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ABSTRACT

This thesis utilizes a theoretical and methodological approach that explores subjectivity as the relational, complex, fluid, multidimensional, recursive and intersectional modes in which social subjects are animated (Ortner 2005, 31). I discuss these different aspects of subjectivity construction through a contemporary example from urban Australia and by employing frameworks that underscore the agency of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples (Aboriginal or Aboriginal Australians) in constructing and maintaining their own subjectivities through discourses that challenge settler colonialism. I work to intertwine related theoretical approaches such as practice theory as defined by Sherry Ortner, and Pierre Bourdieu’s discussion of the distinction of taste and its ties to unequal power relations in contemporary societies (Ortner 1984, 146; Bourdieu 1984, 57). Specifically, my study questions and problematizes the processes that constitute, perpetuate, and hinder the subjectivity formation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People (Aboriginal Australians) in an inner city suburb of Sydney, New South Wales called Redfern. My case study examines the intersection of Aboriginality (as both an ethnicity and as a facet of subjectivity), agency in contemporary urban Australia, and to a lesser extent the role of bureaucracy. I analyze these concepts in terms of their historical and cultural contexts, which complicate and inform contemporary lived experiences of members of Aboriginal communities in Redfern. Specifically, I argue that initiatives aimed at lowering inequality between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australians as well as attempts at incorporating Aboriginal Sydneysiders into an Anglo-Australian society ultimately perpetuate longstanding tensions involving Aboriginality, agency, and subjectivity. This paper also argues that the adoption, contestation, maintenance, rejection, and construction of Aboriginality are inextricably tied with bureaucratic processes and the agency of Aboriginal Australians in Sydney, which can be seen through examples of initiatives such as this housing development that are aimed at combatting inequality between Aboriginal Australians and Anglo-Australians.
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Introduction

The processes involved in the construction of subjectivity are significant in cultural anthropology. We have long grappled with how to conceptualize subjectivity; such a task is daunting, as it is difficult to accurately understand every aspect of consciousness that leads to the creation of social subjects. Nevertheless, through the development of different theoretical approaches anthropologists have strived to understand how humans perceive themselves within their respective contexts and in relation to other subjects. It is first important to define how I conceptualize subjectivity. I utilize a theoretical and methodological approach that explores subjectivity as the relational, complex, fluid, multidimensional, recursive and intersectional modes in which social subjects are animated (Ortner 2005, 31). I discuss these different aspects of subjectivity construction through a contemporary example from urban Australia and by employing frameworks that underscore the agency of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples (Aboriginal or Aboriginal Australians) in constructing and maintaining their own subjectivities through discourses that challenge settler colonialism.¹ I work to intertwine related theoretical approaches such as practice theory as defined by Sherry Ortner, and Pierre Bourdieu’s discussion of the distinction of taste and its ties to unequal power relations in contemporary societies (Ortner 1984, 146; Bourdieu 1984, 57).

Specifically, my study questions and problematizes the processes that constitute, perpetuate, and hinder the subjectivity formation of Aboriginal and
Torres Strait Islander People (Aboriginal Australians) in an inner city suburb of Sydney, New South Wales called Redfern. My case study examines the intersection of Aboriginality (as both an ethnicity and as a facet of subjectivity), agency in contemporary urban Australia, and to a lesser extent the role of bureaucracy. I analyze these concepts in terms of their historical and cultural contexts, which complicate and inform contemporary lived experiences of members of Aboriginal communities in Redfern. Specifically, I argue that initiatives aimed at lowering inequality between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australians as well as attempts at incorporating Aboriginal Sydneysiders into an Anglo-Australian society ultimately perpetuate longstanding tensions involving Aboriginality, agency, and subjectivity.

Attempts at incorporating Aboriginal Australians into a largely urban, middle-class Anglo-Australian are the result of cultural and legislative racism have persisted since Europeans colonized the coasts of Australia in the 1780s (Bolt 2010). Most attempts made at incorporating Aboriginal Sydneysiders, who make up only 1.5% of the Australian population (Radford et al. 1999), into the local community are conducted by private companies (e.g. Aboriginal Housing Company), international and national non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and at times, state agencies (e.g. the Australian Bureau of Statistics, Federal Court of Australia). Myriad issues with bureaucracy frequently result in an othering and marginalization of Aboriginal Australians in Sydney. The lack of
progress of these projects focused on lowering inequality is indicative of incongruence between the bureaucratic actors and the Aboriginal stakeholders, who continue to be contained into positions of lesser power.

This paper uses Pierre Bourdieu’s writings on distinctions of taste, class, and power dynamics to analyze the manifestations of power dynamics between different stakeholders. I observe these manifestations by examining contemporary newspaper clippings ranging from local sources in Sydney to national and international papers, video recorded at the Pemulwuy Project site, and other anthropological literature. I argue that the adoption, contestation, maintenance, rejection, and construction of Aboriginality are inextricably tied with bureaucratic processes and the agency of Aboriginal Australians in Sydney, which can be seen through examples of initiatives such as this housing development that are aimed at combatting inequality between Aboriginal Australians and Anglo-Australians.
Historical Background and Site Context

When Captain James Cook sailed along the east coast of Australia in 1770, he claimed what he thought was a *terra nullius* for the kingdom of Great Britain. A little over a decade later, 11 ships from Portsmouth, England, known as the First Fleet arrived in New South Wales to establish a penal colony. In order to do so, British settlers frequently forced the Aboriginal populations away from the coastal areas to make room for incoming Europeans. Similar to the removal of indigenous peoples elsewhere in the world (the United States, Canada, etc.) this was most often accomplished through warfare, killing, misconceptions about appropriate land use, and newly introduced diseases (Litster and Wallis 2011).

Subsequent to this racialized conflict came a dichotomous conceptualization of Australian society; Anglo-Australians were juxtaposed to the more “savage” Aboriginal Australians. For example, in the foreword to Australian anthropologist A.P. Elkin’s book *The Australian Aborigines*, Margeret Mead writes, “[Aboriginal Australians were regarded as] savage and primitive…these are the people found by the early explorers of the seventeenth century. Living as hunters and food gatherers, stark naked, their hair matted over their eyes against the hot and brilliant sun” (Elkin 1964, vii). Moreover, this dichotomy resulted in legislative and cultural racism throughout the continent, the end product being extreme disadvantage and marginalization of Aboriginal Australians within Australian society (Bolt 2010). Additionally Aboriginal Australians’ extreme disadvantage is bolstered by the fact that they make up only 1.5% of the
Australian population (Radford et al. 1999), an end result of extreme population loss over the two and a half centuries of European contact. Social marginalization of Aboriginal Australians manifests in reduced access to resources such as healthcare, jobs, and housing. As many Aboriginal peoples were forced into the more barren, remote regions of Australia, those remaining or migrating for the first time into urban settings dealt with issues of urban housing settlements as these spaces became one of the only places for such groups to seek affordable housing.

