through reference to the work of Audre Lorde (1984), Cornel West (1993) and prior research—past engagements:

Traditionally most of the research on race and culture has been conducted by nondominant racial groups working within the paradigm of racial oppression (1999: 187).

This reiterates issues regarding the choice of authors and texts to include in inquiry, and Riggs' prescription that 'a range of approaches to both epistemology and ontology' are required so as not 'to reinforce the hegemony of whiteness' (2004: para. 5). As Warren explains, with '[n]ew ways of thinking and theorizing whiteness... constantly being created and explored, which means that new theoretical directions are always possible’ this ‘problem’ may become more complex (1999: 188).

Warren’s concerns alongside those of Rasmussen, Klineberg, Nexica and Wray contrast with and exemplify Riggs’ prescription. As research in this field of inquiry consolidates, this ‘problem’ of broad and diverse ways of thinking and theorizing will almost certainly consolidate with clearly defined and exemplified foci emerging specific to research directions and disciplines. Perera’s (2005) comments on a focus on ‘relationships between Indigenous and Anglo-Australians’ identifies this trend, and potential issues. What needs to be engaged with during this process is that ‘a range of approaches to both epistemology and ontology’ is maintained.
Otherwise the potential exists for whiteness studies to become institutionalized and homogeneous and thus undermining its own existence as a field of critical inquiry. Herein lies a substantial challenge that Wiegman describes as enmeshed in the ‘foundational gesture of whiteness studies’:

the texts heralded in the academic press as a “new humanities subfield” coalesce as a kind of ethnic studies formulation, but one profoundly divided by the need to destroy its object of study—whiteness—as well (1999: 123).

The focus on how academic research on whiteness exposes the white assumptions of the academia is broadly articulated by Riggs, in referring to emergent scholarship on whiteness in Australia: ‘critical whiteness studies may call attention to the very practices of the academy itself’ (2004: para. 4). It is in providing clarification for this ‘rather grand claim’ that the sentiments of Wiegman’s articulation, with both an Australian focus and contrast with the reification of the Race Traitor school of thought, are explicit:

my intention in suggesting this is not to position critical whiteness studies as being the answer to ‘solving’ racialised oppression’, nor to suggest that it is inherently more ‘critical’ than any other subject area that analyses race... My point is that...critical whiteness studies may be placed to critically examine its own assumptions (Ibid: para. 4).

An awareness of these concerns, potential issues and possibilities of the study of whiteness leads to questioning not only the impetus behind pursuits in this field of critical inquiry, it also raises a number of important questions:

Why do we need whiteness studies, and what are some of the social contexts that have brought it about? (Ibid: para. 5).
These questions get to the crux of the question what is whiteness studies. Riggs addresses these questions with specific reference to numerous works, including Gloria Yamato (1990) and Nado Aveling (2004). He concludes that white people should be engaging in work on racism for their own sake as opposed to a perceived benefit for the ‘racialised other’ (Riggs 2004a: para. 8). This is echoed through reference to Lila Watson (1992) ‘statement as an Indigenous educator in the context of Australia’. Riggs calls for a shift in focus towards the oppressive, rather than the oppressed, subject. White should be seeking to expose whiteness in their own actions, to transcend it. He links this to another critical issue: the broad, pervasive and apparently universal paternalistic assumptions that underpin the strategies and tactics adopted by white supporters at Sandon Point. Why do whites engage with specific issues centring on and/or provide support for Aboriginal Australians? Is it ‘for the sake of the racialised other’? (Riggs 2004a: para. 8, on Yamato 1990).

White support for First Peoples struggles frequently resembles paternalism. The pervasiveness and ubiquitousness of colonial paternalism mediates and continues to shape the support afforded both those participating in the walkout at Wave Hill and SPATE. An explicit challenge of and to studies of whiteness, somewhat succinctly described as both a ‘conundrum’ and ‘the dilemma that haunts’, is how to escape, dismantle, deconstruct, challenge, resist white racial privilege while avoiding inadvertently bolstering the logics of white supremacy and underwrite it (Haggis 2004: para. 1).

Haggis (2004) in ‘Beyond race and whiteness? Reflections on the new abolitionists and an Australian critical whiteness studies’ adopts such a task in exploring the potential for an Australian critical sociology of whiteness that both avoids the pitfalls of the racist/antiracist binary and thus builds into its praxis an awareness of the complicity in white race privilege (Ibid:
In referring to pitfalls, Haggis is directly commenting on Hage’s (1995) *The limits of ‘Anti-racist sociology’*. The ‘problem of privileging agency for the white traitor’ emanating from the *race traitor* school, has specific ‘implications... for an Australian social formulation of white race privilege constructed around the white/non-white/indigenous boundaries of identity and difference’ (Haggis 2004: para. 12).

Hage’s work, including the widely referred to *Against Paranoid Nationalism: Searching for hope in a shrinking society*, is in line with the ‘New Abolitionist’ approach. It embodies an approach that ‘American radicals call becoming a “race traitor”’ (Hage 2003: 3). There are similar themes in the work of Australian’s Peter Read (2000) and Germaine Greer (2003) which, alongside *Against Paranoid Nationalism*, receive critical attention from Haggis. References to and/or implications for recognizing, adopting and/or succumbing to ‘indigeneity’ are central to this. Haggis identifies Hage’s (1995) critical identification of the problems that ‘good intentions’ have in sociology with specific reference to

The explicitly anti-racist stance of much sociology [in which] the social analyst assumes the role of moral arbiter; the point of the exercise is to identify the ‘bad’ racism, revealed in the assumed anti-racist gaze of the sociological observer (2004: para. 3).

A second issue of importance in *Paranoid Nationalism* is it contrasts with the awareness of whiteness indicated above and is clear throughout its sixth chapter: “Polluting memories: migration as colonial responsibility in Australia”. The impacts of colonialism are firmly located in the past, visible in the focus on (national) ‘memory’—repeated in many of the chapters sub-headings. In considering the implications of ‘past wrongs’, specifically that the focus should not rest on these, rather on ways to remove their consequences, awareness of the implications of ongoing colonialism vis-à-vis whiteness is lacking (Hage 2003: 84; Patton 1997). In attempting to highlight the problematics of a collective ‘we’—both for Aboriginal
peoples in Australia and non-Anglo migrants—the benefits of colonialism for non-Anglo migrants, and the impacts of whiteness emanating from lived experiences, are not afforded consideration.

To return to Haggis’ critical consideration of Greer (2003), Hage (2003) and Read (2000) in questioning whether they are ‘trying to displace the possessiveness of whiteness and its incommensurability with the [Indigenous] ontology of country’, the answer is both yes and no (Haggis 2004: para. 23). This centres around both the affording of agency and the individualism of experiences of guilt and/or shame—the ‘affective states’ of ‘retrospective consciousness’ (Nicoll 2004: par. 30). Alison Bailey, in drawing from the work of Marcía Lugones (2003), locates one of the implications of guilt.

if we stop thinking about oppressed peoples as victims consumed and exhausted by systems of oppression (i.e. the Racial Contract) and instead consider how oppressed subjects resist systems aimed at disciplining, violating and erasing them, then different ways of making sense emerge (Bailey 2007: 82).

Locating the oppressed other as a victim, as requiring white assistance to help them, fosters paternalism that, in turn, perpetuates constructions of the other as subordinate, inferior. The flip side of denying the agency of the oppressed other negates an ability to consider strategic resistance practices and resistant logic. Such resistance practices can further act to maintain (white) epistemologies of ignorance (Hoagland 2007: 107-8). The presence, and implications of this, will be illustrated with respect to the actions at Wave Hill, Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley.

Haggis exposes further implications of a focus on guilt, or of resolving guilt, in her contradictory answer to the question regarding Reid and Greer:

Their traitorous intent to acknowledge Aboriginal presence and authority is constrained or compromised by the logic
of agency in their texts (Haggis 2004: para. 23).

Haggis’ critique draws specifically on individual experiences with specific reference to Read’s account: ‘the “grief” of the settler’ resulting from ‘recent awareness that his memories of happy family holidays on the north Sydney beaches occurred alongside the deprivations, marginalisation and oppressions of... Aboriginal’ Australians (Ibid: para. 23). Read’s experiences, ‘as a “symptom” of postcolonial Australia’, are also critically commented on by Ken Gelder, with Haggis considering this criticism as ‘equally applicable to Greer’ (Ibid):

This is postcolonialism-as-fulfillment, but only for white Australians. This is reconciliation, but only on ‘non-Aboriginal’ Australia’s terms: to make this class of people even more settled than they were before (Gelder 2000: para. 6).

There is a clear re-focus here on the privileged white centre—exemplifying Haggis’ conundrum/the dilemma that haunts. Her criticism, however, is more scathing of these works:

It seems to me this is precisely what these attempts to imagine a post white Australia are about: getting the anti-racist white subject comfortable again (2004: para. 24).13

Moreton-Robinson also comments are Reads attempts to ground his own sense of belonging. In focussing on and privileging individualised attachment, the entrenched epistemic and structural violence of colonial Australia is obscured—‘it is the denial or original (and continuing) dispossession that forms the foundation for Read’s belief that his personal sense of belonging is based on an equal partnership with Indigenous people. There can be no equal partnership where

there is illegal dispossession’ (Moreton-Robinson 2003: 27).

Moreton-Robinson’s identification of attempts at imagining a past/present/future encompassed within the ‘possessive logic of patriarchal white sovereignty’ is enlightening (2004, 2007). At its simplest the assumptions emanating from accounts such as Read’s are explicit in the following:

the well-meaning intentions of those of us working in the area of anti-racism are rendered problematic when viewed within the broader framework of colonisation (Riggs 2004b: para. 1).

Deconstructing how ‘good intentions’ work to mask and perpetuate racism is a crucial aspect of any study of whiteness and/or broader anti-racist endeavours (Haggis & Scheech 2004; Haggis 2004; Moreton-Robinson 2001; Nicoll 2000; Riggs 2004a, 2004b). Jane Samson (1998) comments on the impacts of good intentions far more bluntly than Riggs, within the specific context of her research on white missionaries:

one person’s humanitarian intervention is another’s neocolonialism (Sampson 1988, reproduced in Riggs 2004b: para. 1).

Such an interpretation is challenging to many whites. The task of becoming self-aware of the implications of whiteness is an ongoing and somewhat arduous one based on the pervasiveness of whiteness. The question here is how far to challenge one’s assumptions without effectively undermining one’s will to act. Whilst not specifically addressing this concern, Nicoll engages with the sentiment of Samson’s humanitarian/neocolonialism dualism:

White people can be painfully aware of the racialised conditions of Indigenous and non-Indigenous subjectivities both in the past and in the present even as we perpetuate these conditions… It is unfortunate that we often come to
the awareness only when Indigenous subjects are able to demonstrate the negative effects of our representations or actions (Nicoll 2004: para. 29).

Nicoll introduces the term ‘retrospective consciousness’ as a means of describing actions that fall between unconsciousness and disingenuousness or deliberate misrepresentation (Ibid). In drawing from the work of Australian scholars Elspeth Probyn (2000) and Sara Ahmed (2004), Nicoll refers to these affective states as having individualising tendencies. Such individualisation can actively work against recognition of the collective recognition of whiteness. That is: the experience of ‘my white guilt and/or shame’ can paradoxically prevent me from connecting with other white people to address the real problem that we constitute for Indigenous Australians (emphasis added, Nicoll 2004: para. 30).

This real problem is inextricably linked to the basis for action, the need to recognise the liberation of whites from whiteness is bound-up with liberation of the oppressed ‘other’ (Watson 1992). Nicoll addresses this by specifically tying the ‘real’ problem to this individualising and the subsequent prevention of the collective:

This is why I think it’s important to resist a tendency to try to ‘resolve’ our discomfort at the recognition of whiteness into individual(ising) affects of shame and/or guilt (Nicoll 2004: para. 30).

Rather than the painful awareness ‘of the racialised conditions of Indigenous and non-Indigenous subjectivities’ and our implicit perpetuation of these, one should not allow guilt and/or shame to cloud and restrict responses. Nicoll describes a ‘more effective model’ as being a ‘sort of collective project’ aimed at ‘examin[ing] why Indigenous claims on this place unsettle us so deeply’. With specific reference to Moreton-Robinson’s challenging and critical works on whiteness in
Australia, Nicoll finds this model provides for theorising ‘how to give up power’ rather than focussing on ‘the multiplicitous, fractured subject’ (Ibid).

Haggis’ engagement with recent works of Greer and Read highlights that theorising how to give up power is crucial. In expanding on her critique of these works, similar themes to those underlying Nicoll’s reflections are present: ‘[a]ddressing the race privilege of whiteness is a profoundly discomforting process’ and leads to a crucial question. This question highlights the necessity to be aware of white complicity and the resulting perpetuation of what anti-racists are attempting to undermine:

How can we be anti-racist and agents of white race privilege at the same time? (Haggis 2004: para. 24).

It is the drive to address and eventually overcome this dualism (i.e. an end to being agents of privilege) that Haggis attributes the ‘sense of urgency and passion’ behind such arguments. With far reaching implications for colonial countries, the works of Moreton-Robinson (1999; 2000; 2001; 2004a; 2004b, 2007) provide what are disturbing, challenging, and refreshing critical points to consider in reflecting on this question.

Haggis reflects on this drive and potential problems with it. As a result of the unfortunate means by which whites become aware of their involvement in the perpetuation of the effects of whiteness (to paraphrase Nicoll), another question dawned upon Haggis when attending a key note speech provided by Irene Watson (2003), an indigenous legal theorist14:

how do ‘we’ white ‘radical professionals’ stop assuming we are ‘free to roam’? Free to roam into indigeneity, free to roam out of whiteness, free to roam by re-naming the claim

---

14 The keynote address was most recently reproduced in (Moreton-Robinson2007).
of incommensurability as essentialist, free to universalize our knowledge production (Haggis 2004: para. 27).

Haggis’ reflection on this question is critical, detailed and very challenging. What is required is ‘an “uncomfortable” engagement with the doubleness of whiteness… by the white “traitor”’ which recognises that ‘whiteness is an essentialising claim to possess that is incommensurable to indigenous ontology’ and to also realise the need for ‘a continuing effort to reveal, analyse and challenge the multiple ways in which whiteness is internally incoherent, differentiated, hyphenated’. This detailed, difficult and outwardly challenging response provides a strong and clearly articulated account of what is central to a postcolonial approach to the study of whiteness. More appropriately articulated as the study of whiteness in contemporary society:

This captures the doubleness of whiteness, as a plurality of complicity and contestation that is always already pulled together into a cohesive hegemony (Ibid: para. 27).

The ongoing uncomfortable engagement also requires repeated prefigurative reflection: ‘revising the metaphors we use to envisage our goal’. Resulting from such reflection

a vision of ‘together in difference’ might be more productive, a togetherness based on the recognition of incommensurability (Ibid: para. 28).

Haggis draws from Ang (2001), who outlines a basis for togetherness-in-difference from a starting point of Charles Taylor’s (1992) politics of recognition. Haggis moves beyond Ang’s focus on in-betweeness, ‘complicated entanglements’ (Ang 2001: 16), locating incommensurability in the ‘radical difference that precludes blending or entanglement’ that is a feature of multicultural hybridity (Haggis 2004: para. 22). Incommensurability is located in the contrast between white ways of knowing and seeing that shape conceptions of possession predicated on a denial of First Peoples sovereignty and an Indigenous ontological belonging to
country (see Moreton-Robinson 2003). Haggis’ notion of togetherness is based on a different conception of situatedness, where there is a clear ‘line between us and them’ (Ang 2001: 3), by ‘taking seriously the incommensurability claimed by indigenous intellectuals’ and accepting the discomfort this entails (Haggis 2004: para. 27, 9).

Central to this vision, and a result of uncomfortable engagement, is the need to constrain the white ‘freedom to roam’, of ‘adopting’ indigeneity (Ibid: para. 27). The task of ‘refusing the seductions of slipping into indigeneity to avoid the discomforts of being within whiteness’, alongside restraining one’s freedom to roam and whites’ own internal and collective redress effectively can be considered as emanating from one of the most challenging aspects of critical whiteness studies. This is the disavowal of the oppressive positions afforded whites in the power relationship that arise from their inclusiveness in whiteness and the many unseen and unmarked pervasive hegemonic impacts (Ibid: para. 29).

It is thus relations of power which provide a clear illustration of a Foucauldian understanding of power|knowledge, not as a relationship, rather as ‘not to be studied separately’:

the relation is such that knowledge is not gained prior to and independently of the use to which it will be put in order to achieve power (whether over nature or over other people), but it is already a function of human interests and power relations (Hoy 1986: 129).

The focus here is ‘how what counts as knowledge and power has historically come to be so counted’ (Ibid). Barry Smart reflects on this:

Central to Foucault’s analyses of the political problem(s) of truth have been both a recognition of the importance of a scientific hierarchization of knowledges through which ‘true’ and ‘false’ have increasingly been distinguished in modern Western societies, an important consequence of
The demarcation of knowledges is boundary work (Gieryn 1995). Cognitive authority is afforded white ways of knowing and seeing, western science, which is relationally constructed. Knowledges that exist outside the realm of white western knowledge are defined ‘defined as lower in development and earlier in time’, pre-progress (Tully 1995: 65-6). The implications constructing boundaries are illustrated as praxis by Moreton-Robinson:

Students in academia are taught as though they can know everything. They are taught to believe that all knowledge is available to them for the taking and is knowable. Knowledges that exist outside the realm of white western knowledge are perceived as being available for appropriation because they are positioned as being unowned and therefore free… This theft is based on white fiction that I term ‘Terra Knowlegius’—knowledge belonging to no one (Moreton-Robinson 1999: 32-3).

To illustrate how a Foucauldian power|knowledge ‘heuristic device’ can be utilised to critically deconstruct whiteness requires further consideration of the hegemonic nature of whiteness.

THE HEGEMONIC NATURE OF WHITENESS
In the preceding two sections, repeated references were made to descriptions of whiteness as having hegemonic qualities. Unpacking and expanding on this locates a necessary and critical point of departure from scholarly works on
whiteness to date. This point of departure has, at its core, two major aspects: both are based on the hegemonic nature of whiteness.\textsuperscript{15} The first is consent and the role it plays that affords whiteness, as hegemonic, its overarching and affective position in colonialist power relations. The second relates to a shifting and efficacious unmarked aspect of whiteness in itself, one that requires further consideration: discourse on technique. It is here that pervasive aspects of the scientific hierarchisation of knowledges embodied in whiteness are located. Contrasting and reifying the phenomenological aspects of whiteness unmarked, Ellul's (1964; 1990) writings on technological society highlight an area in which whiteness studies is under-theorised.

Angela Pratt, as a central aspect her doctoral thesis entitled "Indigenous Sovereignty—Never Ceded": Sovereignty, Nationhood and Whiteness in Australia, provides a broad definition of whiteness that clearly indicates its hegemonic nature:

Whiteness... [is] a system of power which privileges and normalises certain values, interests and systems of knowledge, and which is maintained by a series of discursive strategies and practices (2003: 19).

This description of whiteness as hegemonic, or \textit{hegemonic whiteness}, is consistent with many of the works referred to in the preceding sections, even those that do not refer to whiteness as hegemonic. This is most clearly expressed

\textsuperscript{15} This has received little direct expression in most works on whiteness, aside from those emanating from Australia (Bloom 1994; Moreton-Robinson 1999; Pratt 2003; Riggs 2004a; Saxton 2004; Shaw 2001). Two exceptions are Wiegman, albeit published in Australia; and Amanda Lewis who adopts a Gramscian approach to hegemony, contrasting with the approach of this thesis and the recent works referred to—specifically a more Foucauldian, non-(clearly) ideological approach, as outlined previously (Lewis 2004; Wiegman 1999). Moreton-Robinson (1999) also refers to adopting a Gramscian sense of hegemony, however this does not alter the significance of her work for this research—unlike that of Lewis —given its specific foci and context.
in Dyer’s description that whiteness

[mostly] not deliberately and maliciously... reproduces itself regardless of intention, power differences and goodwill, and overwhelmingly because it is not seen as whiteness, but as normal (Dyer 1997: 9-10).

Whilst Dyer makes no explicit reference to hegemony, reference to the normalising effects of whiteness locates an understanding of whiteness as hegemonic. The lack of explicit reference to the hegemonic basis of whiteness in the works introduced previously can be explained by the youth of whiteness studies as a field of inquiry. The diversity of approaches within whiteness studies could also be considered a factor.

This thesis’ focus on the impacts of whiteness on supportive community actions reflects the continually refined focus of critical whiteness studies. The ‘ability’ of those supporting the walkout at Wave Hill, SPATE at Sandon Point and the Haudenosaunee in the Red Hill Valley to be completely unaware of their cultural impropriety, and/or act under misguided assumptions that their actions are in the interests of First Peoples, provides an example of whiteness as hegemonic.

Crucial to the (contested) maintenance of hegemony is consent. Agency clearly plays a role in the actions of those involved. It should be noted that agency in this sense refers to an ability to withdraw consent to the implied common sense and normality of certain (white) ways of knowing and seeing. In essence, such consent actively perpetuates the hegemony of whiteness. This locates the second point of departure from existing whiteness theory. The point of departure is the notion, and acceptance of, technology as progress. Less abstract, and more indicative of the hegemonic nature, and colonial basis of such a notion, is the treatment of technological progress as inevitable.

Whilst community support at/around the actions taken at Wave Hill, Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley is on many levels counter-hegemonic, many of the actions embody whiteness via assumptions about progress. These actions can also act to
entrench and perpetuate white privilege. Riggs prescribed that engagement with whiteness ‘represents one mode for critiquing white hegemony’ (Riggs 2004a: para. 3).

How do white ways of knowing and seeing the world define what is normal? How do certain notions become considered inevitable? How are paradigmatic western notions of scientific and technological rationality enmeshed within whiteness? How does this become normal/natural or common sense? Consideration of these questions is essential to reflect on the imposition of order on a disordered nature (and the Indigenous other as nature) for ‘progress’ to be achieved for ‘all’ involved. A theoretical basis for understanding this can be found by recalling ‘Foucault’s analyses of the political problem(s) of truth’, the hierarchisation of knowledges, with scientific knowledge afforded the status of truth, and other knowledges being disqualified (Smart 1986: 164).

It is important to get to the core of the hegemonic nature of whiteness and the how and why of is functionality. Central to whiteness is consent, and via an exploration of consent, the role or white supporters of First Peoples as perpetuators of whiteness can be exposed. It is through looking at the exercise of power vis-à-vis consent that potential means’ to undermine whiteness can be located.

CONSENT, AND ITS WITHDRAWAL
The role of consent in power relations, specifically its withdrawal as a means to challenge domination, has received detailed attention by Sharp (1973; 1980). He has been described by Brian Martin as ‘the foremost writer in the world today on the subject of non-violent action’ (1989: 213) and Kate McGuiness as ‘one of the most important theorists writing about the tactical and strategic value of nonviolence’ (1993: 102). Sharp’s work is based on detailed empirical analysis of nonviolent struggles. His writings are specifically relevant to this thesis and ‘worthy of critical attention as they have been widely adopted by social activists as providing a theoretical underpinning for their own non-violent actions’—which contrasts significantly to the little scholarly attention they have received (Martin
Consent in power relations has received significant attention from many scholars of power, with it ‘play[ing] a central part in Western political thought throughout the modern period’ (Hindess 1996: 12). The empirical basis of Sharp’s work has clear and tangible links to the basis of this thesis and is thus given significant focus in addressing consent in power relations in this thesis.

Sharp’s views on power are central to *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (1973), which is ‘widely regarded as a classic’ (Martin 1989: 213). Martin has provided a succinct description of Sharp’s theory of power:

> people in society may be divided into rulers and subjects; the power of the rulers derives from consent by the subjects; non-violent action is a process of withdrawing consent and thus is a way to challenge the key modern problems of dictatorship, genocide, war and systems of oppression (ibid).

Sharp’s focus on the ruler/subject dualism is specifically targeted at government and its bodies of authority. Whilst this provides a means to consider the effects of power and the withdrawal of consent that is somewhat easily shown, in the context of whiteness as a discursive strategy and tactic, this requires some reworking for consideration. This task will be returned to, following a focus on the central theme of these works: consent and its withdrawal. It is the notion of the role of consent as presented by Sharp that has received critical attention from a small number of scholars.

Consent is presented as central to a government’s ability to exercise power over its citizens. Alongside the ruler/subject dualism, Sharp also refers to two views of political power—these being monolithic or pluralist in nature. Barry Hindess describes these as the ‘[t]wo conceptions of power that have dominated Western political thought in the modern period’ (Hindess 1996: 1). The monolithic conception sees power as ‘a simple quantitative phenomenon’, a ‘generalized capacity to act’ and is ‘prominent in recent academic discussion’. The pluralist conception is a more complex understanding of
power as involving not only a capacity but also a *right* to act, with both capacity and right being seen to rest on the consent of those over whom power is exercised (Ibid).

Sharp rejects the monolithic view of power in which dependence rests with the good will of those in control of state structures—in which power stems from the ability to impose sanctions (which can include violence) on the ‘governed’—with his empirical material on non-violent struggle providing numerous examples to support this (McGuinness 1993: 102).

The contrast to this monolithic view of power is the view that it is ‘pluralist and relational in nature’. There are many similarities between Sharp’s pluralist view and a Foucauldian notion of power. Central to the pluralist view of power is that ‘obedience’ on the part of the governed is required for those in control to be able to effectively exercise power. This obedience is thus not inevitable and is ‘essentially voluntary in nature’. Specifically,

those who obey have made a decision to do so. They have consented to be governed by those in power (Ibid).

The ability to choose whether to consent or not (essentially a privilege) is the ‘dynamic’ behind Sharp’s theory. Withdrawal of consent provides a challenge to power over, and the ability to withdraw contrasts with the monolithic view of power. Charles Tilly refers to an acute theoretical problem that arose from the contradictory 1960s populist analysis on power that has clear implications for Sharp’s concept of consent: ‘if ordinary domination so consistently hurts the well-defined interests of subordinate groups, why do subordinates comply? Why don’t they rebel continuously, or at least resist all the way along?’ (Tilly 1991: 594). The concept of consent adopted by Sharp provides a partial answer to these questions, and needs to be considered for an appreciation of his theory of power. He provides a clear delineation between consent achieved through ‘obedience’ as opposed to ‘coercion’:

If, for example, a man who is ordered to go to prison
refuses to do so and is physically dragged there (that is, he is coerced by direct physical violation), he cannot be said to obey... But if he walks to prison under a command backed by threat of a sanction, then he in fact obeys and consents to the act, although he may not approve of the command. Obedience thus exists only when one has complied with or submitted to the command (Sharp 1973: 27).

Before engaging with this delineation, the questions posed by Tilly and what he describes as ‘available answers’ require further outline:

1. The premise is incorrect: subordinates are actually rebelling consistently

2. Subordinates actually get something in return for their subordination, something that is sufficient to make them acquiesce most of the time.

3. Through the pursuit of other valued ends such as esteem or identity, subordinates become implicated in systems that exploit or oppress them. (In some versions no. 3 becomes no. 2)

4. As a result of mystification, repression, or the sheer unavailability of alternate ideological frames, subordinates remain unaware of their true interests.

5. Force and inertia hold subordinates in place.

6. Resistance and rebellion are costly; most subordinates lack the necessary means.

7. All of the above (Tilly 1991: 594).
Stephen Lukes refers to Tilly’s ‘checklist of the available answers’, reflecting on the last as clearly correct and that all of ‘the other answers should not be seen as mutually exclusive (or, indeed, jointly exhaustive). The fourth answer is provided specific attention: ‘[i]t was and remains the present author’s conviction that no view of power can be adequate unless it can offer an account of this kind of power’ (Lukes 2005: 11). He refers to this as

the so-called ‘third dimension’ of power—the power ‘to prevent people, to whatever degree, from having grievances by shaping their perceptions, cognitions, and preferences in such a way that they accept their role in the existing order of things’ (Ibid: 10-11).

This description appears to imply that Lukes is referring to a consent theory of power. However, such a theory of power is considered as idiosyncratic and ‘out of line with the central meanings of “power” as traditionally understood’ (reproduced in Hindess 1996: 10). This contrasts with consent being at the centre of ‘Western political and social thought throughout the modern period’. Consent is ‘employed across a considerable variety of political and intellectual standpoints, and Hindess claims that ‘Lukes’ own radical view of power makes considerable use of precisely this conception’ (Ibid: 10, 12). Hindess extends this with a more detailed summary of what

underlies Lukes’ ‘radical’ view of power. In effect, Lukes presents us with a view of civil society as dominated both materially and ‘ideally’ by a powerful minority whose interests are opposed to the interests of the majority. The fact that the majority are prevented from recognizing their real interests ensures they consent to their subordination (1996: 84).

Whilst Lukes ascribes an ideological basis to actions (see Hoy 1986), there are clear implications implicit in each of these perspectives on consent for the earlier discussions on whiteness and its lived privileges. This is inextricably bound up in
the means through which consent can be gained—touched on by Lukes and his third dimension—as encompassed by Sharp:

The overwhelming percentage of a ruler’s commands and objectives can only be achieved by inducing the subject to be willing for some reason to carry them out (Sharp 1973: 27).

This correlates with a Foucauldian notion of power, with consent as implicit:

Power is exercised over those who are in a position to choose, and it aims to influence what their choices will be (Hindess 1996: 100).

There is a significant distinction between how Lukes and Foucault view the exercise of power. The implications for consideration of the role of consent, whilst not being dissimilar, are worthy of reflection.

Whereas for Lukes power is exercised by one agent over another, Foucault, who wishes to avoid suggesting that power is possessed by subjects, sees power in the effect of one action on another action (Hoy 1986: 135).

An understanding of the “field of possible actions” in which the action occurs provides for an explanation of the relations of power implicit in and shaping the outcome. Such an explanation enables/requires inclusion of both

The way that action inhibits some other possible actions, but also the manner in which that action increases the probability of other actions (Ibid).

This gets to the core impact of choice in perpetuating whiteness. What actions are taken have implications. Herbert Marcuse’s concept of ‘preconditioned receptacles’ refers to ‘massive socialisation begin[ing] at home’ (1972: 21). Actions taken by white supporters reinforce whiteness or challenge whiteness,
with either potentially inhibiting the other. An understanding of the ‘field of possible actions’ can seen as analogous to governmental relations—a process that ‘structure[s] the field of eventual actions by others’ rather than an overt adversarial process (Hoy 1986: 135). Boundary work, the demarcation of knowledges acts in a similar way (Gieryn 1995).

Foucault looks at discourse as shaping ‘our conscious and unconscious normalization and self-disciplinary practices’ and that ‘we are both constituted by and constitutive of our social relations’ (McGuinness 1994: para. 25, 9). There is a clear link between hegemony and self-disciplinary or panoptic actions as crucial factors of consent. There are two core notions packaged within these perspectives on power relations. First is the agency afforded and the implications of this, in contrast with structural analysis. Second is the privilege and social status essential to having a choice, an ability to choose.

Both of these notions can be subject to critique. McGuinness (1993; 1994) has provided some valuable comments and insights drawn from feminist perspectives, specifically directed at Sharp alongside engagement with the work of Foucault. There are, however some limitations to her analysis, some of which are structural, others having subsequently shown themselves through praxis post publication of her work.

McGuinness considers the differences between what Sharp and Foucault theorise on power, in contrast to the striking similarities from which she draws inspiration, as providing for significantly productive tensions (1994: para. 17). Bound up in her comparative discussion on the theories of Foucault and Sharp are some specific assumptions about resistance as an oppositional and negative form of the exercise of power. It is based on these (and a number of others) that many of her attempts to quantify difference are not well defined.

In referring to the ‘diffusion of power’ and contrasting Sharp’s view of power as a ‘zero-sum concept’ with that of Foucault as a ‘positive-sum concept’, McGuinness discusses locations of resistance. Introducing and drawing on the example of a ‘punk rocker with pink hair’ and authority (one loci of power in
Sharp’s theory) she discusses whether this would be considered a form of resistance by either theorist. It is the potential lack of a specified target that is presented and discussed as providing the contrast. The question to be posed here, with reference to whiteness, is whether a specific ‘target’ is required. In perhaps furthering the critiqued individualistic and voluntaristic orientation of Sharp’s theory (Martin 1989: 216), is not the target here both the self and the social construction of oneself—if this can be a target? Or is the aim to be prefigurative—does this require a target, rather the aim being self-change, with a flow-on collective benefit? Inextricably linked to this is the variability in intensity of consent (Lukes 2005: 8). Recalling Marcuse, and that it is white supporters that need to modify their actions to constrain ones assumed ‘freedom to roam’, points to some of the limitations of McGuinness’ analysis.

A significant focus of McGuinness’ critique of the work of Sharp (and Foucault) lies with how these theorists’ works relate to patriarchy. Whilst patriarchal relations are embodied in all of the case studies examined in this thesis, the concerns raised by McGuinness have striking parallels with how these theories relate to whiteness.

Carol Pateman’s (1988) The Sexual Contract is drawn on by McGuinness to support her description of Sharp’s views on power as aligned to the ‘historical and political tradition… [of] social contract theory’ (1993: 104). There are two central arguments to Pateman’s position as espoused by McGuinness. The first is that for women in patriarchal society ‘consent is not their privilege’. Secondly, ‘the sexual contract is submerged in modern (patriarchal) civil society’ with ‘the political rights originating with the social contract depending on a prior contract: the sexual contract’. Deeply intertwined within this is the ‘state of nature’ which, to entertain further the notion of social contracts, is considered re-affirmed in the ‘marriage contract’—also central to ‘modern (patriarchal) civil society’ (1993: 104). The

---

16 It is of interest to note that Moreton-Robinson (2004) also draws on Pateman’s (1988) concept of the sexual contract to explain how patriarchal white sovereignty in conferred on the citizenry of a nation-state.
outcome of this line of argument is that ‘women are not fully constituted individuals in civil society, [and] the notion of consent does not apply to them’. Thus ‘change cannot be based on the withdrawal of consent’. The crux of McGuinness’ critique of Sharp is that ‘consensual power does not universally apply… [and] the role of consent must also been seen as differentiated’ (Ibid: 105).

