



Feminism and Institutionalized Racism: Inclusion and Exclusion at an Australian Feminist Refuge

Author(s): Tikka Jan Wilson

Source: *Feminist Review*, No. 52, *The World Upside Down: Feminisms in the Antipodes*, (Spring, 1996), pp. 1-26

Published by: Palgrave Macmillan Journals

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1395769>

Accessed: 02/08/2008 09:57

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=pal>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Feminism and Institutionalized Racism:

Inclusion and Exclusion at an Australian Feminist Refuge

Tikka Jan Wilson

Abstract

This article is a microlevel discussion of indigenous/white relations at an Australian feminist refuge. It argues that the organization and practices of the refuge, including those which were specifically 'feminist' and those purporting to be anti-racist, reproduced a pattern of institutional racism which privileged and naturalized 'whiteness', white feminism and white women, and perpetuated the racial disadvantage of Aboriginal women, including continuing accountability to white colonizing women, loss of employment and economic security and contingent rather than guaranteed access to appropriate domestic violence crisis services. The article focuses on three interrelated concepts which were fundamental to the white women's construction and legitimation of their positions in the events: 'sisterhood', 'multiculturalism' and 'the good feminist worker'.

Keywords

racism; feminism; Australia; indigenous rights; social welfare; refuges

Why are so few Aboriginal women part of the feminist struggle? . . . because . . . you have little or no understanding of your colonial presence; because you believe the media images of indigenous women and indigenous society . . . because Black Australian history to you is a void or an irrelevance . . . because women's services have few if any black women; because you are baffled by the idea that Black women are justified in fearing you; because you want to help Black women; because you presume that having attempted our genocide you can attempt our ideological resurrection; because you think that indigenous culture survived for millennia in this country *without* Black feminists.

(Lucashenko, 1994: 24)

In Australia, the relationship between indigenous (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander)¹ women and the second wave women's movement – the latter understood by both black and white women to be a white women's movement – has been marked by intense conflict. Since the early 1980s, the debate on racial (and ethnic) differences between women has mostly revolved around the assimilationist question, 'Why don't Aboriginal women join the women's movement?' (Ang, 1995). On many occasions,

indigenous Australian women have responded to the question, arguing that the white women's movement is both irrelevant to and in conflict with the particular aims of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women (O'Shane, 1976; Huggins, 1991, 1994; Goodall and Huggins, 1992; Felton and Flanagan, 1993; Lucashenko, 1994).

The question of the broad relevance of Australian white feminism to indigenous and other non-Anglo women, however, must be situated within the specific historical context of the Australian welfare state. Australia is internationally recognized, along with the Scandinavian countries, as a leader in the provision of wide-ranging social welfare benefits, including national health care, unemployment support, old age and single parent pensions. Significantly, indigenous (and other non-white) Australians were specifically excluded from many of these benefits at the outset, and have had to struggle to receive the entitlements granted to white Australians (Horner, 1974; Shaver, 1989). Indigenous people did not receive full citizenship rights until 1967 (Markus, 1994).

Until the early 1970s (and the timing of this varies from state to state) indigenous Australians were segregated into racially defined welfare categories, and subject to a loss of self-determination paralleling that of white prison and mental institution inmates (Horner, 1974). As inmates of Aboriginal reserves, Aboriginal people received separate and profoundly inferior social services. Official records, for example, refer to the provision of 'huts' (tin shacks, two rooms, no running water, no electricity, no sanitation, no heat) instead of the houses provided to white reserve staff (APB, 1912). 'Education' was mandatory for Aboriginal children, but often did not exceed grade four, and was taught by unqualified teachers in 'special' segregated Aboriginal schools (Horner, 1974; Fletcher, 1989).

Although the state continues to be a site where indigenous people are 'mainstreamed' into dominant culture practices and ideologies (Morris, 1989), particularly since the 1970s, it has become an important arena where indigenous (and other) Australians have been able to contest and redress earlier practices and their present effects. The landmark High Court 'Mabo' decision affirming the possibility of native title to otherwise unalienated crown land;² the formation of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, a statutory body elected by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, and the implementation of various affirmative action measures in the areas of housing, health, education and employment, are exemplary. Despite improvements, indigenous Australians continue to be extremely disadvantaged in relation to other Australians: infant mortality rates in 1994 were four times the national average; life

expectancy for indigenous women and men was respectively 20 and 18 years less than the national average; school retention rates to year 12 were 25 per cent, compared with a national average of 78 per cent; the median income level was two-thirds that of the population at large; unemployment rates ranged from 30.4 per cent to over 50 per cent, compared with 11.7 per cent in the total Australian labour force, and in 1992, police custody rates were twenty-six times that of non-indigenous people (ATSIC, 1994).

Wilson (1977) pointed to the woman-to-woman interactions characteristic of social welfare transactions, where women were both welfare workers and welfare recipients. The internationally noted success of white feminists in appropriating or extending the Australian state welfare apparatus to address 'women's issues' raises the particular issue of the institutionalization of white feminism(s) and its effects on indigenous and other non-Anglo women (Huggins, 1994). In a paper entitled 'A tiddas manifesto' ('tidda' is an Aboriginal word for sister), Catrina Felton and Liz Flanagan argued that:

[t]he elevated status that White women have enables them to secure the resources to control feminism. This control enables them to hold the view that they solely initiate resistance to women's subordination. . . . Generally speaking White feminists have not recognised or challenged the implications of racism or the historical and political discrimination that Koori women face. . . . That is why many Koori tiddas view feminism as simply another White politically controlled institution, established to benefit White women, first and foremost.

(1993: 55)

Although academic white feminists have been concerned with differences between women (Curthoys, 1984; de Lepervanche and Bottomley, 1988; Larbalestier, 1990; Pettman, 1992; Jolly, 1993), the white feminists concerned with feminist state welfare practice have been slower to grapple with the profound effects on practice of recognizing that 'women' and 'white women' are not the same (see Watson, 1995). Significantly, although Anglo Australian feminists have analysed and debated the problems of 'femocrat' co-option by a patriarchal and bourgeois state – especially the debate on that peculiarly Australian figure, the 'femocrat' – as far as I know, these debates have mostly ignored the problem of co-option by and participation in a white supremacist state (Franzway, 1986; Eisenstein, 1990, 1991). A notable exception is Shaver (1989) who revised an earlier analysis of the emergence of Australian social welfare focused on gender and class, recognizing that race and ethnicity were equally relevant. White feminists focus on the problems of masculinization and class privileging within state bureaucracies, but ignore racial

privileging. When addressed, racial (and ethnic) differences are figured in terms of additional disadvantages to a presumed baseline of the 'plain' (white) woman (see, for example, National Committee on Violence Against Women, 1992: 12). Such logic, Spelman (1988) argues, hides the power differentials underlying racial differences, and hides 'what white middle-class women help to *keep afloat*' (pp. 166–7, emphasis added). It erases the ways in which, 'instead of alleviating the burdens for Aboriginal women, white women usually add to them' (Huggins, 1994: 78).