Subsequent to the forced migration of many Aboriginal peoples into rural settings was a larger collective conceptualization of the Australian Outback as a place for Aboriginal Australians and urban centers as a place for Anglo-Australians. This idea is directly a result of the dominant settler-colonial idea of “so-called ‘real’ Aboriginal people [being] the remote-dwelling, spear-carrying ‘traditional’ Aboriginal person” (Maddison 2013, 293). Because of these facts, one is left asking: How do we understand Aboriginal Australians who reside in urban centers? Are they Aboriginal? Do they belong somewhere else? How are they forced to fit within Anglo-Australian society in a way different from how Aboriginal populations in rural areas are forced to fit? Examining the lives of urban Aboriginal Australians allows for an examination of how such groups act and have agency within a society that has marginalized them and how such a context might have shaped or transformed a sub-set of the larger Aboriginal Australian population.
Historically, the inner city suburb of Redfern has been categorized as the primary Aboriginal suburb of Sydney given its high percentage (still only 2.1%) of Aboriginal Australians compared to other parts of the city (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2016). Many Aboriginal individuals came to this suburb for work at the numerous factories and to escape persecution running rampant throughout the rest of Sydney. In some ways it is not surprising that out of this concentration of Aboriginal individuals came varied Aboriginal organizations and civil rights movements in the 1960s and 1970s (Jones 2014, 1). While Redfern certainly was an environment where Aboriginal individuals were rallying together in the face of neo-colonial oppression, the Sydney Anglo-Australian population ultimately exploited this identification of “Aboriginal” to further discriminate against the Aboriginal Australians in Redfern.

This continuous exploitation has led to varied agentive responses on the side of Aboriginal Australians. For instance, after being subjected to arbitrary and ethnically charged arrests for being out past a 9:30PM curfew in 1970, Aboriginal individuals in Redfern established Redfern’s Aboriginal Medical Service, the Aboriginal Legal Service, and eventually the Aboriginal Housing Company (AHC) (Jones 2014, 2). The latter collective ultimately purchased all the houses on the Block, a precinct located within Redfern, which formed an impactful symbol of continuous Aboriginal presence in the heart of Sydney (Jones 2014, 3). Nonetheless, the Block experienced an influx of heroin use, largely brought in by non-Aboriginals in the 1980s, which led to the area being deemed unsafe by
most. Other Aboriginal collective groups in Redfern such as the Tribal Warrior Association thus took it upon themselves to confront the resulting Aboriginal heroin use and abuse in order to shift how insiders and outsiders of the community characterized Aboriginality in Sydney. This move was also compounded by popular conceptions of Aboriginal peoples in Sydney being violent and criminal.

Such negative conceptions have contributed to instances of unequal treatment of Aboriginal residents in Redfern and in some cases even death. In recent years, the Block area of Redfern has been the scene for multiple riots, including the 2004 Redfern Riots, which were sparked by the death of an Aboriginal adolescent boy named Thomas “TJ” Hickey (Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 2016). TJ was killed in 2004 after becoming impaled on a fence in Redfern while riding his bicycle. Several eyewitness accounts support claims that TJ was impaled after being pursued by a police car, which is what ultimately sparked the local riots. The Aboriginal community largely banded together in support of the Hickey family, underscoring a need to reexamine relationships between enforcement officials and Aboriginal residents, as “the police force has a long established track record of racist and provocative behavior against the Aboriginal community [in Redfern]” (World Socialist Web Site, 2004). This assertion of a collective community identity that is broadly pan-Aboriginal, as opposed to tribal (the more traditional form of social organization), is part of a larger process of identity negotiation (see chapter 3) that is sparked by a long
history of ethnic discrimination in Australia.

High levels of violence, drug use, and incarceration in Aboriginal groups have been exacerbated by legislative and social exclusion, oppression, and lack of resources, e.g. affordable housing, education, health services, etc.). Therefore, the image of the urban Aboriginal individual is one that is negative and less authentic than a remote-dwelling Aboriginal individual. However, this identity is always in the process of being renegotiated and re-conceptualized by members within the Aboriginal community of Redfern as well as by those non-members of the Aboriginal community inside and outside of Redfern. Some anthropological work on this process of renegotiating Aboriginality in Redfern note that community members pushed to reclaim their Aboriginal identity as something positive, “not based on substance abuse or drinking or things that are going to be dysfunctional” and that this renegotiated Aboriginality is not perfect, but it is something to be proud of (Jones 2014, 3). Most important to glean from this excerpt is the agency of Aboriginals involved in constructing their own subjectivity within the larger settler colonial structure of Australian society. Many of these same themes can be seen in the Pemulwuy Development Project.

Pemulwuy Project

Bob Bellear, Australia’s first Aboriginal judge, founded the AHC in Redfern, Sydney in 1972 (Aboriginal Housing Company 2015). Bellear had lived through years of conflict between the local Aboriginal communities and the police. The police would arrest Aboriginal “Goomies,” (an Australian slang word
meaning drunk) because of their seemingly excessive alcohol consumption in empty houses owned by absentee landlords, in order to maintain the status quo power dynamics within Redfern (Aboriginal Housing Company 2015). These empty houses were often the only shelter for Aboriginal individuals in the area, who sought solace from discrimination by others in the community. Bellear’s wife, Kaye, took it upon herself to set up temporary housing for her fellow Aboriginal residents in Redfern at a church hall, which quickly gained notice by large numbers of individuals in need of housing. However, the city council planned to evict those residing in the church hall, leading the Bellears to negotiate a housing arrangement with absentee landlords who owned properties in Redfern (Aboriginal Housing Company 2015). Eventually through much hardship and discrimination, the Bellears worked with the Department of Aboriginal Affairs and the Australian Labor Party government to secure funding that eventually led to the establishment of the AHC. Today the company operates as a non-profit charity in Redfern, receiving no government funding. Additionally, the company is entirely governed by Aboriginal Australians, who agentively developed the company after facing much discrimination.

Given the origins of the AHC in Redfern, it was not unthinkable for the organization to redevelop the “most Aboriginal” part of Redfern, The Block (Aboriginal Housing Company 2015). This area was part of one of the aforementioned areas in Redfern that became occupied by Aboriginal Sydneysiders after they were subjected to large-scale housing discrimination.
Following years of disrepair and precarity, the AHC announced plans to redevelop the Block, claiming to “breathe new life into [it], and restore a strong and healthy Indigenous community to Redfern with emphasis on cultural values, spirituality and employment. [The] Pemulwuy Project will make Redfern the best urban Aboriginal community in Australia and in doing so, set the benchmark for all other communities” (Aboriginal Housing Company 2015). Approved in the early 2000s for development, the Pemulwuy Project will feature a precinct with a six story building that includes 62 affordable dwellings for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, a gymnasium, a retail space; another precinct with a six story building complete with a childcare center, retail space, and office space; and a third precinct with a six story building containing 154 student accommodations within 42 rooms (NSW Government 2017). Since its inception, this development project has been inextricably tied to economic development. It is because of this link that the AHC argues the student accommodations and commercial retail space are necessary to the project.