McGuinness also draws on the work of Lipsitz & Kritzer (1975), who ‘have re-oriented the discussion’ on Sharp’s theory, to consider consent or obedience with regards to a ‘potential invader or occupier and an indigenous population’. The focus of this re-orientation is how aims ‘may effectively eliminate the role of consent in that relationship’ (McGuinness 1993: 105). Whilst McGuinness draws parallels with gender relations, there are a number of issues left unconsidered. The role of consent in such relationships is discussed as emanating from ‘the cooperation of his or her own subjects’. McGuinness summarises what role the consent of a ruler’s (non-Indigenous) subject, central to Lipsitz & Kritzer’s critique of Sharp, as follows:

For example, even if an indigenous group identifies and successfully manages to organize a withdrawal of consent among a ruler’s supporters to their advantage, this does not mean that consent underpins power in the relationship with the occupier or invader. It is not the consent of the indigenous population that has been withdrawn. Rather, it is the consent of the ruler’s subjects and other that has been withdrawn (Ibid).

Mills’ outlining of The Racial Contract, self-described as inspired by Pateman’s work on The Sexual Contract (Mills 1997: 6), also addresses the location of consent:

It will be obvious, therefore, that Racial Contract is not a contract to which the nonwhite subset of humans can be a genuinely consenting party (though, depending again on
the circumstances, it may sometimes be politic to pretend that this is the case). Rather it is a contract between those categorized as white over the nonwhites, who are thus objects rather than subjects of the agreement (Ibid: 11-12).

Taken together, Lipsitz & Kritzer’s and Mills’ reflections on consent partly overcome the binary of McGuinness’ critique, and provide some indication of differentiated consent, or to adopt Lukes’ terminology, the variability in its intensity. This is extended by Hindess’ comments on consent and Lukes’ ‘radical’ view of power, which is not restricted to the analysis of society in terms of contending classes. Societies have also been analysed in terms of contending gender collectives, leading to the idea of patriarchal power serving the interests of men by moulding the thoughts and desires of gendered persons through the institutions of politics and the economy, as well as through the patterns of everyday life (Hindess 1996: 84).

Whilst Hindess’ comments refer to patriarchal relations, when considered with Lipsitz & Kritzer’s critique and Mills (1997: 89) outline of how the Racial Contract seeks and acts to achieve consent from non-whites, the role of differentiated consent, as in consent from those considered as ‘not fully constituted individuals’ is apparent. With respect to the actions of white supporters at Wave Hill, Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley, they were (and are) influenced by the withdrawal of consent by ‘those who have not been granted the benefits of incorporation into the overall system of domination’ (Hindess 1996: 90). In this sense, it can be seen that such groups are essential to limit power over—at least in this regard (Moore 1998: 141, on Ellul). Foucauldian requirements for relations of power reflect this, with dominance being a ‘particular modality of the exercise of power’ (Hindess 1996: 102).

McGuinness also refers to Colette Guillaumin’s (1989) work on the ‘appropriation’ of women to reinforce Lipsitz & Kritzer’s critique. Central to Guillaumin’s ‘unique
perspective’ is ‘appropriation rather than control’ and this is achieved ‘without the need of consent from individual women or class of women (in this instance, an indigenous population)’. The result is that ‘a ruler still has power without consent… indicat[ing] that particular social constructions of reality have a critical impact on consent’ (McGuinness 1993: 106). There is credence to this point. Whiteness can be considered to exist without the consent of those appropriated by it. Yet both whites and nonwhites are appropriated. The same can be said for patriarchal relations—the degree of appropriation, as with whiteness, is differentiated. Following McGuinness’ intent, the appropriation of the non-white other partly occurs without a need for consent, though the withdrawal of such consent does impact on power relations.

Within a Foucauldian analysis there is a focus on the techniques and rationalities of government (the ruler/subject binary) with an emphasis on self-disciplinary incarnations as they are embodied in whiteness—with consent crucial to their impact. Consent, with the resulting exercise of power over another, requires a privileged position of the subordinate: possession of the ability to choose. The decision to consent is influenced by ‘the instruments, techniques and procedures’ brought to bear and central to whiteness as hegemonic (Hindess 1996: 100). This is one of the most significant, pervasive and as yet unmarked implications of white ways of knowing and seeing the world (i.e. whiteness). These instruments, techniques and procedures are unmarked phenomenologically. Aside from the work of Moreton-Robinson (1999, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2004, 2004a, 2007) little if any significant attention has been afforded these by whiteness studies scholars.

TECHNIQUE AND TECHNOLOGICAL BLUFF
Moore, through a focus on the implications for environmental issues and agency, makes the bold statement that ‘[p]erhaps one way to add new life to any discussion of hegemony… is to pay closer attention to the prolific writings of Jacques Ellul’ (1998: 129). Ellul was a French social theorist and philosopher of technology. Many of his writings (aside from those explicitly promoting theologian perspectives) explored the implications of what he referred to as the technological
society in which we live. Through to his death he continued to argue, despite much criticism, that discourse on technique is hegemonic in that it is unmarked and shapes our lives irrecoverably. He believed that the technological paradigm was so pervasive that we could not see beyond its implications and ramifications. The actions of white supporters at Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley indicate the pervasiveness of this paradigm, as a central aspect of contemporary whiteness, whilst also indicating the potential for recognition as a means to expose it.

Ellul’s ideas have received critical support, with descriptions such as ‘the master of classical philosophy of technology’ appearing alongside stinging criticisms (Son 2004: 518). He is often referred to as technologically determinist, fatalistic and, alongside Heidegger, the Frankfurt School and other social critics, ‘described unkindly as technophobic’ (Feenberg 1996, 1999: 151). As a result of these criticisms, and some of Ellul’s ‘foundational elements… [that are] less than palatable’, the extent to which some of his concepts are applicable have not been realised (Moore 1998: 142). Partly resulting from these ‘numerous elements’ is the attention given, and the status afforded to these works: ‘Ellul’s position is for the most part marginalized, if not offhandedly dismissed’ (Goudreau 2003: 175).

*The Technological Bluff*, considered the last of Ellul’s academic works (as distinct from his theological writings), is specifically described as attracting ‘little attention’:

> Many articles have been published about Ellul’s works and ideas since [*The Technological Bluff*] was published; however only a few have mentioned this work, most of them only in passing, some of them with obvious misunderstanding and contempt (Son 2004: 518).

The concept of technological bluff refers explicitly to discourse. The significant difference, and the basis for optimism as expressed by Moore (1998), Wha-Chul Son (2004) and the small number of others who draw positives from Ellul’s work (see, for example, Goudreau 2003; Stivers 2004), lies with the focus on society as technologically mediated. Specifically, technological bluff refers to the
discourse that equates scientific and technological rationality (technological advancement and implementation) with progress. The effectiveness of such discourse in defining and limiting the achievement/advancement of progress to technological means is central to Ellul’s analysis (Son 2004: 519, 539).

To understand Ellul’s concept of the technological bluff, it is useful to first briefly examine his concepts of *technique* and *technology*.

The term *technique*, as I use it, does not mean machines, technology, or this or that procedure for attaining an end. In our technological society, *technique* is the *totality of methods rationally arrived at and having absolute efficiency* (for a given stage of development) in *every* field of human activity (Ellul 1964: 1).

Kim Goudreau describes technique as being ‘the monolithic sociological phenomenon at the hub of technological societies’ (2003: 174). In contrast, technology is defined as discourse:

American usage has implanted in our minds the idea that the word technology refers to actual processes... But in a strict sense technology is discourse on technique... (Ellul 1990: xv).

This ‘strict sense’ is clarified further, with a clear distinction made between technology as discourse and the (technical) processes through which technology comes into existence. In defining the technological bluff, Ellul states

I am not referring to technical bluff. I am not trying to show that techniques do not deliver what they promise, that technicians are bluffers. I am talking about technological bluff, about the gigantic bluff in which discourse on techniques envelop us, making us believe anything and, far worse, changing our whole attitude to techniques...
The bluff consists essentially of rearranging everything in terms of technical progress, which with prodigious diversification offers us in every direction such varied possibilities that we can imagine nothing else. Discourse on technique is not a justification of techniques (which is not necessary) but a demonstration of the prodigious power, diversity, success, universal application, and impeccability of techniques (ibid: xv-xvi).

Generally, technological bluff refers to the discourse that sustains western paradigms—i.e. promoting, normalising and conveying the inevitability of white ways of thinking as progress. It is “[a]s the result of the technological bluff, [that] technique is seen as the only chance for progress and development in every society’, reinforcing the hidden assumptions intertwined within this paradigm. It spreads, promotes and normalises the vague and broad notion that technique is the inevitable and sole source of progress (Son 2004: 519). What can be drawn from this is that technological bluff is both context specific and hegemonic in nature.

Ellul outlined the role of context (broadly) and the hegemonic nature of technological bluff, whilst also alluding to the role consent plays:

Things are done, “by force of circumstances,” because the proliferation of techniques, mediated by the media, by communications, by the universalisation of images, by changed human discourse, has outflanked prior obstacles and integrated them progressively into the process. It has encircled points of resistance, which then tend to dissolve. It has done all this without any hostile reaction or refusal, partly because what is proposed infinitely transcends all capacity for opposition (often because no one comprehends what is at issue), and partly because it has obvious cogency that is not found on the part of what might oppose it. For what would it be opposing? This is no
longer clear… (Ellul 1990: 18).

The ability to normalise existing power relations and the dynamic/challengeable yet dominant position of the technological bluff illustrate its hegemonic nature. The efficacy of technological bluff, how it is achieved and perpetuates itself was also outlined by Ellul, somewhat pessimistically:

There is no longer any need for myths or great projects. The transformation takes place in the everyday world. Its very ordinariness ensures its success. To present an image of a changed humanity is to provoke an inevitable reaction. Ordinariness gives reassurance. The genius of technique (not of technicians) is to produce the most reassuring and innocent ordinariness. This is what we are studying under the title of the technological bluff… It is not that we or society are better adapted to technical growth, but only that we are, let’s say, neutralized in a way that there can no longer be any open or secret conflict (Ibid: 18-19).

The notion of not being able to imagine anything other than a technological means to progress (through its ordinariness), and the prodigious power, diversity, success, universal application, and impeccability of techniques, raises a number of significant questions for white ways of knowing and seeing the world. Can this impeccability and prodigious power be overcome, or is the pessimism of Ellul accurate? Are there effective means available, paralleling whiteness’ foundational gesture, to destroy the object of study? (see Wiegman 1999: 123).

Ellul’s detailing of technological bluff infers consent is a central feature, with reassurance playing a significant role. Moore has elucidated this directly, sharing aspects of Sharp’s consent theory of power:

The image, then, is not of oppression, but of submission by society as a whole in hopes of a greater good (Moore 1998: 134).
Ellul defines the shift in technique, or where his description of technique is located, as paralleling the great innovation in the 1980s. This is where he locates a shift in perception to where ‘technological development [was] seen as something positive for its own sake’ (see: Ellul 1990: 16-19; Son 2004: 520, 524-5). This can be supported with reference to the Kelly’s Bush campaign and Sandon Point, for example: the Hunters Hill residents action group called for the protection of Kelly’s Bush as it was, whereas at Sandon Point calls for protection include variants of an alternative proposal embodying different forms of ‘development’. There are also parallels with what has transpired at the Red Hill Valley, with similar alternate proposals being proposed. The source of such shifts is addressed in Son’s summary of Ellul’s concept:

As a result of technological bluff, technique is seen as the only chance for progress and development in every society. Here Ellul is addressing a problem that has been largely ignored in the philosophy of technology. It is not a matter of concrete problems caused by techniques, but how people perceive technique and react to problems caused by it. The techno-logical bluff makes those problems invisible and thus obsolete (Son 2005: 519-20).

In critiquing the absence of engagement by philosophers of technology, Son has located a basis for non-consideration. Progress, in this sense, is defined via reference to the ‘other’ in line with whiteness. The implications of this, and the clear similarities with a Foucauldian reference to hierarchisation of knowledges:

The techno-logical bluff spreads the vague and broad idea that technique is the inevitable and unique source of human betterment and progress (Ibid: 520).

Ellul provides a detailed expansion of the notion of progress as inevitable, with science as ‘indistinguishable from technique’, as a source of salvation, it is the means to progress. Parallels with the missionary project are striking:
More than ever, through the social transformation that it entails, science is becoming not merely the *discovering* of nature but the response to everything that disquiets or troubles us. There is thus developing an ideology of science that I would call a soteriology. The present-day ideology of science is an ideology of salvation. That is, science is our only recourse, and any negative aspects are strenuously contested. Science alone holds the future to our society. No matter what problems may arise the inevitable answer will always be: Science will take care of it (emphasis added, Ellul 1990: 182).

Aside from the religious overtones, the similarities with a Foucauldian analysis and the centrality of technical bluff to whiteness are clear. The relationship between power and knowledge, with science as the legitimate source of knowledge, can be considered indistinguishable (Hoy 1986: 128).

The pervasiveness expressed by Ellul, and the negativity and/or pessimism many attribute to his works, also parallel many of the concerns raised by scholars engaging with whiteness. Exploration of this pessimism further indicates this:

Ellul does not deny that people are still able to have and express their critical mind, form critical movements, and influence decisions concerning particular techniques. The real problem is, according to Ellul, that techno-logical bluff is changing the basic perception of technique so proudly and subtly that even those critical movements cannot be completely free from its grip (Son 2004: 528).

Ellul’s expression of an inability to become ‘completely free from [technological bluff’s] grip’ highlights the parallels with whiteness. This resonates with Haggis’ (2004) critique of whites’ perceived freedom to roam and the impacts of whiteness on lived experiences. Ellul expresses this apparent inability to fully escape, that ‘we show our freedom by recognising our non-freedom’, though
further deference to verbose theological imagery:

Following Hegel, Marx, and Kierkegaard, I have often said that we show our freedom by recognising our non freedom. But this is no longer a matter of debate between the servile and the free will. Our back is to the wall. We must not cheat or think that we can extricate ourselves by talk. Seeing the Hydra head of trickery and the Gorgon face of hi-tech, the only things we can do is set them at a crucial distance, for it is by being able to criticize that we show our freedom. This is the only freedom that we still have if we have at least the courage to grasp it. Nothing is more certain (Ellul 1990: 411).

Nikolas Rose, whilst not sharing Ellul’s apparent pessimism, also locates freedom as relational and formed, for example, in practises of resistance (Rose 1999: 94). Critical ‘genealogical investigations’ would be aware of such non-freedoms, how these are defined, and locate ways of ‘practising freedom’ that are open and questioning. Such investigations ‘would help us to calculate the costs of being what we have become; hence [they] might allow us to invent ways of becoming other than we are’ (Ibid: 97).

Son provides a summarised account of Ellul’s intent, in which whiteness could almost be interchanged with technological society:

We are not free, because we can neither escape from the situation, nor change it. Citizens of the technological society are stuck. Nevertheless, we can be free when we

---

17 Rose notes, ‘I think we can distinguish freedom as a formula of resistance from freedom as a formulae of power. Or rather, to be more circumspect, between freedom as it is deployed in contestation and freedom as it is instantiated in government (Rose 1999: 65).
can take our distance from the whole affair and reflect on the situation of our nonfreedom. When one can see personal non-freedom, one is free. One can do something to change the circumstances, only when one realizes it is impossible. One cannot extricate oneself by talk, but to know the fact is the beginning of the only way out (2004: 529).

This ‘active pessimism’ repeats the challenges of engagement with whiteness and the possibilities:

the noting of limits and recognition of fragility are the most necessary forms of a ‘positive pessimism’ (Ellul 1990: 116).

The concluding paragraph of *The Technological Bluff* also shares a common theme with the a Foucauldian analysis, the writings of Sharp and critical whiteness scholars. For completeness, this requires reproduction, at length:

Are we thus shut up, blocked, and chained by the inevitability of the technical system which is making us march like obedient automatons thanks to its bluff? Yes, we are radically determined. We are caught up continuously… Yet not really, for the system does not stop growing, and thus far we have no examples of growth that does not reach the point of imbalance and rupture… balance and cohesion have been increasingly difficult to maintain. Not really, for as we have seen, the gigantic bluff is self-contradictory and it leaves a margin of chaos, it covers gaps without filling them, it gives evidences of mistakes… we must meet two conditions. We must be prepared to reveal the fracture lines and to discover that everything depends on the qualities of individuals. Finally, not really, if we know how little room there is to manoeuvre and therefore, not by one’s high position or by power, but
always after the model of development from a source and by the sole aptitude for astonishment, we profit from the existence of little cracks of freedom, and install in them a trembling freedom which is not attributed to or mediated by machines or politics, but which is truly effective, so that we may truly invent the new thing for which humanity is waiting (Ibid: 411-12).

Putting the implicit prophesising aside, the prefigurative and non-prescriptive reflections common with a Foucauldian analysis, whiteness studies and Sharps consent theory of power are clear. Whilst being non-prescriptive, there is much more than mere rhetoric and posturising, with reflections that go towards addressing a direction to take. Ellul’s writings can thus aid in considering the implications of remnant colonialisms for white supporters. It provides some necessary tools to overcome the under-theorised aspects whiteness studies.

DRAWING THE THREADS
Whiteness is a relational and socially constructed standpoint, largely defined by what one is not. Dyer located whiteness’ normativity and universality (to whites) in its representational paradoxes (see Kutcha 1998). The fluidity of whiteness’ boundaries, the adaptability and ability to absorb, to co-opt, lend to its unmarked presence for whites. Whiteness is unmarked phenomenologically, which has significant implications for both the actions of white supporters and scholarship.

As a standpoint, there are tensions between universalism and particularities of whiteness—in Australia and Canada it is a colonial whiteness. These are its broad contexts. It is founded on a denial of First Peoples sovereignty and embodies other remnant colonialisms. Moreton-Robinson (1999) has identified this denial as based on patriarchal white sovereignty. Whereas the actions of white supporters can directly challenge colonial sovereignty, the implications of possessive logic can be seen in other aspects of whiteness.

Extending beyond a denial of First Peoples sovereignty, the rationalisations of
Terra Knowlegius clearly embody possessive elements—the control of knowledge as an exercise of power. These underlying premises for these rationalisations identify areas in which whiteness studies can be extended. A Foucauldian analysis of power relations, specifically what is rationalised as constituting knowledge, provides a means to critically reflect on these remnant colonialisms. Ellul’s ‘prolific’ writings have explored the ideology of science and technology, its discourse, and the implications for society. The rationalisations on which such discourse is based are embodied within colonial whiteness.

Constructions of science and technology as progress have not yet received enough critical attention from whiteness scholars. The hegemonic nature of discourse on technique, the technological bluff, is (partly) unmarked to white academics. This emanates from the lived experience of whiteness and the pervasive ideology of science as salvation (Ellul 1990). It is further manifested through constructions of good and bad—whether this be a racist/anti-racist binary, or what Gieryn (1995) has labelled as boundary work. The dualistic construction of good, anti-racist archaeology by white supporters has serious implications for actions seeking socially just outcomes. Such constructions embody possessive logic, perpetuation of ‘control and domination’ as opposed to challenging the colonial basis of such rationalisations (Moreton-Robinson 2004: para. 5).

Colonial control and domination of First Peoples, remnant colonialisms of whiteness in Australia and Canada, are based on degrees of paternalism. The rationalisations of possessive logic, Terra Knowlegius, the scientific hierarchisation of knowledges and notions of science and technology of progress all embody paternalism. Paternalism is visible in constructions of reconciliation ‘to’ (Gelder 2000; Nicoll 2002). Discourse on reconciliation in Australia is framed on white terms, a means for white Australians to get comfortable again, postcolonialism-as-fulfillment (Gelder 2000: para. 6; Haggis & Scheech 2004: 24). The rationalised authority of science, anthropology and archaeology, as arbitrator of significance is control and domination and postcolonialism-as-fulfillment. What is accepted as valid knowledge, what is determined, is on white terms.
Consideration of the question of how we should evaluate the actions of white supporters requires reflection on the level to which white terms have permeated such support. Does this support effectively transcend aspects of whiteness, terms most familiar? To what degree do actions taken challenge possessive logic and paternalism? Given differentiated consent, how have the actions of First Peoples influenced and shaped the actions of white supporters? Engagement with praxis is required to consider effectively these questions.

WHERE TO FROM HERE?
Whilst one can hope for more than any form of pessimism (i.e. active or positive) in working towards the dismantling of whiteness, domination and the pervasive impacts of technological bluff, it is essential to take on board many of the issues raised. It is with self-awareness of the engagement of others and their experiences (and/or theorising) in working to address these issues that the following chapters proceed. In engaging with accounts of the Wave Hill walkout, the approach adopted is clearly different to that in the subsequent chapters on current actions. Whilst many positives can be drawn from differences in these supportive actions and those at Wave Hill, noting that a want to ‘feel better’ has an influence—discomfort and solace can be found in Ahmed’s reflections (2004; 2005). They provide a suitable closing to this chapter and a context for the shift to engagement with praxis:

Feeling better, whatever form it might take, is not about the overcoming of bad feeling, which are effects of histories of violence but of finding a different relationship to them. It is in the face of all that endures of the past in the present, the pain, the suffering and the rage, that we can open ourselves up, and keep alive the hope that things can be different (Sara Ahmed, reproduced in Nicoll 2004).
three

(MIS)INTERPRETATIONS OF THE WAVE HILL WALKOUT

Well, one thing I’m sure of; wages are not main issue for the Aborigines in this strike… I’m convinced tribal identity and land are the real issues for them in this strike… It wasn’t even on my mind. I was thinking of wages and conditions and strikes.
Hardy (1976).

It is crucial to understand that the Gurindji people had been fighting for their land until 1986 when finally their inalienable freehold title was granted. Therefore what they thought was worth telling to the non-Gurindji during that time was probably not ‘who invented the walk-off?’… Since then, the Gurindji peoples political circumstances have changed and their rights over their country have become more certain. Today the Gurindji people probably feel more comfortable telling the stories about different aspects of the walk-off episode. The story of Sandy Moray has been gradually revealed to the non-Gurindji according to their situations at different times.
Hokari (2000).

On 23 August 1966 Aboriginal workers and their families packed up what little belongings they had and left Wave Hill Station, in Australia’s Northern Territory, never to return. The significant and Australia-wide support that the action received was something previously unseen in Australia. After a brief stay adjacent to the
Wave Hill Welfare settlement, those involved relocated to Wattie Creek/Seal Gorge, part of territory known to them as Daguragu—where many remain to this day. Accounts of Aboriginal participants\(^\text{18}\) detail the walkout as a pre-planned action with control of ancestral lands central to the aims.\(^\text{19}\) In contrast to these professed aims, white accounts of the walkout continue to refer to the walkout as a strike. A strike that later shifted in focus, with the shift in focus considered to be mediated by white supporters. Why is this so?

The walkout came to have a significant impact on respect and recognition in Australia. Mervyn Bishop’s 1975 photograph of Prime Minister Gough Whitlam pouring earth into the hands of Vincent Lingiari at Daguragu (see Figure 3, page 7) is considered ‘one of the defining images of the Whitlam era’ (Shaw 2005). Younger generations have a similarly iconic representation in Paul Kelly and Kev Carmody’s song *From little things big things grow* (Dunn 2007; Kelly & Carmody 1993; Lander 2007). The walkout continues to receive mainstream press commentary, including the 40\(^\text{th}\) anniversary celebrations in 2006 (Forrest & Forrest 2006; Hardy 2006; Maley 2006; Murdoch 2006; Sieper 2006). The route taken is now included on the National Heritage List (Mitchell 2007).

The immediate context of the walkout was a North Australian Workers Union (NAWU) sponsored test case brought before the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. This case concerned Aboriginal wages and conditions, challenging discriminatory practices in the pastoral industry. Aboriginal workers were paid significantly less than white workers—if they were paid at all. The issue of wages, and the role this played in the walkout continues to be discussed by scholars.

\(^{18}\) The term participant is used in this chapter to refer to Aboriginal participants only.

\(^{19}\) Sue Stanton (2007), a Kungarakan-Gurindji women, refers to the action at Wave Hill as a walkout. Cariona Elder also refers to this as a walkout, noting that ‘Gurindji workers did not walk off the property’ (Elder 2007). What is at issue with the latter is the framing in western constructions of property. The boundaries of the pastoral lease had little bearing on where the Gurindji walked to (Stanton, S. 2007. pers. comm. November 20).
Debate centres on the aims of the walkout, the role(s) played by white supporters and what influence they had in shaping the actions of Aboriginal participants.

White interpretations of the walkout are mediated by whiteness and colonial assumptions about Aboriginal peoples. What are these assumptions, how are they manifested and how do they mediate white interpretations? Is there a basis for such assumptions in the actions of Aboriginal participants and their accounts of the walkout? These are pertinent questions that this chapter responds to, drawing from the theoretical approaches explored and engaged with in chapter two. Emphasis is placed on locating and exploring differences between the accounts of Aboriginal participants and white interpretations of the walkout. Engagement with
whiteness as a relationally constructed standpoint, structured in a colonial context provides a basis to expose colonial assumptions in white interpretations of the walkout (Bloom 1994; Dyer 1997; Frankenberg 2001). Aileen Moreton-Robinson’s concept of *Terra Knowlegius*—the positioning of ‘other’ knowledges as knowable, and what is referred to as the possessive logic of patriarchal white sovereignty, locate both roots and persistent means through which paternalist assumptions can be mobilised to legitimate white terms (1999, 2003). Engagement with the implications of whiteness provides a means to consider the implications of consent: what aspects of whiteness was support for withdrawn; what aspects of whiteness was consent hegemonically attained (Hindess 1996; Lipsitz & Kritzer 1975; McGuinness 1993; Sharp 1973).

What are the implications of this for white interpretations? Reflection on this question is important. Engaging with white interpretations of the Wave Hill walkout provides an historical grounding for manifestations in contemporary society. For this thesis, such reflection provides grounding for a comparative basis of colonial whiteness in the actions of white supporters at Sandon Point (chapter 4) and the Red Hill Valley (chapter five).

The actions taken at Wave Hill were perceived in terms most familiar to white supporters and the public at large—in language that such action could be *understood* by a white populace (Hokari 2001a; Macintyre 1985):

wages were a language which Europeans could understand, and constituted an issue which trade unions were known to support (Rose 1991: 227).

Oral historical accounts provide a contrast to these (white) interpretations. Minoru Hokari’s (Hokari 2001b) research, recording and documentation of oral historical accounts detail how participants kept their aims intentionally vague, not directly challenging white interpretations. The basis for this was experiences with the legacies of colonial power relations. Michael Hess refers to this ‘paradigmatic accommodation’ (Hess 1994: 66). The public concern about the wages for Aboriginal stockworkers was seen as an expression of support for respect and
recognition. Oral historical accounts dating back at least 15 years prior to the walkout had expressed a desire to regain control of ancestral lands. What was waited for was the support that respect and recognition would bring.

The walkout, a withdrawal of the differentiated consent of the Aboriginal stockworkers and their families, influenced sympathetic whites leading to a nationwide challenge to the racist practices in the Pastoral Industry. Support for respect and recognition emerged, leading Prime Minister Whitlam’s symbolic act of transferring land title as recorded by Mervyn Bishop (see Figure 3, page 7). If land was central to the aims of the walkout, why do contemporary interpretations continue to focus on wages?

The works of numerous authors provide a basis to examine white interpretations of the actions taken at Wave Hill (Gurr 1983; Hardy 1976; Leach 1971; Long 1992; Long 1996; Macintyre 1985; Macleod 1997; McConvell & Hagen 1981; McGrath 1987; McGrath 1988; Middleton 1977; Middleton 1979; Riddett 1990; Riddett 1997; Rose 1991). Whilst not free from the influence of whiteness, the oral historical accounts reproduced and referred to in some of these works detail the actions and aims of participants in their words. Following Deborah Rose (1991), Hokari’s doctoral research presents

...Aboriginal oral historical accounts as ‘analysis by Aboriginal historians’... Aboriginal people are not interviewees or informants, no even just story tellers; they are historians who analyse the Australian past (Hokari 2001a: 16-17).

The pervasiveness of whiteness in mediating white interpretations of the walkout is evident in recent scholarship that misattributes ‘credit’ and understates the

20 The differentiated nature of consent is an implication of patriarchal and colonial power relations (Lipsitz & Kritzer 1975; McGuinness 1993).
agency of Aboriginal participants (see, for example, Attwood 2000; Long 1996). Many white interpretations are both anti-racist and embody white race privilege (see Haggis 2004). This paradox highlights the existence and implications of Riggs’ (2004) definition of a good white anti-racists/bad white racists dualism in white interpretations of the walkout. Good intentions act to mask the implications.

GOOD INTENTIONS
Hokari refers to the actions of author Frank Hardy, perhaps the most prominent supporter of the walkout, as embodying ‘conscientiously resisted paternalism’, ‘admirable’ restraint and respect (Hokari 2001a: 128). Commenting on the actions of Frank Hardy and other white supporters requires reflective criticism to avoid hypocrisy, as many contemporary actions with good intentions will similarly be deconstructed (see Riggs 2004b). The pervasive and unmarked nature of colonial whiteness continues to shape contemporary praxis. In reflecting on white support, consideration of individual (white) agency requires engagement with structural and hegemonic assumptions central to whiteness (Bloom 1994; Brodkin 1999; Frankenberg 2001; Moreton-Robinson 2004).

Stuart Macintyre’s (Macintyre 1985: 127) description of Frank Hardy’s assumptions, ‘in common with most white supporters’, as based on ‘the terms most familiar to him’ resonates with sympathetic portrayals of other supporters. Whites acting with good intentions, and the assumptions they embody, have been described ‘a product of their time’ (Mateer 2000; Morton 2004; Russell 2000). Whilst not justifying such intentions, these descriptions identify the need for an understanding of context and its implications. Mervyn Bishop’s photograph provides one example. Whitlam’s act galvanised and provided ‘hope’ for those supporting and working towards change in the relations towards Aboriginal peoples in Australia (Nicoll 2002: para. 9). Official recognition and respect are indicated, yet Whitlam’s good intentions are counterpoised with the patriarchal white sovereignty embodied in the imagery (see Moreton-Robinson 2004).

The restraint that Hokari attributes to Frank Hardy can be seen in Hardy’s own account of the walkout. He had an awareness of the paradigmatic
accommodation of Aboriginal peoples, their concept of the right time:

The Aborigines like to please a white man, especially a friendly one, and tell him what they think he wants to know. In this way they can reserve their inner feelings which the white man often despises, and he will probably buy them a drink, give them a smoke and go away happy (Hardy 1976: 59).

Engagement with white accounts also requires reflection on the (good) intentions of prioritising oral historical accounts. Are Aboriginal accounts prioritised out of a romantic misattribution of Aboriginal agency? (Attwood 2000: 4-5). The recollections of Frank Hardy and other white supporters reflect the order in which participants shared information and what they were able to observe. These accounts provide a limited, outsider’s perspective. What of contemporary accounts based on the same oral historical accounts or experiential sources? Are they not limited as well? Frank Hardy’s (1976) *The Unlucky Australians*, and a number of other accounts, include oral histories. These texts provide empirical material to explore whiteness in the accounts of white supporters: the oral historical accounts included expose white assumptions.

Hokari reflects on the use of oral historical accounts, locating agency in the hands of Aboriginal participants, as expressed in their words. He detailed the actions of Aboriginal participants as more than paradigmatic accommodation: the selective sharing of information and seemingly vague responses to questions were intentional (Hokari 2000: 128-9, 140-2). If oral historical accounts are predetermined to achieve specific ends, what can be drawn? Recent scholarship on epistemologies of ignorance have directly engaged with the strategic accommodation or management of ignorance by oppressed peoples/groups. Sarah Hoagland has noted that

there are strategic practices of ignoring within a logic of oppression and also strategic practices of ignoring within a logic of resistance, though very different things are going
on in the two locations (2007: 97).

Are oral accounts then an accurate reflection of history? Are contemporary oral histories revisionist? How should they be considered? Hokari considered such questions:

...one should be more critical of the naïve notion that earlier oral testimonies are more accurate than the later. We should consider the historical and political situation in which any—oral and written—accounts are inevitably situated. Therefore, the assessment of oral historical accounts should not only be based on their temporal distance from the events, but also according to their political context (2000: 113).

Hoagland also notes that, from a logic of resistance, such oral accounts are made on their own—as opposed to, yet within white—terms. Such an approach can maintain white ignorance whilst destabilising the relationally on which it is based (Hoagland 2007: 107-8). Of note here are the implications of this for white support—how support shifts and changes in the context of such destabilised relationality.

In light of this, the potential for situated revisionism exists in the accounts of all participants and commentators. Revisionist accounts can be ‘present views of the past’ rather than ‘the reality of the past’, though whose reality needs to be noted (see, for example, Attwood 1988; McGrath 1988; Rowse 1988a, 1988b). The politics of history requires reflection (Attwood 1989; Birch 2007; McGrath 1995). Hokari noted that whilst ‘every detail’ in oral historical accounts of the walkout may not be accurate... it is compelling that the essence of the story has remained identical over the decades spanning the research done by McConvell, Rose and myself (Hokari 2001a: 138).
The ‘essence’ identified by Frank Hardy, and visible in accounts reproduced by others (Hardy 1976; Riddett 1990; Riddett 1997; Rose 1991), provides a baseline to consider white interpretations and challenge poorly founded criticisms.

WAVE HILL AND DAGURAGU
Wave Hill is located in the north-west of Australia’s Northern Territory, approximately 600 km south of Darwin in what is known as the Victoria River district. Wave Hill’s national and regional location is shown in Figure 4. Wattie Creek is one of over 200 significant sites in the ‘Daguragu land claim area’. Recognition of place was an issue raised by participants and many white supporters. The interpreted emphasis on Wattie Creek as the ‘centre’ or ‘main’ sacred site fit within white peoples understandings of place, in language they could understand much like wages (Hokari 2000: 111, 2001a: 154-6).21

Wave Hill Station was one of number of pastoral leases granted to the British Vesteys group of companies, essentially an absentee landlord, in Australia’s north. The lease was run by Wave Hill Pastoral Company, a subsidiary of Australian Investment Agency (AIA) since 1914 (Attwood 2000: 8; Berndt & Berndt 1987: 15-16). Frank Hardy described the leases held:

over 6,000 square miles of Wave Hill station, part of the vast Vestey cattle empire which extends from the Queensland eastern coast across the Australian continent to the Kimberly mountains. An empire almost as large as England and rented for peppercorns… (Hardy 1976: 87)

21 McConvell and Hagan (McConvell & Hagen 1981) recorded ‘some amusement’ amongst the Gurindji in response to the name ‘Wave Hill’ following the station when it relocated due to flooding in 1924, and relocated again in 1967 following the walkout. This ‘contrast[ed] strongly with the Gurindji view that a name belongs to a site forever “in law” and obviously could not be applied to another place’ (Hokari 2001a).
THREE

Bain Attwood describes the Wave Hill pastoral lease as comprising 6158 square miles, ‘owned… by Vesteys since 1914, carr[ying] a herd of 40,000 cattle and employ[ing] the largest number of Aborigines of any station in the Territory’ (2000: 8). The pastoral industry drew heavily from Aboriginal labour for both station operations and to facilitate substantial profits. Aboriginal workers, at least in the foundational years of the pastoral industry, were ‘regarded as the “exclusive property” of the signing station’. The term signing station refers to the station granted leasehold rights over the ancestral lands of the Aboriginal peoples now ‘owned’ (*Daniel v State of Western Australia* [2003] FCA 666 at 167). This was reflected in the rate of pay, if any, given to Aboriginal workers. Appalling working conditions provided the basis for concern amongst white supporters and unions—though not always with the interests of Aboriginal workers in mind.