The objective of this article is to look at a local instance of how racism was kept afloat within a (white) feminist institution. I discuss a state-funded feminist domestic violence refuge where intense racial conflict developed around the firings of two Aboriginal women – firings which were unanimously supported and carried by the white majority and unanimously but unsuccessfully opposed by an Aboriginal minority. I argue that the organization and practices of the refuge, including those which were specifically 'feminist' and those purporting to be anti-racist, reproduced a pattern of institutional racism which privileged and naturalized 'whiteness', white feminism and white women, and perpetuated the racial disadvantage of Aboriginal women, including continuing accountability to white colonizing women, loss of employment and economic security and contingent rather than guaranteed access to appropriate domestic violence crisis services.

Black whitefellas

I am an immigrant to Australia, positioned as both non-white and non-Aboriginal, and with a complex relationship to both of these groups. As a descendant of black Africans enslaved to produce wealth for European colonizers in North America, I share the racial position(s) of the 'black' with Australian indigenous people. Yet my potential racial alliance with them is embedded in complex (neo/post)colonial relations between African Americans and other black peoples. In Australia at present, African Americans are sold as 'rap' and basketball superstars; we are the black faces one sees on 'racially correct' multinational advertising (Langford Ginibi, 1994). We are apparently more desirable to white majority markets than home-grown blacks, although, since Cathy Freeman's Commonwealth Games gold medal, this is changing. Our histories of slavery and civil rights movements are better known to many white Australians than the histories of dispossession and struggle of indigenous blacks.

Although motivated and informed by being ‘black’ in another racial context, in the events described in this article I was positioned by both sides as a ‘whitefella’. Myrna Tonkinson, a dark-skinned Jamaican immigrant and academic, said she was shocked when she first heard herself described as a ‘whitefella’ by an Aboriginal man (Tonkinson, 1994). So was I. In this naming of the world, all people who are not indigenous Australians are whitefellas, whatever their skin colour or background. Positioning us as whites highlights the substantial economic and social benefits all migrants reap from the colonial appropriation of Aboriginal people’s land and resources (Castles *et al.*, 1988; Pettman, 1992; Markus, 1994). While many immigrants, both in Australia and elsewhere, analyse and struggle against racial/ethnic subordination in the ‘host’ country, it is equally important for us to acknowledge and respond to any new positions of structural privilege we assume as a result of migration.

The following brief narrative is one of many versions which could (and should) be told. I constructed it to highlight the features I perceived to be racial – women situated differently would tell differently racialized stories, or else highlight other features which, from their perspective, enabled these events to unfold (Haraway, 1988). Because it concerns personnel issues, I have had to be circumspect about matters which are confidential; the story is therefore necessarily sketchy.

My portrayal of white women at Matilda’s will be criticized for presenting them as unduly homogeneous. There were differences in age, sexuality, class, education, whether or not former residents, level of commitment to feminist ideology, and so on, but these did not seem to make a difference in the public stances taken on the firings – at least in my eyes. It is important, however, to recognize these women’s structural locations within class and gender hierarchies *as* refugee workers. Refugee work, feminist or otherwise, is difficult, demanding and often unrewarding. It involves ongoing struggle with overwhelmingly masculinist police, and bureaucracies which, at best, only tolerate feminist projects. Like many feminized occupations it is also underpaid, but may provide employment for women who are disadvantaged by lack of credentials or childbearing responsibilities.

The point of this analysis, however, is to look at how racial privilege and disadvantage are structured and legitimized *within* feminist spaces, in socially acceptable and overtly anti- or non-racist representations. What interests me is how the events at this refuge were shaped by and embedded in the racial/colonial history of Australia; how this history saturated the present, and how the white women’s location of themselves

within a white feminist history in which they were oppressed, marginalized and disempowered *as* women and feminists made it virtually impossible for them to recognize themselves also *as* dominant culture whites participating in the historical and ongoing racial subordination of indigenous people. Thus part of the objective of this article concerns recounting some of the histories relevant to continuing colonial relationships between white and indigenous Australian women; and part is concerned with how the political subject positions of the white feminists and Koori women were grounded in different, often conflicting, yet intertwined projects of 'righting the wrongs of the past'.

Hiring and firing at Matilda's

I joined a management collective of a state-funded feminist women's refuge in mid-1992. The refuge – let us call it Matilda's – was located in rural New South Wales and had been operating for about three years. The (patriarchal) political/bureaucratic context of the refuge was hostile. A conservative state government, elected in 1988, was rationalizing and cutting back human services funding, rendering marginal services vulnerable. To provide 24-hour on-call service, Matilda's employed four full-time workers and several relief workers. It was always under-resourced and understaffed.

The jobs at Matilda's were well paid and had good benefits compared to other rural work. The local job market was limited, unemployment high and many local people relied on various forms of social welfare. Koori people were almost exclusively employed in the public sector, and almost totally excluded from private sector work. Over a four-year period, I don't think I saw even one Koori person working in any of the hundreds of white-owned small businesses in the area.

The four full-time positions were equally divided between white and Koori women. During the period described here, the only permanent worker was white; both Kooris and the other women were in the first six months of probationary employment. The white women said they were very proud of the racial equality in the allocation of jobs. When telling the story of how this came to be, the white women explained that Koori women comprised a significant proportion of the local population and Matilda's was committed to providing culturally appropriate refuge services to them. This meant employing at least one Koori worker, but because Koori women argued that it was racially oppressive to be only one Koori worker in an all-white environment, the white majority collective had allocated two positions to Koori women. In addition, the collective had modified the organization's aims and objectives to

include a commitment to anti-racism, and had altered the employment interview protocol to include questions on sensitivity to racial and cultural differences.

The refuge was managed by a collective. Most decisions were taken by consensus, but a vote was taken if a consensus could not be reached. Voting rights were vested only in full-time permanent employees and long-term collective members. Probationary workers and probationary non-worker collective members (including me) could participate fully in discussion, but were not entitled to vote. At the time discussed here, although there were four Koori collective members out of a total of about nine women, only one Koori, but three white women, could vote.

Shortly after I joined the collective one of the two Koori workers was due for a six-month review, which if favourable would have resulted in her permanent employment. I was not aware of the review process until a negative evaluation was brought before the management collective (which included the woman being evaluated) by the white permanent worker. She recommended that the collective did not renew the Koori worker's contract. We polarized racially, with all of the Koori women opposing the evaluation and arguing that the 'problem' was not the worker, but the (white) service's training. The white women responded that this worker had been given the same training as everyone else, but had not taken enough initiative. After lengthy discussion a compromise was negotiated, but the worker later decided that the conditions of the compromise were too onerous, and she resigned. This left Matilda's with only one Koori worker, who demanded that a second be hired as soon as possible. The Koori women on the collective had pointed out that this would be a problem, because the refuge was developing a reputation among Koori women of being racist. In fact it was quite some time before a Koori woman applied and was hired. During her first month of work there was a racially polarized crisis among the workers. The 'facts' of this incident, like the other, were hotly contested. As in the earlier dispute, the management collective polarized racially. The issues were whether or not the worker had violated the terms of employment, whether her training/supervision had been appropriate, and whether or not the decision-making process was racist. After weeks of emotionally searing conflict involving numerous 'emergency' meetings, the end result was that the worker lost her job. The Koori women were angry and bitter. The remaining Koori worker resigned, followed by all the Koori collective members, and subsequently they organized their communities to boycott Matilda's. In both disputes I felt and was marginalized as a non-white, non-Koori and non-Australian. I was most disturbed that I felt unable to adequately 'read' most of the women's arguments because

I knew nothing about the specific histories they addressed. Shortly after the second firing, I also resigned and soon after left the area.