Still, the AHC explains their vision as one that does “not simply replace the buildings on the ‘Block’ but [one that] restores a strong and healthy Indigenous community to Redfern with an emphasis on tradition, cultural values, and spirituality” (Redwatch 2017). After reading much of the literature and news media regarding the Pemulwuy Project though, it remains unclear how a housing and retail development project will improve the lives of the local Aboriginal community or make Aboriginality more prominent in Redfern as opposed to just
gentrifying the local area.

Interestingly, the project is not only a move toward providing affordable housing for local Aboriginal residents, but it also attempts to signal a greater Aboriginal identity even in its nomenclature. Pemulwuy was an Aboriginal (Bidjigal) warrior from Botany Bay, Sydney, who fought against European invasion and colonization. The AHC considers Pemulwuy a hero and claims that by naming this housing project after him, they are paying respect to his memory. The company states that Pemulwuy’s “legacy ensures that the identity and culture of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people continues to be handed down to future generations” (Pemulwuy Project 2017). Nevertheless, the AHC gives no explanations for how exactly this homogenous Aboriginality and culture will be maintained through the Pemulwuy Project. Instead, halfhearted claims about providing Aboriginal Australians in Redfern with housing similar to the options provided to Anglo-Australians seem to be the rhetoric. This fact is also counterintuitive to the argument of this paper, which recognizes a continuously and agentively negotiated Aboriginality. Thus, we are still left with the following questions: What makes the Block the “most Aboriginal” part of Redfern? How is this Aboriginality constructed and understood by multiple stakeholders such as the evicted Aboriginal residents of Redfern, the AHC, and the state government of New South Wales? What other processes and societal structures are involved in constructing, constraining, and maintaining Aboriginality? And finally, how do individual Aboriginal agents work within societal structures such as regional
governments (New South Wales) and private companies (AHC) to negotiate these identities?
Theoretical Frameworks, Methodology, and Methods

Theoretical Frameworks

The various facets of subjectivity and identity formation make for complex understandings of aboriginality in Australia. Here, I define aboriginality as the state of being (or in some cases being identified as) ethnically Aboriginal Australian. While it is certainly the case that an individual can be Aboriginal, it is never the case that the same individual is *only* Aboriginal. His/her/their subjectivity is intersectional and is “negotiated in the dialogue between the internally generated cultural traditions and practices that promote cohesion and inclusivity within society and the externally imposed realities of an individual’s placement in the broader hierarchy of social power” (Pitts 2007, 709). This subjectivity is linked to questions of subordination, ideology, and a consciousness that occurs through a process of identifying oneself as a knowing subject (Weedon 2004, 5; Ortner 2005, 31). Using this conceptualization, we can begin to understand how Aboriginality is constructed in Redfern, Sydney.

Not only does the construction of Aboriginality consist of internalized processes of Aboriginal individuals recognizing their own subjective positions as partly Aboriginal, but it also consists of an externalized process of being identified by others as Aboriginal. In other words, this identification lies both within the individual agent (in this case an Aboriginal Australian) and outside the individual agent, being constructed by the larger social world. Aboriginality is built from “a belief in group affinity that is based on subjective beliefs of shared common
ancestry drawn from ‘similarities of physical type or of customs or both’ or ‘of memories of colonization and migration’” (Hu 2013, 372). Although this definition was originally applied to archaeological examples, it has application within contemporary societies as well.

With this framework of ethnic subjectivity, the lived experiences of contemporary Aboriginal individuals in Redfern are more easily understood. Shared cultural norms are not simply passive reflections but are actively constructed through dynamic and situational processes, taking “diverse forms in different contexts of social interaction” (Jones 2005, 327). For Aboriginal Australians, Aboriginality is recognized from within, based on connections to collective customs and experiences, but outsiders also recognize it as an ethnicity distinct from others. Aboriginality is additionally intertwined with the cultural practices that dynamically work to produce such subjectivity. Through a close examination of Aboriginality in Redfern, it will become evident that identifying as an Aboriginal subject does not necessarily mean a person is part of the Aboriginal community. In the eyes of some Aboriginal residents, one must actively use their Aboriginality to support the local Aboriginal community by fighting for equality to be considered an Aboriginal member of the community, lest that person be understood as an outsider. Therefore, a promotion of inclusion and cohesion is easier said than done within Australian society on the whole.

Modern day development projects targeted at Aboriginal communities
exemplify tensions inherent in highly populated, urban contexts. As an example, I argue that the Pemulwuy Project promotes a particular inclusion and cohesion of Aboriginality within Sydney, one that is largely Euro-centric. This kind of inclusion and cohesion rests upon integrating (or arguable assimilating) Aboriginal people in Redfern into more typical Anglo-Australian “lifestyle” of multi-story apartment complexes intermixed in shopping areas. This “lifestyle” consists of aspects of taste that have become mainstream in urban, middle-class Anglo-Australia today (Special Broadcasting Service 2010). Such tastes reflect the fact that Sydney’s population (and Australia writ large) consists predominantly of Anglo-Australian descendant people.

Much of the support for the Pemulwuy Project comes from urban renewal notions about beautifying Redfern (City of Sydney 2018). In recent years, this specific area of Redfern, the Block, has been viewed by outsiders from the greater Sydney area as old, dilapidated, and much in need of a renovation so that it will better fit into a contemporary image of how the inner-city suburbs of Sydney look (Aboriginal Housing Company 2017). This aesthetic idea of commercial and residential taste is significant as “taste classifies, and it classifies the classifier” and furthermore, that by classifying these classifications, subjects distinguish themselves so that “their position in the objective classifications is expressed or betrayed” (Bourdieu 1984, 6). Although Bourdieu was principally referring to forms of taste regarding high art forms such as music and painting, this theoretical approach can be applied to the Pemulwuy Project, as architecture
is another example of the entwinement of art, taste, and the functionality, which simultaneously work to construct a certain kind of subject. My case study discusses in more detail how the Pemulwuy Project exemplifies Bourdieu’s notions of taste, classification, social subjects, and power relations.

One should be wary of uncritically applying an Aboriginal Australian versus Anglo-Australian rhetoric, as Aboriginality is a collective ethnicity and discord exists between different subsets of Aboriginal residents in Redfern and elsewhere. For example, although the Aboriginal Housing Company (AHC) is entirely owned and operated by Aboriginal Australians, numerous Aboriginal people living at the Block prior to the redevelopment plans disagree with the Pemulwuy Project (Youtube 2017). The current Chief Executive of the AHC, Mick Mundine, is frequently at odds with Aboriginal protesters who were evicted from the Block in order to make room for demolition and redevelopment processes (Feneley 2015). A Wiradjuri elder, Jenny Munro, has frequently spoken to Australian news outlets claiming the AHC under Mundine does not have the interests of the local Aboriginal community at heart stating, “‘This is Aboriginal Housing Company, not Micky Mundine’s Housing Company,’ and that ‘it needs to be resolved at a community level and the community still haven’t had a chance to have a say” (Australian Broadcasting Corporation 2015). This contention is significant as it highlights the complexities of collective ethnicities and it speaks to issues with top-down approaches, which are not productive in the everyday lives of the local Aboriginal community.
Collective Aboriginality is further complicated by socioeconomic status and place within greater Australian society. There is disconnect between the members of Redfern that constitute the local Aboriginal community who protests the development project and the Aboriginal administrative officials who own and operate the AHC and belong to a higher socioeconomic class, which ultimately underscores issues about a collective Aboriginality. As I argue, tensions between the Aboriginal administrative officials of the AHC and Aboriginal residents evicted from the Block to make way for the Pemulwuy Project development can be framed as an example of Aboriginal subjectivity being constantly and actively renegotiated by the involved actors. Aboriginality is agentively adjusted, constructed, and maintained by each member of the Aboriginal community in Redfern, which supports an intersectional understanding of subjectivity for each of these individuals.