ABORIGINAL LABOUR AND THE PASTORAL INDUSTRY
Support for the walkout was mobilised through publicity about the racist basis of wages in the Pastoral Industry. The prominence given to the issue by Unions and white supporters locates terms most familiar and more insidious colonialisms. The standard and legal practice of the pastoral industry in Northern Australia around the time of the actions at Wave Hill, was for Aboriginal employees to receive only a fraction of the wage of their white counterparts—if at all. Legislation specific to Aboriginal peoples covered many issues, including seeking to protect the ‘native’ as an ‘economic asset’, by discouraging abuses on the part of employers of native labour (see, for example, Biskup 1968: 449). The provision of rations, in lieu of wages, was provided based on government funding with, for example, the Western Australian Aborigines Protection Board from 1886 and the Aborigines Department, after 1898, providing ‘a rations allowance for pastoral stations’ (*Daniel v State of Western Australia* [2003] FCA 666 at 167).

The payment of wages to Aboriginal workers had caused a number of incidents, stretching back at least as far as 1916, with direct union involvement. The basis of these earlier incidents, however, was less than supportive of Aboriginal workers and the notion of equal pay for equal work. Such actions were
seemingly [aimed] to protect the jobs of white workers from a pool of cheap Aboriginal labour (McConvell & Hagen 1981: 93). An early example was in 1916 when, ‘shearers agitated for aboriginals to join the Union and receive union wages. Aboriginal workers at Cooya Pooya struck for higher wages’ (Daniel v State of Western Australia [2003] FCA 666 at 176). In the aftermath of the walkout at Wave Hill, the NAWU was at times less than supportive, including public statements of non-endorsement, the breaking off of relations with the Rights Council and its disbanding of a Joint Disputes Committee (Hardy 1976: 77). In official negotiations, the NAWU agreed to settlements that were no more than perpetuations of colonialisms. One of these settlements ‘was for fourteen dollars and 16 cents and keep for a stockman with a wife and child, slow workers to remain on six dollars’ (Ibid: 114). The notion of a ‘slow worker’ was in essence a provision to pay Aboriginal workers at a lower rate based on a perceived inferiority. This colonial notion would again resurface.

The issue of wages for Aboriginal workers again received significant attention at a conference held in January 1944. A petition to present evidence for the inclusion of Aboriginal workers under the Federal Pastoralist Award was refused by the Industrial Relations Commission. It was in this context that what is referred to as the first strike of Aboriginal workers, and considered the longest strike in Australia history, began: on 1 May 1946 (Middleton 1977: 96). At the start of the shearing season, Aboriginal workers in the Pilbara region of northwest Western Australia refused to work on 20 of the area’s 22 pastoral stations. The planned action was an outcome a meeting between 200 people from 23 different language groups in 1942 (Fuentes 2004: para. 22). At the forefront of the actions were Aboriginal

---

22 Michael Hess provides a similar analysis (1994: 66).

23 The actual date the action commenced is disputed, yet this was the date referred to and celebrated as the 60th anniversary of both the first Aboriginal and Australia’s longest strike around May Day 2006.
spokespeople Dooley Bin Bin and Clancy McKenna, supported by Don McLeod (a white Australian). Freedom of movement and self-representation, effectively a reduction in state control over their lives, were aims of the action. Don McLeod was subsequently jailed for his involvement as breaching the *Native Affairs Act*.

A conference in 1947 facilitated discussions between the NT Administration and pastoralists after the Australian Workers Union (AWU) had applied for a review of the Award covering pastoral workers (Middleton 1979: 111). These discussions had no Aboriginal participants. In 1948 the Bateman Royal Commission recommended a minimum wage be established for Aboriginal workers in the pastoral industry (*Daniel v State of Western Australia* [2003] FCA 666 at 178). The proposed wage scale was not equal to non-Aboriginal workers and it was lower than the demands of those taking action in the Pilbara (Berndt & Berndt 1987: 259-63; Broome 1994: 138). At Wave Hill Aboriginal workers withdrew their labour in 1949, 1952 and 1955 (Attwood 2000: 8; Riddett 1997: 51). Attwood considers that ‘these strikes failed for want of support’ (2000: 8).

The issue of non-equal wages for Aboriginal workers received renewed attention in the 1960s following the 1963 biennial Australian Council of Trade Unions Congress. At this congress, after having lobbied at the two prior meetings in 1959 and 1961, the Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement (later renamed the Federal Council for the Advancement of Aborigines and Torres Straight Islanders—FCAATSI) successfully managed to change a view that what was considered as being ‘largely indifferent to the rights of Aboriginal workers’. A policy of ending discrimination against Aboriginal labour was adopted (Broome 1994: 140). Following this decision the North Australian Workers Union (NAWU) sponsored the test case presented to the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in March 1966.

The NAWU sponsored case led to changes in the Cattle Station Industry (Northern Territory) Award, including removal of the word ‘Aboriginal’, and its definition, from the document (Long 1992: 154; Rowse 1998: 118). Alongside the proposed changes to the Award, there were two major issues of contention with the findings of the Commission: the proposed changes would not be introduced until
December 1968 (i.e. close to 3 years later), and a ‘slow worker’ provision, lobbied for by the Pastoral Industry, would be included. The changes would allow for Aboriginal workers to paid a lower wage based on a notion that they were ‘less efficient than European workers’ as had been adopted previously (Broome 1994: 140). The implementation of this provision was effectively at the discretion of individual station managers.

NEWCASTLE WATERS
Following the release of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission’s findings, Aboriginal workers at Newcastle Waters withdrew their labour.24 Newcastle Waters, like Wave Hill Station, is in the Victoria River region of Australia’s Northern Territory (see Figure 4, page 85) and located within the lands of the Gurindji people.

There were many factors that influenced the timing of action at Newcastle Waters. Alongside, and tactically central to its challenge to the discriminatory basis to the Award, the NAWU began a broad campaign to recruit Aboriginal organisers. Dexter Daniels, who was to have a visible role in the actions at both Newcastle Waters and Wave Hill, was one of these recruits (Long 1992: 154). Daniels visited numerous cattle stations, encouraging action without the knowledge of the NAWU executive (Attwood 2000: 6; Hardy 1976: 24, 27-9).25 The response at Newcastle Waters was swifter and more successful that at any other station Daniels had visited (Hokari 2001a: 140-1). Why was this so?

---

24 It was in May 1966 that Aboriginal workers at Newcastle Waters Station withdrew their labour, less than two months after the release of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission’s findings and three months before the walkout at Wave Hill (Hokari 2000). As with the actions taken in the Pilbara (in 1946), reference is often made to May 1 as the date the action commenced, with this similarly being disputed (Hess 1994; Middleton 1977).

25 Davis Daniels, older brother of Dexter Daniels, was secretary of the Northern Territory Council for Aboriginal Rights.
Dexter Daniels sought out Lupgna Giari, a Gurindji elder who worked at Newcastle Waters, also known as Captain Major, after hearing about discontent at the station. Whilst travelling he met Double-O, an ‘old man… from Newcastle Waters’, away from the station for medical reasons, who told him ‘about Captain Major’ (Hardy 1976: 27). Hokari reflects on this conversation:

Why did Double-O tell [Daniels] to see Captain Major? It is reasonable to assume that, through the network among Aboriginal people, they knew of the long awaited Gurindji project, and in particular that Captain Major (and Sandy Moray) were looking for ‘someone behind them’ (Hokari 2001a: 141).

Oral historical accounts support Hokari’s reasonable assumptions. Frank Hardy’s recorded account of Lupgna Giari, indicates the planning referred to:

I bin thinking longa time about my people not havin proper money or conditions. I bin thinkin’ we got no one to help us, no one behind us. Then I bin hear about them white fellas talkin’ in the Court somewhere about equal wages…

And I bin thinkin’ agen: Wish we had someone behind us somewhere (Giari, reproduced in Hardy 1976: 29, 31).

The reference to wages is of note, with conditions for Aboriginal workers at Newcastle Waters being far better than at other stations in the region (Ibid: 30). Why then was the response to Daniels’ interest ‘much swifter and more organised… than at many other stations’. Hokari postulated that:

It is logical that if you are looking for help and waiting for

---

26 Lupgna Giari had previously worked at Wave Hill (Hardy 1976).
the right moment, your response to the right offer will be quick (Hokari 2001a: 140-1).

Daniels had travelled to Newcastle Waters seeking out Giari.

...when I met him I had faith in him... he seemed like a man who would fight. He told me he often thought about this. He told me about having someone behind them, someone who would help the Aborigines.

He said: ‘I wanted to find a man somewhere who can help us get proper money and get treated properly like white people... And I’m happy it is a man of my people, my color’.

That’s what Captain Major said to me. I said to him best way is to strike. And he seemed to know what a strike is (Hardy 1976: 28).

Giari had worked and travelled with Alex Moray, a pastoral inspector with Vesteys the “travelling boss” (Hardy 1976: 30; Hokari 2000: 102, 2001a: 134). Tipujurn, who is commonly referred to as Sandy Moray, a respected Gurindji elder, also worked and travelled with Alex Moray. The experiences of travelling with Alex Moray shaped the actions taken at Newcastle Waters and Wave Hill (Hardy 1976: 30; Hokari 2001a: 134-5, 139-40). Through their respective roles with Alex Moray, Tipujurn and Lupgna Giari gained exposure to the broader treatment of Aboriginal peoples in Australia, white responses to this and the actions of unions in other states (Hokari 2000: 102).

‘ONE OF THE RECURRING FIGURES IN STORIES OF RESISTANCE’
Details of Tipujurn’s actions are recurrent in oral historical accounts (Rose 1991: 226). His recurring influence is outlined in the stories yet absent from the majority of written and/or scholarly (i.e. white) accounts. Frank Hardy’s account, recalling
his experiences at Wave Hill in the wake of the walkout, includes only one direct reference to Tipujurn. Recent scholarly accounts negate any mention. Why are references to the role and influence of Tipujurn missing from white accounts of the walkout? What role does whiteness continue to play in mediating white interpretations? Frank Hardy, amongst other white supporters, was aware of the impacts of colonial legacies on participants and their learned distrust of white Australians.

Oral historical accounts detail how Tipujurn’s role was central to the actions taken at Wave Hill. His plans shaped how white supporters were introduced to Gurindji aims. The essence of stories about Tipujurn have ‘remained identical’ over decades of research recording oral historical accounts. Recent accounts have provided more detail about the role Tipujurn played, how he planned the action and instigated it when it was deemed to be right time (Hokari 2001a: 138). In light of this, what is the basis for contemporary scholarship that understates Aboriginal agency in the walkout (Attwood 2000: 4-5)?

Aside from a sketch, Frank Hardy makes only one direct reference to Tipujurn in the entirety of The Unlucky Australians, describing him as ‘An ancient thin man’ (Hardy 1976: 161). This account implies a depth of knowledge and the respect afforded Tipujurn by other Gurindji, yet provides no indications that he had any significant role in what had, was, or would come to happen at any of the pastoral leases on Gurindji land. The closest Frank Hardy came to indicating the significance of Tipujurn was:

They had talked about this amongst themselves all the time and their fathers before them. They wanted their land back (Ibid: 109).

Riley Young Winpilin was involved in the actions at Wave Hill. His memories of Tipujurn detail the importance of his role in the planning and execution of the walkout:

And old Sandy Moray used to come out from Wave Hill…
He used to come out there and tell us this story for us. Tell us. Ohh, myall time. We were working for whiteman yet. He used to come out and tell us. He used to come out from Wave Hill for holiday you know.

‘Ah,’ he told us, ‘ah, you gotta change the law now. Eh? Might be four years’ time, might be five years’ time.’ He education for whiteman before. Working the whiteman too long. He used to go down Canberra, talk with them waterside Union. Talking with them. Telling them. Sneaking without no permit… He used to come out telling us: ‘We gotta get this land back. Don’t tell anybody’… (Rose 1991: 226).

Riley Young Winpilin’s account was recorded in April 1992, with the story dating back to 1950 (Ibid). Tipujurn came out from his ‘country’ (Hokari 2000: 111). It was at Wattie Creek, where the Gurindji relocated and later to become widely known as Daguragu, that the ‘partiki tree meeting’ took place (Hokari 2001a: 136-8). The partiki tree still stands in the middle of the Daguragu township, adjacent to the memorial stone commemorating Prime Minister Whitlam’s 1975 visit. The shade of the tree provided the location for the first meeting in which Tipujurn told his plans for action to Gurindji elders (Hokari 2000: 111).

Rose’s description of Tipujurn as ‘one of the recurring figures in stories of resistance’ provides contrast with white accounts and supports Hokari’s claims about the essence of stories about Tipujurn remaining the same (Hokari 2001a: 138; Rose 1991: 226). Attwood’s (2000) “The Articulation of ‘Land Rights’ in Australia: The Case of Wave Hill” questions whether white supporters ‘only played a minimal role… fail[ing] initially to understand the import of land’. In challenging descriptions of white supporters as thinking in terms most familiar, Attwood fails to fully grasp the significance of whiteness in shaping interpretations. Contrasting with Hokari, Attwood over-emphasises and misattributes the role of white supporters, describing the walkout as ‘mediated by settler Australians’ (2000: 4-5).
Tipujurn’s role extended beyond sharing his plan with other Gurindji. Vincent Lingiari travelled to Darwin in early August—under the pretence of seeking medical treatment—to meet Dexter Daniels. Numerous white accounts interpret this as a chance meeting, contrasting with oral historical accounts. Hokari questioned such interpretations, postulating that overt manipulations were in fact used: the epistemic ignorance of whites was maintained (Hoagland 2007: 107-8). The oft-implied and/or stated chance basis for the meeting was also questioned:

Was it too coincidental that while the strike had been going on at the Newcastle Waters station, a leader of the Wave Hill Aboriginal people broke his foot and went up to Darwin, and that Daniels happened to know he was in hospital? (Hokari 2000: 106, footnote 61).

Dexter Daniels account of this meeting in Darwin, recorded by Frank Hardy, implies there was more to the meeting than chance:

I went to the hospital one day just before dinner and I met this old man there. His name was Vincent Lingiari. The white men call him Tom Vincent. And I said to him: ‘Old man, where are you from?’ And he said: ‘I come from Wave Hill.’ And I said: ‘I might take a trip to Wave Hill one day.’ I said to him: ‘I might see you there...’ Later on, Vincent came out of the hospital. He went to Bagot, and I met him there and he said: ‘I’m going to Wave Hill on Saturday by plane.’ And I said to him: ‘I’m going to Wave Hill by road. I leave on Thursday.’ So I left Darwin on Thursday morning... (Hardy 1976: 68-9).

His recollection of the first words Vincent Lingiari spoke to him at the Wave Hill airstrip, drawing on the Darwin meeting, stated the intent:

‘We have waited for you long time and wanted to see you.’

(He told me that in Darwin before.) We heard a lot about
you and the Newcastle Waters people,’ and I said to him: ‘Well I am here now’ (emphasis added, Ibid: 69).

Dexter Daniels had visited other stations encouraging action, Lupgna Giari led the withdrawal of labour at Newcastle Waters, Frank Hardy was garnering southern support, and a meeting at Rapid Creek had reformulated the NT Council for Aboriginal Rights with explicit demands for self-determination (Ibid: 41, 42-53). In this context, support was actively sought out at the direction of Tipujurn:

Mick Rangiari told me another story about this meeting. Sandy Moray told Vincent Lingiari to pretend to be ‘sick’ (injured?) in order to go to Darwin to see Dexter Daniels (Hokari 2001a: 145).

There are numerous oral historical accounts supportive of Mick Rangiari’s account. Hokari’s research is effectively the only scholarly work detailing this. He reflects on potential criticisms, considering potential issues with contemporary oral historical accounts and the non-existence of any study that accounts for how this meeting was made possible:

We might believe the story was made up later by the Gurindji people in order to control their own past more actively. However this story may be true… if the Gurindji people were ready for the action and waiting for someone behind them, and then found out what Captain Major did at Newcastle Waters station, it is reasonable that they wanted to hold discussions with Dexter Daniels about further action at Wave Hill. Captain Major may have sent a message to Sandy Moray or Vincent Lingiari to come to Darwin to see Dexter Daniels (Ibid: 145).

The orchestration of such a meeting clearly fits within oral historical accounts. Tipujurn’s regular stories included changing the law/lore, waiting for someone behind them, getting their land back, and not telling anyone about these plans.
The orchestration of this meeting illustrates the ‘Aboriginal agency’ Attwood understates (Attwood 2000: 4-5).

The majority of white accounts of the walkout focus on the issue of wages and conditions. Tipujurn’s 1950s prescription ‘we gotta get this land back’ indicates what was paramount to participants and the extent of his role in Gurindji plans. Alongside the clarification might be four years’ time, might be five years’ time were notions of the right time and the right way. Oral historical accounts indicate that the NAWU test case and its recruitment of Dexter Daniels were the external conditions waited for; an opportunity for the Gurindji to gauge what level of broader support was available. How the Gurindji acted was a form of strategic ignorance (Bailey 2007).

THE WALKOUT AS INDETERMINATE
Riley Young Winpilin’s recollection of Tipujurn’s visits illustrate that the Gurindji had pre-determined aims alongside an awareness of the right time, when the waited for white support was available. Tipujurn had been ‘think’n… got a bit of idea’ (Mick Rangiari, on Tipujurn, reproduced in Hokari 2000: 102). Lupgna Giaria’s ‘thinkin’ about support at Newcastle Waters, more than three months prior to walkout at Wave Hill, considered the NAWU test case and the support it fostered. The Gurindji had been waiting for a long time for such support and keeping their aims secret was more than paradigmatic accommodation. Support was accommodated, until white supporters could see beyond terms most familiar. Whiteness shaped, and continues to shape white interpretations of the walkout. Many scholars still refer to it as a strike in white terms.27

When considering oral historical accounts and recorded details of what happened at Newcastle Waters and Wave Hill, there are important points to note: the

27 Hokari reflects on the use of the term strike by the Gurindji as based on a different understanding/meaning (Hokari 2001a).
‘strikers’ left the stations. At Newcastle Waters, Daniels arranged transport for workers and their families to nearby Elliot (Hardy 1976: 28), at Wave Hill they walked to the welfare settlement. Hokari provides an answer to his own questioning (with respect to Wave Hill) of this:

Why did they walk off? If the Gurindji Action was literally a ‘strike’, the aim of their action must have been equal wages or improvements in their living conditions. In that case, it would not be necessary to leave the station. They should have stayed there and simply stopped working in order to force the manager to negotiate (2001: 146).

An exchange at the Wave Hill welfare settlement soon after the walkout exposes the action as a strike in white terms only. Frank Hardy summarised Paddy Carroll’s, Secretary of the NAWU, pidgin words in addressing the ‘more than two hundred men, women and children’ at the Wave Hill Welfare Settlement:

The Aborigines operating the pumps at the bores studded around the vast cattle run were still working to supply water to the station, and the cattle at the waterholes. ‘That not right,’ Paddy told them. ‘One man sit down, all men sit down’ all on strike together. If any man go back, him no good. Let Vesteys find some white fella work them pumps (Hardy 1976: 86).

The response of Lingiari to Paddy Carroll’s address, and Frank Hardy’s reflections on this response, illustrate accommodation and appeasement of white supporters, illustrating acts of strategic ignorance:

Vincent Lingiari said, his eyes gazing into the distance: ‘All right, Paddy, we bin get them pump workers back here, maybe tomorrow.’ Strange, he had made that same promise to Brian [Manning] and Dexter a fortnight before (Ibid).
The issue of the pump workers continuing to take care of the cattle at Wave Hill came up again in days following:

One of us asked Vincent: ‘When will you bring those pump workers back on strike and cut off the water supply?’

Vincent gazed into the embers of the camp fire, his nobly moulded face enigmatic: ‘Maybe tomorrow’, he said without conviction…

‘We not bin let them cattle die of thirst… (Hardy 1976: 90).

The workers were not on ‘strike’ in the sense understood by white supporters. Accommodation of white interpretations did not eliminate concern for the safety of cattle at the station: ‘Them big Bestey bosses not hear them cattle die; but I bin hear them cattle die’ (Lingiari, reproduced in Hardy 1976: 90). Having control of their own land and affairs was the aim, not leaving cattle to die at the hands of Vesteys (Hokari 2002: 28). Of note is that more detail was provided to those viewed as more supportive (i.e. Hardy) than those whose depth of support was unclear (i.e. Carrol). Vincent Lingiari was appearing to act as slow to mobilise the ignorance of whiteness against itself (see Bailey 2007: 84, 87-90).

If the walkout was not a strike, why was it perceived as so? The concept of ‘equal wages’, the masters tools, was used to accommodate white terms, a means to help outsiders understand and foster support (Hokari 2000: 111). Use of white concepts such as equal wages shaped interpretations of the aims of the walkout. Details of the aims of the walkout, Tipujurn’s plans, were increasingly shared with white supporters yet misinterpretations continue to be produced. Attwood’s (2000) “The Articulation of ‘Land Rights’ in Australia” illustrates the pervasiveness of whiteness, and how it continues to shape contemporary interpretations. He wrongly constructs ‘patterns of [cultural] authority’ attributing authority over what transpired to Dexter Daniels (Ibid: 10). Vincent Lingiari’s own words, recorded by Frank Hardy, provide a basis to expose the inaccuracy of Attwood’s attribution:
I am Vincent Lingiari from Wave Hill. That’s my proper aboriginal name. Tom Pisher and that Bestey mob called my Tommy Bincent. My people are Gurindji. Who live in the Wave Hill area. That Me country. They live here longa time before Cudeba. I have had Gunabiba ceremony. Gunabiba is the mother of all the Gurindji people, and the corroboree dances tell the story of a man and him son spewed by the rainbow snake near Wattie Creek in the Dreamtime. I am Kadijeri man of Gurindji people. But Bestey mob don’t understand about that (Hardy 1976: 71).  

The significance of Vincent Lingiari having had the Gunabiba Ceremony and being a Kadijeri man was recorded Frank Hardy, immediately after the walkout. Attempts were made by Vesteys staff to persuade the participants in the walkout to return to Wave Hill, even if not to actually work:

They ‘nother bloke there. I don’t know that bloke, reckon he might be missionary some sort—and he said to me: ‘Hey Vincent,’ he said, ‘you got Gunabiba ceremony?’ I now know why he bin ask ‘em that. Maybe him wanna see if me high in Gurindji tribe, or something like that, I reckon. ‘Are you Kadijeri man?’ and I said: ‘Yes, I am and he said something to Peter Morris and Tom Pisher and they never said no more. They walk away and start the motor car (Ibid: 74).

Recognition of this ‘authority’ has implications for Attwood’s interpretation of the role of Dexter Daniels:

---

28 Hardy reproduces phonetic grammar in representing numerous oral accounts of participants in the actions taken/recorded. As an explanation, he provides the following: ‘The Gurindji language has no F or V sounds so they substitute P and B for these when talking English’. 
When the ‘strike’ began at Wave Hill, Lingiari, *in keeping with patterns of authority in his culture*, deferred to Daniels (emphasis added, Attwood 2000: 10).

Lupgna Giari actively dismissed a similar interpretation to Attwood’s, regarding his role at Newcastle Waters. Dexter Daniels was actively recruited by the NAWU as an Aboriginal organiser; he was an outsider as well:

Some white fella bin say Dexter tell me to strike because him higher man in tribe. That not right. Dexter Roper River man, me Gurindji; nothing do with Roper River mob (Hardy 1976: 32).

The attribution of authority to Dexter Daniels above that of Lupgna Giari and, by implication, all Gurindji taking action at Wave Hill, exposes cultural ignorance, whiteness. Authority was interpreted as being with Dexter Daniels based on his role with the NAWU, a constructed hierarchy central to white industrial organising. Vincent Lingiari’s recollections of first meeting Dexter Daniels further illustrates patterns of cultural authority:

Dexter said: ‘Are you big boss of Wave Hill Aborigines?’ ‘yes I am.’ And I told him where I am in Gurindji tribe and he told me where he is in Roper River tribe, and we talked about our skin color. I can’t tell white fellas about that, but I told Dexter and he told me (Ibid: 72).

The assumptions shaping Attwood’s interpretation of outside factors as the driving force behind the walkout are reflected in his critique of other works. Lyn Riddett’s account of the walkout locates colonialist assumptions that Aboriginal peoples were inferior and lacked agency in white interpretations:

Senior welfare officials in the NTA in Darwin believed that station ‘blacks’ were either too ignorant or too ‘unsophisticated’, to notice, without prompting, that on
cattle stations they lived in hovels with no sanitation and no running water on exposed, unshaded areas of land. Indeed the suggestion was that, even if they could be brought to notice the squalor of their living conditions, Aborigines lacked the intelligence and skills necessary to organize themselves for industrial/political action... the judgment seems to be predicated on racist assumptions about alleged Aboriginal primitivism and consequent lack of sensibility (Riddett 1997: 52).

Attwood describes Riddett’s interpretation as ‘not advanced by any serious student of Aboriginal history... [and] also unsatisfactory however appealing we might find such accounts of Aboriginal agency’. Such interpretations are not worthy of any consideration: ‘[it] need not detain us’ (emphasis added, Attwood 2000: 4-5).

Hardy’s observations of the native camp at Wave Hill station provide support to Riddett’s account and reflect an awareness of a good white anti-racists/bad white racists dualism:

We drove to the smaller huts. ‘That bin Bincent’s hut there, ‘Bandy said. It was a rusty humpy no more than four feet high, eight feet deep, by perhaps five feet wide. Vincent Lingiari, the elder of the tribe, the sacred Kadijeri man, and a noble human being, had had to crawl into this dwelling, often after working from daylight to dark. And this had happened in affluent Australia in the sixties, while Government Welfare officers were either powerless or unwilling to intervene. Useless to blame Tom Fisher who knew no better, or Vestey’s ‘who couldn’t find Wave Hill station on a map’, or Peter Morris who views Aborigines indulgently but as seeking no better treatment, or even the Federal Government which had framed a policy of assimilation aimed, in the final analysis, at genocide. No,
white Australia is to blame—every white Australian from the nigger haters and gin jockeys who abound on the cattle stations, the racist ten percent who despise the Aborigines so much that they voted against them even being counted as Australians in a referendum less than a year after I stood, speechless and ashamed, in front of old Vincent’s hut, to the ninety percent who voted yes, cleared their conscience and, smugly satisfied, turned to their beer (Hardy 1976: 97-8).

Attwood’s dismissal of agency on the part of the Aboriginal participants falls within this dualism. Whilst there was some secrecy surrounding the intent of the walkout, conforming to Tipujurn’s *don’t tell anybody*, oral historical accounts illustrate the persistent presence of agency, and a logic of resistance, in shaping what happened. In dismissing Riddett’s interpretation, Attwood’s summaries her account:

non-Aborigines played no important role in making the history that occurred at Wave Hill; they were all just bit players in a drama that unfolded around them (Attwood 2000: 4).

White supporters effectively were all just bit players. Describing them as such is not to suggest that ‘non-Aborigines’ played no ‘important role’, rather the role they played was within and largely shaped via the actions of the Aboriginal participants whether they were aware of it or not. Paradigmatic accommodation and ‘strategic resistant practices’ (Hoagland 2007: 107) were employed to garner and facilitate support, with concepts such as equal wages expressed as terms white supporters could relate to. Whiteness, as separate yet linked to this

---

29 Tony Birch (2007) has noted what amounts to boundary work in Attwood’s challenges to conservative historian Keith Windshuttle’s portrayal of Australian History.
accommodation, continues to shape interpretations of the walkout. In focussing on the white legalistic construction of ‘land rights’, Attwood normalises colonialisms to fit his interpretation (Moreton-Robinson 2004a; Tully 2000; Weber 2000):

Little purpose is served by arguing whether the claim for land at Wave Hill was or was not shaped by non-Aborigines; instead it makes more sense to accept that it was mediated by settler Australian’s—this, after all, is what occurs in the context of colonialism—and the task of the intersections between the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal players (Attwood 2000: 5).

Unpacking this statement illustrates that whiteness mediated settler Australian support and action. Rather than accepting that the actions of the Gurindji were mediated via settler Australian’s, engaging with the notion that ‘the claim for land at Wave Hill was or was not shaped by non-Aborigines’ is of significant import. Whilst legalistic and public interpretations were clearly shaped by the actions of supporters like Frank Hardy, the definitions emanating from his interpretation indicate the impacts and implications of whiteness in shaping Attwood’s analysis. This is a clear and important distinction that needs to be recognised. Riddett highlights the inaccuracies of Attwood’s focus on land rights/a land claim:

What eventually became clear, in the early 1970s, was that the Aborigines were not asking for their land to be returned to them, because, in their view and in their law, they had never given it up or lost it (Riddett 1997: 53).

The participant accounts reproduced by Frank Hardy’s (1976) *The Unlucky Australians*, the oral historical accounts recorded by Hokari (2000; 2001a; 2001b; 2002) and other writers support this position.

Jeremy Long, a patrol officer in the Northern Territory, expressed a similar interpretation to that of Attwood. He questioned why Frank Hardy had not
received his ‘due share of the credit’, that the positive outcomes of his role are not included in many accounts. The link between his critical comments and that of Attwood lie in the following statement:

Readers are left to assume that it is somehow ‘natural’ or even inevitable that the Gurindji would have given up the aims that motivated their walk-off to embark on a radically different campaign for land (Long 1996: 7).

It is the notion of a radical shift to land rights, as a natural progression, which ties in with the work of Attwood. To illustrate and strengthen this position, Long refers to the work of HC ‘Nugget’ Coombs (1978), specifically:

While there can be little doubt that the shift of emphasis in the Aborigines’ demands was stimulated and given expression by Frank Hardy, a radical Australian writer, and other white advisors, it seems likely that the idea of basing a claim of ‘traditional rights’ emerged quite naturally from discussions within the group themselves who certainly would have made clear to their advisors what territory they considered to be ‘theirs’ (Coombs reproduced in Long 1992: 6).

The description of a shift in emphasis, and that Frank Hardy stimulated it, exposes the basis of misinterpretations. This, alongside a politico-legalistic framework, provides for Attwood’s reference to white supporters mediating this perceived shift. Numerous accounts of the Darwin meeting are shaped by such assumptions. It is repeatedly referred to, or implied as being, a chance encounter (see, for example, Ibid: 2). Reference to the meeting as being predicated on chance reifies the interpreted indeterminacy of what was to happen, and the interpreted directionless-ness of actions taken. The meeting as a chance encounter, alongside white notions of industrial action provides basis for overstating the role of Dexter Daniels.
Frank Hardy arrived in Darwin approximately a week before the walkout at Wave Hill, having no knowledge of what was about to happen. His perceptions were shaped through meeting with supporters and participants. He recounted his first discussion with Vincent Lingiari (at the Wave Hill Welfare Settlement):

I asked Vincent Lingiari what he had been thinking down at the strike camp. He replied: ‘Well, at first, I bin thinking am I right or am I wrong? Then I bin thinkin’ I am right walkin’ away… And I bin thinking’ this bin Gurindji country. We bin here longa time before them Besty mob’ (Hardy 1976: 93).

Vincent Lingiari’s answer highlights an issue that goes far deeper than the ‘waiting for someone behind us’ that predicated the Darwin meeting. Frank Hardy, whose “restraint” in terms of respecting Aboriginal initiatives is admirable’, noted this (Hokari 2001a: 128). He expressed this in reflecting on the actions of Dexter Daniels and Vincent Lingiari immediately following the walkout:

I knew that the generations of white supremacy had bred in him no less than in other Aborigines a real difference about approaching whites who have power. Yet from time to time he confronted them with courage…

The Aborigine is secretive. He rarely volunteers information, even to a friendly white man. Perhaps it is a tribal habit, keeping the sacred laws from those who should not know. Perhaps it is distrust (Hardy 1976: 90).

Bill Jeffrey, the Welfare Officer at the Wave Hill Welfare Settlement, expressed a similar awareness:

The Aborigines didn’t trust me, they don’t trust any white man, the never will and I don’t blame them. They didn’t even tell me too much (emphasis added, reproduced in Ibid: 78).
Riddett, in recalling 13 months of intermittent stay at Daguragu from 1970-73, reflected on her experiences:

What I did learn was how easy it was for an otherwise strong and assertive person to become silent, even submissive, in circumstances where it was not certain what support was available. The lesson helped me to clarify some of the perplexing contradictions felt I’d had seen in the response of Gurindji people towards white authority figures (Riddett 1997: 62).

These reflections indicate a visibility of the implications of power relations emanating from and within contemporary Australia. Billy Jeffrey recalls his experiences, on arrival at the Wave Hill Welfare Settlement:

Well, the first thing they did, these Aborigines, was to call the white man Cudeba to put him in the position he surely deserves—and that is one of mistrust. They mistrust me to this very day and I don’t blame them; everyone has earned it. They still will not put their complete trust in me and they never will (reproduced in Hardy 1976: 104).  

Having had ‘lubras… in the house all the time’ and being ‘brought up by them’ in a climate in which his ‘earliest memories of [his] father and… brother showing off their inhuman treatment of Aborigines’ provides context for Bill Jeffrey’s perspective. He also clearly stated having a self-professed ‘guilt complex about Aborigines’ that had him labelled as a ‘black fellow lover’:

I grew up with a feeling that I had to repay them for the

---

30 For further explanation on the use of the term Cudeba, see Manning (2002).

31 Lubra was used to refer to Aboriginal women.
things people like my father had done to them (Ibid).

This provided the impetus for his seeking out a position as a Welfare Officer in the Northern Territory.