Two years later, at the time of writing, the refuge continues to exclude and alienate Koori women from employment and collective membership. Although I have seen many advertisements for Koori designated positions at Matilda's, the Koori women refuse to work there until they see evidence of fundamental change on the part of the white collective in relation to racism. (Their refusal, however, is understood stereotypically by whites as Koories being too lazy to apply for work.) As a result of there being no Koori workers, Matilda's does not provide the Koori community with the domestic violence crisis services to which it is entitled. As one Koori woman commented after reading a draft of this article, 'What bothers me most is knowing that there are Koori women in DV situations who would rather sleep under a bridge than use that refuge – 'cos they know they're going in there for more abuse by the people who are supposed to be helping them.'

Only two sides: whites and blacks

The two employment conflicts were structured and perceived by the participants to be disputes between the two racially defined groups. Like many systems set up for reasons having nothing to do with race (but also without considering the potential racial impact), the two-tiered system of voting worked to concentrate decision-making power with the white women, reproducing their privilege as whites. Throughout these disputes we were all aware that, ultimately, the white group could legislate the outcome.

All the Koori women indicated at various moments that they thought the firings were racist. The white women, however, denied this, arguing that they were not motivated by a racist dislike of the workers *as blacks*. On the contrary, the white women said they actively sought the participation and inclusion of black women, but these particular individuals did not fulfil the job requirements. It was a professional, not a personal question. One white woman said that she would have dismissed any white worker under similar circumstances. Another said she believed it would be racist not to treat a Koori woman the same as a white woman, that it would have been racist not to dismiss a Koori worker because this would require setting different and lower standards for Kooris than for whites. Her assumption that 'difference' equals 'lower' reproduced black inferiority (lower standards for lower people). In general terms, the white women's analysis of the situation was shaped by racial theories which define racism as individual pathology and anti-racism as

equal opportunity and equal treatment (on terms set by the white majority). As many analysts have pointed out, however, structural or institutionalized racism (sexism, classism, ageism, heterosexism) functions (mainly) through racialized rather than 'racist' subjects (see Frankenberg, 1993; Goldberg, 1993). It is ironic, or perhaps simply indicative of naturalized privilege, that these women would have found the same equal opportunity/equal treatment arguments unacceptable from a male-dominated collective.

In considering how these events at Matilda's were racialized, that is, how race was a fundamental organizing principle working to maintain the dominant/subordinant positions of white and Koori women, I will focus on three interrelated concepts which were fundamental to the white women's construction and legitimation of their positions in the events: 'sisterhood', 'multiculturalism' and 'the good feminist worker'. I will try to unravel how each of these concepts worked to hide, naturalize and keep afloat the privilege of 'whiteness'. The content presented here is specific to Anglo/indigenous relations, but the underlying processes are relevant to other differences, including those of class, ethnicity and sexuality.

Imperialism and gender relations in the women's sphere

The refuge was essentially (although this was contested) a 'white' space at the time I joined it. It was part of a history of second-wave Australian white feminist organization against (white) male violence (see McFerran, 1990; Hopkins and McGregor, 1991). From the stories I was told about the anti-racist efforts made by the refuge, it was clear that these were an afterthought, an alteration or an adjustment of an already ongoing enterprise. The 'normal' situation of the refuge was 'whiteness', whereas anti-racist policies and the employment of Kooris were described as special, even generous. When proudly talking about the decision to allocate two of the full-time positions to Koori women, the white women located themselves as owners and decision-makers; at a fundamental level they believed they had given the jobs to the Koori women. Further evidence of white ownership emerged as the second employment dispute developed. There were several moments in all-white (including me) informal discussions, when the white women expressed the fear that the refuge would cease to exist if the Koori women 'won'. In their own eyes, it was not the white women's power *within* the refuge that was being challenged, it was the refuge *itself*. That Koori women's issues were not central to Matilda's project was apparent in a decision that Matilda's workers would not go out on calls to the Aboriginal reserve where many Koori people lived.³ At the time I joined the collective, the

Koori collective members were proposing alternatives so that Koori women living at the reserve could get crisis help.

Since Matilda's was the only refuge for miles, and the nearest Aboriginal-run refuge was a four-hour drive, Aboriginal women had few alternatives. As a state institution providing for 'women', all women were expected to use Matilda's *as women* – indeed, white feminists argued for and received state funding on just this basis. The Koori women deeply resented white feminists receiving state funding ostensibly to benefit all women, but then using it in ways which advantaged themselves and harmed indigenous women. In one Koori woman's words, 'they get the money in the name of women, and then spend it on themselves. Some of that is *our* money!'

Historically, white feminists have presumed an overriding commonality among women *as women*, often featured in early second-wave white feminism as 'sisterhood' (Morgan, 1970). During the employment disputes at Matilda's, the belief or faith in sisterhood was mentioned many times by the white women, both among themselves and as an appeal to the Koori women to stop struggling against their white 'sisters', and to join together against the 'real' enemy – the patriarchy. That Koori women could have seen the white women as an equally 'real' enemy seemed to be utterly incomprehensible to them (Huggins, 1994; Lucashenko, 1994). This self-perception is only possible because neither mainstream nor white feminist (in Australia and elsewhere), nor Aboriginal historiography⁴ has focused on the roles of white women in colonialism, or on the relationships between white women and black women, although this is changing (see Huggins, 1987/88; Fox-Genovese, 1988; Tonkinson, 1988; Chaudhuri and Strobel, 1992; Huggins and Blake, 1992; Ware, 1992; Jolly, 1993).

Many efforts to deal with gender and colonization in Australia have tended to highlight white male rape, sexual abuse or sexual relationships with Aboriginal women (Evans, 1992; Evans *et al.*, 1993). While this was and is a significant aspect of racist colonial violence, it tends to highlight the commonality of Aboriginal and white women both suffering sexual violence at the hands of white men, while it erases the racial violence of white women towards Aboriginal women (and men). In several discussions among the white women at Matilda's, this version of history was referred to, and white men rather than white women were explicitly identified as the perpetrators of colonization. This version of history enabled the white women to maintain their belief in sisterhood, and their perception that the Koori women were undermining 'the feminist project' by focusing on 'race'.

The historical record indicates otherwise. Not only is there little empirical support for the proposition of interracial sisterhood in the present, historical research has found no support for a presumption of egalitarian gender solidarity between colonizing and colonized women in the past (Burgmann, 1984; Huggins, 1987/88; Tonkinson, 1988). On the contrary, the evidence indicates a pattern of white colonizing women dominating 'other' women, sometimes more ruthlessly than white men (hooks, 1986). How these relationships were structured varied with specific historical contexts – the relationship between Afro-American slave women and white plantation mistresses differed from the matron/inmate relationship characteristic of white/indigenous women's relationships on 'reserves' or 'reservations' in Australia, Canada and the United States. The class positions of white women are also relevant, and in many (post/neo)colonial locations, the mistress/domestic servant relationship has been pervasive (Davis, 1984; Huggins, 1987/88; Fox-Genovese, 1988; Jolly, 1991).