Finally, one can argue whether these types of conflict challenge notions of indigenous authenticity. It is worth considering this possibility, as ideas about tradition are still used to fragment Aboriginal Australians and bolster problematic conceptions of what it means to be more or less authentic, which is further upheld by the historical context of structural violence of the settler colonial regime in Australia (Maddison 2013, 292). While the practice of settler colonialism emerged as a nation-state endeavor within the past 500 years, the concept of settler colonialism has both risen in part as a result of these practices and in part from the anthropological discourse on indigenous peoples (Wolfe 1991, 198).
Australia, this regime began with the colonization of the eastern coast of Australia in 1788 and consisted heavily of coastal warring, perpetrated by the incoming British who recognized the continent as a *terra nullius*, or empty land. Later, moves inland created circumstances of hostility between invading Anglo-Australians and resident Aboriginal groups. Currently, settler colonialism discourse has shifted dramatically from Eurocentric support of the expansion endeavors of imperial powers to Aboriginal critiques of these processes (Moreton-Robinson 2015, 10).

Remnants of colonial processes continue to exist in Australia and have led to consistent oppression and discrimination of Aboriginal peoples. What was once a conversation about missions and assimilation as a tool for Aboriginal amelioration (Elkin 1964, 351) has since become a conversation about closing the gaps of inequality between Aboriginal and Anglo-Australians (Burmeister 2009, 42). Because of reduced access to resources, Aboriginal Australians are frequently left in poverty. Thus, the popular connection of Aboriginality to poverty, homelessness, drug abuse, and violence has created a misleading category of ethnicity that rests upon a relation to these plights in order to establish any kind of authentic indigeneity, at least from the point of view of outsiders. Notions of authenticity also derive from common conceptions of Aboriginal Australians residing in the rural desert in the center of the continent. In other words, there exists a fomenting fragmentation between ‘those living in so-called traditional communities (‘real’ Aborigines) and those living in urban or fringe communities
(‘ersatz’ Aborigines)” (Maddison 2013, 293). Hence, my research problematizes this conversation by examining how Aboriginality is constructed in an urban setting.

Ultimately, from an anthropological point of view, one must understand that a systematic approach to thinking about who is more or less Aboriginal is not a productive way of approaching ethnicity or subjectivity. Rather, both are formed through dynamic processes of situational and relational contexts. From this perspective, the Aboriginal residents of Redfern are no less Aboriginal than those residing in the outback of central Australia, just as Mick Mundine is no less Aboriginal than Jenny Munro, even though he is the president of the AHC and she is occupying the Block. Each of these actors is, at least in part, in control of their own ethnicity formation, which are complex and ongoing processes, intersected by other facets of subjectivity construction, such as political power, class, gender, and age.

One cannot ignore that this agency involved with the construction of subjectivity is constricted by larger societal structures as well. These structures range from other groups of individuals involved with the Pemulwuy Project such as the Anglo-Australian population of Redfern; conglomerate organizations such as the AHC; and finally, the local state agencies involved. Thus, my research applies practice theory to underscore how these individual actors and societal structures recursively inform one another. It is evident that both structure and agency are interactive aspects of Aboriginality. Power and inequality are integral
to practice theory (Ortner 1984, 145). The Pemulwuy Project is an ideal example of Ortner’s ideas about how human actions and related events are often affected or even determined by larger societal systems (1984, 146). It is my goal to underscore the complexities of Aboriginality and agency through the application of these related theoretical frameworks. By doing so, I will highlight the lived experiences and effects of such a large architectural development project on the local Aboriginal community.

Methodology and Methods

The methodological framework for this research project was established to answer the following research questions: “How is Aboriginality constructed and understood by the community in Redfern, Sydney?” and “How do such conceptualizations of Aboriginality inform the subjectivity of these community members?” I categorized data through quantitative and qualitative methods. Both the qualitative and quantitative datasets come from secondary research sources such as newspapers, websites, and videos.

Citing Waples and Berelson (1941) and Berelson and Lazarsfeld (1948), Krippendorff (2004) describes the history of content analysis, which entails a systematic reading of images, texts, and other symbolic matter (Krippendorff 2004, 3). This type of analysis has a long history, appearing in languages other than English as earlier as the 17th century during the Spanish Inquisition when theologians were examining newspapers. During the 20th century, content analysis became focused on the social functions that words perform in mediums
such as newspapers (Weber 1911, 39). Speed (1893) went so far as to perform what was probably the first quantitative analysis of newspaper contents by examining how coverage had changed over time (Speed 1893, 706).

In anthropology, content analysis largely developed as a technique to understand folklore and kinship terminology (Goodenough 1972, 195). Content analysis later spread throughout the discipline as a means for ethnographers to interpret their field notes after leaving the field. Additionally in anthropology is the use of ethnographic content analysis aimed at unpacking categories other than word use such as style, images, settings, and situations (Krippendorff 2004, 16; Altheide 1987, 68). Still on a fundamental level, interdisciplinary approaches to content analysis underscore the importance of word content and meaning making. My study builds on such methodological frameworks that understand words as performing social functions as well as exploring how words have social meanings, specifically by examining how certain words are linked to ideology and public opinion (e.g. “ Aboriginal” as linked to “Redfern” and/or “community”).

To address the initial research question “How is Aboriginality constructed and understood by the community in Redfern, Sydney?” I performed a qualitative content analysis that examined large themes, such as community (at multiple scales including the social network of the Redfern Aboriginal tent embassy and the larger Aboriginal social network of Redfern) conflict and opposition, unity, inequality, and indigeneity. I gathered multimedia sources at the aforementioned scales, ranging from information specifically written about the Pemulwuy Project
housing development as well as information about the larger Redfern community in Sydney. An approach focusing on both the Pemulwuy Project and the Redfern community writ large underscores the dynamism and intersectional nature of Aboriginality.

To address my second research question regarding the relationship between Aboriginality and subjectivity, I used both quantitative and qualitative content analysis to examine how themes of community, conflict and opposition, unity, inequality, and indigeneity manifested in the written and visual record. Specifically, I performed a manual word frequency analysis that speaks to larger notions about categories of markedness. The results and interpretation of the data I obtained from this manual word frequency and content analysis is described in detail in chapter 4.
Interpretation of Data

Aboriginality

This paper answers the following research questions: “How is Aboriginality constructed and understood by the community in Redfern, Sydney?” and “How do such conceptualizations of Aboriginality inform the subjectivity of these community members?” In order to do so, it is first important to understand what some of these terms mean. In addition to expounding working definitions of such words as “Aboriginality,” “ethnicity,” and “subjectivity,” this section will discuss in detail the implications of all datasets I analyzed.