Frank Hardy was also aware of the secrecy that emanated from this distrust of Cudeba’s. Recalling his first talks with Lingiari, within days of them meeting:

I discovered that wages were not the only, perhaps not even the main, issue for the Gurindji men. They were concerned about their women, about the children getting an education, about housing, about dignity and self respect, about tribal identity—and there hovered vaguely behind every thought a desire to live alone in their own land (Ibid: 93).

There are clear links between the recollections of Frank Hardy, Bill Jeffrey and Lyn Riddett, and the interpreted indeterminate aims as expressed by Attwood: reference to the desire ‘vaguely’ behind every concern. This is clear in the detail given by Robert Tudawali, regarded as the worlds’ first Aboriginal actor based on his roll in the cinema classic Jedda (Chauvel 1955). Recorded by an ABC television crew at the Wave Hill Welfare Settlement on the same day as Frank Hardy’s conversation with Vincent Lingiari, and in response to a question regarding whether the Welfare Department would look after dependents ‘[w]hen the Aborigines get equal pay’, Robert Tudawali, after pausing ‘thoughtfully’, responded:

What my people need most is independence. Handle their own wages and pensions. Buy things for their childrens… They better do things for themselves (reproduced in Hardy 1976: 92).

Paradigmatic accommodation, distrust for whites, locates this vagueness.
Tipujurn’s expressed the notion ‘don’t tell anybody’ some 15 years prior to the walkout. Hokari documented the basis for the choice of Wattie Creek as the relocation site as having similar basis:

their explanation of Wattie Creek as a main place for their dreaming was probably their tactic to make white people understand how important it was to establish their community there. Such a tactic is similar to the way they used ‘equal wages’ to gain public attention at the first stage. They needed a public reason that could help outsiders understand their decision (Hokari 2000: 111).

Pincher Manguari also expressed the long held desire for control of ancestral lands. Having worked on several cattle stations in the region, described as ‘a man who understands what has happened to his people’, he outlined his thoughts to Frank Hardy shortly after the latter’s arrival at the Wave Hill Welfare Settlement:

That Tom Pisher, we want him go ‘way. We want the Bestey mob all go ‘way from here... We Wave Hill Aborigine native people bin called Gurindji. We been here longa time before them Bestey mob. They put up building. think ‘em they own this country... This is our country, alla this country bin Gurindji country. Wave Hill bin our country (reproduced in Hardy 1976: 101).

Frank Hardy’s reflections on discussions with Manguari and Lingiari provide an explanation for the apparent vagueness of the aims of participants, white rationalisations

Deciding not to press Pincher to expand on his statement about the land; deciding to listen to the other natives, and ask Bill Jeffrey if he has heard of them on this theme—*and inclining still to think in terms of wage labor and conditions* (emphasis added, Ibid: 101).
He thought in terms most familiar to himself, locating Maclntyre’s (1985) criticism of interpretations that misattribute agency and locate influence with white supporters. When Frank Hardy did question Bill Jeffrey as to whether he had heard talk regarding control of ancestral lands, the answer was ‘many a time’, with both Pincher Manguari and Vincent Lingiari having discussed it with him (Hardy 1976: 107). In contrast to many of the subsequent published accounts that attribute talk of land as emanating from Frank Hardy, Bill Jeffrey had noted that the issue of land emanated from the Gurindji:

This is different, Anne. Pincher mentioned it to Frank first (reproduced in Ibid: 109).

The context of this comment is significant. Anne Jeffrey, who was involved in and/or present during conversations about land between Frank Hardy and her husband, expressed caution:

‘You have to be careful you are not triggering this Frank. If you are they’ll drop the idea when you leave. Bill and I have often thought the People had an idea when it was really our idea. Haven’t we Darling?’ She appealed to Bill, for once he disagreed (reproduced in Ibid).

Frank Hardy’s thoughts emanating from his self-questioning have been interpreted and used to support interpretations that he played a significant role in shaping what came to happen at Wave Hill:

‘I wonder?’ I found myself saying. ‘What if they applied to get their land back? The whites never paid them for it or drew up any treaty…’

Bill said: ‘There are only six white men working at Wave Hill and more than eighty black fellas. This place is rich in base metals and precious stones. The black fellas know where the stuff is but they won’t tell the Cudeba.’ (Ibid: 108).
Frank Hardy thought in legislative terms. He was a source of information to southern supporters and the press. It was his words that shaped public awareness of what was transpiring at Wave Hill, not those of the participants. This is a distinction Attwood fails to address. When the waited for support started to materialise, the right time had come, the Gurindji had someone behind them.

No one behind we before. Now we do things right way (Vincent Lingiari, reproduced in Ibid: 112).

THE ONGOING ROLE OF WHITENESS
Oral historical accounts identify the nature and aims of the walkout and similar actions at other stations. References to pre-planning of the walkout date back to the 1950s, with Tipujum spreading word about what needed to happen. Misinterpreted aims of the walkout are based on white supporters thinking in terms most familiar, as Frank Hardy reflected with regards to his own assumptions and Macintyre identified more broadly (Hardy 1976: 101; Macintyre 1985: 127). These terms emanate from colonial whiteness (see Moreton-Robinson 2004a; Tully 2000; Weber 2000).

Scholarly accounts continue to be mediated by the hegemony of whiteness (see Bloom 1994; Brodkin 1999; Wiegman 1999). Attwood’s attempts to dismiss analyses including Macintyre’s and Riddett’s provide a contemporary example. Attributing Gurindji cultural authority to Dexter Daniels, a Roper River man, locates some of the implications of whiteness; of thinking in terms most familiar (Attwood 2000: 10). Lupgna Giari dismissed such a notion some 30 years prior to Attwood’s claim (Hardy 1976: 32). Similarly, Vincent Lingiari and Dexter Daniels own accounts articulate cultural authority that challenge Attwood’s interpretation (Ibid: 72). Gurindji cultural authority was recognised by Tom Fisher, the manager of Wave Hill station at the time of the walkout (Ibid: 74).

Attwood’s focus on the role of white supporters in mediating ‘the claim for land at Wave Hill’, the ‘interpretive narratives’, highlights the role of differentiated consent (2000: 5). Participant aims were ‘given expression by Hardy’; the support
it fostered required a withdrawal of differentiated consent (Long 1992: 6). The walkout was essential to the garnering of broader support, a withdrawal of white consent for the racist practices in the Pastoral Industry and challenges to the inadequate levels of respect and recognition from which this racism emerged (see Sharp 1973). Attwood does not note this, however. He emphasises the role of white supporters as shaping actions, including the relocation to Wattie Creek as ‘planned’ by Frank Hardy (Attwood 2000: 26). This contrasts with the accounts of participants.

The emphasis on wages and interpretations of white supporters mediating and planning what was to happen at Wave Hill locate paternalism in Attwood’s analysis. Frank Hardy was aware of and ‘conscientiously resisted paternalism’ (Hokari 2001a: 128). He expressed distaste at the paternalism of the NAWU and the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, before the walkout at Wave Hill: ‘Not one Aborigine had been called to give evidence’ (Hardy 1976: 14). Unions and other officials considered Aboriginal peoples unable to comprehend the issues, nor represent themselves. Riddett’s critique, dismissed by Attwood, expressed the racist assumptions clearly (Attwood 2000: 4-5; Riddett 1997: 52).32

Attwood’s emphasis on the union and the role of Dexter Daniels, de-emphasising the agency of participants, emerge from such notions. Aspects of *Terra Knowlegius* shape this interpretation (Moreton-Robinson 1999: 32). Attwood’s explanation of cultural authority rests on more than the notion that all knowledge is knowable; it locates an assumption that his interpretation is more accurate, truer, than that of Gurindji elders. White people can not only know, understand and possess Aboriginal knowledge and culture, they can do so better (see Davis 1996;...

---

32 Tony Abbott’s (Federal Health Minister in 2006) call for a renewal of paternalistic government policies exposes contemporary assumptions about Aboriginal peoples in Australia (Metherell & Peatling 2006). Under the Howard government’s *intervention* in the Northern Territory, perhaps more aptly described as their *Northern Territory solution* is one manifestation of this (Howard & Brough 2007).
Metallic & Monture-Angus 2002; Smallacombe 2000; Tully 2000). Further example of this is visible in Attwood’s analysis of participant action in the wake of increasing support:

In the weeks following the walk-off, the ‘ strikers ’ reportedly grew in confidence as they realised they had allies to protect and assist them (Attwood 2000: 9).

This increased confidence translated to a ‘ growing assertiveness ‘ which Attwood draws from Stan Davey’s, secretary of the Federal Council on the Advancement of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders (FCAATSI), observations:

They feel they have the leadership for the first time and are prepared to stand by it and to free themselves from the white man’s thumb (Ibid).

In contrast to agency, translating in action to meet their own aims, participants would stand by the actions of white supporters. It is assumed that white supporters know best and only white supporters can lead the necessary actions. This is predicated on assumptions of inferiority, ‘ primitivism ‘ emanating from colonial whiteness unmarked (see Frankenberg 2001; Moreton-Robinson 2004).

Hokari’s indicated a willingness on the part of those living at Daguragu to tell their story. He experienced this in formulating his research. Of the ten different Aboriginal communities he contacted, three communities who responded. The Gurindji were the only ones to do so positively (Hokari 2001a: 3-4). He located this willingness as emergent following the transfer of legal title (in 1986), 20 years after the walkout. The accommodation of white terms became less important (Hokari 2000: 113). A newspaper interview, published in the lead up to the 40th anniversary of the walkout, provides further indication of this. Jampijinpa, Rangiari ‘ and the other surviving stockmen want to tell their stories so they will never be forgotten ‘:

I start to think that a lot of people need to get that story.
We will give them that story and tell them about things, about that story too (Murdoch 2006).

Exposing the paternalism and colonial whiteness present in white interpretations and scholarship on the walkout provides a foundation to engage with praxis in contemporary society. Oral historical accounts have been shown to provide a clear contrast to white interpretations. In exposing aspects of Attwood’s interpretations, exposing how whiteness is manifested in contemporary scholarship locates persistent themes to look for in the assumptions and actions of white supporters. The following chapter engages in this task.

At Sandon Point, has the experiences at Wave Hill and the passing of 40 years since the walkout altered the means and approach to affording support? How different are approaches to respect and recognition in the Red Hill Valley? To what extent are strategic resistant practices, paradigmatic accommodation, present (Hess 1994; Hoagland 2007)? And to what extent do they shape and influence the mobilisation of white support? How much have the spaces created by activism at each locale, and the associated praxis of listening, challenged unmarked colonial assumptions and altered white support, respect and recognition (Smallacombe 2000; Tully 1995)? These are some of the questions reflected on in the following chapters.
THREE
Until Australian governments, at all levels, respect the wisdom of the Elders and Lawmen of our senior cultural partners, on matters of their own culture, the hope for the reconciliation embodied in these words, and the events which engendered them, will not be reflected in the broader Australian community.

Community Advertisement (various 2002)

...reconciliation 'to' implies a relationship of unequal power whereby a dominant agent can render another submissive, whilst reconciliation 'with' does not necessarily imply such a relationship.

Nicoll (2002)

During night of 7 March 1998 heavy seas partly exposed skeletal remains in the fore-dunes of McCauleys Beach, located between the coastal villages of Bulli and Thirroul, part of the northern suburbs of the Illawarra region on the east coast of (NSW) Australia. Somewhat pre-empted by the emergence of these remains, the area—known as Sandon Point—was embroiled in a dispute over its future. This one event, specifically its ramifications for Aboriginal and other residents concerned about the future of the area, forms the context for this chapter.
The burial, on investigation by members of the local Aboriginal community, with supporting archaeologists, proved to be of considerable significance. This westernised significance provides just one indication of the implications of the ‘discovery’. This basis for the scientific significance continues to receive discussion and attention. In line with the prefigurative and reflective aims of this thesis, and contrasting with predominant references to the burial, outlining the significance of the presence of these remains as expressed by members of the local Aboriginal community will be introduced first.

Alongside the exposure of the remains in the fore-dunes of McCauley’s Beach there was another crucial factor that provides context for the community actions.

Figure 5. Location of Sandon Point
Stockland Trust Group (herein referred to as Stockland)—a multi-billion dollar corporate entity with a major focus on the acquisition and conversion of freehold lands for housing—began acquiring land at Sandon Point in the late 1990s. Following acquisition, Stockland announced its controversial multi-staged residential proposal for the Sandon Point area. This proposal continues to face community opposition, and at the time of writing, remains several years behind schedule. It is in the context of this residential proposal that community resistance is located and engaged with. The implications of Enlightenment notions of progress are central to this engagement.

The dispute at Sandon Point emerged from the implications of the exposure of the skeletal remains of 7 March 1998. This chapter engages with how the surfacing of these remains has impacted on and shaped community resistance to the Stockland proposal. The dispute that these remains have become increasingly embroiled within has a history—Aboriginal and white—that extends back in time significantly beyond this. The future of this dispute however, is inextricably tied to these remains and their broader context. What is in question is the future of the approximately 61-hectares within which these remains are located, specifically, and the broader and far-reaching implications of whiteness. This is clear in the mediation of actions taken by the local community in supporting local Aboriginal peoples’ still-ongoing attempts to have this area preserved and protected.

Reflecting this mediation, focus is given to the actions of the local (white) community in providing support to Aboriginal calls for protection and preservation. Reflexive engagement with the actions taken draws from the diverse yet interlinked theoretical perspectives explored in chapter two and the analysis provided in the preceding chapter. Scholarship exposing the implications of the colonial context in which the offered support provides a basis to expose unmarked assumptions of whiteness (see Haggis 2004; Metallic & Monture-Angus 2002; Moreton-Robinson 2004; Nicoll 2002; Simpson 2000; Smallacombe 2000; Tully 1995). Drawing from scholarship on technological bluff provides an extension on the engagement of the preceding chapter, reflective of differences in context (Ellul 1990; Moore 1998; Son 2004). Assumptions shaping technological
discourse provide a means to consider the scientific hierarchisation of knowledges that facilitates aspects of *Terra Knowlegius*, the politics of representation and the evidentiary burden central to archaeology: the boundary work of western science (Gieryn 1995; Metallic & Monture-Angus 2002; Moreton-Robinson 1999; Smallacombe 2000; Tully 2000). Bennett’s work on the Exhibitionary complex and recent debates in Australia regarding museums and cultural centres provide further critique and empirical material (Bennett 1990, 1994; Mateer 2000; Mickler 1990; Morton 2004; Russell 2000). A Foucauldian understanding of the power|knowledge relation provides a common linkage (Hindess 1996; Hoy 1986).

The aim of engagement is positive. It is not intended to denigrate or detract from the actions taken by the local community. A profound experience as a participant observer is the more than willingness on the part of individuals (both individually and collectively), once aware of the implications of whiteness, to seek to address these and work towards changing themselves. The spaces created by activism were transformative, shaped by the praxis of listening (Simpson 2000; Tully 1995). What has and continues to be shown is a desire to act appropriately. It needs be stated that this is not thought of in the terms of whiteness, rather under the rubric of notions including social justice, reconciliation (a reconstruction of ‘practical reconciliation’), and restorative justice. Perhaps extending these, the actions taken appear to be clearly based on mutual respect—albeit still embodying a number of implications of whiteness as this chapter will detail—and reflects the critical challenge of Lila Watson’s (1992) ‘let’s work together’. The question that needs to be asked is whether the actions constitute reconciliation to or reconciliation with (Nicoll 1993). To what extent do good intentions render aspects of whiteness unmarked (Riggs 2004b)?

In providing an overview of the significance of the Sandon Point area as espoused by members of the local Aboriginal community, the emergence of a point of contention requires consideration. This is the increasing awareness amongst
supporters of the skewed gendered (i.e. male) focus of the considered significance of the Sandon Point area. This is engaged with to consider the implications of patriarchy in affording status to male knowledge alongside the contestation of this and repeated strident, if only from the margins, white community calls for consideration of women’s significance.

Given these challenges, complexities and varied specificities that require consideration, the context for the dispute over the future of the Sandon Point area can be further elaborated. Having already, albeit very briefly, indicated the significance of the area to local Aboriginal people, an overview of the Stockland proposal and the process of its existence becoming publicly known is telling.

ANOTHER ‘OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY’?
The McCauleys Beach at Sandon Point: Masterplan Report was released in May 2002. The report was released following negotiations, over a number of years, between Stockland and other landholders at Sandon Point: principally BHP (now BHP Billiton) and Sydney Water (previously the Water Board). There were a number of indications that such a proposal was in the works well in advance of

---

33 Gendered significance was visible prior to this. As will be indicated, significance relating to ‘men’s business’ is predominant throughout the period studied. The significance of the area based on ‘women’s business’ has received some attention during this time. What will be explored is the patriarchal nature of whiteness in that men’s business dominated. There were white women continually referring to significance of the area to local Aboriginal women, yet the patriarchal basis of the predominance of men’s business issues did not become fully visible and receive discussion until mid 2006—in what can be somewhat ironic, this emanated from a white male. The increased awareness of women’s business has led to an increased awareness in attacks on Aboriginal women who have publicly expressed the significance of the area to them.

34 The acquisition of what is commonly referred to as the Sydney Water land continues to be contentious, with ongoing calls for an investigation into allegations of corruption and impropriety. A ICAC investigation, requested by members of the community for many years, into staff at Wollongong City has further fuelled the controversy.
the land sale negotiations, with many in the local community raising specific concerns. Concerns over the future of the Sandon Point area led to the establishment of the Northern Illawarra Residents Action Group (NIRAG) in the early 1980s. SPATE and the Community Picket were established in November 2000 and May 2001 respectively—prior to the release of the masterplan report.

Figure 6. The Sandon Point area (2006)

A number of documents were prepared and studies undertaken over a period of more than seven years prior to the release of this report. Archaeological studies to
meet regulatory requirements for housing began in 1992. One year later the *Local Environment Study: Sandon Point* was published (unknown 1993b). What followed was the publication of many studies in rapid succession. These include: *Further Archaeological Investigations: Sandon Point, Wollongong, NSW* (Navin 1993); *Contamination Assessment of BHP Steel Collieries property at Sandon Point, Bulli* (unknown 1993a); *Geotechnical Evaluation Sandon Point, Bulli* (unknown 1994b); *Review of Sandon Point Local Environment Study* (unknown 1994c); *Contamination Assessment (Stage II) of BHP Steel Collieries property at Sandon Point, Bulli* (unknown 1994a); and *A review of flooding issues identified in the Sandon Point Local Environmental Study for Wollongong City Council* (unknown 1995b). This rush of studies led to the release of *Amended draft: Development Control Plan 94/17 for land between Sandon Point and East Thirroul* (unknown 1996a) and *Amended: Development Control Plan 94/17 for land between Sandon Point and East Thirroul* (unknown 1998a). Shortly after the release of the first Development Control Plan (DCP), the *Sandon Point Residential Subdivision, Thirroul* (unknown 1996b) was released. The latter report was commissioned by Stockland, its scope limited to the southern most portion of the Sandon Point area south of Tramway Creek.

Wollongong City Council re-zoned the majority of the Sandon Point area as

---

35 The first study, a “walk-over” by Kerry Navin, followed an *artefact*, later to be identified as a circumcision stone by Uncle Guboo, being found. The exact location of the item—referred to in archaeological reports as *Isolated Find 1 (IF1)*—is a point of contention. It has been argued that where it was found was changed on *official* maps given that it was situated in a location that would be a barrier to the approval of a housing lot (the potential value of the lot exceeding $1 million).

36 The differences between these two documents is a source of controversy. Heritage listing that indicated protection of the southern-most portion of the Sandon Point area, included in the 1996 document and subject to community consultation, was removed prior to the adoption of the 1998 (not subjected to community consultation) document. This opened up the area to housing (Salter 2003).
residential in 1997 and the DCP (1996 amended draft) came into effect.\textsuperscript{37} In May of 1998 the findings of the exhumation and archaeological examination of the Kuradji burial (Fullagar & Donlon 1998) was published and the completed DCP was adopted by Wollongong City Council (unknown 1998b). Stockland subsequently negotiated purchase of land held by Sydney Water and the southern portions of the Sandon Point area. The sale of the Sydney Water land to Stockland was finalised in June 1991 without any public consultation. This land included the location of the Kuradji burial and a number of other identified Aboriginal sites (Salter 2003).

The Stockland proposal, which has undergone numerous changes, encompasses the conversion of as much of the site as legally permissible into housing. The increase in population from the proposal is in the order of 3000 people.\textsuperscript{38} The future of the Cookson Plibrico refractory, providing close to 100 local jobs, was compromised by the Stockland proposal. Stockland had earmarked the area occupied by the Cookson facilities for housing from an early stage, with this facing significant opposition. In late 2004 Anglican Retirement Villages (ARV) produced a proposal for an aged care facility for the Cookson site (including the Turpentine Forest).

\textbf{BROAD-BASED OPPOSITION... AND AN ALTERNATIVE}

NIRAG was formed to facilitate a united voice against a BHP proposal to build two 20 metre high coal bins, an associated conveyer system and rail loop in the south-western portion of the Sandon Point area.\textsuperscript{39} The approach adopted by NIRAG was

\textsuperscript{37} The 1997 State of the Environment Report, produced by Wollongong City Council, indicates, incorrectly, that the State Government rezoned the land.

\textsuperscript{38} The residential density proposed was far in excess of surrounding areas and the population increase would equal that of adjacent suburbs (Cleland & Carleton 2003b; Salter 2003).

\textsuperscript{39} Stages 1-6 of the Stockland proposal equate to this area.
to petition for the land at the southern portion of the Sandon Point area to be rezoned as residential, thus prohibiting the industrial BHP proposal. The implications of this were seen as a lesser problem to that of the coal bins, given different approaches to residential estates at the time. The Aboriginal significance of the area was not considered.

The scientific study of the Sandon Point area in the 1990s correlated with an increasing emergence of community concerns over the future of the area. The release of the Sandon Point Residential Subdivision, Thirroul (unknown 1996b) led to increased community activity. The exposure of the Kuradji burial in 1998 was the defining point in the history of the current dispute. It was the burial’s exposure that led to a dramatic increase in public awareness of the usage and significance of the area to local Aboriginal people. This parallels increases in support afforded

Figure 7. The Community Picket\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{40} Image courtesy Sandon Point Community Picket
the walkout at Wave Hill, as detailed in chapter three.

Following the formation of SPATE in December 2000, Max Ackerman, president of NIRAG, sought permission from SPATE to establish the Community Picket. Dootch (Roy Kennedy), as SPATEs representative, provided a written letter detailing the basis for SPATEs establishment and ground rules for the picket. The letter was dated 23 February 2001:

To Whom It May Concern,

On behalf of the Sandon Point Aboriginal Tent Embassy we grant the above named persons and their representatives permission to come onto Country to establish and staff a 24 hour-a-day Peaceful Protest Camp.

This camp has been established with the intention of preventing any disturbance to lands within the boundaries of Kuradji.

We support this move and regard the Peaceful Protest camp as an annex to the Sandon Point Aboriginal Tent Embassy that is situated on the banks of Bugeen Creek at Kuradjii.

The coals for the fire at the Peaceful Protest Camp are from Sacred Fires currently burning at Aboriginal Embassy’s across Australia. Therefore the fire is subject to the same rules and protocols i.e.; (around the sacred fire, there is to be no lighting of cigarettes, drinking of alcohol, & no spitting).

Yours in Unity, Dootch (Roy Kennedy) (Spokesperson for SPATE)

This written approval was addressed to Max Ackerman and members of NIRAG.
The letter was prominently displayed at the Picket for all to see. The Picket comprised a small ‘caravan’ with a bed inside, a covered room outside for people to sit together, a couple filing cabinets, a fire/BBQ and a table for the display of information and petitions. The South Coast Labour Council (SCLC), endorsed the Picket and placed a ‘green ban’ on the site.\(^4\)

A description of participants was provided in *The Sandon Point*—a broadsheet published by the local community:

> A genuinely eclectic mix of local identities, surfers, coal miners, steel workers, retirees, professionals, students, families, the employed and unemployed, locals and blow-ins. Over the years, they have galvanized into an unusually cohesive and culturally-enriching group. The strength of their commitment has resulted in a 24-hour on-site picket & information centre... This display of their resolve demonstrates the depth of their fury at the manner in which this development proposal has been managed from the outset (Brown 2002: 1).

Contrasting with the Stockland proposal, members of the local community published their own vision for the area: the *Proposal for an Illawarra Regional Foreshores Park* (Miller & Miller 2001). The document outlining this proposal explored the many and varied concerns regarding the future of the area, and the

\(^4\) The actions of the SCLC, specifically its support of community’s the Valentines Day Blockade, received attention at the Royal Commission into the Building and Construction Industry (Cole 2002). The Royal Commission has been referred to as a ‘political witch hunt’ against unions (Failes 2001).
many reasons for both/and its protection. These issues included (aside from Aboriginal significance): diverse ecological factors; flooding; local infrastructure; public/open space; social costs; and, European heritage issues.

The Sandon Point area was central to the Proposal for an Illawarra Regional Foreshores Park. A holistic approach was outlined in the preamble, opening with:

We, as residents of the Northern Illawarra, propose that a Regional Park be created along the foreshores from Thirroul to Kiama. The Illawarra currently has no regional park, and this is a situation which should be rectified by the NSW State Government. The Illawarra Foreshores Regional Parklands would be formed by a string of "pearls" linked by the existing and extended cycleway/walkway.

This Regional Park has the potential to provide open space and recreation for the people of the Illawarra and south-western Sydney, as well as attracting NSW, interstate and international tourists. If fully implemented the concept would provide significant direct and indirect local employment opportunities and economic benefits (Ibid).

Statutory provisions for regional parks were implemented in 1996 through amendments to the National Parks and Wildlife Act (NPW Act). A category of protected area was created to enable certain lands to be reserved. The definition specified that:

the areas to be reserved as regional parks are areas that have been substantially modified since European

---

42 For a discussion of the both/and way of thinking—as a contrast and challenge to either/or binary, see hooks (2003).
PRACTICAL RECONCILIATION AT SANDON POINT

occupation and that:

(i) are capable of providing open space and recreational opportunities for major regional population centres, and

(ii) are unsuitable for reservation or dedication as another category of land under this Act (Evans 1996).

A feature of the community proposal was the establishment of an *Aboriginal Cultural Centre* at Sandon Point. Two of the documents four main sections refer to the proposed cultural centre: ‘economic’ and ‘social’. The first direct reference falls with the subsection of ‘tourism’, an economic factor:

The *Regional Park* would provide a focus to encourage greater tourism to the Illawarra. The park would offer a string of open space areas along the foreshores, linked by a cycle/walking track, and could provide services such as car parking, bike hire, skateboarding, wetland bird viewing platforms, picnic shelters, food kiosks, restaurants, heritage walks and information, and an Aboriginal heritage and cultural centre. The parklands could also offer an outdoor venue for local artists, musicians and other performers. Within the Sandon Point area, east-west extensions of the existing bicycle track have the potential to link other tourist facilities such as the Illawarra Grevillea Park and the proposed Bulli Mine Museum, and onwards along the Throsby Track to the Escarpment. *The Regional Parklands would provide a great tourist attraction, particularly for western Sydney residents.*

The *Stocklands Development* would greatly detract from tourism within the area, as the proposed medium density housing links Thirroul with Bulli, removing the "village" and
open space visual aspect of the area. This development would be highly visible from Bulli Pass and the Escarpment scenic lookout, and would dominate the landscape along the bicycle/walking track. Why would people want to visit an area which looks just like an extension of the suburbs of Sydney? *The development not only adds nothing to tourism in the region, it greatly detracts from tourism potential* (Miller & Miller 2001).

There are a number of unmarked assumptions in this excerpt that require unpacking to expose their implications. On the surface, Aboriginal heritage as a tourist attraction embodies notions of Aboriginality as a spectacle, a cultural centre as a window into the past with the subject being a no longer living/surviving culture (Bennett 1990, 1994; Mickler 1990; Smallacombe 2000). Enlightenment notions of progress are embedded within such assumptions—value can be added to the site through the preferred ‘development’, relationally positioned to the inappropriate Stockland proposal.

Relationally positioning different forms of development renders assumptions embodied in the notion of development itself unquestioned, much like a good/bad racism dualism. Ellul’s concept of technique as a modern phenomenon, of technological bluff as hegemonic, is visible in use of the term *development*. This can be seen in comparing different approaches to the notion of development as progress. Contemporary use of the term development can be contrasted with an initially small community campaign that spawned an (in)famous labour and environmental movement now referred to as the birth of ‘green bans’ (Burgmann & Burgmann 1998; Burgmann 1993; Hardman & Manning 1975; Mundey 1981; Roddewig 1978; Thomas 1973).

The roots of this movement began when a local residents action group, almost exclusively comprised of middle-class white women, in Sydney’s inner west contacted the NSW branch of the Builders Labourers’ Federation (BLF). The NSW BLF was approached after a proposal to clear 12 acres or remnant vegetation fronting to Parramatta River for a 147-house residential estate was announced.
Alongside its water frontage, the ‘value’ of the site for AV Jennings (the ‘developer’) was based on its views of the Sydney Harbour Bridge. The NSW BLF considered the issue with regard to its emerging radical perspective on the social responsibility of labour and placed a ‘ban’ on its members working on the site. This would later be referred to as the world’s first ‘green ban’. This phenomenon was to soon grip development in Sydney for more than a decade, causing widespread disputes and leading to the protection of many places now valued across Sydney including ‘The Rocks’ precinct (Burgmann & Burgmann 1998; Burgmann 1993; Hardman & Manning 1975; Kerr 2001; Mundey 1981; Roddewig 1978; Thomas 1973).\(^{43}\)

What is of relevance to this research is not the campaigns success in protecting Kelly’s Bush nor the subsequent use of green bans and the international phenomena that it spawned (see, for example, Bob Brown, reproduced in Burgmann & Burgmann 1998: 9-10). This is not to suggest they have not played a role in the Sandon Point dispute, as a green ban was imposed early on, rather the importance lies with the references to the residential proposal by those involved in the Kelly’s Bush dispute. Neville Wran’s (NSW Premier at the time) acquiescence to the union-backed community calls for protection embodied hegemonic assumptions about progress visible in the actions of white supporters at Sandon Point. Wran’s 1977 announcement included the decision that ‘no development would take place at Kelly’s Bush’ (Kerr 2001: 2).

\(^{43}\) The national body of the BLF attacked the NSW BLF. The branch was considered by many to be too radical based on both its declarations of Green Bans and its challenging many of the bureaucratic structures implicit in the self-serving union movement. Limited tenure of office and pay equivalent to that of the members being represented were two fundamental principles adopted by the progressive organising body of the NSW branch that challenged to status quo and interests of the union bureaucracy. There were also other factors for the infighting, emanating from different perspectives and affiliations. This, in part, emanated from divergent links to the different factions of the Communist Party of Australia between the National and NSW branches of the union.
What is at stake here is the reference to residential and other such proposals (i.e. commercial, industrial, or infrastructure) as developments. Whilst the focus here is usage by local communities or more organised environmental groups/activists attempting to preserve environs, its usage by proponents is also of concern. In regards to the former, challenges to the notion of ‘development as progress’ are effectively undermined by, for example, descriptions of companies promoting controversial projects as ‘developers’. Of note generally, deeply embodied in referring to such proposals—whether they have positive or negative impacts socially, environmentally or otherwise—is the ‘ideology of science as an inevitable and necessary means of salvation’ (Son 2004: 520).

Similarly, assumptions located within this tourism subsection are contrasted with counter hegemonic aspects of the proposal, outlined under ‘ Aboriginal Sacred Site’, with this listed as a social aspect. Respect and recognition are central features, expressed as a contrast with the Stockland proposal:

The Regional Park would preserve and protect the Sandon Point Aboriginal sacred site, thus providing a tangible example of the process of Reconciliation. Tourist and recreational facilities would be developed only in close consultation with local Aboriginal representatives. The wetlands and surrounds would be restored to as near natural condition as possible. An Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Centre at the site would provide an opportunity to educate the community and overseas visitors about Aboriginal culture, and promote understanding. Other important Aboriginal heritage sites between Bulli and Kiama would be preserved and managed within the regional parklands. The park would prevent a sacred site, known as Kuradji, from being destroyed, and promote Reconciliation.

The Stocklands Development would cover a sacred site with residential housing, and build close to the sacred
burial site. The development would destroy forever a sacred site, and demonstrates a complete lack of respect for indigenous cultural and religious beliefs (Miller & Miller 2001).

Does this outline transcend the good/bad racism dualism as defined by Riggs (2004)? There are expressions illustrating a level of awareness of the importance of the area as expressed by SPATE. References to close ‘consultation with local Aboriginal representatives’ and the promotion of reconciliation provide an indication of attempts at prefiguration. The ‘tangible example’ of the reconciliation promoted contrasts with the ‘practical reconciliation’ promoted by the conservative Federal government of the time: ‘an ideologically-driven policy approach designed to undermine the rights-based approach to reconciliation developed under the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation’ (unknown 2005). Yet it is referred to as such. The proposal similarly challenges symbolic reconciliation in the sense of policy ‘on paper’ with little actual outcomes or benefits. Is this reconciliation ‘to’ or reconciliation ‘with’ (Nicoll 2002)? It is both. The Picket was established based on respect for and recognition of SPATE. As the regional park proposal indicates, however, paternalism shaped the concept, with white people deciding what was best—speaking for. The regional Park proposal is framed by white terms. Some form of ‘development’ (i.e. improvement) is central.

Respect and recognition are central to the Picket’s support for SPATE. As exposure to the wishes of SPATE increased, so to did community support—the spaces created by activism have proven transformative. Awareness of the expressed Aboriginal significance of the area provides a foundational basis for understanding the context of the dispute and the actions of the Picket. How this awareness increased locates whiteness as hegemonic: its role in shaping perceptions of Aboriginal culture at Sandon Point and the ways in which this mediated white support.