In Australia, as elsewhere, gender and race were intertwined in the Christian project of transforming (backward, primitive) native women into (inferior replicas) of the 'advanced' European woman. Because the gender orders of the western colonizing cultures deemed white women the most suitable agents of the feminine 'civilizing mission', and because indigenous women were particularly targeted due to their role in physical and cultural reproduction, the two groups of women were (and are) brought into close association *within* 'women's spaces' dominated by white women (Jolly, 1991). In Australia, from the early decades of this century, state institutions have played a significant and direct role in subordinating indigenous people. The various states (at various times) delegated extensive powers to state agencies over Aboriginal children, including the authority to assume custody and remove them from their parents with very little formality or scrutiny (see Read, 1982; Haebich, 1988; Edwards and Read, 1989; Cummings, 1990). Control or removal of children formed (and continues to form) the basis of much intervention in and disruption of Aboriginal families and communities. Because women and children fall within the 'women's sphere', white women were deeply implicated in child removals and in other aspects of state and/or church intervention involving women, children and families. At the same time, they improved their own economic positions, securing employment (or unpaid work) in the developing social welfare sector. White women also were specifically recruited by the state to become foster and/or adopting mothers of removed Aboriginal children.

In New South Wales (where Matilda's was located), the Aborigines Protection Board female home-finder inspected reserves and camps

specifically to identify children to remove from their families and communities (APB, 1912). White women were also the matrons, assistants and teachers at the special institutions where Aboriginal girls were trained to be 'useful' as domestic servants (Tucker, 1983; Cummings, 1990). White female welfare officers inspected Aboriginal homes and rated Aboriginal women's domestic performance (AWB, various issues). White women who did not want their own children to be 'contaminated' by black children persuaded the Department of Public Instruction to put Aboriginal children in separate and markedly inferior schools (Goodall, 1982). From 1902 to the late 1940s, the Department's written policy was to expel Aboriginal children from school upon the receipt of a complaint from a white parent (Fletcher, 1989). Although Aboriginal people have resisted, avoided and challenged all these policies, until the late 1960s they had few, if any, legal rights to pursue their claims for justice. In the private sector, white women were the primary employers of Aboriginal women (and girls) who mostly worked as domestic servants (Horner, 1974; Huggins, 1987/88). Many of the other jobs open to Aboriginal women, such as laundresses or cleaners in hospitals, were gender segregated and therefore largely supervised by white women (Austen, 1946).

Many white women were well intentioned (many were not), and may be remembered by Aboriginal women as kind individuals who eased and even resisted the subordination of Aboriginal people (some are remembered as sadists) (see Tucker, 1983; Ward, 1988). The conjunction of European gender ideologies and practices with imperialism produced a situation in which many white women of various classes and in various ways were significant agents of the assimilation process. It is perhaps difficult for Anglo-Australians, including white feminist women, to recognize the enormity of the colonizing project to physically or, failing that, culturally exterminate indigenous Australians. Anthropologist Tim Rowse (1993: 47) commented, in reference to the practice of taking Aboriginal children away from their families and placing them with white adopting families, that 'it requires some effort to see the "normal" non-Aboriginal family as the consummate site of Aboriginal confinement'. His comment, I think, highlights how it is precisely the ordinarieness and taken-for-grantedness of 'whiteness' (i.e. white supremacy) that is most powerful in the project to 'de-Aboriginalize' indigenous people (see Frankenberg, 1993). As an already ongoing white women's space into which Koori women were incorporated, Matilda's, and the white feminist women within it, were always already embedded in and saturated with the ongoing project of assimilation.

We must provide for their different needs: multicultural feminist practice

If historically Aboriginal women were channelled into white women's spaces for the explicit purpose of de-Aboriginalization and assimilation into the dominant white culture, inclusion operates at present within a multicultural framework which acknowledges and accommodates 'difference', but also maintains the so-called 'core' (i.e. Anglo/western) values. Ang (1995) criticizes Australian white/western feminism for assuming a position analogous to that of the multicultural nation; that is, seeking to include various other women within a common feminist/woman identity without changing its fundamentally Anglo/feminist values. Martin (1991) also pointed to the possibility that feminism's commitment to pluralism might increase the marginality of various 'other' women. I will argue here that the employment of Koori workers at Matilda's operated within a logic of multiculturalism that worked to naturalize 'whiteness', and formed the basis for the firings/exclusions that expressed an active maintenance of white privilege.

Multicultural discourse developed in Australia in the 1970s in response to various contestations on the part of so-called 'ethnic' Australians. Simultaneous with and in complex relationship to other liberation movements of the 1960s and 1970s, 'ethnics' (meaning immigrants of non-Anglo-Celtic, or non-English-speaking, or non-white if British and/or English-speaking) sought in various ways to challenge various aspects of Anglo-Celtic Australian hegemony. Since the mid-1970s, an official (and changing) policy embracing multiculturalism has been enshrined in Australian representations of its national identity, and in various social welfare policies.

Current multicultural discourse features differences in terms of food, dance, music and other cultural productions, glossing over the structural disadvantages of non-Anglo peoples (Castles *et al.*, 1988). A fundamental Britishness is retained in the so-called 'core values': parliamentary democracy, the English language, freedom of speech and religion, and interestingly (if only theoretically) equality of women (Office of Multicultural Affairs, 1995). Core values are usually non-negotiable. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have resisted incorporation into the multicultural framework on the grounds that, as First Australians, their claims are historically and fundamentally unique, and substantially different from the histories, claims and situations of 'ethnic' immigrants (Castles *et al.*, 1988). Nevertheless, mainstream Anglocentric representations of multicultural others, such as those appearing on the state-owned television channel 'SBS' (Special

Broadcasting Service), are frequently collages of cultural icons signifying interchangeable Asian-ness, German-ness, Italian-ness, Greek-ness and Aboriginal-ness.⁵

Within social welfare services, multicultural 'awareness' has become a recognition of and commitment to meeting clients' 'special needs' mainly through the employment of 'special' workers to provide culturally appropriate services (Castles *et al.*, 1988). This is problematic in several ways. First, the logic of special needs maintains Anglo-Australians as the norm, in comparison to which everyone else is special. Second, it identifies 'special' people primarily and fundamentally as clients – subordinate and on the receiving end of social welfare services. Third, the employment of 'special' workers is contingent on the existence of similarly special clients. This employment is often seen as a way of increasing the opportunities of people with special workplace disadvantages, positioning these workers in an in-between status of half worker/half client, and somewhat subordinate to other 'normal' (Anglo) workers (Vasta, 1993). Finally, difference is contained within the private relationship between 'special' workers and their clients. Following a bilingual/bicultural model, the underlying assumption is that non-dominant group workers will speak/act in their own language/culture with clients, but switch to the dominant language/culture when relating to other workers. There are parallels here with feminist theorization of public/private spaces; in this case the private worker–client relationship is the domain of difference, while in the public workspace differences are submerged within the dominant culture.