My introduction defined Aboriginality as the state of being (or in some cases being identified as) ethnically Aboriginal Australian (see chapter 3). Although this is a succinct definition for the purposes of clarity, the concept of Aboriginality is highly complex and contested in Australia. As stated previously, the different understandings and constant renegotiations of Aboriginality are highlighted by the different voices of the community members involved in the Pemulwuy Project in Redfern. Moreover, the historical precedent for Aboriginal self-determination that allows a space for such negotiation within the settler colonial regime lies in the legislative history of the definition of “Aboriginal.” Therefore, this information is a significant aspect of the data interpretation within this paper.

Originally, the government of Australia did not recognize “Aboriginal natives” should be counted as part of the national census (Brazil and Mitchell
1981, 24). For example, the early 19th century was the temporal setting for many legislative decisions surrounding Aboriginal subjects. Commonly, the state governments in New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia, and Tasmania in 1839, 1844, 1864, 1865, 1874, and 1912 respectively used “blood-quotum” classifications to refer to Aboriginal subjects (Gardiner-Garden 2003). Essentially, this involved discrimination against any individuals that were outwardly perceived to be darker-skinned than Anglo-Australians. It was not until the 1970s that legislation defined an “‘Aboriginal’ as ‘a person who is a member of the Aboriginal race of Australia’” (Federal Register of Legislation 1975, 1). Still, questions about who defines the members of this pan-Aboriginal race of Australia are left unanswered.

It was not until the 1980s, the *Report on a Review of the Administration of the Working Definition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders* clarified that “An Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander is a person of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent who identifies as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander and is accepted as such by the community in which he (she) lives” (Brazil and Mitchell 1981, 24). With this definition came a tripartite definition of Aboriginality: self-identification, ethnic descent, and community recognition. Although this more thorough definition of Aboriginality addressed the issue of who is able to define who is or is not Aboriginal in Australia, this definition was still contentious among legislators because it did not specify which of these three aspects of Aboriginality were to take precedence.
Thus, judicial officials raised questions that harkened back to earlier ideas about “degree of Aboriginal descent,” and consequently juxtaposed such concepts to “cultural circumstances” becoming important aspects in “determining whether a person is ‘Aboriginal.” 6 The court’s decision in Shaw v. Wolf specifically states “the development of identity as an Aboriginal person cannot be attributed to any one determinative factor. It is the interplay of social responses and interactions, on different levels and from different sources, both positive and negative, which create self-perception and identity” (Shaw v. Wolf, 1998).

Through these definitions of Aboriginality in Australia, which clearly evolved over time, we can begin to interpret how the construction of Aboriginal subjects in Redfern may be manifesting.

Chapter 2 discussed the historic background and site context to Redfern, Sydney and its local contemporary community. The history of Redfern began tens of thousands of years ago when it was originally occupied and inhabited by the Gadigal Aboriginal people of the Eora nation (Stockton 2004, 59). The arrival of Europeans in 1788 drastically affected the landscape that would later become known as Redfern through the displacement and decimation of the local Gadigal population. As was suggested in the above discussion of 19th century legislation involving Aboriginal peoples, only those with a percentage of “Aboriginal” blood-quotum were categorized as Aboriginal. Unfortunately, this classification of Aboriginal Australians was used for exclusionary purposes. Those individuals categorized as Aboriginal were not census counted until the definition of
Aboriginality changed in the 20th century. While this practice of exclusion was discriminatory, it is reflective of an Aboriginal subjectivity that is consistently renegotiated and problematized. The first definition of Aboriginality certainly did not remain unchanged through time; instead, it was redefined by the courts systems, which better reflected how Aboriginal Australians experienced their Aboriginality. They recognized themselves as such (Aboriginal) internally, while also being recognized by others as Aboriginal.

Interestingly, the similarities between Aboriginal Australians’ consistent contextual renegotiation of their Aboriginal subjectivity and the way the Australian Bureau of Statistics redefined Aboriginality over time end here. I argue that Aboriginal subjects relationally and contextually define Aboriginality; it is not a singular subjectivity. Thus, an Aboriginal subject is never only an Aboriginal subject. Nevertheless, the Australian Bureau of Statistics [and related agencies e.g. the Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination (OIPC)] fails to allow for this type of fluidity and flexibility. This is especially problematic, given that other nation-states have taken this into account in terms of their legal definitions of Aboriginality. For example, since 1996 the New Zealand census allows for a person to identify as Maori both solely or partially (e.g. identifying as Pakeha/European) (Parliament of Australia 2003). The New Zealand example underscores the malleability of Aboriginality.

The significance of these varying examples can be characterized by employing Michel de Certeau’s (1984) framework of power and space. De
Certeau defines two terms: *strategy* and *tactic*. Strategies are those manipulations or calculations of power relationships, enforced and implemented by structures such as a city, a business, etc. (de Certeau 1984, 36). The census agencies and judiciary officials discussed above therefore represent the state structures’ top-down application of *strategies* used to define Aboriginal subjects. Alternatively, a bottom-up solution involves subjects’ employing *tactics* in order to assert agency and subvert subjugation by structural systems (1984, 37). An example of this is the constant renegotiation of Aboriginality by Aboriginal individuals in Redfern.

The Pemulwuy Project involves numerous actors ranging from the local community of homeless Aboriginal individuals who were evicted to make room for the development project, to the leaders of the Aboriginal Housing Company, to the Aboriginal residents of Redfern who support the project, to the municipal government in charge of approving and overseeing the development project (to name a few). These actors unquestioningly have some level of agency in constructing, maintaining, and renegotiating Aboriginality. Yet, the differing levels of agency in these processes vary. Moreover, the agency used by the Aboriginal Housing Company when aimed at both the evicted Aboriginal residents of the Block in Redfern and the faction of Aboriginal supporters in Redfern is a top-down *strategy* that is relational and contextual. Only when the Aboriginal Housing Company is juxtaposed to larger structural systems like the New South Wales Government Department of Planning & Environment does it become the “other,”
operating through the use of bottom-up tactics (de Certeau 1984, 37). Following Lelièvre’s reimagination of “the political’ in which all subjects contribute to the construction of the political sphere, if not equally so,” we can see within these relational contexts not only a renegotiation of who defines Aboriginality but also a renegotiation of power relations (Lelièvre 2012, 334).

*Within the Settler Colonial Regime*

Many may understand Australia as a post-colonial state, but the remnants of the settler colonial regime are still largely present, especially for Aboriginal subjects (see chapter 3). Building on the above argument that there are multiple contextual levels to conceptualizing Aboriginality, I will now situate this discussion within the settler colonial regime of Australia. The purpose is not to reinforce any part of this regime, but instead to underscore how Aboriginal subjects are agentively operating within such a system. Further drawing on Lelièvre’s interpretation of how subjects act, often with less power than the structures within which they are acting, I interpret the Aboriginal subjects in Redfern as both challenging and reinforcing outside ideas of Aboriginality. In other words, the settler colonial regime in Australia has created a system that Aboriginal subjects are forced to act, exist, and prove themselves as authentically Aboriginal within (Raibmon 2005, 3).