ABORIGINAL HISTORY AND THE DOUBLE BIND
The Sandon Point area forms part, and is located at the end, of a dreaming trail.
This dreaming trail is of significance to the northern Illawarra region and continues to be used as a meeting place for Aboriginal peoples from the north, south and west. Dreamtime stories refer to the roaming of spirit ancestors during which all life was created. These ancestors eventually became trees, rocks, rivers and animals, thus providing a basis for all life beyond Aboriginal peoples (for examples located in the Illawarra region, see Organ 1990).

Ruben Brown, chairperson of the Korewal Eloura Jerrugaraugh Aboriginal Corporation (KEJ), details that the Sandon Point area:

was and still is a very significant place... [It] was the meeting place where the Chief of the Illawarra would meet the Chief of the Gundagarra People to trade and tell their stories.

Sandon Point is a very significant area to me and my people... it is of spiritual significance and part of our cultural heritage. Every Aboriginal that occupied these lands used these tracks to move throughout their territory and meet with our people... stories have been passed down orally. This land is not unsung land it is of ancient and sacred significance... (emphasis added, reproduced in Navin & Officer 2001c).

It was only very recently that the significance of the Sandon Point area to Aboriginal women received any regulatory consideration. The vast majority of ‘officially’ recorded oral historical accounts published are sourced from Aboriginal

---

44 KEJ is a ‘legal’ Aboriginal corporation representing (not exclusively) Aboriginal people from the greater Illawarra region. This ‘Aboriginal Corporation’ is often referred to as the Korewal = La Perouse = Eloura = Illawarra = Jerrungaraugh = Shoalhaven Tribal Elders: Aboriginal Corporation linking the white place names La Perouse, Illawarra and Shoalhaven with there Aboriginal sources.
males. Patriarchal white sovereignty locates a basis for this gender bias. Members of the Picket continued to challenge this. It was only recently that anthropologists and archaeologists sought out Aboriginal women’s voices. The first detailed attention to women’s significance was in a report prepared by Stuart Huys of Australian Archaeological Survey Consultants (Huys 2006).

A number of prior studies and reports referred to women’s significance in vague terms. Kevin Cleland and Mark Carleton’s Land use planning for certain land at Sandon Point, Wollongong City report emanating from the Sandon Point Commission of Inquiry (the COI) refers to women’s significance on a number of occasions (2003: 54, 67, 69, 81, 89 & 90). Mary Dallas, a consulting archaeologist who undertook investigations into one specific and compartmentalised area at Sandon Point, referred to women’s significance in her subsequent report (Dallas 2005). A larger study undertaken by Therin and Bennet—also consulting archaeologists—made a number of references to a ‘Women’s site’ (Therin & Bennet 2003: 63, 96 & 85). The Huys report and that prepared by Dallas refer to this study as providing base detail.

The Huys report provides the most detailed information regarding the significance of the Sandon Point area to Aboriginal women. Prior to this report, references to women’s significance (i.e. the COI, Dallas, Therin & Bennet reports) were largely anecdotal, emanating from Aboriginal men or members of the white community as opposed to sourced from Aboriginal women. The summarised accounts provided by Huys are from interviews and site walks in February and April 2006—some 8 years after the exposure of the Kuradji burial site.

As with Wave Hill, there is emphasis on one specific site. Generally referred to in previous studies (i.e. based on anecdotal accounts), the Huys report locates this site as:

---

45 The area covered by the COI is shown in Figure 13, appendix 1.
the area on the north side of Tramway Creek, where the present day remnant Turpentine Forest is located, was a very significant ‘Womens area’, where women from various parts of the South Coast would periodically come together, and where a range of activities were carried out. This would include birthing, ceremonies, the gathering of food resources etc (Huys 2006: 40).

These women provided a more detailed explanation of the size of the area referred to. Their description challenges the scientific compartmentalisation of this site and non-consideration beyond physical aspects that may be provable:

the ‘Womens area’ is not defined by the present day extent of the Turpentine Forest. Instead, they believe that the ‘Womens area’ would have “extended south and east along Tramway Creek, all the way to the sea...”. It is also [sic] originally extended north beyond Wilkies track and west beyond the railway, incorporating the main spur line that the Wilkies Track runs down” (Ibid: 56).

The portrayal of ‘belief’ locates white assumptions, the relegation of Aboriginal knowledge as inferior, unscientific, disqualified (Smart 1986: 164; Turnbull 2000). These themes persist, visible in further interpretations of significance. The women interviewed

strongly assert that the ‘Womens area’ is of high significance to themselves, and to other ‘Women Elders” of the region (Huys 2006: 57).

46 The grammar ‘Womens area’ persists throughout the Huys Report.

47 Present for the site inspection was a local (female) resident and a white male—aside from Stewart Huys and the participants.
The women were particularly interested in the spirituality and cultural significance of the Turpentine Forest, from a traditional and contemporary perspective. Both women felt a religious need to undergo a secret ceremony before going on site (Ibid).

In re-naming the area Kuradji during the establishment of SPATE in December 2000, Uncle Guboo stipulated ‘no houses’ were to be built at Sandon Point. The women interviewed provided a similar stipulation, expressing the implications of not heeding it. They

*felt* that the “whole place”, extending from the escarpment to the sea, was sacred and culturally important and should be preserved. To destroy the place would damage their folklore traditions which relate to and rely on country (emphasis added, Ibid).

Huys again adopted emotive, in contrast to perceived as rational, language in summarising the accounts. 48

The context of these and other interviews require consideration. AASC (Huys) was engaged by the NSW Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources (DIPNR) after the COI recommended further investigation to determine

---

48 This is not the only incident of emotive language. Such language is only used in reference to the accounts of female participants. There is a clear correlation and contrast with the summaries of male participants and the perceived rational knowledge they express (as deemed superior to emotive). Rational knowledge attributed to the male Aboriginal participants is repeatedly couched or contextualised with the potential to scientifically prove. Specifically, this significance is physical in nature and thus there exists the possibility to determine the extent of such physical significance through scientific methods.
area’s suitability for ‘development’ (Cleland & Carleton 2003b). Kerry Navin and Kelvin Officer (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants) were engaged by Stockland to support its residential proposal, Therin by WCC, and Dallas by Anglican Retirement Villages. Ruben Brown’s account was shared with Navin Officer for the preparation of a report, required under existing legislation, supporting physical destruction and desecration of the Sandon Point area for the Stockland proposed residential estate.

Chapter three engaged with the recording of oral historical accounts, and white interpretations of these. At Wave Hill the aims of the participants were interpreted as ‘indeterminate’ and ‘not pre-determined’ (Attwood 2000). Smallacombe (2000) has explored the implications of the assumptions shaping such perceptions, the construction of Aboriginal actions. Constructions based on colonial manifestations of a perceived inferiority; a superiority of white ways of knowing and seeing. Tully (1995), amongst others (Metallic & Monture-Angus 2002; Rose 1991; Weber 2000), has also reflected on the implications of the colonial terms and language in which discourse is constrained.

The basis for sharing knowledge influenced what was shared, when and how—often shaped by the logic of resistance (Hoagland 2007). Riley Young Winplin’s account of the role Tipujurn had with the pre-planning for the walkout contrasts with many white interpretations, including that of Attwood (2000):

He used to come out telling us: ‘We gotta get this land back. Don’t tell anybody’… (reproduced in Rose 1991: 226).

There is correlation between the level of support available and the depth of white awareness regarding Aboriginal significance at Sandon Point and Wave Hill. Yuin Elder, Uncle Guboo, ‘the last initiated tribal elder of the South Coast’, made a similar statement that has become inextricably tied to the actions at Sandon Point—even though not made in direct reference to it (Newstead 2002):

These are sacred matters which must be kept quiet… We
only talk about these things when we are forced to do so in order to protect our sacred sites from ignorant white people to whom only the dollar is sacred (reproduced in Byrne 1984: 2).

Uncle Guboo made this statement during the campaign to save and protect Gulaga (Mumbulla Mountain). It clearly located agency, often masked by the strategic use of resistant practices, and use of the masters tools against himself (Bailey 2007: 87). The implications of these actions, after many years, led to NSW Premier Neville Wran, in 1979, to end logging on Gulaga, opening the way for ‘the first land rights settlement’ in NSW (Newstead 2002).

In contrast to the actions at Wave Hill, Uncle Guboo’s statement of forced acquiescence, *Terra Knowlegius*, was made in the context of threatened desecration of sacred sites. Navin Officer interviewed Ruben Brown in a similar context. His accounts were recorded for a report specifically written (and legally required) to support desecration (unknown 2002b).

There is a recurrent theme, identified by Huys, regarding support amongst the local Aboriginal community for further subsurface archaeological testing at Sandon Point. Introductory remarks of the Huys report refer to this, alongside the context of his approach and assumptions regarding archaeological study:

One of the main issues raised by all the Indigenous stakeholder groups consulted during Stage 1 of the project was that they were *hesitant* to support sub-surface investigations that may *unnecessarily* impact upon Aboriginal sites located within the COI [area]. The Indigenous stakeholders would *prefer* to have these sites protected and left undisturbed (emphasis added, Huys 2006).

Huys reports on this dichotomous relationship: that subsurface investigation would be supported if it were the only potential means available to secure
regulatory protection. He does not explore this, however. Inclusion of such remarks, indicating an awareness of this imposed binary, is constructed as good archaeology: the wishes of the Aboriginal people involved are noted. A dualistic boundary is created; this is good, as opposed to bad, science (Gieryn 1995). These are the actions of a good white anti-racist as defined by Riggs (2004). The wishes of those interviewed were noted only. Good science would determine the actual value of the area. Colonial implications of western science are not considered (Simpson 2000; Smallacombe 2000).

Huys' assumptions embody more than Terra Knowlegius (Moreton-Robinson 1999). Beyond assuming Aboriginal knowledge is available and knowable, Aboriginal knowledge can be known more thoroughly and objectively and rationally via science. Scientific analysis would transcend the emotive and spiritual intangibles embedded within Aboriginal knowledge, providing a defined formulaic resolution to an acceptable (i.e. white) standard. Aboriginal stakeholders should find comfort given the sympathetic approach:

One of the main tasks stipulated in the project brief was to prepare a research methodology for the comprehensive archaeological subsurface investigation of the study area, and to carry out these sub-surface investigations. In consideration of the feedback received from the Indigenous stakeholder groups, AASC decided that it would be prudent to take a conservative approach to field work investigations (emphasis added, Huys 2006).

Uncle Guboo’s statement highlights the precarious position imposed on Aboriginal peoples, contrasting with Huys’ methodology and stated conservative approach. Deference to rational methods, and a requirement for white standards of proof, remain central. In summarising previous archaeological studies, Huys' belief in the superiority of scientistic knowledge is stated:

Based on their findings, Navin Officer (2001) argue that there is no evidence for cultural features on the site area
and that it is doubtful that spatial information relating to Aboriginal behaviours can be reliably identified from the present artefact distribution (Huys 2006: 24).

Deference to what is both ‘physical’ and ‘evidence’ illustrate a perceived need to ‘prove’ significance with what is considered tangible only through scientific investigation—irrespective of the implied good intentions of Huys via his conservative approach. The evidentiary burden is unjust in itself, and judged on white terms (Monture-Angus 1995; Tully 1995: 34).

Huys’ interview summaries repeatedly refer to the imposition of scientific methods, and how this contrasts with the wishes of those interviewed. Support for archaeological subsurface testing is imposed

Allan Carriage has stated that the Wadi Wadi Coomaditchie Aboriginal Corporation would generally support further archaeological investigations (including the implementation of sub-surface archaeological investigations) being carried out within the COI area. Allan Carriage would like these investigations to be focused in those areas that are zoned for future development activity and where there is still a possibility of Aboriginal archaeological materials to be present.

Allan Carriage has stated that he would generally not support further archaeological investigations of site areas and PAD’s that are located within a proposed VCA and are not under direct threat of impact from development. Particularly with regard to sub-surface investigations which may result in the additional disturbance of Aboriginal archaeological materials (Huys 2006: 49).

Allan Carriage, as a representative of the Wadi Wadi Coomaditchie Aboriginal Corporation, has initiated several proceedings against Stockland in the NSW Land
and Environment Court. These proceedings have sought cessation of the Stockland proposal, challenging regulatory approvals. Huys’ summary illustrates the precarious bind Aboriginal peoples find themselves in (see Ellsworth 1997). Correlating with Uncle Guboo’s statement, ‘support’ is forced. It was only given for the use of invasive and destructive technologies in areas under direct physical threat.49 There is a ‘unanimous’ absence of support for such actions in areas not under direct physical threat of desecration (Huys 2006: 74).

Aboriginal women referred to have taken increasingly leading roles in action aimed at protecting Sandon Point, with explicit support from the Picket. Huys’ summaries of interviews with Aboriginal women have exposed implications of the previous non-consideration.

Both women believe that all the areas recommended for 7A zoning by the COI should be retained, with no development on the Cookson’s Land, and that the factory should be removed so that the land can be returned to public use (Ibid: 57).

These were the first officially recorded accounts calling for the closure of the Cookson Plibrico operation, with subsequent restoration and protection of the area. One of the Aboriginal women, echoing Uncle Guboo’s statement, stated that there was opposition to ‘housing anywhere on the Sandon Point site’ (Ibid: 60). There are parallels with what happened at Wave Hill when the waited for white support started to materialise. Members of the Picket had repeatedly challenged the non-consideration of Women’s significance at Sandon Point, creating spaces for the involvement of Aboriginal Women.

The Huys report vaguely referred to other indications of significance not published

49 Huys (2006) noted that some of those interviewed would not support any subsurface testing— even in areas under threat.
in any previous archaeological studies or official reports.

Roy Kennedy (SPATE) also claims that he was told by Guboo Ted Thomas that Gibson Park, located just to the north-west of the COI area, was an important Aboriginal place (Ibid: 74).

Huys noted that Gibson Park ‘may also be a massacre site’ and that it had ‘been identified as an initiation site by Uncle Guboo’ before his passing (emphasis added, Ibid: 74). Information about the area being a massacre site was shared with members of the Picket in February 2002, following attempts by Stockland to began earthworks at Sandon Point. Other indications of significance previously shared with members of the Picket received official recognition in the Huys report:

Besides the midden site and associated [Kuradji] burial that have been identified within the dune system, Geoff Simpson is of the opinion that at least eight additional burials have been un-covered within this dune system (Geoff Simpson states that this occurred when the pipe line for the pumping station was put in) (Ibid: 53).

These burials, anecdotally referred to as the Water Board burials, were uncovered during excavations for the laying of sewage pipes in the 1970s.50 Members of the Aboriginal community relocated these burials in the early 1980s.51

50 Sydney Water has no ‘official’ (or more specifically officially sanctioned) records or documentation pertaining to these burials. They deny their existence and that Water Board workers had any involvement in their disturbance.

51 Huys provides maps referring to these burials alongside vague references in summaries of the accounts of local Aboriginal people contacted during his study.
STATUTORY CONTROLS AND LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS…
The Huys report was commissioned by DIPNR to meet statutory requirements. The Therin report, prepared at the request of Wollongong City Council, was significantly large and provided substantial detail, however lacking with regards to Women’s issues. The Huys report was limited to NSW legislation, specifically the NPW Act 1974 and the EP&A Act 1979, noting that:


The majority of legal challenges emanating from SPATE targeted NSW legislation. An unsuccessful challenge was launched under the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1987 (Commonwealth) in early 2002. The Act is administered by the Department of Environment and Heritage (DEH) and provides ministerial authority to make an emergency declaration for protection. It was passed to provide protection for the Aboriginal heritage, in circumstances where it could be demonstrated that such protection was not available at a state level. In certain instances the Act overrides relevant state and territory provisions (Ibid: 12).

Extending from the language of inquiry being unjust, are more insidious assumptions and implications (Smallacombe 2000; Tully 1995; Weber 2000). The

52 Both Authors are male. The ‘need’ for female archaeological report was stressed by Huys (2006). Dallas (2005) investigated the Cookson Plibrico site, which is referred to (inaccurately) as containing the Women’s site, yet has been found to not provide sufficient detail.
links between cultural heritage issues and the *EP&A Act* (NSW) stem from its inclusion of cultural heritage assessment within the rubric of ‘environmental impact assessment’. The Stockland proposal at Sandon Point at times has fallen under Parts III, IV and V of the Act. The implications relate directly to requirements for approval on the macro level: impacts on ‘sites and places sacred or significant to Aboriginal communities’ falling within initial studies required for local government consideration (Part III) as outlined in State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPP’s), Regional Environment Plans (REP’s) and Local Environment Plans (LEP’s).

Part IV of the *EP&A Act* provides a framework for decisions emanating from such plans and associated requirements for environmental impacts assessments—including cultural heritage assessment in the case of Sandon Point. Part V of the Act refers to State government agencies, and includes provision for a site to be deemed of ‘State Significance’. A site deemed to be of State significance is ‘called in’: responsibilities for the decision making process are removed from the local authority and assumed by the state government.

Application of the *NPW Act* at has resulted in significant controversy. The Act ‘provides the primary basis for the legal protection and management of Aboriginal sites within NSW’ (emphasis added, Huys 2006: 9). Huys summarised the basis for the relevant sections of the Act, adopting the terminology he used in referring to interviewees:

> The general rationale behind the Act is the prevention of unnecessary, or unwarranted destruction of relics, and the active protection and conservation of relics which are of high cultural significance (emphasis added, Ibid).

The notion of unnecessary, or unwarranted destruction is framed within a western construction of significance: what can be proven as having high cultural significance via scientific investigation. *Terra Knowlegius* is central. Aboriginal culture is also portrayed as in the past, a relic. Aboriginal culture is not a living culture, it is history (Bennett 1990; Bennett 1994; Haraway 1994; Russell 2000;
What constitutes ‘unwarranted’ destruction is an issue of contention. SPATE has launched a number of legal challenges to approvals provided under the *NPW Act*.\(^5^3\) Section 90, Part 6 of the Act continues to receive the most criticism. The colloquialism for Section 90 is ‘consent to destroy’. The Huys report draws directly from the *NPW Act*:

Section 90 of the Act provides statutory protection for all Aboriginal ‘objects’, whereby it is an offence (without the Minister’s consent) to:

\[
\text{damage, deface or destroy Aboriginal sites without the prior consent of the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service.}
\]

The Act defines an ‘object’ as:

\[
\text{any deposit, object or material evidence (not being a handicraft for sale) relating to Indigenous}
\]

---

and non-European habitation of the area that comprises New South Wales, being habitation both prior to and concurrent with the occupation of that area by persons of European extraction, and includes Aboriginal remains (Huys 2006: 9).

It is ‘only’ an offence to ‘damage, deface or destroy Aboriginal sites’ if the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) has not given ‘his’ consent. The ‘protection’ offered is limited to this consent, determined based on scientific evaluation of significance, as opposed to oral historical accounts. The gendered implications parallel those that emerged during the dispute over the bridge at Kumarangk (Hindmarsh Island), in which the final decisions about women’s significance was made by a (white) male government Minister (Bell 1998; Mead 1995).

The Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) acts as a regulator of the NPW Act, and the Director of the NPWS. In the wake of heightened controversy surrounding Section 90 of the Act, the DEC released *Interim Guidelines for Aboriginal Community Consultation—Requirements for Applicants* in December 2004. These guidelines outlined an increased requirement for consultation with members of the affected Aboriginal Community(s).

‘Environment’ is a theme in both the *NPW Act* and the *EP&A Act: National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974* (NSW); *Environment Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (NSW). Ecofeminists have pioneered critical thought on the subjugation of women and other, deemed inferior, cultures to nature in western thought (Plumwood 1993; Saleh 1997). Aboriginal culture is regulated as an environmental issue, associated with a disordered, chaotic, and irrational nature. Colonial assumptions about Aboriginal peoples as inferior are deeply embedded (Simpson 2000; Smallacombe 2000; Tully 1995). The Acts reify and perpetuate these racist assumptions. The underpinnings of colonial assumptions of inferiority are more profound in the history of the *NPW Act*. References to Aboriginal peoples in Australia within the Act have a very long history—stretching back to the life of its precursor. In its earliest incarnation, the *NPW Act* was known as the *Flora and...*
The actions of white supporters at Sandon Point are shaped by the experiences of praxis, of exposure to the actions of SPATE. Contemporary whiteness is shaped by Australia’s colonial legacies as evidenced in the *NPW* and *EP&A Acts*. Perceptions of inherently inadequate governmental responses to SPATEs calls for no houses, both within and external to the statutory controls and legislative requirements, continues to shape how white support is manifested.

**THE EMERGENCE OF WHITE AWARENESS**

The first white colonists arrived in the northern Illawarra region in 1817. This was some two years after Charles Throsby became the first European to make the overland journey south from the Sydney area. Throsby was led by Aboriginal guides down the Illawarra escarpment to present day Bulli, via dreaming trails used since time immemorial. They reached the Pacific Ocean at Sandon Point. With the exception of Michael Organ’s (1990) *Illawarra And South Coast Aborigines 1770-1850*, very little written material regarding the area’s pre-European history is in existence. Anecdotal accounts indicate knowledge of the Sandon Point area as a burial site were widespread in the region.

Cornelius O’Brien was the first ‘settler’ in the Northern Illawarra, with a grant of 300 acres. The land grant extended approximately from the south side of the Sandon Point ridgeline through into current day Thirroul village in the north, from the Pacific Ocean in the east to the escarpment in the west: the entire Sandon

---

54 Nicoll exposes the implications and remnant colonialisms in the ‘the male and female Aboriginal heads mounted on the wall of memory at the Australian War Memorial in the national capital, Canberra’: It is the context in which they are mounted that locates the reification of such assumptions: ‘Apart from the Aboriginal heads, all of the other heads are sculpted reliefs of “native fauna”’ (Nicoll 2002).
Point area was encompassed in this grant (McLeary 1833; Salter 2003: 17). Enlightenment notions of progress are embedded in descriptions of the O’Brien’s actions: he *improved* the land (see, for example, King 1965: 7). These improvements include a farm and whaling station in which both convicts and local Aboriginal people were exploited (Couzins 1948: 206; King 1965: 5; Organ 1990: 171).

The first published reference to the Sandon Point area indicating Aboriginal significance was in the context of a burial uncovered in 1887: Sid Dumbrell and Jack Lloyd described the area as ‘a black burial ground’ (Organ 1990: 343). Subsequent to events one year later, O’Brien was a target of official rebuke for his ‘leading’ of a ‘vigilante action’ against local Aboriginal people. The Sydney Bench of Magistrates officially investigated, finding no case to be answered. Following this release of the Magistrates’ findings, Governor Macquarie wrote to Chief Magistrate D’Arcy Wentworth to express his ‘surprise, regret, and displeasure at the Bench of Magistrates [in] treating this wanton attack on the Natives with so much levity and indifference’ and called for further action to be taken (Ibid: 101-4).

For a significant period of time, reference to burials uncovered in the Sandon Point area was the limit of published materials referring in any tangential way to the significance of the Sandon Point area to local Aboriginal people. The first recorded (white) account of a burial exposed by heavy seas on McCauleys Beach was in the 1950s: a local resident stumbled across it. In 1974 Kim and Tony Stephenson, nephews of this resident, noticed another set of remains in the same area on their

---

55 This action is anecdotally referred to as the *Minnamurra Massacre*.

56 This is in stark contrast to the actions of Governor Macquarie on other occasions and/or contexts. For example, he had unofficially declared war on Aboriginal peoples of the Sydney region in 1816. Numerous massacres resulted. No such declarations were made for the Illawarra. Local Aboriginal peoples were seen to be ‘peaceful’, and therefore considered ‘harmless’ (Organ & Speechly 1997).
way to school (Stephenson, T. 2002. pers. comm. February 14; Brown 2002: 1, 4).

Prior to the 1991 Navin Officer ‘walk-over’ at Sandon Point, Max Ackerman came across an artefact that was later labelled *Isolated Find 1* (IF1) (Navin 1993). Uncle Guboo subsequently identified this as a tool used during male initiation ceremonies. This ‘find’ and the subsequent increase in archaeological, and other, attention was a significant factor in the increase in white awareness of the areas significance to local Aboriginal people.

The 1998 exposure of the Kuradji burial site substantially increased white awareness. This significance of the burial site was framed within the context of the Stockland proposal and its implications for the area. A 1999 letter from Basil Smith, of the Illawarra Local Aboriginal Land Council (ILALC), to NIRAG indicates the active support of the local community:

> The Illawarra Local Aboriginal Land Council... fully support NIRAG endeavors to have no new developments of any kind in that area. The land in question is an Aboriginal burial ground and regarded as a significant and sacred site to the traditional tribes of this area. This land council will not support any further building developments in that area... (reproduced in Salter 2003: 112).

In the lead up to and during the 2002 ‘Valentine’s Day Blockade’ long-term (white) residents shared their knowledge and experiences of growing up in the area. One account shared awareness of a detailed Aboriginal history: specific sites in the Sandon Point area were recognised as places one was not to enter. The information had been handed down from parents and was shared with other local

---

57 It was around this time that the Water board burials were disturbed.

58 The author was present, as a participant in the action.
children. Respect and recognition dated at least 80 years prior.

During the three-day Valentine’s Day Blockade, members of SPATE shared many stories about the Sandon Point area with white participants. Widespread involvement in the blockade fostered diffusion of this information. General awareness of Aboriginal significance increased. The outcomes of shared experience and non-violent resistance during this three-day period continue to shape participant involvement and action, alongside governmental and regulatory responses.

Prior to the exposure of the Kuradji burial, there was widespread community awareness of the existence of middens in Sandon Point area. ‘The Point’ is an internationally renowned surfing location, previously the home of Konica Skins World Championship Tour event, considered on par with the ‘world class’ break at Bells Beach in Victoria. To enter the surf requires passing a large midden site on the point. Local surf culture, has facilitated discussion of the existence of the midden. Recognition fostered respect. Uncle Guboo was regularly asked to share dreamtime stories of the area with participants on the first morning of the annual ‘Save Sandon Point Surfing Festival’.

Exposure of the Kuradji burial site received brief mention in the local press, portrayed as of little real import. The advice of a respected local archaeologist was requested by members of the Aboriginal community to assist with the exhumation of the burial and its subsequent relocation to an undisclosed and more protected location in the immediate vicinity. Richard Fullagar and Denise

59 Local residents, surfers and others gather on the point when large swells arrive to watch the spectacle.

60 This is reflected in references to Aboriginal significance on the shirts produced for festival participants.

61 Tony Stephenson—who had stumbled across remains in 1974 and whose uncle had come across remains in the 1950s—noted the exposed burial site after the storm in March 1998.
Donlon (1998) documented the exhumation. Their report provided the first source of public/lay knowledge regarding the scientifically based significance of the area, concluding that the remains formed part of an intact ceremonial burial site. Scientific methods dated the burial site as being up to 6000 years of age.  

SPATE was established in the context of the public awareness of the Kuradji burial site and the impending release of the first Stockland masterplan. A month later, coals from the sacred fire at the Aboriginal Tent Embassy in Canberra were used to establish a sacred fire at Sandon Point. SPATE was established to keep the sacred fire burning; to watch over and protect the Sandon Point area. On 16 February 2000, Uncle Guboo renamed the area Kuradji and made the proclamation that ‘no houses’ should be built: to do so would desecrate the area and impinge on its significance to local Aboriginal people (Organ 2002; Salter 2003). SPATE is a meeting place for local Aboriginal people and provides a means for others to be exposed to local Aboriginal culture.

A number of archaeological investigations were commissioned since the early 1990s. The majority of the reports produced were required before approval could be granted for any aspect of the Stockland proposal. The release of these studies fostered awareness of the areas Aboriginal significance amongst the local community. Despite contestation of the findings, which broadly discounted the significance expressed in oral historical accounts, the Navin Officer reports (Navin & Officer 2001a, 2001b, 2001c; Navin 1993) that directly increased local awareness of the extent of Aboriginal usage of the area.

---

62 The dating of this burial site was estimated based on deposits underlying an adjacent midden site—no direct attempts were made to date either material from the burial pit or the Kuradji itself. Thus this burial, and another site (dated without a detailed investigation) at Kuradji/Sandon Point, could be significantly older. Based on detailed archaeological investigations at the two oldest dated Indigenous sites on the south coast of NSW—Bass Point and Burril Lake, which both have similar characteristics, Indigenous use of the Kuradji/Sandon Point area may have began up to 20,000 years ago—or before.
The findings of the Navin Officer reports led to a dispute within the archaeological community. At the request of SPATE and other members of the local Aboriginal community, the Picket funded a review of the Navin Officer investigations by Professor Peter Hiscock from the Australian National University. Hiscock’s (2002) findings were scathing. With the Hiscock report supporting SPATEs expressions of significance, oral historical accounts were supported by science. Science provided authority, proof to an accepted standard. Media representations of the Sandon Point area’s Aboriginal significance subsequently increased, influencing public awareness.

Hiscock was engaged following a number of specific events. In late 2001 the SCLC held discussions with Stockland, WCC and community representatives aimed at establishing a non-adversarial mediated process for discussions about the future of the Sandon Point area (Illife 2001). Rick Farley was appointed as chair by WCC in January 2002. Farley had served on the Native Title Tribunal, as Executive Director of the National Farmers Federation and was a member of the National Reconciliation Council (Clennell & Kontominas 2006). Despite general cynicism based on the process of community consultation leading up to the release of the DCP, the appointment of Farley facilitated a level of community optimism (Carty 2002a). The first meeting was held on 30 January 2002. The process was short lived (Carty 2002b).

On February 9, Stockland announced it would commence work within a week. This followed approvals for Stages 1-6 in the NSW Land and Environment Court. Stockland cited ‘commercial pressures’ as the reason for the announcement and asserted that it had always “reserved the right” to press on with stages 1-6’ (Ibid). The public response from community participants in what became commonly referred to as the ‘Farcilitation process’, and Farley himself, are indicative. The Illawarra Mercury represented the community response of the announcement as being ‘an act of treachery from Stockland which has effectively sabotaged the process’ (Arthur Rorris, SCLC Secretary, reproduced in Ibid). Farley was reported as being of the opinion that the process to which he was appointed ‘would review the whole site, including stages one to six’ of the Stockland proposal (Ibid). NSW
Planning Minster Andrew Refshauge expressed disappointment in the breakdown of the process after refusing to previously become involved despite community requests (Salter 2003: 39).

On 11 February armed security guards arrived at the ‘construction entrance’ to stages 1-6. At 5 am the following morning contract crews and heavy machinery arrived. They were unable to enter the site. Preventing their entrance to Sandon Point were ‘illegally’ parked private vehicles, which in turn were surrounded by several hundred local residents. A stalemate lasted until a little after midday on 14 February: Valentines Day.

![Figure 8. Valentine’s Day Blockade](Image courtesy Sandon Point Community Picket)

The spectacle of police marching in formation along Point Street, followed by unprecedented local defiance to follow police directives, lead to mass arrests. The

---

Image courtesy Sandon Point Community Picket
final arrests were made around 2pm, allowing workers onto the site. A short time later, all workers and construction equipment were ordered removed from the Sandon Point area: SPATE initiated proceedings in the NSW Supreme Court, that commenced on 13 February, were transferred to the NSW Land and Environment Court and an intralocular injunction was granted. Stockland were not permitted to undertake any activity at Sandon Point.

The blockade enlarged opposition to the Stockland proposal. Local residents became increasingly aware of the many and varied implications of the proposal. Whilst knowledge of the area’s Aboriginal significance increased dramatically, the numerous issues behind community calls for protection received effectively equal voice. Following the granting of the intralocular injunction the Picket mobilised support for protection of the entire area. A four-page broadsheet known as The Sandon Point: A Community Bulletin for the Protection of Sandon Point and was published and distributed to 6000 houses in the region. The introductory article described [t]he issues [as] wide-ranging and complex’ and that the broadsheet ‘gives an overview of important past and recent events’:

If [the Stockland proposal was] allowed to proceed, close to 1200 new dwellings would be built... equating to an additional 3000 people in the area. The current population of Thirroul is 5400. There are no plans for infrastructure such as roads, shops, car parks, transport, schools, hospitals, police presence, community facilities and sewage systems to accompany this massive increase in population (Brown 2002).^64

The broadsheet included specific detail on a number of issues considered of import: the ecological values of the area were framed with reference to the ‘State-
protected wetland ecosystem on the site, namely the Sydney Coastal Estuarine Swamp Forest Complex (SCESFC)’ and as being ‘part of the last remaining green link between the ocean and the [Illawarra] escarpment’. Sandon Point is the last remaining coastal open space in the northern Illawarra. Its wetlands are the home of numerous threatened species, including internationally protected migratory birds’; the undermining of European heritage protection; flooding issues; land stability, local employment; and Aboriginal heritage issues. Respect and recognition are visible in the broadsheet, as challenges to whiteness. Yet whiteness is also visible:

Should it be left to the bulldozers to unearth and destroy [Aboriginal sites]? Or has the time come to recognise and treasure this site of world importance that sits on our doorstep? Other nations value and respect their history— are we such philistines as to allow this destruction? (Ibid: 4).

The perceived impacts of the Stockland proposal were nationally publicised with the inclusion of the Sandon Point area on the National Heritage Trust’s Endangered Place list for 2003. At a public rally organised to coincide with the announcement of the listing, the local State member of parliament David Campbell announced he would formally request the site be ‘called in’. A call-in would transfer regulatory approval to the State government, for the ‘remainder of the site’. This would leave out the area covered by Stages 1-6 of the Stockland proposal (Failes 2002a). Less than one-month prior, Campbell had refused to intervene, echoing Minister Refshauge’s comments at the breakdown of the ‘Facilitation process’.

Campbell’s decision was made in the context of increased community dissatisfaction with the Australian Labor Party (ALP). In early August, Steven Martin, the sitting Federal member for Cunningham, which includes the Sandon Point area, resigned mid-term. Respected local historian and community activist Michael Organ announced he would contest the bi-election for the Australian Greens. The bi-election was held on the evening of Saturday 19 September.
Michael Organ become the first member of the Australian Greens to be elected to the Lower House of Parliament in Australia—and the second candidate not from one of the major parties to hold a seat. This was the first time since the creation of the Cunningham electorate that the seat was not held by the ALP. The ongoing dispute at Sandon Point was a significant factor in the election.\(^{65}\)

Less than one month after the election of Michael Organ to the Federal Parliament, and following the release of the Hiscock report, Minister Refshauge announced that a COI would be held to determine the future of the Sandon Point area. This announcement contrasted with his response to Campbell’s announcement at the 22 August public rally: he ‘had made no decision about Mr Campbell’s letter but was not ruling anything out’ (Failes 2002b). The terms of Reference for the COI were published as:

> To make recommendations on the preferred land uses, planning outcomes and management options for the land as shown edged heavy black on the map identified as Attachment A (dated November 2002), having regard to its values and constraints in the broader context of the surrounding urban and non-urban environment.\(^{66}\)

Minister Refshauge informed WCC via its then General Manager Rod Oxley. The letter addressed issues previously raised by the Picket, including criticisms of the inaction of the ALP dominated council and its General Manager:

> In my decision I am mindful of the significant environmental, heritage and recreational values of the site. I

\(^{65}\) No single factor can be separated. For a concise overview of a number of these factors, albeit without discussion of the impacts of the specific issues with the ALP dominated WCC, see Bennett (2002).