Consistent with a multicultural approach to difference, Matilda's white collective members described the inclusion of Koori women in terms of the service's responsibility to provide culturally appropriate services. They positioned themselves primarily as deliverers of welfare and the Koories as primarily clients. Furthermore, during the various discussions among the white women, it seemed to me that they expected the Koori women to act like Koories (whatever that might have meant to them) only in the context of Koori worker–Koori client relationships. In other contexts they expected the Koori women to act like 'normal' workers, that is, white, or more specifically, white feminist workers. Following the logic of the multicultural framework, white refuge feminist values constituted the 'core values' of the service, and they were not only largely non-negotiable, but were protected and enforced by the white women who had a moral commitment to them. These core feminist values formed the basis (or at least the legitimation) of the exclusions of the Koori women.

White feminist core values

In using the provocative phrase ‘white feminist core values’, I do not mean that white feminism is monolithic and has ‘core values’. I do, however, want to show how the core values of this refuge, which were constituted within a particular strand of white feminism, and which legitimated the exclusion of the Koori women *as* workers, were also fundamentally ‘white’.

The white women understood the organization of Matilda’s to be embedded in white radical feminist theory and practice in dealing with violence against ‘women’. Whereas non-feminist approaches to male violence focused on the victims and perpetrators as pathological individuals, the feminist analysis located the problem in gender hierarchy and women’s systematic dependence on and subordination to men. Whereas non-feminist social welfare practice maintained hierarchy by replacing the victim’s dependence on a husband with dependence on a social worker, feminist practice sought to empower women to take charge of their lives and become independent. Empowering as counselling practice envisioned workers and clients in egalitarian, non-hierarchical relationships in which the worker provided information, resources and emotional support. Furthermore, since violence was understood to be an outgrowth of hierarchy, a non-hierarchical collective form of workplace organization was an essential (in some cases the most essential) aspect of feminist intervention in domestic violence (see Hopkins and McGregor, 1991).

Despite criticism since the early 1970s of collective organizations’ replacement of visible hierarchy with various invisible (or at least non-explicit) hierarchies, Matilda’s was deeply committed – and at least during the time I was there, most attentive – to the various problems of collective structure (Freeman, 1973). I think this was due, in part, to Matilda’s ongoing battle with a conservative state government looking for ways to dismantle feminist collectives in favour of more hierarchical management committees. Collective organization was seen by both the state and feminist refuges as a key to the identity of a feminist service. The collective workplace of Matilda’s was supposed to be egalitarian on every front: everyone equally responsible for the totality of the work, everyone able to do every job, everyone assuming leadership, everyone making decisions, everyone receiving the same pay.

As defined in the workers’ contracts, the job required not only the performance of certain duties like counselling, outreach, publicity, administration, reception and liaison; it also required the workers to have qualities usually associated with western professionals: leadership,

initiative, cooperation, judgement, creativity and dependability – values which work to maintain subordination under a guise of neutrality (Young, 1990). It was axiomatic that workers would model feminist empowerment as part of their work, and this included a particular orientation to learning as a key site of eliminating dependence on men or experts. As a founding member of the Marrickville Women's Refuge in Sydney described it, the fundamental process of a feminist service was to give people resources to 'make something' of their situation:

When we all started we knew so little and it was just a matter of learning as we went and learning from other people. That process could happen with everybody and that should be fundamental to our philosophy: give people the resources and let them make something of it.

(Johnson, 1981: 129)

In addition to being one white, university-educated woman's recollection of the history of a particular refuge, this is a sort of refuge foundation myth which tells of every woman's journey from ignorance to self-determination. In its imaginary, successive waves of women follow in the footsteps of the women who initiated the process, becoming the same as the founders.⁶ It is a myth which positions all women as equally disadvantaged by patriarchy (we *all* knew so little), and erases the differences between the 'so little' of an educated middle-class white woman, a working-class white woman who left school at age 14, an Aboriginal woman who grew up on a reserve, or an 'ethnic' woman whose first language is not English.

When I first read these words, I was struck by the similarity of this story to the imaginary path from new worker to good worker which the white women on Matilda's collective required all workers to follow. Appeals to this mythology did much of the work of legitimizing the white women's judgements of the Koori women's work performance. The white women said that it was part of the refuge feminist philosophy that workers take responsibility for themselves and actively seek out the information and skills they needed, that they empower themselves rather than depend on others. They said that the Koori women had received exactly the same training (i.e. the opportunity to pitch in and learn) as everyone else, but had not taken advantage of the opportunities to make themselves into good workers. The white women adamantly did not want to provide more 'special' training to Koori workers.

These arguments expressed the white women's racial privilege in a number of ways. First, and most obviously, the dominant culture women (meaning white/Anglo culture, although within the Anglo majority white refuge feminists may rightly see themselves as marginalized

within the dominant masculinist, heterosexist, classist culture) designed, drafted and enforced compliance with job descriptions that reproduced feminist versions of western professional workers. Second, the enforcement of an egalitarian regime in regard to both work performance and training erased significant racial differences in access to education and employment experience. Both the full-time white workers had had previous experience in social services; neither of the Koori women had. It also erased, as the Koori women pointed out, significant racial differences in the relationship between workers and their respective communities. The Koori women said Koori workers were seen by their communities to be all-purpose access points to white resources and had to be available at all times of day or night. White workers could work their shifts, go home and forget about it. Third, the feminist figure of the self-empowered woman as an active resource user resonates with racist colonizing discourses which construct European/native oppositions around the issues of resource use, initiative, intelligence and work.

They don't do enough/as much as we do: the stereotype of the lazy black

Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century European explorers, travellers and pioneers described the continents they 'discovered' as 'empty': vast natural resources waiting to be developed (Pratt, 1992). The representation of the non-producing (in other words, non-existent) native underwrote European invasion and conquest of various indigenous territories. In Australia, this representation was formalized in the doctrine of *terra nullius*, meaning literally 'empty land', devoid not of inhabitants but of the evidence of intelligent, productive human labour expected to be manifest in the enclosure and cultivation of land, houses, roads and towns, and taken as a sign of sovereignty by the British (Markus, 1994: 20).

In European eyes (particularly those focused on the discourse of anthropology during the nineteenth century), Australian Aborigines were categorized as so-called 'hunter-gatherers' and located at the lowest end of the evolutionary continuum from animal to man, Stone Age to modernity, primitive to civilized, subsistence to capitalist. The Europeans represented themselves as having the most advanced relationship to resources – a bringing together of natural resources, individual initiative, intelligence and inventiveness, technology, capital and hard work – and Aboriginal others as having the most 'backward' relationship to resources, and profoundly lacking the qualities which made Europeans the most advanced race. Although romantic visions of the degenerate

European and the noble savage were subversive, they did not alter the racialized hierarchy. Any skills which Aboriginal people were observed to possess were often attributed to 'animal instincts' rather than human intelligence (Reynolds, 1990).