Paige Raibmon’s discussion of Kwakwaka’wakw authenticity on the Pacific Northwest Coast in North America is applicable to the experiences of Aboriginal residents in Redfern. Both of these indigenous populations “were
collaborators—albeit unequally—in authenticity” (Raibmon, 2005, 3). It is through the creation and establishment of an Australian settler colonial regime (in this case created and perpetuated largely by Anglo-Australians), that a concept of an authentic or inauthentic Aboriginal exists (Povinelli 2002, 6). A continued analysis of how the different facets of the Australian government have categorized Aboriginality highlights how Aboriginal subjects are forced to act and define themselves as thoroughly Aboriginal. For instance, the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) notes that while “Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander heritage is something that is personal” and that one does “not need a letter of confirmation to identify as an Indigenous person,” that same person may be asked to confirm or prove their Aboriginality when applying for certain services and programs dedicated to Indigenous-specific causes (AIATSIS 2018). Though the link is clear between a larger societal structure negotiating Aboriginality, which in this case is the AIATSIS, and Aboriginal subjects being sometimes forced to prove their Aboriginality, a further connection to the Pemulwuy Project is also present. The AIATSIS website explains that one such program or service that an Aboriginal person may have to prove or confirm their Aboriginality would be for Indigenous-specific housing assistance.

The AHC’s Pemulwuy Project consists of three precincts (see chapter 2 for a further explanation of these individual precincts). Arguably, the most contentious precinct is the plan for “affordable Aboriginal housing” (AHC 2015).
Though there are metrics for determining which housing in Sydney is considered affordable or not, the AHC seemingly makes no concrete determination. Affordable seems to be a relative term, as does Aboriginal in this instance. At the crux of this point are the questions: Who is defining Aboriginality? How is such Aboriginality being defined? While the AHC gives no sufficient answer to these questions, the Aboriginal subjects in Redfern are still consistently subjected to such attempts at defining Aboriginality according to the settler colonial regime. To invoke Raibmon once more, the Aboriginal subjects’ lives in Redfern are “complicated and hard-won blends of indigenous and colonial practices,” which is lost on outsiders seeking a purely authentic Aboriginality (Raibmon 2005, 198).

The most compelling aspect of this multidimensional understanding of how both Aboriginal Australians and Anglo-Australians contribute to understandings of Aboriginality is the result of recursive interplay between individual Aboriginal subjects and larger societal structures. I argue that through an internalization of the external societal structures, Aboriginal Australians in Redfern work to define their own Aboriginality contextually and relationally, through recursive practices (de Certeau 1984, 57; Bourdieu 1977, 72). These practices are not independent from larger structures, but this does not take away from the agency of Aboriginal subjects. Instead, the regulated improvisations and dispositions of Aboriginal subjects are shaped and informed by such structures, resulting in an externalized habitus (Bourdieu 1977, 78), which in turn continue to inform how structural systems are produced (Ortner 1984, 146). On one hand, the Aboriginal
opponents of the Pemulwuy Project reject many of the administrators of the AHC as part of their Aboriginal community because the former group does not believe the latter organization has the local community’s values at heart. For example, the Wiradjuri elder mentioned in chapter 2, Jenny Munro, identifies the CEO of the AHC, Mick Mundine, as an outsider even though he is ethnically an Aboriginal resident of Redfern. Mundine’s status as an executive businessman essentially nullifies his place within the local Aboriginal community because, in their view, he does not put their best interests at the forefront.

On the other hand, outsiders to the Aboriginal community in Redfern group Mundine as an Aboriginal subject because of his performed ethnicity. Mundine also identifies himself as an Aboriginal subject within the Redfern community because he has spent his entire life embodying cultural practices that align him with such a subjectivity. Thus, initially an Aboriginal subject was defined as such by the state of Australia. Consequently, non-Aboriginal subjects’ ideas about how Aboriginal subjects existed and acted in the world were and continue to be shaped by these definitions. Because Aboriginal subjects were forced into a settler colonial regime, this system also worked to inform constructions of Aboriginality. Over time, Aboriginal subjects (including Jenny Munro, Mick Mundine, etc.) negotiated and renegotiated what such an Aboriginality informed by the Australian settler colonial regime meant to them as individual subjects.

Not only do Aboriginal Sydneysiders have to contend with their place within the settler colonial regime, but they are also clearly confronted with
outsiders’ understandings of Aboriginality. Per the discussion of my methodological framework for this paper in chapter 3, it is important to underscore how Aboriginality is both talked about and understood on the ground as opposed to the more theoretical explanation given above. For this paper, I analyzed 27 sources that discuss Redfern either in reference to hostility toward the Aboriginal residents or the Pemulwuy Project. 13 of these sources were written sources ranging from newspaper articles to journal articles to online reports. The remaining 14 sources were video interviews with individuals from Redfern who self-identified as Aboriginal. Using the content and word frequency analysis described in the methodology section of this paper, I assessed how frequently certain significant words occurred throughout these sources.

One category of words I examined was the occurrence of “Aboriginal/Indigenous/black.” These variations of the word “Aboriginal” were mentioned 126 times throughout these sources. This is almost ten times the frequency of the category “White/Anglo/non-Aboriginal,” which only occurred 13 times. The significance of this quantitative analysis lies in broader sociological ideas about marked and unmarked categories (Goffman 1966, 4). While Goffman’s *Behavior in Public Places* explored the implications of deviant or unusual public behaviors, I apply this framework to understand the social meanings of descriptor words like “Aboriginal/Indigenous/black.” I argue that the high frequency of these words is a result of categories of markedness (Brekhus 1998, 34), whereby the regularly occurring form “white/Anglo/non-Aboriginal”
need not be spoken, as it is the societal norm. However, when describing people of Aboriginal ethnicity, the authors or speakers from these sources felt the need to mark such a subjectivity, as Aboriginality is more conspicuous than Anglo-ness in Australia. In essence, this exemplifies the unequal positions of power that Aboriginal Australians from the Block in Redfern (and Australia writ large) are contained to. The settler colonial regime has transformed from originally excluding, displacing, and often times decimating Aboriginal populations to more covert operations such as marking Aboriginal subjects as the abnormal persons of Australian society. These operations are manifested through initiatives such as the Pemulwuy Project, in which the local Aboriginal community has differing ideas about the definition and constitution of Aboriginality.

The Pemulwuy Project exemplifies the multiple levels and subjects that are involved in redefining and renegotiation Aboriginality in Sydney. The project is in part representative of the Australian settler colonial regime informing the *habitus* of its Aboriginal subjects by way of establishing (both intentionally and unintentionally) socially understood definitions of residential space and taste (Bourdieu 1984, 466). The urban environment of Sydney creates an interesting setting for manifestations of taste, which differ from how Aboriginal subjects experience the settler colonial regime in more rural settings. High-rise buildings and closely situated row houses are largely what one sees when walking around the central business district (CDB) and the nearby inner-city suburbs. After
almost 250 years of being enveloped into this context of urban space, the Aboriginal community in Redfern continues to negotiate their place as subjects in Sydney.