\(^{66}\) ‘Attachment A’ is provided in appendix 1.
am particularly concerned about issues of Aboriginal heritage, riparian and floodplain management and the protection of ecological communities (Refshauge 2002).

The COI commenced on 3 March 2003. General proceedings were held in the WCC chambers, with a number of site visits at Sandon Point and surrounds. Cleland and Carleton’s findings, which were very critical of WCC and Stockland, were sent to the new Minister for Planning, Craig Knowles in September 2003:

The Commission finds the COI area has significant inherent cultural, ecological and social values as indicated by the extensive evidence before the Commission. These values are too important to be compromised by the level of development proposed for residential purposes in Council’s draft DCP or Stockland’s draft Master Plan, notwithstanding the limited availability of land and the importance of providing for additional residential development in the northern Illawarra (Cleland & Carleton 2003a).

Criticisms levelled at Stockland, WCC and other regulatory bodies were not met with much support by SPATE or the Picket. The findings were seen as inadequate. The commissioners detailed an awareness that this would be the case. In summarising the submission of Michael Organ:

the community has no faith the Commission of Inquiry process will see justice done, or even a fair compromise reached (Cleland & Carleton 2003b: 60).

Cleland and Carleton recommended further investigations of the Aboriginal significance of the Sandon Point area:

Aboriginal heritage values of the COI area require further assessment and identified Aboriginal sites in the eastern
section of the COI area require protection (Ibid: ii).

There was no immediate response to the COI from the Minister’s office. The future of the area was uncertain. Stockland pushed ahead with Stages 1-6, the local community supported the actions of SPATE and other Aboriginal peoples in challenging a number of regulatory approvals for the further destruction of Aboriginals sites. Respect and recognition increased, with the support increasingly emphasising Aboriginal significance as the primary reason for protection. The publication of further archaeological studies, the forced sharing of Aboriginal knowledge as indicated in Uncle Guboo’s comments further exposed white supporters and increased community awareness of the areas importance.

With no official response to the COI recommendations, some members of the community saw the compromise it proposed as the best offer they would receive from the State government. Calls were made for the recommendations to be implemented. These went unheeded. In this context, two specific events galvanised white support for SPATE. The implications of the first linger:

In the early hours of Sunday 19 September 2004 two men were seen running away from the Sandon Point Aboriginal Tent Embassy towards Thirroul. Moments later flames were seen to erupt from the structure. Luckily all five people asleep inside at the time managed to escape through a rear window... (unknown 2007a).

The Sandon Point Aboriginal Tent Embassy, irreplaceable Aboriginal artworks, photographs, case notes and evidence were all destroyed. Not the first incident of arson, it was the most destructive. It was also not the last.

In May 2005 Charles Hill was appointed by Craig Knowles to undertake another review of the future of the Sandon Point area. The aim of the review was to provide an independent review of the findings and recommendations of the 2003 Commission of Inquiry (COI)
into land at Sandon Point (Hill 2005: 4).

Many in the community were cynical of yet another formal process. Frank Sartor, the new Minister for Planning in a 16 November 2005 media release, outlined the predicted outcome:

The Commission of Inquiry ordered by the former Planning Minister failed to resolve the issues (Sartor 2005).

The Hill Review comprised one public seminar at the Thirroul Surf Club and a select number of private meetings—with no public hearings. Despite widespread cynicism, attendance at the seminar was higher than the quasi-legal COI hearings. In the lead up to this review ARV publicly announced their proposal for an aged-care facility on the Cookson Plibrico site.

On release of the Hill report, Minister Sartor responded to the ARV proposal, announcing that

About 17 hectares of the western boundary of the site is suitable for medium density residential development, including aged care facilities (Ibid).

Hill’s recommendations differed to the Minister’s announcement, stating that it needed to be determined

whether there are any significant Aboriginal heritage aspects which require specific land conservation, management or treatment (Hill 2005: 7).

In outlining his recommendations, Hill dismissed oral historical accounts of

67 The author was one of the select few asked to attend a private meeting.
Aboriginal significance. Significance was limited to that provable by science (i.e. physical significance only). Differences between the findings of the Hill report and the COI can be seen in respective zoning recommendations.

Hill’s report undermined the compromise recommendations of the COI. Some members of the community continued to call for the COI recommendations to be implemented, contrasting with Uncle Guboo’s proclamation. Others continued to reiterate that ‘no houses’ was the only acceptable outcome. Many continued to express a need for Aboriginal women to be consulted before any decisions could be made. Otherwise, such decisions could not have any semblance of legitimacy. It is with these participants that consent was clearly and consistently never given, whiteness was challenged. The respect and recognition professed led to the Huys report.
The release of the Hill report fed community cynicism. It was released during a period when members of the Picket were discussing its future. With the 5th anniversary approaching, many were having difficulty keeping up with the tasks required to organise and maintain a 24 hours-a-day, 7 days-a-week presence. Discussions had been held with WCC about a memorial to replace the Picket. Many in the community saw the release of the report as too coincidental, that the State government had held out hoping community opposition would fade over time. The Hill report was seen as largely mirroring Stockland’s original proposal and it was resolved to keep the Picket running in the short term as a visible sign of opposition. A continued and visible public presence was deemed essential. With the fifth anniversary of the community picket pending, it was hoped that broader renewed enthusiasm could be mobilised in the wake of the Hill report.68

In spite of the renewed enthusiasm, the community picket would not make its five-year anniversary. At approximately 9:30 pm on 24 February 2006 the community picket was destroyed in another arson attack. This was less than a month before planned celebrations to commemorate the historic event and provide a public rejection of the recommendations of the Hill report.

The Huys report was released in the aftermath of this event. The consideration of Women’s issues provided some renewed enthusiasm amongst the local community. On 30 July 2006, following the release of the further revisions to the Stockland proposal, a public demonstration was held at Sandon Point. These revisions included a shift from single dwelling houses, to apartment buildings comprising up to five storeys that would tower over Thomas Gibson Park. The Picket successfully distributed information about the revisions, leading to renewed outrage. The Lord Mayor attended the rally and criticised Stockland—for the first time. These events forced the hand of Minister Sartor. The Minister had previously

68 This was the largest attended formal meeting regarding the community picket and strategic planning for a very long time, perhaps the largest single meeting aside from public events.
arranged to be in Wollongong on 1 August and had refused requests to meet with local representatives. In response to media coverage of the rally, including the collection of 1500 letters of objection (which accounts for 20% of the local population), the Minister agreed to a meeting with representatives. Unknown to the Minister, members of the Picket organised for two Aboriginal women with in depth knowledge of the Sandon Point area to attend. This was the first time that Aboriginal women had received any Ministerial consideration. It provided a challenge to the gender bias in previous decisions, including archaeological investigations.

Members of the Picket continued to pressure the State government by challenging regulatory approvals. Continuing emphasis on Aboriginal significance: the ARV proposal is targeted for specific criticism with respect to Women’s significance, with criticism of the Stockland proposal being more general. The current stalemate revolves around a successful challenge in the NSW Land and Environment Court (Walker v Minister for Planning [2007] NSWLEC 741). A local resident challenged Minister Sartor’s approvals in the wake of the Hill report. There were ‘three grounds of challenge’

(a) the Minister failed to consider an express mandatory consideration under s 75O(2)(c) [of the EP&A Act], namely, the findings and recommendations in a 2003 report of a Commission of Inquiry into Sandon Point;

(b) the Minister failed to take into account implied mandatory considerations, namely, the principles of ecologically sustainable development (ESD) and the impact of the proposal upon the environment in several respects, including whether the flooding impacts of the project would be compounded by climate change;

(c) the Minister deferred essential matters for later consideration or the concept plan approval lacked finality.
Biscoe J found that:

The applicant has succeeded on the ESD ground of challenge insofar as it concerns the climate change flood risk consideration.

The Stockland and ARV proposals have stalled awaiting a challenge to the Minister’s successful appeal (Minister for Planning v Walker [2008] NSWCA 224).

THE ROLE OF GOOD INTENTIONS
The good intentions of white supporters at Sandon Point have had positive outcomes. The spaces created by activism, the experience of supporting SPATE, have had a transformative effect. Awareness of the colonial implications of whiteness has shaped the expression of respect and recognition (Simpson 2000: 114, 117; Tully 1995). Aspects of colonial whiteness have been exposed and challenged. Are these good intentions limiting (Hage 1995; Riggs 2004b)? One aspect of support embodies a speaking-for paternalism, a remnant colonialism: the community proposal for an Aboriginal cultural centre (Smallacombe 2000). Other aspects of whiteness emerge through engagement with this proposal. The local community’s counter hegemonic challenges to whiteness are tempered with unmarked assumptions that reify and perpetuate whiteness. Ellul’s concept of technological bluff aids in exposing these assumptions, currently under-theorised by whiteness scholars.

The National Parks and Wildlife Service’s Regional Parks Policy Statement was created to reserve areas designated as ‘substantially modified’. In the Tourism subsection of the communities regional park proposal, the question was posed: ‘Why would people want to visit an area which looks just like an extension of the suburbs of Sydney?’ (Miller & Miller 2001). The aim of posing this question was to challenge the appropriateness of the Stockland proposal, yet Enlightenment notions of progress are embedded within it. A Lockean notion of property underlies the Regional Parks policy statement. Whilst ‘improved’ is not used to refer to designated areas, implications that value was added to the land are
implicit. As the land was modified through the application of man’s labour, it attained value, with this value being the property of the man whose labour created it: the liberal-capitalist property formation mythology (Plumwood 1993: 111, 2002: 21). The land became a commodity (Salter 2003: 34-5). It is the value of the land, attained through its modification, which provides a basis for seeking designation as ‘substantially modified’. This contrasts with lands not considered to be modified by colonial settlement; land in a state of nature, wilderness. Such land is considered unimproved; Aboriginal labour does not add value. Aboriginal culture is rationalised as in a state of nature, subjugated, inferior (Plumwood 1993; Saleh 1997; Turnbull 2000). This enables Aboriginal culture to be regulated as an environmental issue—falling under the provisions of the NPW Act.

The Regional Park proposal moves beyond classification of land, though embodies the same underlying assumptions and rationales. Central to the proposal were the creation of facilities that would improve the land, value would be added. The land would be ‘developed’ via the rational application of technology: progress. The assumptions shaping such ideas are unmarked, normalised. Such improvements were not only normal they are inevitable. This is technological bluff. The community’s regional park proposal remains within, reifies and perpetuates such discourse. The colonialisms embodied within such a notion of progress are not addressed. Ellul’s concept of Technological bluff is central to contemporary whiteness. Enlightenment rationalisations and notions of progress are hegemonic and permeate through whiteness. These assumptions are deeply embodied in the proposed Aboriginal cultural centre.

The idea behind the ‘development’ of an Aboriginal Cultural Centre was to afford protection to Aboriginal culture, to foster respect and recognition. The good intentions come packaged with white rationalisations. Assumptions that the land required value-adding, a form of development, to compete with the Stockland proposal framed the approach to such protection. The development of a cultural centre would enable the ordering of Aboriginal culture in an acceptable modern interpretive state (Bennett 1990, 1994; Smallacombe 2000).

The actions of ‘well meaning’ anthropologists at the Melbourne Museum’s
Aboriginal Centre expose similar implications, embodying the same assumptions. Lynette Russell, appointed to the Melbourne Museum ‘based on [her] archaeological expertise’ proposed ‘the working title Remains to be Seen’ for a detailed exhibition on ‘the Aboriginal Archaeology in Victoria’ (Russell 2000: 3). Use of the term ‘remains’ locates Aboriginal culture as in the past, belonging in the past, a culture of the past, as history. Adding that the are to be seen locates visitors as voyeurs, looking back on an inferior culture in history. Stephen Mickler, in drawing from Bennett’s (1994) “The Exhibitionary Complex”, adds:

we should recall that the elementary function of any museum is to construct a reading of the past that in the final analysis naturalizes and legitimates the origins of a particular economic and social order (Mickler 1990: 24).

A shift in the focus of museums around 1930 and again in 1960 and 1970s expanded their functions. Cultural displays ‘present themselves as stages of naturally progressing historic continuum…[an] evolutionary momentum (Ibid: 20). With reference to the displays of Aboriginal materials and history at the Rottnest Island Museum, Mickler describes the observer as being

positioned for a reading that the European colonization of the island was as natural an occurrence as the geological formation of the island itself some 7000 years before (Ibid: 21).

The title proposed by Russell contrasts with critical awareness indicated by descriptions of the museum present in her scholarship: ‘a manifestation of colonial power’, a ‘spearhead of modern colonizers’, and ‘in the past…as a location of and for internal colonialism, a place where Aboriginal people were positioned as specimens and disempowered: a site of “cultural and political subordination”’ (2000: 3, 4-7). Aspects of whiteness are unmarked.

The exhibition at the Melbourne Museum included a life size replica of Walter Baldwin Spencer, ‘a leading anthropologist and expert on Aboriginal issues
throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries’ (Morton 2004: 55). The presentation of the Spencer replica reifies colonialist assumptions and Mickler’s continuum. It constructs a good white anti-racist/bad white racist dualism (Hage 1995; Riggs 2004b). The replica was enclosed in a glass case with the ‘poignant words’ written above (Russell 2000: 7):

We do not choose to be enshrined in a glass case, with our story told by an alien institution which has appointed itself an ambassador or our culture (Morton 2004: 57; Russell 2000: 7).

A plaque inside the glass case included critical words on his profession:

To be a voyeur on the physical objects of other peoples culture is not a way to understand them. That understanding could only come from becoming involved in debates in the issues that are at the heart of the peoples concerns today (Russell 2000: 7).

Spencer is portrayed as a relic of a colonial past, like the depictions of Aboriginal culture, he is a part of history, left behind. His good intentions are located in his being ‘a product of his social situation’ (Ibid) and having ‘values… [that] were those of their time’ (Mulvaney & Calaby 1985: 182). MacIntyre made the same observation of Frank Hardy, as thinking ‘in the terms most familiar to him’ (Macintyre 1985: 187). Similar observations can and will most likely will be used at a later time to refer to the actions of white supporters today. Deference to good intentions normalises whiteness, makes excuses for it. It masks the assumptions rather than challenging them. The intentions were good, they are therefore not racist (Hage 1995; Riggs 2004b).

The debate surrounding the Aboriginal Centre at the Melbourne Museum illustrate that, despite the explicit presence of a level of critical awareness, colonialisms are still deeply engrained within what are construed as attempts at positive action in support of Aboriginal Australians. They are seen as challenges to the colonial past,
colonialisms are in the past. A response to conservative criticism of the exhibition locates the assumptions and rationalisations: the exhibition ‘is about history; it was never intended as history’ (Morton 2004: 62). Aboriginality and other cultures are considered as in the past, despite attempts to present them as otherwise.

The community’s regional park proposal for the Sandon Point area has challenged assumptions behind the Stockland proposal whilst also reifying and perpetuating colonialisms. White supporters were ‘anti-racist and agents of white race privilege at the same time’ (Haggis 2004: para. 24). In regard to the protection of ecological integrity, preservation as is has been called for, with supportive infrastructure. The cultural centre proposal requires development, the imposition of order, on a substantially larger scale. Culture is to be protected via progress. The proposal does little to challenge the Lockean assumptions that provides for the provision of housing (or any other envisioned structure) as somewhat acceptable. Each proposal falls within the white ways of knowing and seeing the world: Enlightenment notions of technology as progress (Ellul 1964; 1990). Community action at Sandon Point provides a direct challenge to aspects of whiteness whilst perpetuating others. This effective ‘limitation’ of the community proposal for a cultural centre within Enlightenment rationalisations locate a pervasive, yet unmarked, indicator of whiteness. This is the concept of ‘development’. Not only is development progress, it is fundamental to progress and as such perceived as inevitable. There are clear linkages here to Aboriginal culture as in the past, pre-‘modern’, something worthy of gaze in a historical sense, not a living/surviving culture (Bennett 1990, 1994; Smallacombe 2000; Tully 1995).

Ideas and discourse are rearranged into white notions of progress; this is seemingly the only foreseeable option (Ellul 1990: xv-xvi). Cultural artefacts can only be protected through progress. This mirrors the sentiments of many aspects of the NPW Act. The conflict between calls for protection for ecological integrity as is and the explicit support for calls for protection as emanating from SPATE and other members of the Aboriginal community have largely gone unnoticed by white supporters. This indicates the pervasiveness of whiteness and technological bluff embodied in remnant colonialisms. The good intentions of white supporters
masked whiteness. The proposal is paternalistic, reflecting the hegemony of whiteness in contemporary Australia.

TEMPERED POSITIVES
Substantial positives are evident in the good intentions of white supporters at Sandon Point. Respect and recognition are central features of the support offered. The actions of the Picket have emphasised the area’s significance, as expressed by SPATE and Aboriginal women. It was through persistent action that official consideration was afforded women’s significance. Continuous fundraising efforts organised though the Picket continue to finance SPATE and numerous legal challenges to regulatory approvals. The Valentine’s Day Blockade saw local residents take a stand and many arrested for the first times in their lives—in direct support for SPATE. These positives, this ‘practical reconciliation’, are tempered with unmarked assumptions. Colonial whiteness has shaped the actions and support afforded.

The scientific hierarchisation of knowledges is a hegemonic aspect of colonial whiteness. In emphasising Aboriginal significance and explicitly supporting SPATEs calls for protection, white supporters repeatedly deferred authority to archaeology. Professor Hiscock was engaged to challenge the findings of Navin Officer. The intent was to undermine the scientific authority of Navin Officer’s findings, contrasting them with those of Hiscock. Whilst Hiscock’s findings largely supported the significance of the area as expressed by SPATE, the authority of science was required to legitimate this. The implications of deference to archaeology, and the direct negation of respect and recognition, extend beyond the attempts to challenge the Navin Officer findings:

Even if such proof is successful in the future, the structure of the process further entrenches the taken-for-granted colonial relationship in which the claim is presented (Tully 2000: 48).

The boundary work of Hiscock and Navin Officer acted to perpetuate colonial
whiteness. Both attempted to construct boundaries between good and bad science (Gieryn 1995). The constructions of good science as objective contrasted with the opposing portrayal of an inferior, subjective, pseudo-science in the others work. The white assumptions and implications of science are left unquestioned—by the archaeologists and white supporters. Within this discourse, and the unquestioned discourse of archaeology, the emphasis on physical significance, at the expense of other aspects, was normalised. Demarcation of knowledges that exist outside the realm of white western knowledge rendered significance beyond the realm of white western knowledge non-considered. Evidentiary burden for physical significance was imposed on SPATE and other local Aboriginal people, predicated on white unjust terms (Metallic & Monture-Angus 2002; Tully 1995: 34). The white fiction of Terra Knowlegius locates many of the underlying assumptions (Moreton-Robinson 1999).

The Huys report, the first archaeological analysis to consider women’s significance in any detail, constructed a rational versus emotive dualism in summarising women’s oral historical accounts of significance. These accounts were framed as non-proven, rather suggested. The consistency with Uncle Guboo’s explanation of ‘no houses’ was not considered. This parallels the non-awareness of the role of Tipujum at Wave Hill—oral historical accounts have remained constant over the last 40-plus years and continue to be non-considered. The community facilitated meeting between the Aboriginal Women interviewed by Huys and Minister Sartor has positive implications. Whilst counter hegemonic, assessment was again deferred to the cognitive authority of archaeology—to white experts.

The Aboriginal Cultural centre proposal, whilst expressed to include direct consultation with local Aboriginal people, emanated from white supporters as opposed to SPATE or other Aboriginal people. The proposal was shaped by a speaking-for paternalism, mediated by colonial whiteness—one that contrasts with the professed aims of white supporters. White ways of knowing and seeing were seen as the most effective means for a solution, paralleling rationalisations of science and technology as progress (Ellul 1964, 1990).

The notion of technology as progress, permeating through the Regional Park
proposal, is built into the *National Parks and Wildlife Service’s Regional Parks Policy Statement*. In relationally constructing its own Regional Park proposal, rather than challenging the assumptions central to the Stockland proposal, community efforts did not transcend white assumptions. The *inappropriate* level of ‘development’ proposed by Stockland was challenged. The community proposal acts to normalise notions of technology as progress. Some level of development was accepted as inevitable, and was subsequently consented to. Technology as progress is built into the *NPW Act*. Huys put this into practice. The Act legislates for the *necessary*, or *warranted*, destruction of Aboriginal sites (Huys 2006: 9). Assessing the scientific significance of the area requires the destruction of Aboriginal sites. Science *necessitates* this destruction. Aboriginal significance can be salvaged, protected though storage in a box in the basement of a museum, or on display (Haraway 1994; Mickler 1990; Russell 2000; Smallacombe 2000). It cannot be left as is. It must be studied and assessed according to western constructions of science—it can add to western knowledge (Smallacombe 2000: 153). Only then can it be determined if the area, or compartmentalised sections of it, are worthy of protection.

White supporters at Sandon Point have explicitly challenged aspects of whiteness in their respect and recognition of SPATE. They have acted with good intentions. This is visible in the engagement of Professor Hiscock, the promotion of women’s significance and the intent of the Regional Park proposal. The spaces created by activism have proven transformative and shaped how respect and recognition was offered, and increased awareness of the area’s significance. The good intentions, however, have left aspects of whiteness unmarked, acting to further normalise unmarked assumptions. Without discounting the positives, they have been tempered by whiteness.

The paternalism shaping the actions of white supporters is visible in white interpretations of the Wave Hill walkout. Is paternalism a general aspect of colonial whiteness? Is it specific to these case studies? The following chapter engages with white support in the Red Hill Valley, reflecting on these questions.
Neither man is native. But both have been given the great honour of keeping the fire that burns at the base of the controversial valley. They are among the vocal, dedicated, earnest group of protesters or protectors—depending who you ask—who want the construction of the Red Hill Expressway to stop.

Clairmont (2003)

Formal alliance or not, co-operation between non-native and native activists was clear as the house slowly took shape.


In 1991, local residents of Hamilton’s east end formed the Friends of Red Hill Valley (herein Friends)—‘[p]robably the most prominent group working to save the valley’ (Collier 2003: 15; Friends 2004a). This followed some 40 years of debate regarding the future of the area—largely restricted to broad-based environmental and aesthetic factors. Friends describe the 7 km long Red Hill Valley, the last remaining green corridor linking Lake Ontario with the Niagara Escarpment, as ‘the centrepiece of 700 hectares of linked publicly-owned parkland in the industrial east end of Hamilton’. The Niagara Escarpment is a World Biosphere Reserve and the valley comprised the only ‘large natural area’ in the east end of Hamilton-Wentworth with the Red Hill Valley having ‘persisted as a visible link to the
environmental and cultural history of the local area’ (Friends 2004a; Peace 1998c). The valley is described as comprised (i.e. past tense), as much of it has been cleared, the creek realigned several times, and a 6-lane expressway is currently forming through the centre of it from a gap blasted in the Niagara escarpment through to Lake Ontario.

In 2003 members of the Haudenosaunee established a sacred fire and erected a Longhouse in the Red Hill Valley, physically asserting their treaty rights. The Longhouse received direct support from Friends and other supporters. This support was based on respect and recognition, typified by speaking with, as opposed to speaking for. How support was offered was shaped by the praxis of listening. Existing scholarship provides tools to consider how this was facilitated by the spaces created by activism (Simpson 2000; Tully 1995). As with chapter four, this chapter draws from scholarship on whiteness, how relations of power|knowledge construct boundaries between knowledges, to reflect on the actions of white supporters (Ellul 1990; Gieryn 1995; Metallic & Monture-Angus 2002; Moore 1998; Moreton-Robinson 1999, 2004; Smallacombe 2000; Tully 1995, 2000). What is explored is how whiteness permeated into the actions of Friends; how context mediated the support offered and to what degree whiteness shaped the actions of white supporters counter to the expressed aims of respect and recognition.

The erection of the Longhouse and lighting of the sacred fire followed the seeking of permission for members of Friends and others supportive of Six Nations to ‘occupy the land as guests of the Hodenosaunne’ (Powless 2003). This was followed by the erection of a Roundhouse and Longhouse and lighting of a sacred fire in the valley by members of the Six Nations Confederacy. Six Nations are often referred to in a number of different ways. Aside from Six Nations and Haudenosaunee, the following are also used interchangeably: the Haudenosaunee Confederacy; Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy; Iroquois Confederacy or more simply the Confederacy.

Official recognition and respect, located in existing treaties provide a clear distinction between Australia and Canada (Metallic & Monture-Angus 2002; Tully
1995). White supporters acted with awareness of the Gushwenta (the Two Row Wampum Treaty of 1613) and the Nanfan Treaty of 1701. The actions of the Haudenosaunee in respect to these Treaties, including a late 2003 withdrawal of legal action to protect these treaty rights, shaped the response of white supporters. The lighting of a sacred fire and erection of the Longhouse further heightened the public dispute over the Red Hill Valley and fostered significant implications for the support afforded Six Nations people.

The Red Hill Valley is located in the east end of Hamilton—along with much of the City’s industrial operations. The valley was one of the last areas of the city to be ‘improved’, in the Lockean sense, beyond use for farming. This was based on its...
distance from the city centre, the fertility of the soil and Thomas McQuesten’s vision for large areas of parklands surrounding the city (Best 1991). The lack of ‘development’ resulted in a significant amount of the areas’ ecological and visual significance remaining intact. The valley contains the last remaining largely natural creek within the city of Hamilton. Of the 14 streams that had passed through the city prior to settlement, Red Hill Creek was the last remaining that had not suffered from significant alteration of its course, piping and/or damming. This was a major source of opposition to the expressway proposal.

In engaging with the actions of white supporters, this chapter shares commonalities with From Mountain to Lake: the Red Hill Valley, a self-described biography of place. What is provided

is not intended to be (nor is it possible to write) a ‘definitive’ history of the Red Hill Valley (Peace 1998b: xviii).

This chapter considers a small and specific snippet of the actions taken in opposition to the expressway proposal.

WHERE IS THE COMMUNITY CAMPAIGN AT?
On 18 October 2006 the second annual ‘Spirit of Red Hill Valley Lecture’ was held in Hamilton (see appendix 2). The emphasis and aims of the annual lecture are ‘keeping the spirit alive’. The inferred spirit is that which drove so many people to take action, risking arrest for the first time in their lives. The notion of this legacy, the lasting spirit behind the actions, was first raised following the destruction of the Longhouse and the associated arrests in 2003: a vigil was held to indicate ‘The spirit is still very much alive’ (Wilamina McGrimmond, reproduced in Brown 2003b). The lasting legacy of the actions taken, which this spirit refers to, was also described by many involved in the actions taken as a positive outcome of the struggle (see, for example, Friends 2004a; Iotzova 2004).

Following the multiple arrests, the destruction of the Longhouse and forced extinguishment of the sacred fire, participatory direct intervention was effectively
quashed. Whilst many viewed the subsequent destruction in the valley as irrecoverable, there was a desire to keep the level of community, solidarity, compassion and drive for social justice that the struggle embodied, and the empowerment it fostered, alive and flourishing. Participants interviewed for Maia Iotzova’s documentary film Grass Through Concrete—the struggle to protect the Red Hill Valley, express these sentiments. The closing caption of the film metaphorically restates this:

After the raid on the Longhouse The Sacred Fire was relit and continues to burn in the Red Hill Valley and in the hearts and minds of those who resisted (Iotzova 2004: 69mins).

In November 2006, in the wake of the municipal elections, the political implications of the city’s actions in pushing ahead with the expressway were raised. Larry Di Ianni’s unexpected ‘stunning defeat’ in his bid for re-election as mayor brought forth direct self-reflections including

Whether people didn’t like me because of the Red Hill stand (Di Ianni 2006).

Di Ianni, previously a city councillor and chair of the expressway implementation committee, championed the proposed expressway and pushed forward with construction in the weeks leading up to the previous election in 2003—in which he became Mayor. His actions in pushing forwards with clearing trees in the Red Hill Valley and removing the Longhouse, with the election pending, was the target of significant criticism (Iotzova 2004). Di Ianni’s contentious decision, on behalf of the city, to sue 68 Federal officials for $75 million who insisted the expressway proposal be subject to a Federal environmental assessment was considered another factor (Jones 2003; Macintyre 2006; Nolan 2005; unknown 2002a).

Following the destruction of the Longhouse and the cessation of participatory direct action, the last substantial challenge to the expressway was Six Nations legal action to protect usage rights afforded under the Nanfan Treaty—“A “Deed
from the Five Nations to the King, of their Beaver Hunting Ground," made at Albany, New York, July 19, 1701' (Royce 1899). This legal action was withdrawn on 1 June 2004. Factors shaping the withdrawal became evident on 28 February 2006:

A small group of Six Nations protesters from the Grand River Territory reserve move[d] onto the Caledonia construction site, erecting tents, a teepee and a wooden building (unknown 2006).

The ‘Caledonia construction site’ was known as Douglas Creek Estates—a proposed expansion of residential housing in Caledonia, located approximately 20 km south of Hamilton. The Caledonia site is at the centre of an ongoing dispute over legal claim to the land—originating with the Haldimand Proclamation of 1824 that allotted a tract of land 6 miles on either side of the Grand River to Six Nations. The land at Caledonia, including the entire town and many others, falls within this tract—alongside the referred to Grand River Territory reserve. The actions at Caledonia were pre-planned and alluded to in advance, indicated in the text of a press release issued to explain the withdrawal of legal action launched to protect treaty rights in the Red Hill Valley:

we have decided, after long reflection and following a meeting with the Elected Chief and Six Nations Council representatives, that we will assert our rights at the right

69 The Caledonia ongoing dispute has significant regional and national political ramifications. Repeated references were made linking the actions in the Red Hill Valley and Caledonia to the police shooting of Dudley George on 6 September, 1995 during an occupation of Ipperwash Provincial Park on Lake Huron in Ontario (Burman 2003; Clairmont 2003a; Dubniczky 2006; Marr 2003; Nolan 2005; Orkin & Klippenstein 2003). An inquiry was established by the government of Ontario in November 2003, lasting 25 months. The findings were published on May 31, 2007 (Linden 2007). The occupation at Caledonia continues.
time, in the right place, and with a good mind and in a strong way. That time is not now and that place is not the Red Hill Valley (Green, Ireland & Doxtador 2004).

The importance of the basis for the decision to withdraw this legal action, without specific detail of what was to follow, was indicated in the reference to the right time and the right place. The title of the press release emphasised the importance of this: The Plaintiffs in the 1701 Nanfan Treaty—Red Hill Valley lawsuit against the City of Hamilton announce the withdrawal of their lawsuit: “Our treaty rights exist, and must be honoured. We will assert them at the right time and in the right place”. The ‘right time’ and the ‘right place’ was the land reclamation at Caledonia (Green, L. 2006. pers. comm. October). The strategic vagueness, strategic resistant practices (Hoagland 2007), of this statement shares similarities with the directions of Tipujurn at Wave Hill and Uncle Guboo at Sandon Point.

Preceding the June 2004 announcement, three residents had climbed trees adjacent to the area where blasting through the Niagara Escarpment for the proposed expressway was scheduled (CATCH 2004). The tree-sits were undertaken in direct support, and at the request, of Six Nations (Clark, N. 2005. pers. comm. October). Nathan Clark, the last of the three tree-sitters, remained aloft for 105 days, descending on 18 September for his birthday. Coincidentally, this was the same day the Sandon Point Aboriginal Tent Embassy was destroyed by arsonists (see chapter 4). The removal of the final tree-sit signalled the cessation of direct action within the Red Hill Valley. As indicated above, the valley was presumed lost and emphasis has subsequently focussed on keeping the

70 Participants in the Caledonia reclamation indicated the potential for further land reclamation during a visit to the blockade in mid-2006. It was also indicated that they had sought all recourse possible via legal avenues prior to occupying the site, to prevent further damage to the land.

71 CATCH, Citizens AT City Hall, was formed in the wake of the actions of the City in pushing forward with the expressway proposal. Its aim was to monitor city meetings and publish details for the general public.
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spirit alive.

FIRST NATIONS AND THE RED HILL VALLEY
One of the small number of published accounts indicating the importance of the Red Hill Valley to the Haudenosaunee was a statement by Chief Arnold General the day before police moved in to end the 13-week Six Nations occupation of the valley:

The Valley includes former Iroquois village sites, burial grounds, medicines and sensitive wildlife habitats (General 2003).

The police raid led to 14 arrests, the destruction of the Longhouse and the forced extinguishment of the sacred fire.

The basis of the respect and recognition afforded the Haudenosaunee is rooted in the Gushwenta, the Two Row Wampum Treaty (1613) between the Haudenosaunee confederacy and white settlers. The symbolic wampum belt has two rows of purple beads that

symbolize the path of two vessels, travelling down the same river together. One, a birch bark canoe, will be for the Indian people, their laws, their customs and their ways. The other, a ship, will be for the white people and their laws, their customs and their ways. We shall each travel the same river together, side by side, but in our own boats. Neither of us will try to steer the other’s vessel (Chief Michael Mitchell, reproduced in Tully 1995: 128).

The agreement enshrined in the Gushwenta was repeatedly referred to during the campaign to protect the Red Hill Valley. Living together in difference and non-interference, with the respect and recognition on which it was based, were stressed (Iotzova 2004; T’hoahahoken 2004). The signing included a rejection of
the paternalism espoused by white settlers:

The white man said he would respect the Onkwehonweh’s [the real people’s] belief and pronounce him as a son. The Onkwehonweh replied, “I respect you, your belief, and what you say; but you pronounced yourself as my father and with this I do not agree, because the father can tell his son what to do and also can punish him.” So the Onkwehonweh said, “We will not be like father and son, but like brothers” (unknown 2007c).72

From Mountain to Lake, ‘a record of the environmental and cultural histories of the Red Hill Valley’ provides, amongst other standpoints, detail from an archaeological perspective of the First Nations history of the Red Hill Valley (Peace 1998b: xviii). In detailing this archaeological perspective, the author’s intent, paralleling that of the field, is explicit:

This chapter examines the archaeological record of Aboriginal Activity in the Red Hill Valley (Wilson 1998: 105).