Having appropriated indigenous people's land in order to use it more productively, the problem of dealing with 'remnant' populations of indigenous people – those who survived shooting, poisoning, disease or starvation – emerged. At first, the European colonists adopted 'special' welfare measures to 'ease the dying pillow' of the 'Stone Age' people who, according to social Darwinist theory, were fated to extinction in the face of European progress (Markus, 1994). By the early part of the twentieth century, however, the new science of population statistics which meticulously counted indigenous people by sex, age and 'caste' indicated that Aboriginal people were not dying out as expected, but rather increasing, particularly those known as 'half-castes' (Markus, 1994).⁷

This discovery initiated a series of policies and practices to encourage or force indigenous people (particularly so-called 'half-castes') to stop being dependent on social welfare and to become productive workers within the European economy, almost always at the lowest, most poorly paid (if they are paid at all, as rations were frequently all the remuneration Aboriginal workers received), and most marginal occupations (Horner, 1974; Castle and Hagan, 1978; Markus, 1978; Langford Ginibi, 1994). For various reasons, many indigenous people did not (many did) readily embrace either the western work ethic coupled with the desire to accumulate wealth, or the poorly paid, dangerous, remote, unskilled labour which constituted a European vision of economic assimilation. These refusals were understood by whites to be a manifestation of essential and racialized Aboriginal inferiority: laziness, stupidity, thriftlessness, degeneracy and (desire for) dependency. After the 1940s in New South Wales, people of indigenous descent who lived in a respectable and hard-working European manner, however, were allowed to apply for exemption certificates which legally exempted them from the category 'Aborigine' and from the myriad legal restrictions which dominated the life choices of Aborigines. The strength of the association of race with particular attitudes towards work and money is highlighted in this legal fiction. Few exemptions were actually granted, however, because most of the applications were refused by white authorities, and because Aboriginal people deeply resented the racist premises of the exemptions and referred to them as 'dog tags' (Horner, 1974; Langford, 1988). The stereotype of the non-working black has been so strong that, until recently, the substantial contribution of Aboriginal knowledge and

labour to the 'development' of Australia has been virtually erased from white Australian history, and many white Australians are unaware of it (Reynolds, 1990; Langford Ginibi, 1994).

In about 1970, a number of measures were begun by various levels of government to redress the extreme disadvantages caused by two centuries of dispossession, displacement and neglect. Conservative discourse judges these efforts to be wasted, money thrown away on people who will not take advantage of the resources given to them. A feature article in the March 1995 issue of *ABM*, an upmarket magazine for business people, exemplifies this position. Significantly, the thirty-four page article focuses on the present (the last thirty years) and mentions history only twice. One of these references is quite interesting: 'The present population has to expiate the sins of the pioneers who dispossessed the original inhabitants' (Sykes, 1995: 35). As a representation of original, completed and past sin, it works to erase the ensuing 200 years of legal and *de facto* political, economic and social subordination, and to position the present (white) population at great distance from the sinners. The rest of the article is devoted to itemizing 1992 to 1994 government expenditures on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in order to show, line item by line item (non-indigenous Australian taxpayers' money is being wasted.

Aborigines amount to fewer than 1.6 per cent of Australia's population and *we* are spending a relatively large amount of money on *them*. Is it being spent well? How much money do *we* have to *pump in* for how long before we see a *result*? . . . The aim of ATSIC and of all non-Aboriginal politicians should be to *give* Aborigines more incentives to *help themselves* and, necessarily, to *penalise* those who don't. Because if a community is not prepared to help itself then in the long run the *rest of us* won't be able to *help* it either – no matter how much money *we throw* at the *problem*.

(Sykes, 1995: 34, 57; emphasis added)

This racist scenario/stereotype of 'we', the white Australian taxpayer as the willing but frustrated helper, 'pumping' or 'throwing' vast sums of money into 'the problem' of dependent Aborigines too lazy to help themselves, and who should be *penalized* for failing to use resources appropriately so as to produce a *result*, is depressingly common in the media and in everyday conversations among non-indigenous Australians, although many non-indigenous people would take exception to these portrayals.

It is precisely this position, however, which was taken up by the white women at Matilda's. The white women said they had *given* two jobs to Kooris. Note who owns the jobs, who is active, who is object, and the

implied largesse of giving. But having done that, the white women felt that the Koori women should have used the opportunities and the resources provided to learn the job properly, thereby empowering themselves and becoming just like any other white woman/worker. As in the *ABM* quotation above, the white women defined the 'problem' as the Koori women's lack of initiative, and duly penalized them by withdrawing employment.

White feminist and anti-white supremacy

The purpose of this article has been to examine a local instance of the racialized effects of white Australian feminist 'success' in appropriating the welfare state to achieve feminist aims. Although I have focused on indigenous/white relations, 'ethnic' women have also argued that white women's services are oppressive (see Vasta, 1993). Many international readers will have had limited access to Aboriginal women's critiques of white Australian feminism(s), first, because only a few Aboriginal women write about this issue. This is not to say, however, that Aboriginal women and Aboriginal feminists are not vocal critics and analysts. Furthermore, most Aboriginal women do not have access to national, let alone international publications networks, feminist or otherwise. Finally, although the consequences may be significant, Aboriginal women's relationship with white feminism is a low priority on a very long list of pressing survival issues (Huggins, 1994).

Nevertheless, indigenous women need and are entitled to appropriate domestic violence services and it is sometimes the case that white feminists provide the only available services. It should not be possible that a black woman would rather 'sleep under a bridge' than face the racism of a white feminist refuge. In addition to the obvious injustices, a Koori woman sleeping rough with children in New South Wales continues in 1995 to be subject to the surveillance and intervention of the Department of Social Services, and vulnerable to being accused of neglect and having her children taken from her.

Since I began writing this article in early 1995, several lengthy articles have appeared in the media on 'intra-racial' violence, and a video on the issue made by a Koori woman has been televised. Several leading Aboriginal activists have also spoken out about the trauma caused by colonization to Aboriginal communities, including violence. Even the *ABM* article (Sykes, 1995) mentioned domestic violence, managing to be anti-feminist while positioning (white) feminists as experts who should help implicitly helpless Aboriginal women: 'Aboriginal women must be

the group in Australia most exposed to domestic violence, Australia's strident feminist movement could rightly give this subject a higher priority' (Sykes, 1995: 51).

Insofar as violence against Aboriginal women seems poised to become a highly publicized mainstream social issue, it is an opportune moment for white feminists involved in any aspect of women's service provision, from high-level bureaucrats, to academics, to coalface workers, to acknowledge the partiality of the white feminist project (Ang, 1995). Some white feminist analysis and insight into the workings of male violence in Anglo culture may prove useful to Aboriginal women; however, this will be up to Aboriginal women to determine. Since the late 1980s, it has been apparent that there are significant differences between black and white feminist analyses of domestic and other violence against women (see Bell, 1989; Huggins *et al.*, 1990; Larbalestier, 1990).

Although the events presented in this article are not exceptional, in some women's services, women of various racial and ethnic backgrounds have been able to negotiate these differences successfully. But this can happen only if dominant culture women act on the suggestions, insights and analyses of other women. In rereading Matilda's minutes with one of the Koori women, it was apparent that she had many times raised the issue of training for white women in cultural differences and the history of Australian race relations – but these suggestions had been ignored. Given epidemic historical amnesia among white Australians, such training is vital. In addition, she had argued for specific structural changes in feminist organizations. Based on her experience at another feminist service where Koori and white women worked together successfully, she said the key difference was that Koories had a 50 per cent share of power on the collective. The other element she mentioned was a willingness on the part of the white women to abandon or reformulate any and all ideas, projects and strategies that did not work for Koori women. In both cases, the white women had to give up an underlying belief in a utilitarian benefit to the majority, and instead adopt a practice which either did or did not work for *all* women. She ended our discussion about the draft of this article by saying, 'It's totally wrong that Koori women are still disadvantaged because of white women. It's got to stop. If they feel as strongly about their feminism as I do about my Aboriginality, then this is a slur on them. They're behind these refuges.'