The news and video sources I examined certainly mark Aboriginality as the defining aspect of subjectivity of individuals involved with the Pemulwuy Project. One article begins by posing the question “To which Aborigines does The Block at Redfern belong” underscoring the notion that Aboriginality is not a static and homogenous fact (Feneley 2015). Although different Aboriginal stakeholders (largely represented in public media as those that fall within the camp of Mick Mundine and the AHC or those that support Jenny Munro and the Redfern Aboriginal Tent Embassy) have strong opinions about the Pemulwuy Project, all Aboriginal voices represented in the sources I examined work to assert agency in how they construct their Aboriginality. They use their marked positionality as Aboriginal Sydneysiders to negotiate their place in contemporary urban Australia. The AHC has adopted an Anglo-Australian model for how society should be arranged, and consequently seeks to redefine the “urban Aboriginal” to the public (Special Broadcasting Service 2010; Memmott 2015, 59). The primary way Mick Mundine and his associates plan to redefine Aboriginality is through building the precincts of the Pemulwuy Project. Mundine and the other AHC officials want Aboriginal to no longer mean “drunk and lazy,” instead choosing to claim an Aboriginality that is largely informed by urban, middle-class Anglo-Australian tastes (Special Broadcasting Service 2010).
Opponents of this kind of reconstitution of Aboriginality such as Jenny Munro and the Redfern Aboriginal Tent Embassy contextualize Mundine’s aims as thinly veiled attempts at assimilating the Aboriginal subjects living in Redfern (Feneley 2015). Although these positions seem to be polarities, they are both representative of an actively negotiated, dynamic, and contextual Aboriginality.

Moreover, Mundine, Munro, and other Aboriginal subjects’ construction of Aboriginality are inextricably tied to the “norms values, and conceptual schemes” that “get reproduced by and for actors” within a larger structural system (Ortner 1984, 154). Aboriginality does not exist independent of structural systems, but instead is produced within such systems (Merlan 2005, 474). This does not mean subjects have no autonomy within these systems. Alternatively, it means subjects and structures are dynamic counterparts.
Conclusion

The arrival of Europeans in Australia in the 1780s does not mark the start of history on the continent. Conversely, it marks the start of a settler colonial history in Australia that has continued to affect Aboriginal peoples. Not only were Aboriginal groups often forced to move inland to make space for incoming Europeans, but they were also discriminated against and contained to social positions of lesser power. The Australian settler colonial regime contributed to negative conceptions of Aboriginal Australians that often involved them being categorized as degenerate, impoverished, and less deserving. Because the majority of Aboriginal peoples were forced onto reserves, missions, or out of (what became) urban spaces, those left in urban spaces (and similarly those who migrated to urban spaces later) faced challenges to their Aboriginality that those in non-urban spaces did not.

While the focus of this paper was on identifying and underscoring the agency of Aboriginal Sydneysiders in the processes of subjectivity construction and negotiation, the potential for future research on a broader subjectivity in contemporary urban Australia is not lacking. I plan to continue to explore ideas related to the interaction between the urban environment and subjectivity in my future work. Another facet of Aboriginality ripe for future research includes the tension between a strategic essentialism of Aboriginal for political and legislative purposes and the intentional descriptive distinctions of tribal affiliations.

My paper argued that initiatives aimed at lowering inequality between
Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australians as well as attempts at incorporating Aboriginal Sydneysiders into an urban, middle-class Anglo-Australian society ultimately perpetuate longstanding tensions involving Aboriginality, agency, and subjectivity. To make this argument, I examined a case study in the inner-city suburb of Redfern, Sydney. The Pemulwuy Project housing development project that is led by the Aboriginal Housing Company seeks to redefine both how Aboriginal people in Redfern see themselves and how Anglo-Australians perceive Aboriginal Sydneysiders. The AHC’s CEO, Mick Mundine, aims to negotiate an Aboriginal subjectivity that distances itself from popular negative conceptions of Aboriginal people in Redfern as impoverished, substance dependent, and degenerate. Other Aboriginal residents of Redfern identify this negotiation of Aboriginality as one that perpetuates notions of Aboriginal people assimilating into contemporary, urban, and middle-class Anglo-Australian society. Nonetheless, these tensions between different Aboriginal stakeholders support my argument that Aboriginal subjects agentively and continuously renegotiated their Aboriginality. One perspective is not more or less powerful than the other. Instead, the different perspectives of these individuals and groups of individuals are parts of a larger discourse on the development, dynamism, and construction of subjectivity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Source Name</th>
<th>Representation Type (First Person, Second Person, etc.)</th>
<th>Potential Biases</th>
<th>Potential Advantages</th>
<th>Potential Negatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
<td>The Australian</td>
<td>Third Person</td>
<td>Widely syndicated newspaper, working to appeal to mass audiences</td>
<td>Far reaching sources; written by a third-party journalist, not involved in the community’s disputes</td>
<td>Journalist is a contractor of large media conglomerate (News Corp); journalist is not an Aboriginal Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
<td>Australian Broadcasting Corporation</td>
<td>Third Person</td>
<td>Widely syndicated news source, working to appeal to mass audiences; owned by the Australian government</td>
<td>Far reaching sources; written by a third-party individual, not involved in the community’s disputes</td>
<td>Author is an employee of the government media corporation; author is not an Aboriginal Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
<td>Australian Broadcasting Corporation</td>
<td>Third Person</td>
<td>Widely syndicated news source, working to appeal to mass audiences; owned by the Australian government</td>
<td>Far reaching sources; written by a third-party individual, not involved in the community’s disputes</td>
<td>Author is an employee of the government media corporation; author is not an Aboriginal Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Article</td>
<td>Human Rights Initiative</td>
<td>Second Person</td>
<td>Produced by the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI), aimed at realizing human rights</td>
<td>Written by an outsider of the local Redfern Aboriginal Community; internal biases less likely</td>
<td>CHRI likely to underscore the wants/needs of the local indigenous community, possibly producing bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Article</td>
<td>Journal of Indigenous Policy</td>
<td>Third Person</td>
<td>Produced by the Journal of Indigenous Polity, which aims to provide a forum for intellectual discussion about policies affecting Aboriginal Australians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written by an outsider of the local Redfern Aboriginal Community; internal biases less likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positionality of journal creates an inherent bias that might overlook some facts by way of protecting and promoting indigenous values and opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
<td>South Sydney Herald</td>
<td>First Person ; Interview</td>
<td>Newspaper produced by the South Sydney Uniting Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview is with an Aboriginal Australian community member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The interview contains only one person’s point of view; not multi-vocal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Release</td>
<td>South Sydney Herald</td>
<td>Third Person</td>
<td>Press Release produced South Sydney Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Press Release on the Pemulwuy Project’s progress is written by someone separate from the Redfern Aboriginal community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Press release does not assess potential effects on the local Aboriginal community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Production</td>
<td>Special Broadcasting Service</td>
<td>First Person</td>
<td>Single interview with members of the Redfern community (heavily partial opinions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First hand perspective gives up close view into Pemulwuy Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>community (heavily partial opinions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Production</td>
<td>Special Broadcasting</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Single interview with members of the Redfern</td>
<td>First hand perspective gives up close view into Pemulwuy Project</td>
<td>The interview contains only one person’s point of view; not multi-vocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>interview with members of the Redfern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>community (heavily partial opinions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
<td>The Sydney Morning Herald</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Widely syndicated newspaper, working to</td>
<td>Far reaching sources; written by a third-party journalist, not</td>
<td>Journalist is a contractor of large media conglomerate (Fairfax Media); journalist is not an Aboriginal Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>appeal to mass audiences</td>
<td>involved in the community’s disputes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
<td>The Sydney Morning Herald</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Widely syndicated newspaper, working to</td>
<td>Far reaching sources; written by a third-party journalist, not</td>
<td>Journalist is a contractor of large media conglomerate (Fairfax Media); journalist is not an Aboriginal Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>appeal to mass audiences</td>
<td>involved in the community’s disputes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
<td>The Sydney Morning Herald</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Widely syndicated newspaper, working to</td>
<td>Far reaching sources; written by a third-party journalist, not</td>
<td>Journalist is a contractor of large media conglomerate (Fairfax Media); journalist is not an Aboriginal Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>appeal to mass audiences</td>
<td>involved in the community’s disputes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
<td>The Sydney Morning Herald</td>
<td>Third Person</td>
<td>Widely syndicated newspaper, working to appeal to mass audiences</td>
<td>Far reaching sources; written by a third-party journalist, not involved in the community’s disputes</td>
<td>Journalist is a contractor of large media conglomerate (Fairfax Media); journalist is not an Aboriginal Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Article</td>
<td>World Socialist Web Site</td>
<td>Third Person</td>
<td>Produced by the International Committee of the Fourth International, an extreme left-leaning organization</td>
<td>Seeks equality in its writing</td>
<td>Very politically biased toward communism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Article</td>
<td>Vice</td>
<td>Third Person</td>
<td>Widely syndicated newspaper, working to appeal to mass audiences</td>
<td>Far reaching sources; written by a third-party journalist, not involved in the community’s disputes</td>
<td>Subsidiary of large news company, Vice Media LLC; inherent corporate biases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Youtube.com</td>
<td>Third Person</td>
<td>Widely syndicated news source, working to appeal to mass audiences; owned by the Australian government</td>
<td>Far reaching sources; written by a third-party individual, not involved in the community’s disputes</td>
<td>Author is an employee of the government media corporation; author is not an Aboriginal Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Youtube.com</td>
<td>First Person</td>
<td>Video produced by the Aboriginal Housing Company (AHC), which is running the Pemulwuy Project Development</td>
<td>First hand accounts and opinions about the urban housing development</td>
<td>Biases exist that support the housing development; no voice is given to any local Aboriginal community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Nature/Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewsMedia</td>
<td>&quot;The Battle for the Block of flats&quot;</td>
<td>Deputy Editor</td>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
<td>&quot;The Risks of a Split Between Two Generations: A Family in Crisis&quot;</td>
<td>Associate Editor</td>
<td>Mary Parker</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
<td>&quot;The Role of Community Engagement in Social Change: A Case Study&quot;</td>
<td>Assistant Editor</td>
<td>David Johnson</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>&quot;The Importance of Community Involvement in Local Affairs&quot;</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>&quot;An Update on the Status of Oral Health in Our Community&quot;</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>John Brown</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2 Raw Source Data**
References