Wilson’s chapter is predicated on the constructed cognitive authority of science, the scientific hierarchisation of knowledges that positions ‘knowledges that exist outside the realm of white western knowledge as available for appropriation’ (Moreton-Robinson 1999; Smart 1986). Oral accounts are not afforded the authority of written accounts, rendering the standards unjust. The evidentiary burden is placed on First Peoples, limited to colonial language and terms (Metallic & Monture-Angus 2002; Tully 1995: 34). Tully has identified implications of this, in reference to the ‘claim’ for sovereignty in Dalgamuukw v

72 This article was accompanied by the by-line: ‘This interpretation of the Two Row Wampum belt has been widely attributed to the late elder Jake Thomas, a traditional Cayuga chief at Six Nations reserve, and Huron Miller, Onondaga; both leaders in the oral tradition.’
BC. Deference to the cognitive authority of white ways of knowing and seeing entrenches colonial relationships (Tully 2000: 48).

The notion of First Peoples as cultures of the past constructs them as in a lower state of development, in a previous stage of human history as a history of progress (Moore 2001: 332; Tully 1995: 65-6). As history, First Peoples cultures ‘can add to western knowledge’ (Smallacombe 2000: 153). Wilson’s analysis is reflective of published material on the Red Hill Valley and Six Nations history: a focus on physical significance. He refers to a 1963 archaeological investigation as ‘a salvage project’ (Wilson 1998: 116). Aside from the colonial notion of a no longer living culture, a culture of the past, salvage implies saving. The underlying assumptions fostered the good intentions of missionaries, who sought to assist those labelled as ‘in a state of nature, primitive, rude, savage, traditional or underdeveloped’ (Tully 1995: 65).

Augustus Jones performed the first geodetic surveys in the Hamilton region and has been described as someone who came to be on amicable terms with local Mississauga peoples. During his early surveys, he recorded that the Red Hill Creek, the ‘Creek at the Carrying Place’, was known as gusegupoceloning. A loose translation of this is ‘place where a small kind of turtle laid their eggs’ (Peace 1998c: 6). The term ‘carrying place’ refers to the portage between Lake Ontario and the Red Hill Marsh near the creek’s mouth. Portage is a term that refers to carrying, over land, of a canoe from one water body to another. The existence of a portage route is indicative of the trail following the Red Hill Creek from Lake Ontario through to the Niagara escarpment (Stewart-DeBreau & Nugent 1998: 204).

The trail running adjacent to the Red Hill Creek (through the valley) was one of three prominent trails used by First Nations in the Hamilton region. All three of these are linked to the valley. Alongside the trail ‘from mountain to lake’ was the ‘Iroquois trail’ that links Queenston and Brantford on the Grand River, and another trail running east-west along the shoreline of Lake Ontario (Cuming, MacDonald, Phil & Robertson 1998: 33-4; Peace 1998c: 17). In reflecting on The Aboriginal Presence and the trail system, Wilson describes the Red Hill Valley as being
Locally important in terms of its position relative to the system of trails in the region as well as its potential for seasonal, special purpose use as evidenced by archaeological finds (1998: 127).

The importance of this trail system was recognised by white settlers: major road routes in Hamilton (aside from the expressway proposed for the valley) still follow these trails. To provide context for his analysis, Wilson locates the aims of his work within the archaeological field:

The discipline of archaeology is uniquely positioned to enhance our understanding of the peoples, times, and events about which there is no written records (emphasis added, Ibid: 105).

Deference to written records illustrates the cognitive authority afforded white ways of knowing and seeing, relationally constructing a boundary to separate the oral histories of the Haudenosaunee (Gieryn 1995). Demarcation of knowledges, technologies of knowledge, is predicated on the notion of human history as a history of progress (Moore 2001: 332).

Following a long period of regional contact with Six Nations, settlement in the Hamilton region was pursued in the 18th Century, around the time of the US War of Independence. The context of settlement in the region was largely predicated on the outcomes of the war:

The treaty of peace between Great Britain and the United State of America was signed in 1782… In the whole text of the treaty there was not a word about the Six Nations. But all their lands south of Lake Ontario as far as the banks of the Hudson came into the possession of the United States… All that they could fall back on was the promise that their rights would be respected when the conflict ended.
‘Now is the time for you to help the King,’ General Haldimand had said to the assembled redskins in 1775. ‘The war has commenced. Assist the King now, and you will find it to your advantage. Go now and fight for your possessions, and, whatever you lose of your property during the war, the King will make up to you when peace returns’ (Wood 1915: 99-100).

Racist terminology (i.e. ‘redskins’) aside, Lockean notions of property shaped the British approach to the Treaty. The advantage referred to was detailed in the Haldimand Proclamation. Under the seal of Royal authority, reparations were granted with regards to the Grand River west of the Hamilton region:

A tract six miles wide on each side of this stream, extending from its source to its mouth, was allotted to the Six Nations (Ibid: 103-4).

Prior to this reparation, the Crown acquired land from the Missassuagas with the intent of granting a portion to the Six Nations and the remainder for British settlement. The acquisition, on 22 May 1784 was referred to as the ‘Between the Lakes Purchase’. Including more than one million hectares, the specified land extended from the Niagara Peninsula and Lake Erie (south of Hamilton) through to the head of Lake Ontario, known as Burlington Bay (Graymont 1972: 284; Wilson 1998: 125). This ‘gift’ included the disputed lands at Caledonia (Chadwick 1897: 23-4, footnote). Whilst the Red Hill Valley falls outside of this gift it, in part, constituted the theoretical Kanonsionni (in the Seneca language Hotinonsonne or Hodenosaunee), or “Long House” in which the several nations were regarding as dwelling... Here dwelt the first family, the Senecas, who were the door-keepers; next to them the Cayugas, and, successively, the Onondagas as the third family, and the Oneidas, the fourth family; and originally, the Mohawks, the fifth family; but this order was changed when the
Tuscaroras were admitted, and, occupying a district south of the Oneidas, became the fifth family, the Mohawks being then the sixth, occupying the east end of the “House” near a line drawn from Montreal to Albany. The Onondagas, being in the central position, where the common fire in the actual common dwelling would be found, were the fire keepers, and here was very appropriately the place of the Great Council meetings of the Confederacy (Ibid: 27).

The Red Hill Valley and Caledonia fall within the lands detailed in the Nanfan Treaty, which established ongoing usage rights (Royce 1899). Larry Green, of Six Nations, sought an injunction against the proposed expressway through the Red Hill Valley in November 2003 based on Nanfan Treaty rights:

> When we lit the Ancestors’ Sacred Fire in the Red Hill Valley, the original Firepeople made it clear that no road should be built through there. The Iroquois Confederacy posted that land and supported the Firepeople’s freedom to exercise our indigenous rights in the Red Hill Valley that are governed by treaties.

> I am taking this action to insist that the Crown prevent its people from building the expressway, to protect my rights and the rights of my future generations to enjoy this part of our country free from any threat.

> As an heir and descendant of those Iroquois People who entered into treaty with the Crown, it is my duty and responsibility as a citizen of the Iroquois People to act in the best interests of my heirs and descendants. This is all I have to say at this time (Green 2003).

The term ‘posted’ details legal notification of the Red Hill Valley as Six Nations
land: signs indicating this were posted in the valley in 2001, April 2002 and again in August 2003 (Friends 2002; General 2003; Hughes 2002; Iotzova 2004).

Lawyers acting for Green pragmatically defined the importance of the Red Hill Valley in the broader context of the continuing encroachment on Nanfan Treaty rights:

Yes, “we” have simply occupied and stolen much of the rest of the 1701 territory identified in the treaty and on the treaty map.

But surely this makes the rights of the Iroquois people and their “heires and descendants” to be “free of all disturbances” in the modest remaining Red Hill Valley corner of their original 1701 hunting territory so very much more important.

It is a corner that is clearly still very amenable to the exercise of these economically, culturally and spiritually fundamentally important hunting and other treaty rights Newspaper article (Orkin & Klippenstein 2003).

The Summary Report of the Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment (Cuming, MacDonald, Phil & Robertson 1998) and its predecessor the Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory: Technical Report (Andreae, Cuming, Garner, Robertson & Williamson 1997) were both commissioned as a part of The Red Hill Creek Expressway North-South Section Impact Assessment process. Like Wilson’s (1998) The Aboriginal Presence: the Red Hill Valley 9000 B.C.—1615 A.D, these reports considered physical evidence of usage exclusively and infer significance from this. The colonial assumptions—the focus on physical significance and the imposition of evidentiary burden—are counter to the basis of respect and recognition laid out in the Gushwenta and subsequent treaties.

The reports from the assessment process refer to 113 registered archaeological
sites in the Red Hill Creek Watershed, with a ‘high overall archaeological potential… [which] suggests that numerous as yet undocumented archaeological resources are present’ (Andreae, Cuming, Garner, Robertson & Williamson 1997: 58; Cuming, MacDonald, Phil & Robertson 1998: 11). More indicative of this:

    The locations of many of the sites that have been documented appear to have been reoccupied on many occasions, attesting to the attractiveness of the watershed, and the many natural resources that it offered to the people… (Andreae, Cuming, Garner, Robertson & Williamson 1997: 58).73

Of the 113 archaeological sites referred to as recorded in the Red Hill Creek watershed, a large number are located in areas that would be directly impacted by the proposed expressway. Members of Six Nations referred to the existence of burials in the valley, indicating that the expressway would desecrate these areas (Iotzova 2004)74.

THE CONTEMPORARY RED HILL VALLEY

Hamilton is located in the region known as the Golden Horseshoe, midway between Toronto and Niagara Falls, on the western tip of Lake Ontario (see Figure 10, page 179). The Red Hill Valley is located in the industrial east of the city. The process of European settlement in the region provides an important basis to understand the contemporary valley.

73 The Summary Report was ‘a summary of the draft Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Technical Report… [was] intended for public distribution and review’ Cuming, MacDonald, Phil and Robertson 1998. The Summary report does not include inferences to ‘archaeological potential’ reproduced in the draft version.

74 Wilson (1998) also refers to the existence of burials.
The Red Hill Creek draws its name from the ‘red colour of the bluffs and hills adjacent to the creek’ at a distance roughly halfway between its descent of the escarpment at Albion Falls and where it flows into Hamilton Harbour. When this name was first used is unknown, with the creek being referred to by a number of different European names including Big Creek (which was used around the time of the Battle of Stoney Creek) Clenches Creek and Lottridge’s Creek (Peace 1998c: 6-9).

The influx of white settlers was a result of and central to the provision of land grants. The introductory chapter to From Mountain to Lake, provides context:

“The land is before you; choose as much as you will.” With these words John Grave Simcoe, Lieutenant of Upper Canada, made a generous offer to William Davis in 1793 (Ibid: 1).

Davis and his family were United Empire Loyalists who had set north following British defeats in the south. The establishment of settlements in the region specifically followed the American Revolution. The grants offered were subsequent to the signing of the ‘Between the Lakes Purchase’ on 22 May 1784:

The entire cession included the Niagara Peninsula, lands close to the head of Lake Ontario, and the north shore of Lake Erie... From this tract of over one million hectares, the British carved out a tract to run ten kilometres deep on each side of the Grand River from its mouth to its source, and awarded it to the Six Nations...’ (Wilson 1998: 125).

Davis and his family, who would become pioneers in the Hamilton region, selected land in both Barton Township and Saltfleet Township. The Red Hill Valley was situated on the east and west sides of the townships respectively (Peace 1998c: 3). The settlement of the area followed the signing of the Purchase and the ‘so important’ surveys of Jones, referred to previously, who ‘established close ties with the resident Natives’ (Gouglas 1998: 132; Johnston1964: xxxix; Smith 1915:
Smith provides an indication of the influence of Jones, identifying linkages between cultures that he assisted in creating:

A physically strong and ambitious man, whose wives and best friends were Indians, he lived in two worlds simultaneously and, particularly in his first years in Upper Canada, served as a bridge between them (Smith 1988: 451).

The first road in the region—King St—follows the east-west First Nations trail and, ‘as the twentieth century comes to a close, the valley’s landscape still bears the legacy of the Aboriginal presence, primarily in the form of present day roads...’ (Stewart-DeBreau & Nugent 1998: 207). King St bisects the current day Hamilton downtown core and is a major thoroughfare.

Enlightenment notions of technology progress are visible in descriptions of the Valley, with Sean Gouglas describing the 1871 landscape:

almost 70% of the Red Hill Valley had been cleared or improved, with each individual landowner having cleared approximately 89.3% of his or her land (emphasis added, Gouglas 1998: 139).

The precisely determined and ‘impressive’ improvement of land was reiterated, with over 83% of the valley being ‘cleared or improved’, equating to 90.2% for individual landowners, by 1899 (Ibid: 152). In contrast with these references to improvement of the land as progress, opposition to the expressway proposal was substantially based on the valley’s significance as a green corridor.
Coinciding with an increase in environmental consciousness generally during the 1970s, works were undertaken that substantially reduced or removed a number of the most serious point sources of pollution impacting on the creek and valley. As

Figure 11. Aerial photo of the Red Hill Valley\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{75} Image courtesy Friends of Red Hill valley
such, specific changes in interpretations and reflections on the ecological and aesthetic values of the Red Hill Valley resulted from both this shifting environmental consciousness, a reduction in pollution and an associated reclamation of the former farmlands in and around the valley by native vegetation. These shifts and changes came to have a significant impact on the impending dispute (Duncan 1998; McGuinness 1989; Peace 1998a; Stewart-DeBreau & Nugent 1998; Ventresca, Arpino, Augustine, Pascall & Hayashida 1982).

An awareness of the social benefits of the Red Hill Valley as open green space, and the implications of the expressway proposal, alongside many other issues, are presented in Grass Through Concrete (Iotzova 2004). Reference is made to use of the valley by residents of the socio-economically disadvantaged east end of the city who have no means to pay for recreational/institutional facilities. Largely, however, the significance of the Red Hill Valley to local residents of European decent is predicated on the valley’s ecological values, open space and the broader benefits these provide. This is largely expressed through reference to numerous flora and fauna species, some rare and endangered, and the Niagara Escarpment as being designated a World Biosphere Reserve by the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) on 27 March 1990 (Crombie 1994; Duncan 1998; Friends 2004a; Hamilton Naturalists’ Club 1995; Iotzova 2004; McNie 1991; unknown 1995a).

The Red Hill Valley has European heritage value, much like that at Sandon Point. The first industry in the region was the Albion Mill, located next to Albion Falls—where the Red Hill Creek crosses the Niagara escarpment. The region’s first school, church and public buildings were erected in the valley (McLean 1993). The creek and valley also marked the northern-most point of advancement of American troops in the War of 1812. The invading forces were repelled prior to their defeat during the Battle of Stoney Creek (Johnston 1964: lxxv; McLean 1993; Stewart-DeBreau & Nugent 1998: 186).

THE EVOLUTION OF THE DISPUTE
The roots of contestation for the dispute over the future of the valley can be traced
back to 1929 when the

‘City of Hamilton purchase[d] 260 hectares (645 acres) of
land in the Red Hill Valley to preserve as natural parkland’
March 19, 1929 (unknown 1990).

The Cities acquisition of land in the valley had strong public support (unknown 1999: 182; Weaver 1982: 179). Twenty years later the cited had acquired more land, totalling 101 acres between King Street and what was widely referred to as King’s Forest, and between Barton and Burlington Streets (unknown 1950). The purchases ‘in the lower valley lands likely stemmed from the first City of Hamilton Official Plan prepared in 1947’. E. G. Faludi, the instigator of the plan, envisioned ‘a natural barrier between densely built up areas and future developments’: a green belt of parks (Peace 1998a: 221-2). Walter Peace provides a broader indication of the context from which the expressway proposal emerged:

By the 1950s, the cumulative impacts of a growing population (with its increased mobility) and economic development in Hamilton began to reshape the city and surrounding areas in an unprecedented fashion. The Red Hill Valley was one of several areas to experience the impacts of urban growth (Ibid: 213).

The context of these pressures led in 1950 to the first proposal to build a road through the valley (Wilson & Bunnell 1950). The recently acquired land was central to the earliest vision for a road:

Fred Marshal, Parks’ Superintendent, saw the Red Hill Valley as capable of being developed into one of the finest scenic drives in the (Peace 1998a: 221-2).

A 1956 traffic and transportation study recommended ‘a belt expressway bypassing the central city between the Queen Elizabeth Way in the east and the Chedokee Expressway in the south-west’ be established (Smith 1956; unknown
It was reported in mid 1959 that the Board of Control engaged A. D. Margison & Associates to prepare proposals for an east-end expressway, somewhat contrasting with a council decision of the previous year, referred to in the same article, ‘that traffic in this area did not warrant an expressway along the Red Hill Creek ravine’ and that recommending such a proposal was ‘not entirely satisfactory’ (Margison 1959; unknown 1959). The idea of an expressway was resurrected in a 1963 study by C. C. Parker and Associates (Parker, Parsons & Brickerhoff 1963; Peace 1998a: 226).

By 1960, the Red Hill Valley, via annexation, was included within the Hamilton City Limits (Peace 1998a: 222). Within eight years of this inclusion, land purchases in the valley by the City of Hamilton had accounted for more than 1000 acres. The acquisitions included approximately 850 acres in the King’s Forest area. Further land purchase, this time above Albion Falls, was proposed by a Hamilton Region Conservation Authority study. The ‘intensive day-use recreation’ specified as the basis for acquisition was not implemented (Ibid: 226). Amendments to the City’s Official Plan in 1967 designated an area east of the valley for transportation purposes.

With the rise in awareness of environmental issues during the 1970s, and the corresponding establishment of a number of environmental organisations in Hamilton, the dispute over future of the Red Hill Valley ‘re-emerged front and centre in the political arena’. Clear Hamilton of Pollution (CHOP) and the Save The Valley Committee were early groups vocally opposed to the expressway based on generalised ecological factors (Elker 1980: 10; Houghton 1994: 1; Peace 1998a: 227). One study listed ‘over twenty loosely knit non-governmental organizations and community groups working to save the natural and cultural heritage of the valley’ (Collier 2003: 15, 22).

During the 1970s there contention between the city council and provincial government regarding funding for the proposed expressway (Peace 1998a: 227). The city council was ‘adamantly opposed’ to a route through the Red Hill Valley, consistent with the basis for land acquisitions in the valley itself. The acquisitions, which began in the late 1920s, led to period of ‘1927 to 1931 [being] the most
productive in the history of Hamilton’s parks’. The area set aside for parkland ‘nearly quadrupled in size’. This was a significant factor in luring McMaster University to the city (Best 1991: 56, 65).

The original vision for the Parks system, and the future of the Red Hill Valley, were outlined in a Hamilton Spectator full page spread on 5 October 1929 entitled ‘Facts about Parks Board purchase’. Thomas McQuesten, appointed to the Hamilton Board of Parks Management in 1922, articulated his vision: ‘Large park areas in surroundings of natural beauty fulfil… a need which cannot be met in any other way’. The initial lands purchased, later to become known as King’s Forest, were described as ‘something which the Board is convinced will be the most cherished possession of this city in the future’. The aim of the acquisitions was to ‘preserve for all time one of the outstanding spectacular areas in the County of Wentworth’ (Ibid: 67; unknown 1929b). In defending the purchase, another article included in the full page spread—which included a page-width banner image and a map of the area—referred to this as ‘sound planning and commons sense’ (unknown 1929a).

Reflecting public sentiment and rejecting provincial pressure, the City passed the following resolution, unanimously, on 14 March 1974:

That this council make its clear its intention to retain the natural character of the Red Hill Valley and to maintain permanently its present natural state (Friends 2000; Peace 1998a: 227).

The Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth adopted a similar position. The City-Provincial Technical Advisory Committee involved in the study of transportation options, despite the actions of the City and Regional Municipality, continued to recommend a road through the valley. Continued emphasis on a valley route was the subject of a marked dismissal from the City’s Board of Control on 4 July 1974:

the City Council has made it quite clear that the Red Hill
Valley is to be excluded from any study on possible alignments for this freeway. The resolution of City Council in this regard should be stressed with the City Provincial Technical Advisory Committees so that there is no misunderstanding and studies undertaken are not to include the use of the Red Hill Valley (Peace 1998a: 228).

Following this, the City’s Official Plan was amended to remove a route through the valley as a possible alternate for a north-south expressway. Continued pressure from the Provincial government and non-publicly disclosed discussions at the council level followed a July 1977 resolution. The City had changed its position:

for the first time the City Council had removed its long-standing objection concerning the Red Hill Valley and was prepared to have the Technical Advisory Committee study all reasonable alternatives to both the East-West Freeway across the mountain and the North-south Freeway. The exact reason for this change in position remain unclear to this day (M. I. Jeffrey, QC, reproduced in Ibid: 231).

The first community groups to vocally oppose the expressway proposal included CHOP, Save the Valley committee and the Hamilton Region Conservation Authority (HRCA). The Save the Valley committee was formed in 1979, attracting 700 people to its first meeting. During the same year, the HCRA ‘went on record’ as opposing an expressway route through the Valley (Friends 2000). Two petitions opposing the proposed expressway, totalling 11,000 signatures, were presented to the Municipality and a city Alderman in July and August 1979 (Peace 1998a: 231; various 1985). Peace described the basis for some of the support and opposition as follows

On one side expressway supporters argued that the project would ease present and future problems and enhance the attractiveness of the city and region for economic growth. Much of the argument in favour of the
road in the 1970s centred on the need for a commuter route between the mountain and the high employment areas along the bayfront... In some respects, perceptions that the valley was severely polluted were probably responsible for either apathy or reluctant acceptance of the expressway on the part of some residents. On the other side were the project’s opponents. Their position was based largely on environmental grounds and concerns regarding the validity of the region’s predictions regarding future population and job growth in the area (Peace 1998a: 232).

Representations of a degraded environment share commonalities with the framing of the Sandon Point area by Stockland including ‘not pristine land by any assessment’ (McInerny 2001). Inferences of a degraded environment contributed to ‘apathy or reluctant acceptance’ of the expressway proposal within the paradigm of technological progress. Previous damage done could be repaired, fixed through the rational application of science and technology as a part of the expressway proposal, again paralleling the ‘benefits’ of the housing proposal at Sandon Point. The closure of a landfill site that was leaching material in the creek and a significant reduction sewer/stormwater impacts—considered as principal sources of creek contamination, reduced anthropocentric impacts on the creek (Bourns 1986; Ventresca, Arpino, Augustine, Pascall & Hayashida 1982). A January 1975 editorial in the Hamilton Spectator predicted the scope of the impending dispute:

Any government move to force a highway down the valley is certain to touch of a long, costly, pointless political struggle that will make a lot of noise but won’t produce the pavement (McLean 1992).

Two studies detailed how ‘people’s attitudes have changed dramatically from 1979 to 1982’, following the closure of the landfill and reduction in of stormwater/sewer infiltration (Ventresca, Arpino, Augustine, Pascall & Hayashida
1982: 24). Changed perspectives correlated with a significant reduction in resident support for any road through the valley. In 1979 there was a 46.7% approval rating for an expressway amongst local residents, whereas in 1982, support for any transport usage had reduced to 10.9% (Ibid: 25).

Linked to the interpretation of the valley as degraded and the apathy or reluctant acceptance of an expressway were the findings of a Consolidated Hearing. The hearing dealt with the Environment Assessment Act and the Planning Act. The 9-month and $2 million Joint Board hearing held during 1985—the first of its kind—handed down a split decision in favour of the expressway proposal. The configuration of the panel was an issue of contention (Iotzova 2004). The board consisted of two members of the Ontario Municipal Board and one member of the Environment Assessment Board. The Ontario Municipal Board appointees stated that

The road would benefit the valley. The construction of the proposed road will clean up the major points of pollution and provide improved access to the valley (Appen 1985).

Similar notions were mobilised by Stockland in a Newsletter published in May 2002—countering the Newsletter published by the local community:

The polluted creeks will be cleaned up and user-friendly open space parklands will be created. At present few people would venture far from the cycleway into the weeds. Stockland will spend hundreds of thousands of dollars improving the area. The company will also provide cycleways and pleasant pedestrian links to the coast zone, Illawarra Escarpment and surrounding community (unknown 2001).

The instrumental basis for improving the area in both statements draws from notions of technology as progress, with technology as the only means to progress. The members from the Ontario Municipal Board added that
The Board cannot find any evidence in the record... to show that the construction of the proposed road will destroy the valley (Appen 1985).

The Environmental Assessment Board appointee dissented to these findings, providing a detailed account. The proposed expressway would inhibit

the preservation of the area as a continuous natural environment and is in fact incompatible with that natural environment (Ibid).

The expressway was ministerially approved in March 1987, with a project report and timeline issued in November. Ministerial approval did little to stem opposition. The Red Hill Creek Expressway was officially named in May 1990 and a ground-breaking ceremony was held one month later. Works on existing road realignments and a rail overpass commenced soon afterwards:

What had been proposed, debated, and disputed for nearly forty years now had its first visible impacts on the landscape of the Red Hill Valley (Peace 1998a: 234).

By the end of 1990, the future of the City’s expressway proposal was uncertain (Brown 1990; Longbottom 1990; Nolan 1990a, 1990b). At the Provincial election, the Ontario New Democratic Party (NDP) won all six seats in Hamilton-Wentworth and four months later announced a withdrawal of funding for the project. The basis for the previously rumoured announcement clearly stated:

the Red Hill Valley is irreplaceable, it is a natural asset that Hamilton must not lose (Transportation Minister Ed Phillip, reproduced in Peters & Poling 1990).

Following the withdrawal of Provincial funding a business-funded group was formed to promote support for the expressway proposal. On 9 May a 16-page ‘information supplement’, published by the Citizens’ Expressway Coalition was
included in the *Hamilton Spectator*. The supplement contributed to ‘a favourite Hamilton pastime [of] “defending” the city from the “attacks” of Toronto and/or Queens Park’ (McLean 1992). The appointment of Gilles Pouliot to the Transportation Ministry and his reaffirming that the Provincial Government would not fund an expressway through the valley led to a cessation of debate between the city and the province (Peace 1998a: 236).

Supporters of the expressway shifted their focus to the next provincial election, whilst the NDP Provincial government sought to work out a compromise with the Municipality. As a part of this plan it committed to provide $18 million in funding for projects aimed at

restoring and protecting the natural features and enhancing the public use of the… valley (Poling 1994).

Following release of what became known as Crombie plan (reflecting the name of the former Toronto Mayor and the Provincialy appointed facilitator to the dispute, David Crombie) the HCRA announced a five-year restoration project in the Red Hill Valley involving the City of Hamilton, the Province of Ontario. The restoration project would include biological and archaeological surveys. Consideration of Six Nations history was typified by recommendations for further archaeological surveys focussing on physical evidence of prior occupation (Wilson 1998).

Alongside the restoration project, both the HRCA and Crombie proposed a ‘25,000-square-foot World Biosphere Interpretive Centre’ (Crombie 1994: 16-17; unknown 1995a). The interpretive centre would have a focus on the ‘history, ecosystems and the natural heritage of Hamilton-Wentworth’ (Poling 1994). These were not the first calls for some form of interpretive centre. The idea for such a centre shared common assumptions with the Regional Park proposal for Sandon Point and the respective expressway and housing proposals. Such a facility is a

76 Queens Park is the location of the Provincial legislature.
form of ‘development’. The establishment of an interpretive centre would provide some improvements to the valley. Development is equated with progress.

A conservative Provincial government was elected in 1995. Previously approved provincial funding for restorative works in the valley were immediately withdrawn. Funding was restored for the expressway, putting it ‘back on the road’ (Peace 1998a: 237). The dispute over the expressway continued to increase. The recreational trail central to restoration works was completed, near to the route used by First Nations prior to European settlement displacing them. Modifications to the plan for the expressway, in an attempt to appease community concerns, focused on ecological factors.

Following the restoration of Provincial funding for the expressway, after unsuccessfully pursuing lawful avenues, local residents escalated tactics. The outcome was the direct action that began in August 2003. As at Sandon Point, many participated in their first ever ‘illegal’ activities, blocking machinery from entering the valley (Don McLean in Iotzova 2004: 18mins).

AN ISSUE LONG LEFT UNCONSIDERED?
Up until preparations were made for the August 2003 occupation there as limited mention of Six Nations by those working to save and protect the Red Hill Valley. The only reference to Six Nations in a chronology prepared by Friends was indirect. Under 1985:

Work begins on the Red Hill Valley Rehabilitation Project led by the Hamilton Region Conservation Authority. Includes biological inventory, archaeological inventory, water sampling, tree planting and a formal end-to-end cycling and walking path (emphasis added, Friends 2000).

Paralleling this, Peace’s concluding chapter in From Mountain to Lake provides only one generic reference to First Nations:
In terms of the cultural landscape, the valley has come full circle in that it was once the route of an Aboriginal trail from the escarpment to the lake prior to European contact. Now, as the twentieth century comes to a close, another trail, this one for recreational purposes, has been constructed through the valley, thereby renewing the kink between mountain and lake (Peace 1998a: 244).

The emergence of an explicit consideration of Six Nations and their views by opponents of the expressway proposal locates a shift in the approach to support. One of the first scholarly publications analysing the contemporary dispute provides no mention of Six Nations in describing the valley and its broader socio-political context (Elker 1980). In analysing the impacts of the dispute, the Red Hill Valley Recreation Plan: a plan of cultural, social and recreational uses in the Red Hill Valley, prepared for the Save the Valley committee, provides an early reference to First Nations—asbeit without reference beyond prior usage (Ventresca, Arpino, Augustine, Pascall & Hayashida 1982). There were sporadic references to Six Nations and the historical importance of their role in the valley. This was largely limited to the importance as history.

There were early references to protecting areas of (physical) significance to First Nations. A 1991 article in The Hamilton Spectator had an indicative title: A future for the Red Hill Valley: combine nature centres with historic, native villages for a unique urban park. The proposal outlined, long before the Crombie Plan was put together, shared many similarities with the Regional Park proposal at Sandon Point. The general details were shaped by assumptions of First Nations as a culture of the past. What could be developed was a means to

            learn about our native peoples through an active archaeological site, a reconstructed longhouse and Attiwardaronk Village, and [a] First Nations cultural centre (emphasis added, McNie 1991).

The article was also included in the September-October newsletter of the Friends
of Red Hill Valley in the same year. The author was also the founder of Friends in 1991 (McGuinness 2003c). There was no further reference to this idea for a unique urban park by Friends. Whether a cultural centre in the Red Hill Valley would attempt to move beyond the issues covered in chapters two and four is not discernable. References to First Nations as a culture of the past are indicative that the issues raised in the Australian context are also present. Such notions were counter to the respect and recognition afforded the Haudenosaunee, a relationship typified by speaking with in contrast to the speaking for of Scott McNie’s urban park proposal.

The concept of interpretive centres were partly revisited in the report prepared by NDP appointed facilitator Crombie. The former Federal Cabinet Minister and Mayor of Toronto’s report detailed an alternative to the proposed transport route through the Red Hill Valley (Poling 1994). The Crombie Proposal included a ‘25,000-square-foot World Biosphere Interpretive Centre’ that would have a focus on the ‘history, ecosystems and the natural heritage of Hamilton-Wentworth’ (Crombie 1994: 16-17; McLean 1994; Poling 1994; unknown 1995a). No specific detail was provided regarding the inclusion of Six Nations culture within such a facility.

Six Nations history became somewhat of a spectacle in mid 2003 when a ‘four thousand year old Native pendent’ was found in the Red Hill Valley. In response to this discovery, William C. Noble, Professor of Archaeology at McMaster University, made his perspective known in a letter to Regional Chairmen for Hamilton, Reg Whynott:

I am of the opinion that a thorough archaeological survey and perhaps limited excavation would be a good first step towards finding out what remains lie hidden in the Red Hill Creek (reproduced in Friends 1993).

As the dispute continued throughout the 1990s and beyond, reference to physical evidence of Six Nations usage increased. A leaflet prepared by Friends in 1996 referred to ‘at least 18 identified archaeological sites extending back to 7000
B.C.’. This increased to ‘at least 21 archaeological sites will be impacted including an 11,000 year old camp and a 14th century native village’ in a flyer for a November 2002 event in Hamilton in which Noam Chomsky was speaking. A July 2003 update added to this with ‘more than 30 archaeological sites’ found, referring to the ‘11,000 year old site that [is] the first evidence of humans in the Hamilton area, and a native village whose partial excavation has generated over 56,000 artifacts’ [sic] (Friends 2003g).

There were two events that provided the context for the shift in the relationship between white supporters and the Haudenosaunee. The imminent threat of destruction in the valley is one, which can be seen as pragmatic. The basis for the other was the space created by activism; the dynamics of experience and the praxis of listening to the Haudenosaunee (Simpson 2000: 114, 17; Tully 1995). Respect and recognition, the basis of the Gushwenta, evolved in the context of the dispute.

On 5 August 2003, with the commencement of work scheduled for the expressway, two pickets were established to prevent work-crews from entering the valley. At Greenhill Avenue, one of the two locations, over 100 people were present at 7am. This followed two camp-outs at this location, with ‘about 20 people’ involved in this first one in October of 2002 (Cohen 2002; Faulkner 2002; Lukasik 2002; Walters 2002). The picket’s aim was to gain exposure for the campaign. The second, the “camp on the ramp” weekend’, which had 70 participants, was held from 4-6 July as a rehearsal for the planned upcoming occupation (Wells 2003).

Included in the activities at the camp-out were public and private sessions. The public session held:

from noon to 4 p.m. Saturday... [included] speeches, a potluck lunch, valley walks and children’s games (McGuinness 2003b).

The private session ‘include[d] training for non-violent civil disobedience’. The
camp-out was organised by a group previously operating ‘as the Coalition for an Expressway-Free Valley’, which included members of Friends and other organisations. Their intent was publicly shared:

But we’ve adopted a new name, Showstoppers, in response to a statement from Councilor Larry Di Ianni (chair of city council’s expressway implementation committee) who said work would start even without required permits, unless there was a 'showstopper.'