Notes

Tikka Jan Wilson is currently a Ph.D. student in the Women's Studies Program at the Australian National University, writing about racialized adoption practices and the relationships between white and black women within this issue.

Like any piece of writing, this has really been a collaborative effort. My profound gratitude goes to Annette, Donna, Kerrie, Barb, Carol and Sam – Koori, Murri and Torres Strait Islander women – who shared their thinking, struggles, pain and laughter with me, and without whom this article would not have been possible. I also thank Jackie Huggins, Murri activist, historian and author, who, alongside Audre Lorde, is a source of personal inspiration to me around what it is possible for black women to achieve in changing the world. I am also grateful to Ann Curthoys, Jill Matthews, Jan Pettman, Rosanne Kennedy and Peter Read, all at the Australian National University, who have generously read, critiqued and otherwise supported this project. Errors, omissions and the tendency to homogenize white folks remain my responsibility alone.

- 1 Indigenous people in Australia include mainland Aboriginal people and the inhabitants of the Torres Strait Islands. Although sharing many indigenous issues, there are many differences between the two groups, and they prefer to be named separately. This article concerns mainland Aboriginal people who specifically refer to themselves as 'Koori' people.
- 2 The Mabo decision on native title is named after one of the plaintiffs, Eddie Mabo, a Torres Strait Islander. The decision 'recognised the potential for native title to continue over some parts of Australia, effectively overruling the doctrine of *terra nullius*. . . . The doctrine asserted that there were no civilised inhabitants of the continent at the time of colonisation' (Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation, 1993: 9).
- 3 When New South Wales policies towards Aboriginal people changed in the 1970s, many of the former reserves were turned over to the local Aboriginal community to run and administer (see Morris, 1989).
- 4 Aboriginal history is an academic discipline dealing with the post-invasion history of indigenous people, as opposed to anthropology which focuses on pre-invasion culture.
- 5 SBS is an outcome of the process of ethnic contestation of Anglo hegemony. It specifically caters for 'ethnic' audiences, airing programmes in 'foreign' languages, featuring non-Anglo presenters and running 'foreign' films, meaning non-English speaking. It also airs most of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander productions.
- 6 Two of the workers at the Marrickville Refuge were critical of the class subordination they felt as ex-resident workers:

(Margaret): A lot of them have been to university, which is really privileged, and that usually impresses people who haven't. . . . (Roseanne): I think a lot

of problems are created just by that difference. A lot of it is in our own heads, feelings of inferiority, being less educated etc., but a hell of a lot of it does come from workers who haven't lived in the Refuge and been in that sort of situation. Their expectations of residents and ex-residents are really contradictory. They're either very low or if you're one of the 'chosen few' to work there, they're very high. The pressure is on you to measure up to their standards. (Johnson, 1981: 170-1)

- 7 In the biologically racialized terminology prevalent in the official Aborigines Protection Board (which changed its name to the Aborigines Welfare Board in 1940) until at least the 1950s, 'half-caste', 'quarter-caste', 'octoroon' and 'light-caste' were used to identify Aboriginal individuals. Aboriginal people reject this terminology, saying either someone identifies as Aboriginal or they do not.

References

- ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER COMMISSION (ATSIC) (1994) *Indigenous Australia Today* Canberra: ATSIC.
- ABORIGINES PROTECTION BOARD (APB) (1912) Minutes of Meetings, New South Wales State Archives.
- ABORIGINES WELFARE BOARD (AWB) *Dawn Magazine*, various issues.
- ANG, Ien (1995) 'I'm a feminist but . . . "Other" women and postnational feminism', in Caine and Pringle (1995).
- AUSTEN, Leo (1946) Unpublished notes from the daily diary of a New South Wales Aborigines Welfare Board welfare officer, in the A. P. Elkins Papers, University of Sydney Archives, Box 58.
- BELL, Diane (1989) 'Speaking out about rape is everyone's business' *Women's Studies International Forum* Vol. 13, No. 4: 403-16.
- BOTTOMLEY, Gill, DE LEPERVANCHE, Marie and MARTIN, Jeannie (1991) editors, *Intersexions: Gender/Class/Culture/Ethnicity* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- BROOM, Dorothy (1984) editor, *Unfinished Business: Social Justice for Women in Australia* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- BURGMANN, Meredith (1984) 'Black sisterhood: the situation of urban Aboriginal women and their relationship to the white women's movement', in Simms (1984).
- CAINE, Barbara and PRINGLE, Rosemary (1995) editors, *Transitions: New Australian Feminisms* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- CASTLE, R. G. and HAGAN, J. S. (1978) 'Dependence and independence', in Curthoys and Markus (1978).
- CASTLES, Stephen, COPE, Bill, KALANTZAS, Mary and MORRISSEY, Michael (1988) editors, *Mistaken Identity: Multiculturalism and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia* Sydney: Pluto Press.
- CHAUDHURI, Nupur and STROBEL, Margaret (1992) editors, *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- COUNCIL FOR ABORIGINAL RECONCILIATION** (1993) *Addressing the Key Issues for Reconciliation* Canberra: AGPS.
- CUMMINGS, Barbara** (1990) *Take This Child . . . From Kahlin Compound to the Retta Dixon Children's Home* Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- CURTHOYS, Ann** (1984) 'The women's movement and social justice', in *Broom* (1984).
- CURTHOYS, Ann and MARKUS, Andrew** (1978) editors, *Who Are Our Enemies? Racism and the Working Class in Australia*, Neutral Bay: Hale and Iremonger.
- DAVIS, Angela** (1984) *Women, Culture and Politics* New York: Vintage Press.
- DE LEPERVANCHE, Marie and BOTTOMLEY, Gill** (1988) editors, *The Cultural Construction of Race* Sydney: Studies in Society and Culture.
- EDWARDS, Coral and READ, Peter** (1989) editors, *The Lost Children: Thirteen Australians Taken from Their Families Tell of The Struggle to Find Their Natural Parents* Sydney: Doubleday.
- EISENSTEIN, Hester** (1990) 'Femocrats, official feminism and the uses of power', in *Watson* (1990).
- (1991) *Gender Shock: Practicing Feminism on Two Continents* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- EVANS, Raymond** (1992) 'A gun in the oven: masculinism and gendered violence', in *Saunders and Evans* (1992).
- EVANS, Raymond, SAUNDERS, Kay and CRONIN, Kathryn** (1993) *Race Relations in Colonial Queensland: A History of Exclusion, Exploitation and Extermination* St Lucia: University of Queensland Press (first published 1975).
- FELTON, Catrina and FLANAGAN, Liz** (1993) 'Institutionalised feminism: a ridda's perspective' *Lilith: A Feminist History of Aboriginal Education in New South Wales* Sydney: Jim Fletcher.
- FLETCHER, J. J.** (1989) *Clean, Clad and Courteous* Sydney: Fletcher.
- FOX-GENOVESE, Elizabeth** (1988) *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the South* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- FRANKENBERG, Ruth** (1993) *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- FRANZWAY, Suzanne** (1986) 'With problems of their own: femocrats and the welfare state' *Australian Feminist Studies* Vol. 3, Summer: 45–57.
- FREEMAN, Jo** (1973) 'The tyranny of structurelessness' *MS* July: 76–8, 86–9.
- GOLDBERG, David Theo** (1993) *Racist Culture: Philosophy and Politics of Meaning*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- GOODALL, Heather** (1982) 'A history of Aboriginal communities in New South Wales', Ph.D. thesis, Sydney: University of Sydney.
- GOODALL, Heather and HUGGINS, Jackie** (1992) 'Aboriginal women are everywhere: contemporary struggles', in *Saunders and Evans* (1992).
- GRAHAM, Duncan** (1994) *Being Whitefella* Fremantle: Fremantle Arts Press.
- GRIEVE, Norma and BURNS, Ailsa** (1994) editors, *Australian Women: Contemporary Feminist Thought* Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- GUNEW, Sneja** (1991) editor, *A Reader in Feminist Knowledge* London: Routledge.