Aboriginal Housing Company 2017 (urban renewal of The Block page 14)


Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2016. 2.1%
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Brekhus 1998 (markedness and Goffman article google page 28)


Federal Register of Legislation, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders (Queensland Discriminatory Laws) Act 1975, (Canberra, 1975), 1-5.
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Shaw & Anor v. Wolf & Ors, 83 FCR 113; 163 ALR 205 (Federal Court of Australia 1998).
Shaw & Anor v. Wolf & Ors, 83 FCR 113; 163 ALR 205 (Federal Court of Australia 1998).
Simpson, Audra. 2014. Mohawk Interruptus. Duke University Press, Durham, NC. Still need to cite her somewhere
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Waples, Douglas and Bernard Berelson. 1941. What the voters were told: An essay in content analysis. Unpublished manuscript. Chicago: University of Chicago Graduate Library School.


Notes

1 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People is the preferred nomenclature by most indigenous Australians. The Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies explains that “an accepted definition of an Indigenous Australian proposed by the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs in the 1980s and still used by some Australian Government departments today is; a person of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent who identifies as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander and is accepted as such by the community in which he or she lives” (AIATSIS 2018). This paper recognized this, but uses “Aboriginal” or “Aboriginal Australian” as a shorthand.

2 Bureaucracy is defined in this paper as the intertwinement between state power and private profit (Graeber 2015, 52).

3 The concept of a “knowing subject” is taken from Althusser’s idea, whereby an individual has, at least on some level, a sovereign and rational consciousness. This consciousness is reflected through the thinking and speaking “I,” from the individual.

4 Those in text citations without page numbers reference online sources that contain only a single page of text.

5 Inner-city suburbs, as Redfern is described in this paper, are those communities that are located relatively close to the central business district (CBD) of Sydney. Most frequently used in Australia and New Zealand, the term refers to inner suburbs that are still part of the zone of transition in urban areas. They are characteristically densely populated, home to the working class, and the location of mixed-use development.

6 For details on either court decisions about who is defined as Aboriginal, see federal Australian court cases Gibbs v. Capewell, FCA 25; 128 ALR 577 (1995) and Shaw v. Wolf, 83 FCR 113; 163 ALR 205 (1998).

7 The original state sector that was in control of Aboriginal affairs in Australia was the Department of the Environment, Aborigines and the Arts (established 1971; dissolved 1972). This agency was superseded by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs (1972-1990), which was superseded by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSCI) (1990-2005). Finally, this agency was dissolved and replaced with the Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination (2004-present). Additional related information can be found on the Australian Government’s website of Indigenous Policy Coordination.

8 A structure here may refer to several institutions or bodies beyond the level of the individual or community (e.g. state, state agency, company, etc.) These structures are defined as such because of their ability as “collective bodies that exert some authority over a subject population” (Lelièvre and Marshall 2015, 436). We, as subjects accept “structures” as existing in the world, separate from bodies that are made and remade through social interactions and processes (such as a community or a subjectivity).
Markedness as a concept is taken originally from linguistic critiques. It has since been expounded upon in sociology and anthropology. Brekhus discusses markedness in terms of Erving Goffman and defines conceptions about markedness as devoting “greater epistemological attention to ‘politically salient’ and ‘ontologically uncommon’ features of social life” (Brekhus 1998, 34).

Another significant word that occurred consistently throughout the video and written sources is “community,” which occurred a total of 82 times. However, I would be remiss not to note that the occurrence of “community” was only included as part of the total frequency when it was used directly to refer to “Aboriginal.” In other words, if the word “community” was used without reference to the local Aboriginal community, its occurrence was omitted from the final total.