Well, we’re the Showstoppers. We intend to use, if necessary, non-violent direct action in order to stop the destruction planned for the Greenhill Avenue area. In August, we plan to stay as long as necessary to prevent building of the Greenhill Avenue access ramp (Kevin Stone, reproduced in Ibid).

The campout was organized when it was clear that the city was planning on proceeding and that the legal ways of stopping this had been blocked by the city’s court actions and other steps (Don McLean in Iotzova 2004: 17mins).

With the mainstream press reporting the cutting of 40,000 trees was expected to commence within a month, the stage was set for the upcoming occupation (Prokaska 2003). On 4 August, the day before the ‘greenspace’ at the end of Greenhill ‘officially [became] a construction zone’, an event was held in which about 800 (Don McLean in Iotzova 2004: 18mins):

protesters, neighbours and those drawn by the sight of the crowd of hundreds spent the afternoon in the sun in the park, listening to anti-expressway speakers. They gathered for a group picture, with a line of trees in the background,
and held a potluck (Fazari 2003).\(^77\)

The first direct action in the valley was in April 2002, when members of the Six Nations undertook action to ‘stop archaeological work and all other digging in Red Hill Valley’. After ordering archaeologists contracted by the City to leave, they ‘posted the valley with no trespassing signs’. Details of the action were published in Friends’ May Newsletter, including that the orders were not ‘directed at people going for a walk in the valley’. The newsletter referred to the potential this action had to delay expressway works (Friends 2002). A 15 April Friends email update provided the foundations for a forthcoming announcement, made on the second day of picketing at the Greenhill site. The email update followed a Hamilton

\(^77\) A potluck is a gathering in which those attending bring a plate of food to share.

\(^78\) Image courtesy Cees/Friends of Red Hill valley
Spectator editorial, published the same day, titled *Claim has no credibility, hurts native rights’ cause; Red Hill Creek Expressway: Shameful threats*. The editorial responded to Haudenosaunee assertions of the valley’s significance:

He suggests he knows where burial sites may be, but won’t point them out because they would be disturbed. That sounds more like gameplaying than reverence (Howard 2002).

A previous *Hamilton Spectator* article, published on 11 April, reported that Norman Jacobs of the Iroquois Confederacy—who the ‘he’ in the editorial refers to—was

reluctant to give... information [about significant sites] because once the city is aware of such sites, it is obliged by law to investigate them. As a traditional native leader, he believes such sites should not be disturbed (Hughes 2002).

Summaries of oral accounts in Huys’ *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment* report for Sandon Point included similar ‘beliefs’. Those interviewees were also reluctant to give out information, or to agree to any subsurface testing (Huys 2006).

The *Friends* email update responding to the editorial included ten numerical points challenging the attack on the Haudenosaunee:

the *Spectator* might exhibit some regret over the vile crimes that have been committed against First Nations graves in the past, and show respect for their legitimate concerns, rather than rushing to make accusations against them. They have experienced far too much of that in this country, and far too recently (McLean 2002).

Respect and recognition of the Haudenosaunee was reflected in *Friends* seeking
out permission to camp in the valley, paralleling what had happened at Sandon Point. Permission was granted on the second day of picketing at Greenhill Ave (Friends 2003k; McGuinness 2003e). The written permit included the following specific terms:

The permit is valid only if the permit-holders abide by both Kaianara:kowa (the Haudenosaunee Great Law of Peace), and the Showstoppers “Basis of Unity”. The Basis of Unity consists of the following six points:

1. Our attitude will be one of openness, friendliness, and respect towards all people we encounter.

2. We will use no violence, verbal or physical, toward any person.

3. We will not damage any property.

4. We will not bring or use any drugs or alcohol other than for medical purposes.

5. We will carry no weapons.

6. We will make decisions by consensus.

The picket at Greenhill Ave ‘was opened with the traditional Haudenosaunee Thanksgiving address’ (Friends 2003k). The space created by activism—the experiences of working together, speaking with and the praxis of listening—fostered an evolution in the means of affording respect and recognition. Subsequent actions added to these experiences. On 10 August

members of the Six Nations reserve asserted their jurisdiction over the land on which the city wants to build an expressway… and built a "sacred fire," under the shelter of trees in the park (Bowers 2003).
Following the posting of signs asserting claims over the land in 2001, 2002 and 2003 (Friends 2002; General 2003; Hughes 2002; Iotzova 2004), the group of people from Six Nations established that lodge [the Longhouse] in support of the Iroquois Confederacy asserting its jurisdiction over this land (T’hohahoken reproduced in Bowers 2003).

The erection of the Longhouse and lighting of a sacred fire, as at Sandon Point, enabled white supporters to gain first-hand exposure to Haudenosaunee to resistance:

By establishing the fire lodge, the Confederacy hopes to start a dialogue, something Thohahoken called “talking across the fire”.

“It prepares a place for mediation,” he said. “A place for discussion, dialogue and mediating conflicting points of view and conflicting interests in any dispute” (Ibid).

There was an immediate increase in support, respect and recognition (Iotzova 2004). *Friends* released a seven-point statement containing detailing why construction of the expressway should not proceed. It was the City whose actions are illegal and in violation of the rights of the Haudenosaunee and other First Nations peoples, as well as the rights of nearby residents.

The last of the seven points identified explicit support for the Haudenosaunee:

Finally, and most importantly, any attempt by the City to proceed with work in the Valley must be preceded by an agreement with all the affected Aboriginal peoples (Friends 2003b).
Dialogue with Six Nations, the spaces created in opposition to the expressway, and the opportunity to listen enshrined in the Haudenosaunee Longhouse, further facilitate the shift in how respect and recognition was offered by white supporters (Simpson 2000).

In response to the Greenhill Ave picketing and the erection of the Longhouse, the City of Hamilton ‘filed a notice of motion and statement of claim in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice’. The 12 August notice stated that any action taken to prevent construction activity in the valley was

wrongful, and constitutes trespass, nuisance, intimidation, inducement of breach of contract and conspiracy (Nolan 2003).

The included ‘statement of claim’ sought ‘to have the protesters cover the costs of the court action’ and ‘named’ several people involved alongside ‘any agent or person acting under his, her or their instructions’ (Ibid). On 15 August a temporary injunction was granted ‘barring both protesters and construction crews from the site’. Members of Six Nations ignored the injunction, considering it not applicable to them, based on the Gushwenta (lotzova 2004). A meeting with the City was planned for later in August, to discuss ‘the impact of historic treaties on the city’s expressway project’ (Van Harten 2003c).

The Friends September update again expressed support for the Haudenosaunee, further challenging the 15 April editorial. The update illustrated an awareness of previous actions by Six Nations to protect the valley and support was based on speaking with. Haudenosaunee concerns were promoted to a wider audience, framed as a basis for common ground:

Representatives of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy have expressed concerns about building an expressway in the Red Hill valley for years, so they are not newcomers to this issue (Friends 2003e).
The update provided detail of the actions of the Haudenosaunee Environmental Task Force (HETF), established after Haudenosaunee Grand Council discussions following the return of delegates who attended the Rio Earth Summit in 1992. This was the first detail provided by Friends of Six Nations actions based on environmental grounds. The September update also included the first significant detail of Six Nations connection to the land published by Friends:

In the case of the Red Hill valley, the ceremonial or cultural significance is due in large part to the fact that Aboriginal people are buried in the valley (Ibid).

Respect and recognition were central to detailing that the Haudenosaunee would not be present at the 5 September hearing to consider the City’s application for a permanent injunction to prevent opponents of the expressway entering the valley:

The Haudenosaunee do not plan to represent themselves regarding the injunction when it comes to court on September 5, because they do not consider that the provincial court has jurisdiction over Aboriginal issues (Ibid).

Reference to jurisdiction paralleled the seeking of permission to camp in the valley.

Lawyers representing the Iroquois Confederacy did address the court on 5 September. The injunction was granted late on 12 September, with no concessions provided the Haudenosaunee (McGuinness 2003d). Friends published an update after the decision was released, professing strong support for the moral and legal rights of Six Nations:

The Haudenosaunee have very strong moral and legal rights in Red Hill Valley. They have a right and a duty to protect the burial sites of their ancestors, and they have a solemn treaty with the Crown that guarantees them the right to use of the valley to gather medicinal plants, food and other natural materials. Quite obviously that right will
be seriously damaged if not destroyed by the proposed expressway project. Jurisdiction over the treaty rights of First Nations does not rest with provincial courts. These issues remain outstanding and unresolved (Friends 2003c).

Respect and recognition were subsequently more explicitly expressed by Friends in supporting the Haudenosaunee. A front-page Hamilton Spectator article published the day after the granting of the injunction challenged the City to consider this:

"But there’s no mention in it of the Haudenosaunee and I think that’s where the world turns... It doesn’t resolve the question of rights of the native people (McLean, reproduced in McGuinness 2003d).

The ‘courageous’ actions of the Haudenosaunee and ‘hundreds of individuals’ were pragmatically seen as a means to further delay work on the expressway,

sufficient to prevent the City from doing any major destruction in the valley before the November 10 elections.

The continuing action of the Haudenosaunee will likely guarantee this (Friends 2003e).

The injunction was not seen as a barrier, with the 10 November elections seen ‘as the solution’ (McLean, reproduced in McGuinness 2003d). In the wake of the injunction, resolve against the expressway was considered as the ‘largest outpouring of public support for the valley’. The expressway dispute had received ‘extensive media coverage across the province and the country’ (Friends 2003e). The Friends September newsletter provided perspective:

The level of activism today is far greater than at any point in the 12 year history of Friends of Red Hill Valley (Friends 2003j).
The optimism fostered by the level of public support led to a direct challenge to the injunction on 14 September. The spaces created by activism had fostered respect and recognition, conveyed in a Hamilton Spectator article:

Natives and non-natives joined together... to build a longhouse, a traditional native lodging house. Women in high heels and gold jewellery worked alongside teens, senior citizens and young men (McLeod 2003).

The article included the reflections of participants on the coming together with members of Six Nations. Working together, speaking with, was considered to be having beneficial impacts:

This is what we should have been doing from the beginning. We should have all been pulling from one end of the rope rather than pulling in different directions (David Heatley, reproduced in Ibid).

Some saw legitimation in the actions of the Haudenosaunee, as a means to achieve their goals:

[The city] are writing off the grassroots support as fringe. Joining the Haudenosanee is just the catalyst we needed (Kevin MaKay reproduced in Ibid).

The Spectator article concluded with an expression of how the experience of working together had shaped their outlook. It located the roots of the foundations for the lasting legacy that has become the focus for participants, post-destruction in the valley:

Many labouring protesters said they are invigorated by the new resolve between natives and non-natives to work together (Ibid).

Through September 2003, the ongoing occupation and the clear support afforded
Six Nations received considerable media attention (Buist & Van Harten 2003; unknown 2003b, 2003c). Coverage included an exploration of, and references to, Six Nations cultural traditions—an evolution in the means through which respect and recognition was shown. This mirrored the exploration of Six Nations culture in publications of *Friends*.

Iotzova’s *Grass Through Concrete: the struggle to protect the Red Hill Valley* was pre-screened in October 2004. The documentary includes participant accounts, documenting the context of the evolution in support for Six Nations that emerged as direct action tactics were adopted. The Haudenosaunee were aware of the evolution in support. At the Greenhill Ave picket, prior to the decision being made to build the Lounghouse, Carol Bomberry of Six Nations expressed this:

…I feel that finally you people are coming out and helping us take care of the land. It’s been a long time in coming and thank you very much... 500 years.

We’ve been waiting for you. Instead of destroying, you’re trying to keep it as it is. Thank you very much again (Carol Bomberry in Iotzova 2004: 19mins).

Dave Field’s account adds context to Carol Bombarry’s expression of thanks:

When the native people got involved, we said we’re joining them—and we did. And it’s the first time ever in history, apparently, that native people set up a camp and allowed white people to join them.

And it was the greatest feeling I’ve felt was at that time. Was when they allowed us the join them and live with them, fight with them side by side. Do whatever we had to do to protect this green space (Dave Field in Iotzova 2004: 21mins).
The spaces created by activism was the means through which respect and recognition evolved. Two older residents shared their reflections on how participation, working together with Six Nations, had fostered an increase in awareness and a changed perspective:

[Louis] There was a real good feeling…

[Ed] it was…

[Louis] when we were building that Longhouse…

[Ed] yeah, it was a good feeling. It was a…

[Louis] just a lot of fun, comradery, everybody working together. It was an enjoyable time.

I think it brought a lot of people together. A lot of people that have the same feelings and emotions (Ed and Louis Heatley in Iotzova 2004: 23mins).

The broadening support for the Haudenosaunee, the shift in how respect and recognition were expressed, was recognised by white supporters for its importance:

History is being made on a daily basis here. People of the neighbourhood bring food to us, they bring water to us. They want us to be here for the protection of the valley and the protection of their children. And to make sure places like this exists for their children’s’ children (David Heatley in Iotzova 2004: 24mins).

The shifts in perception of Six Nations, their culture and rights are embodied in the response of another resident to questions about participation in direct action and being in breech of the City’s injunction:
I first came out to find out what was going on. Once I found out, I decided to stay and help...

[Q] What do you make of the fact that it is now illegal to be in this valley?

I'm ignoring it. [pause] As far as I am concerned it is Six Nations land. We have their approval, invitation to stay here (unknown local resident in lotzova 2004: 25mins).

The respect and recognition expressed provides a (part) rejection of the ‘evidentiary burden’ of whiteness (Metallic & Monture-Angus 2002: para. 22). In this sense it is counter-hegemonic. Whiteness as relational and context dependent was shaped in the actions of residents in withdrawing consent (Tully 1995: 14; Weber 2000). The cognitive authority afforded white ways of knowing and seeing were displaced by respect and recognition, acceptance of the basis of the Gushwenta, of living together in difference (Haggis 2004; Iotzova 2004).

Eleven days before the 10 November municipal election, the city ordered the commencement of tree clearing. This followed the fencing off of ‘a very large area of forest on the face of the escarpment over 3 days in mid-October’ (Friends 2003i). Broad support for Six Nations, with many local residents visiting the Longhouse, forced contractors lower in the valley. A number of local residents followed the contractors into these areas to prevent tree felling. People chained themselves to trees and a tree-sit was established. Members of Six Nations also erected a tepee/tipi (Iotzova 2004: 27mins; McGuinness 2003a; unknown 2003a). On 29 October the City gave the Sheriff authority to enforce the injunction (Stephan 2003). The following day police moved in and arrested several people—ending the three-day occupation. The tipi was taken down and tree-cutting commenced (Friends 2003f; Legall 2003c). At this time the City had no plans to remove protesters from the lower part of the valley where natives built a longhouse two months ago (Legall 2003c).
On 3 November ‘formal’ notice was given to those present at the Longhouse that they would be removed later within a week (Friends 2003a). The following day, Anglican Priest Patrick Doyle, wearing ‘a hooded black cassock and carrying a hooked shepherd staff’, fronted ‘a protest march through the Red Hill Valley and was arrested on the escarpment face’. Those who participated, alongside a Six Nations flag bearer (Iotzova 2004: 41mins), in the 3 km march included young mothers with baby strollers, housewives, retired steel workers, native activists, an army veteran with a chest full of medals, a McMaster science professor and a retired psychiatrist. Some were old and frail and had difficulty walking (Legall 2003b).

The march followed Doyle’s seeking of endorsement for his planned actions from the Niagara diocese, which had ‘recently passed a motion to oppose the construction of the Red Hill Creek Expressway’ (Ibid). In support of those previously arrested he actively sought out arrest, seeking to challenge what he perceived as an unjust law. A large number of participants in the march joined the priest and entered the fenced off area in breach of the injunction. Following his arrest, a number of those present pleaded to be arrested. After a long standoff, in which the 250 participants in the march surrounded the police contingent preventing them from leaving, Doyle was unconditionally released from custody, to much applause, and addressed those who had participated in the action. To further applause he commented:

We have demonstrated that those who have already been arrested are not marginalised people, but in fact representatives of many many citizens of this city… (Iotzova 2004: 41mins).

Two days after the march, a pancake breakfast was held at the Longhouse. Doyle was amongst those present and, on being given the first plate of pancakes, was thanked for ‘bringing together the religious community’ and fostering ‘new energy’ for the campaign (Ibid). During this event, ‘over 60 police and security personal’
raided the Longhouse, ending the 13-week occupation (Friends 2003l).

The respect and recognition of white supporters was reflected in a Hamilton Spectator article, contrasting with previous reporting criticised as one-sided in its support of the expressway (McLean 2002):

The most contentious issue, however, was the fate of the sacred fire which has served as a kind of rallying point for the anti-expressway movement (Legall 2003a).

A new Roundhouse was established on land outside the area specified in the injunction, adjacent to an ‘area the city has fenced to protect a partly excavated native settlement site’ (McGuinness 2003f). On 18 November the sacred fire was ‘rekindled… with a portion of the fire that was removed from the previous roundhouse’. Arnold General, an Onondaga Chief, reiterated Six Nations’ wish for the valley to be protected and that they would continue action to protect it (Van Harten 2003a). The ongoing support of local residents was restated (Brown 2003a).

A 5-day walk from the Red Hill Valley to Queen’s Park, over 60 km away, commenced on 20 November (Friends 2003d, 2003h, 2003p; Kay 2003a). On arrival at Queen’s Park requests to meet the Premier Dalton McGuinty were denied, after several weeks notice (Kay 2003b). Corresponding with the Premier’s refusal, ‘one of the Iroquois Fire Keepers who lit a sacred fire in the valley’ filed ‘a $100-million lawsuit against the City of Hamilton to stop construction of the Red Hill Expressway’ (Alcoba 2003; Nolan & Van Harten 2003; Van Harten 2003b; Windle 2003). The lawsuit was launched by Larry Green in response to impacts on the proposed expressway’s on Nanfan Treaty rights (Green, Ireland & Doxtador 2004; Green 2003; Orkin & Klippenstein 2003; Green, L. 2006. pers. comm. October). Friends organised public displays of opposition to the expressway, information dissemination and building support for the Green lawsuit (Friends 2003n, 2003o, 2004b; Puxley 2004). This included raising funds for the Red Hill Aboriginal Legal Fund (Friends 2003m).
In Spring, the City announced contracts for expressway works would soon be finalised (McGuinness 2004). Following the relocation of electrical towers in above the escarpment and commencement of preliminary blasting, direct action was again taken in the valley. On 30 May, at the request of Six Nations (Clark, N. 2005. pers. comm. October), tree-sits were established in the valley.

Under the cover of night a group of protesters crept into the Red Hill Valley blasting zone. Working in silence, within 100 meters of a security guard, they began to climb the trees. By dawn, three activists sat perched in their new treesits; Anton already fast asleep. Equipped with months worth of food, water and supplies, their support team left before the arrival of any police and began spreading the word (Smith 2004b).

The tree-sits were situated adjacent to the escarpment face and aimed to prevent any further blasting (CATCH 2004). Low on water, the last remaining sitter descended, after 105 days aloft, on his 19th birthday (Smith 2004a). Direct action had ceased. Emphasis shifted to the legacy of the struggle. The expressway was officially opened on 17 November 2007, at an economic cost of $245 million (Dreschel 2007; unknown 2007b).

RESPECT AND RECOGNITION BY CONTEXT
Respect and recognition were the basis of white support for the Haudenosaunee. In the early stages of the dispute, Friends emphasised environmental factors in opposing the expressway proposal, the impetus for its founding in 1991. Land acquisitions in the Red Hill Valley were a part of Thomas McQuesten’s vision for large areas of parklands surrounding the City (Best 1991). Successive councils and provincial governments alternated between following McQuesten’s plan and using the valley as a transportation corridor, irrespective of treaty obligations and respect of the Haudenosaunee.

Alongside the environmental emphasis, white supporters were aware of First
Nations and European histories of the valley. As at Wave Hill and Sandon Point, the dynamics of experience influenced the evolution of awareness and support for the Haudenosaunee (Simpson 2000; Tully 1995). Speaking with was the basis of support, which increased as the Haudenosaunee asserted their rights and sought to protect the valley. Whilst speaking with, Friends challenged what they perceived as inappropriate actions on the part of the City and biased reporting in the Hamilton Spectator. There were, at times however, aspects of support that were mediated by whiteness. The urban park idea put forward by Scott McNie, the founder of Friends, embodied many of the assumptions behind the Regional Park proposal for Sandon Point. The proposal was relationally framed to counter descriptions of the valley as polluted and in a degraded state. The promised ‘improvements’ the expressway would provide were contrasted with a more benign form of ‘development’. Lockean assumptions shaped these proposals, persisting in descriptions of the valley (Gouglas 1998).

Friends often referred to the findings of archaeological investigations to present an account of the Red Hill Valley’s history, at times doing so to challenge the actions of the city—actions deemed as inappropriate. The authority of archaeology, as a source of information about an area’s ‘history’, is ubiquitous in discourse about the Red Hill Valley. Wilson’s chapter in From Mountain to Lake, which examined ‘the archaeological record’, is based on the constructed cognitive authority of western knowledge, the scientific hierarchisation of knowledges (Ibid; Moreton-Robinson 1999; Smart 1986; Tully 1995). Oral accounts were discounted (Wilson 1998: 105). There was no reflection on the colonial power relations central to devaluing knowledges that exist outside the realm of white western knowledge (Simpson 2000: 124; Smallacombe 2000: 160-1). Don McLean’s response to the Hamilton Spectator editorial on 15 April 2002 illustrated an awareness of the cultural and structural violence of the evidentiary burden, the science of archaeology (Metallic & Monture-Angus 2002). Yet, in referring to archaeological accounts of the area’s history, Friends actions succumbed to the hegemony of whiteness.

Archaeological investigations of the Red Hill Valley focused on physical aspects,
of the technologies and technological implements that could be ‘discovered’ and what could be added to western knowledge (Smallacombe 2000). Investigations framed results as pertaining to history, locating First Nations cultures as in the past and in a lesser state of development (Tully 1995: 6-6). Reference to a 1963 archaeological investigation as ‘a salvage project’ illustrates this (Wilson 1998: 116). Science and technology provide the most prodigious means for saving and protecting culture (Ellul 1990: 182).

Discussion of the areas archaeological value is in colonial language, on colonial terms (Smallacombe 2000: 161; Weber 2000: 66). In referring to archaeology, Friends and other white supporters left aside the unequal discursive power constructed in the cognitive authority afforded western knowledge (Tully 2000: 37). Non-awareness of the extent of structural violence, the power relations of the positioning of knowledges that exist outside the realm of white western knowledge as unowned and freely available for appropriation, locates an implication of the context of the dispute over the future of the Red Hill Valley (Moreton-Robinson 1999; Smallacombe 2000: 153). The existence of official respect and recognition, the existence of treaties, shaped the approach of white supporters in offering support.

In seeking permission to camp in the valley, to occupy the land to undertake nonviolent action, Friends and other white supporters acted out of respect and recognition. They ceded to Haudenosaunee law following the posting of the valley. This act symbolised speaking with, relationally opposed to the perceived as inappropriate actions of the City, and the agreements of the Gushwenta. The spaces created by activism shaped how respect and recognition were expressed, shifting experientially (Simpson 2000: 117).

In the wake of the expressway’s approval, emphasis shifted to ‘keeping the spirit alive’. The experiences of working together, supporting the Haudenosaunee in the spirit of the Gushwenta, were seen as valuable and worth fostering into new areas (David Heatley in Iotzova 2004: 24mins). With the (inter)nationally significant Caledonia land reclamation inextricably linked to the Red Hill Valley dispute, how support for the Haudenosaunee—‘the new resolve... to work together’—is
manifested locates an interesting case study for future consideration of the pervasive nature of whiteness (McLeod 2003).

The following chapter brings together the engagement with white support at Wave Hill, Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley. Comparative analysis provides a means to consider the extent to which context influences whiteness and the actions of white supporters in challenging many of the unmarked assumptions. Commonalities and particularities in whiteness and challenges to its social constructions provide a basis for determining more effective approaches to seeking socially just outcomes.
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TECHNOLOGIES OF WHITENESS—LEARNING FROM THEORY AND PRAXIS

No matter what problems may arise the inevitable answer will always be: science will take care of it


The embedded characteristics of colonial relations ensures its power to self-perpetuate

Metallic and Monture-Angus (2002)

This journey opened with details of the life-threatening situation that culminated in the destruction of SPATE—at the hands of two arsonists. The actions of these assailants were counterpoised to the actions of white supporters who were seeking to foster respect and recognition for SPATE and the protection of the Sandon Point area. The actions of the two assailants provides an illustration of the context in which such support was offered and a means to reflect on the question of what the actions of white supporters can tell us about contemporary society? To provide historical grounding, white interpretations of the walkout of Aboriginal stockworkers and their families at Wave Hill in 1966 were considered. Specific attention was afforded contemporary scholarship, scholarship that contrasts with participant accounts (see, for example, Attwood 2000). Similarly, consideration of
the manifestations of whiteness in the support offered the Haudenosaunee at the Red Hill Valley has been rooted in context.

This thesis set out to reflect on a number of questions: to what degree have the actions of white supporters embodied the respect and recognition they sought out to promote, overcoming colonial legacies? What can this tell us about whiteness in contemporary society? How should we evaluate such actions? In comparatively engaging with the actions of white supporters, this thesis has addressed these questions through engagement with diverse theoretical approaches, seeking commonalities between them to consider aspects of whiteness that require further theoretical consideration. Comparative engagement in different contexts, historically and spatially, has illustrated how whiteness is context specific in its manifestations (Ang 2001; Frankenberg 2001; Haraway 1989: 401-2, note 15; Kolchin 2002; Moran 2004; Rasmussen et al 2001; Riggs 2004a; Saxton 2004; Turnbull 2000; Wiegman 1999). It has also shown the pervasiveness of common assumptions within these contest-specific manifestations.

Colonial whiteness is predicated on the scientific hierarchisation of knowledges, a relation of power that seeks to determine the validity of knowledges that exist outside the realm of white western knowledge on white terms (Moreton-Robinson 1999, 2004; Smallacombe 2000). The terms of inquiry are unjust (Tully 1995). Hegemonic deference to the constructed cognitive authority of white ways of knowing and seeing perpetuates colonial relationships that white supporters seek to challenge. Technological discourse, as a feature of whiteness, fosters such deference, and is built on assumptions common to Terra Knowlegius and Enlightenment notions of science and technology as progress (Ellul 1990; Moore 1998; Son 2004).

The actions of white supporters—in their own contexts at Wave Hill, Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley—have sought to foster respect and recognition, seeking socially just outcomes. In promoting alternate outcomes, actions have been relationally constructed in the context of the respective disputes. The resulting dualisms have masked colonial whiteness, limiting the terms in inquiry to white ways of knowing and seeing. Oral histories have been discounted, with emphasis
on the constructed validity of written records—assessed by white ‘experts’ (Hokari 2001a). Contemporary interpretations of the walk-out at Wave Hill continue to contrast with oral accounts of participants. Attwood’s (%Attwood 2000) scholarship provides a recent example.

In engaging Hiscock to challenge the findings of Navin Officer, white supporters at Sandon Point facilitated boundary work (Gieryn 1995). The ensuing debate was limited within archaeological discourse, leaving the assumptions upon which it is based unquestioned. The regional Park proposal similarly relationally constructed the Stockland proposal as an inappropriate development. The hegemonic assumptions of development as progress were put aside: the extent of development became the focus of debate. In promoting the issue of women’s significance at Sandon Point, seeking official recognition of this via inclusion in archaeological studies, white supporters were challenging whiteness and acting as ‘agents of white race privilege at the same time’ (Haggis 2004: para. 24). Speaking with the Haudenosaunee at the Red Hill Valley reflected official recognition enshrined in the Gushwenta. Friends sought to foster and promote respect and recognition. This was often manifested in reference to the findings of archaeological studies, seeking legitimacy through association with the constructed cognitive authority of white experts.

THEORISING WHITENESS IN A TECHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY
The roots of technological discourse are located in Enlightenment notions of science and technology as progress, of human history as a history of progress (Moore 2001: 332). Progress in society is relationally framed to ‘the non-European ‘other’... as lower in development and earlier in time: in a state of nature, primitive, rude, savage, traditional or underdeveloped’ (Tully 1995: 65). Moreton-Robinson (1999) has exposed aspects of these assumptions in the white fiction of Terra Knowlegius. The ‘considerable unfulfilled potential’ of whiteness scholarship can be, in part, realised through bringing engagement with technological discourse into whiteness studies (Kolchin 2002).

Ellul’s (1990) engagement with discourse in technological society locates many
unmarked assumptions central to whiteness. The notion of development as progress is one aspect of whiteness that requires further engagement. The implications of a deference to archaeology is another. Scientific hierarchisation of knowledges is a possessive relation of power|knowledge structured in dominance, with the white fiction of *Terra Knowlegius* being one manifestation. The hegemony of science requires further engagement by whiteness scholars to reflect on whether Ellul’s description of the ideology of science as a soteriology is an accurate one. If such a description is accurate, how consent is manifested, mobilised and perpetuated requires substantial reflection. Are they merely nonconsidered, or unmarked phenomenologically? How strategic is the ignorance that enables this?

Engagement that seeks to expose colonial manifestations embedded in western science, and the mechanisms through which cognitive authority is constructed, will aid in moving closer to the aims of critical whiteness studies. Reflective engagement with notions of progress—ranging from colonial constructions of the inferiority of ‘other’ cultures trough to Lockean and Enlightenment notions of improvement—and ensuring that the language of enquiry ‘is in itself just’ is essential (Tully 1995: 34). This requires an awareness of the colonial implications of archaeological discourse and the evidentiary burden placed on First Peoples—on white terms.

Challenging the colonial implications of scientific and technological discourse adds another layer to the task of theorising how to give up power over First Peoples in colonial society—an existing challenge of scholarship on whiteness (Nicoll 2004). The hegemony of technological discourse illustrated in the actions of white supporters at Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley indicates the scale of this task. Predicating such theorising on respect and recognition, the seeking of just outcomes, provides a framework to contest the constructed cognitive authority of science. This requires that whiteness scholars further reflect on the hegemony of their own lived experiences. This requires getting uncomfortable, embracing the discomfort it affords (Haggis 2004).

Exposing the unjust terms of colonial whiteness is central to challenging it. The
hegemony of technological discourse and the scientific hierarchisation of knowledges need to be challenged by whiteness scholars. This is essential for theorising whiteness in a technological society. Scholarship that provides ‘a vision of “together in difference”… ‘a togetherness based on the recognition of incommensurability’ is rooted in a confrontation with the possessive power relations of colonial whiteness, based on notions of progress and the socially constructed inferiority of other cultures (Ibid: para. 38). Such recognition involves acknowledging different cultures on their terms (Tully 1995: 23). Hopefully we are moving towards this end, and it is increasingly reflected in the means.

THE TRANSFORMATIVE NATURE OF PRAXIS
The spaces created by activism have proven transformative. The praxis of listening at Wave Hill, Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley has influenced white supporters. This is most clear in the ongoing implications of the Wave Hill walk-out on contemporary Australia—an action that continues to receive media coverage. Prime Minister Kevin Rudd’s Apology to Australia’s Indigenous Peoples on 13 February 2008 may equal the walk-out as a defining moment in Australia’s history. The recognition it has officially provided will alter the context and hegemony of colonial whiteness in Australia.

At Sandon Point, the shift in emphasis towards a more explicit expression of support for SPATE is rooted in the seeking of permission to establish the Community Picket. The defining moment in this shift was the Valentine’s Day Blockade, which opened spaces for dialogue. The involvement of Uncle Guboo in the Save Sandon Point Surfing Festival extended from this to a broader audience. At the Red Hill Valley, the seeking of permission to camp in the valley can also be located as the root of the defining moment in the struggle. Collaboration in erection of the Longhouse was, however, the defining point—as expressed by many of those who participated.

In reflection of the transformative nature of the actions taken, how can we assess the actions of white supporters at Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley? Respect and recognition were aims of the supportive actions, challenging the respective
proposals. In relationally contrasting their actions to those of proponents, discourse was often limited to white terms. In seeking to highlight the non-considered women’s significance at Sandon Point, white supporters called for further studies. Likewise, Hiscock was engaged to expose what was considered as Navin Officer’s inappropriate assessment of Aboriginal significance. The regional park proposal was framed as a more appropriate form of ‘development’ to that of the Stockland proposal. In each instance, whilst challenging aspects of whiteness, these actions maintained colonial terms. In referring to archaeological reports, white supporters at the Red Hill Valley similarly sought legitimacy in the constructed cognitive authority of western technologies.

The actions of white supporters provides a basis to reflect on Lila Watson’s challenge regarding why action was taken. Were the actions taken for the sake of white supporters themselves, or based on colonial paternalism? At Sandon Point, respect and recognition was tempered with the paternalism of offering solutions—speaking for. At the Red Hill Valley, participants have expressed immense benefits of participation in the wake of the Longhouse destruction and commencement of tree clearing for the expressway. With the ‘greatest feeling’ emerging from working ‘side by side’, it would appear that in challenging colonial whiteness white supporters were also liberated (Dave Field in Iotzova 2004: 21mins).

The actions of white supporters explored in this thesis indicate a need to engage with context. Whiteness does not exist in a vacuum. The conscientiously resisted paternalism of Frank Hardy at Wave Hill provides a historical example, as do the differences in support afforded at Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley. There are commonalities and differences reflecting ‘the tension between particularity and universality’ of colonial whiteness (Wiegman 1999). Deference to archaeology at Sandon Point and the Red Hill Valley—to varying degrees—locate colonial implications of whiteness. The notion of development as progress, embodied in relational constructions of what is appropriate ‘development’ locate the implications of hegemonic technological discourse—beyond colonial constructions of ‘other’ cultures. The language of enquiry is unjust. It is consented to by white supporters. Moreton-Robinson (1999) has located a part basis for this
consent in colonial societies—patriarchal white sovereignty.

The actions of white supporters at the Red Hill Valley provide an example of ‘together in difference’, based on incommensurabilities as defined by Haggis, albeit in a context more conducive than a pre-treaty Australia. The actions of white supporters at Sandon Point can be seen as one of many steps needed to push for official respect and recognition—the essential basis for a just society in contemporary Australia. In that sense, the actions of white supporters have achieved some of what they sought out to achieve. They have shaped the context for pending challenges to whiteness. These challenges continue.
appendix 1
Figure 13. The area covered by the Sandon Point COI (referred to as ‘Attachment A’)
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