- GUNEW, Sneja and YEATMAN, Anna** (1993) *Feminism and the Politics of Difference* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- HAEBICH, Anna** (1988) *For Their Own Good: Aborigines and Government in the Southwest of Western Australia* Nedlands, WA: University of Western Australia Press.
- HARAWAY, Donna** (1988) 'Situated knowledges: the science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective' *Feminist Studies* Vol. 14, No. 3: 575–99.
- HOOKS, bell** (1986) 'Sisterhood: political solidarity between women' *Feminist Review* No. 23: 125–38.
- HOPKINS, Andrew and MCGREGOR, Heather** (1991) *Working for Change: The Movement Against Domestic Violence* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- HORNER, Jack** (1974) *Bill Ferguson: Fighter for Aboriginal Freedom* Canberra: Jack Horner.
- HUGGINS, Jackie** (1987/8) 'Firing on the mind: Aboriginal women domestic servants in the inter-war years' *Hecate* Vol. 13, No. 2: 77–82.
- (1991) 'Black women and women's liberation', in **Gunew** (1991).
- (1994) 'A contemporary view of Aboriginal women's relationship to the white women's movement', in **Grieve and Burns** (1994).
- HUGGINS, Jackie and BLAKE, Thom** (1992) 'Protection or persecution? Gender relations in the era of racial segregation', in **Saunders and Evans** (1992).
- HUGGINS, Jackie, WILLMOTT, Jo, TARRAGO, Isabel, WILLETS, Kathy, BOND, Liz, HOLT, Lillian, BURKE, Eleanor, BIN-SALIK, Maryann, FOWELL, Pat, SCHIMDER, Joann, CRAIGIE, Valerie and McBRIDE-LEVI, Linda** (1990) 'Letter to the editor' *Women's Studies International Forum* Vol. 14, No. 5: 506–7.
- JOHNSON, Vivien** (1981) *The Last Resort: A Women's Refuge* Ringwood: Penguin.
- JOLLY, Margaret** (1991) 'The politics of difference: feminism, colonialism and decolonisation in Vanuatu', in **Bottomley et al.** (1991).
- (1993) 'Colonizing women: the maternal body and empire', in **Gunew and Yeatman** (1993).
- LANGFORD, Ruby** (1988) *Don't Take Your Love to Town* Sydney: Penguin.
- LANGFORD GINIBI, Ruby** (1994) *My Bundjalung People* St Lucia: University of Queensland Press.
- LARBALESTIER, Jan** (1990) 'The politics of representation: Australian Aboriginal women and feminism' *Anthropological Forum* Vol. 6, No. 2: 143–57.
- LUCASHENKO, Melissa** (1994) 'No other truth? Aboriginal women and Australian feminism' *Social Alternatives* Vol. 12, No. 4: 21–4.
- McFERRAN, Ludo** (1990) 'Interpretation of a frontline state: Australian women's refuges and the state', in **Watson** (1990).
- MARKUS, Andrew** (1978) 'Talka longa mouth', in **Curthoys and Markus** (1978).
- (1994) *Australian Race Relations 1788–1993* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- MARTIN, Jeannie** (1991) 'Multiculturalism and feminism', in **Bottomley et al.** (1991).
- MORGAN, Robin** (1970) editor, *Sisterhood is Powerful: An Anthology of Writings from the Women's Liberation Movement* New York: Vintage Books.

- MORRIS, Barry** (1989) *Domesticating Resistance: The Dhan-Gadi Aborigines and the Australian State* Oxford: Berg.
- NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN** (1992) *National Strategy on Violence Against Women* Canberra: AGPS.
- OFFICE OF MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS** (1995) Advertisement in the *Weekend Australian* 8–9 April: 31.
- O'SHANE, Pat** (1976) 'Is there any relevance in the women's movement for Aboriginal women?' *Refractory Girl* September: 31–4.
- PETTMAN, Jan** (1992) *Living in the Margins: Racism, Sexism and Feminism in Australia* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- PRATT, Mary Louise** (1992) *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* London: Routledge.
- READ, Peter** (1982) *The Stolen Generations: The Removal of Aboriginal Children in New South Wales 1883 to 1969* Sydney: New South Wales Government Printer.
- REYNOLDS, Henry** (1990) *With the White People: The Crucial Role of the Aborigines in the Exploration and Development of Australia* Ringwood: Penguin.
- ROWSE, Tim** (1993) *After Mabo: Interpreting Indigenous Traditions* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- SAUNDERS, Kay and EVANS, Raymond** (1992) editors, *Gender Relations in Australia: Domination and Negotiation* Sydney: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- SHAYER, Sheila** (1989) 'Gender, class and the welfare state in Australia' *Feminist Review* No. 32: 90–110.
- SIMMS, Marian** (1984) *Australian Women and the Political System* Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.
- SPELMAN, Elizabeth** (1988) *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought* London: The Women's Press.
- SYKES, Trevor** (1995) 'Black money' *ABM March*: 34–56.
- TONKINSON, Myrna** (1988) 'Sisterhood or Aboriginal servitude? Black women and white women on the Australian frontier' *Aboriginal History* Vol. 12, Nos 1–2: 27–40.
- (1994) 'Thinking in colour', in **Graham** (1994).
- TUCKER, Margaret** (1983) *If Everyone Cared: An Autobiography of Margaret Tucker MBE* London: Grosvenor.
- VASTA, Ellie** (1993) 'Immigrant women and the politics of resistance' *Australian Feminist Studies* No. 18, Summer: 5–24.
- WARD, Glenyse** (1988) *Wandering Girl* Broome: Magabala Press.
- WARE, Vron** (1992) *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism and History* London: Verso.
- WATSON, Sophie** (1990) editor, *Playing the State: Australian Feminist Interventions* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- (1995) 'Reclaiming social policy', in **Caine and Pringle** (1995).
- WILSON, Elizabeth** (1977) *Women and the Welfare State* London: Tavistock Publications.
- YOUNG, Iris Marion** (1990) *Justice and the Politics of Difference* Princeton: Princeton University Press.