

HAT06607

Who are we? And what's education about refugees got to do with it?

Robert Hattam

Abstract

During the last decade or so, schooling policy has had to increasingly grapple with processes that have a global reach. One significant aspect of globalisation has been the global flows of asylum seekers and refugees. Although Australia has a long history of accepting asylum seekers and refugees, in recent times, concerns about national security have fuelled community disquiet about refugees and asylum seekers. As such the 'refugee problem' is a crucial site for research by those interested in the relationships between a vibrant and socially just society and educational policy and practice. This paper draws on Rose's genealogy of 'community' (that is community now a site for governmentality); and Bauman's meditation on 'elusive community' (how can we have both freedom and security?) as a means to think through an appropriate ethico-politics for educators grappling with the refugee problem in Australia. The paper concludes with a brief imagining of a pedagogy of friendship.

Paper presented in the Symposium: *The Education of Refugee Students: Pedagogy and Policy for a global knowledge culture* (06603) at the Australian Association for Research in Education Conference, Nov 2006, Adelaide

Associate Professor Robert Hattam
University of South Australia
St Bernards Road
Magill SA 5072
08 83022446

robert.hattam@unisa.edu.au

Who are we? And what's education about refugees got to do with it?¹

In foregrounding ethical considerations in education, I do not justify any actions which caused human suffering and loss of life. In everyday life, as well as times of crisis and times of war, we live with a horror of the violence and something that people inflict on each other for whatever reason. What is required, beyond judging or blaming, is a preparedness to face this and do it an ethical ways. What is required, ethically, is that we should care. The ethical challenge, I have suggested is to hold a position of continuous questioning on reflection, to work to create and sustain a common public sphere, and to be open to others who are different from ourselves. These, I suggest, are the challenges of education for an ethical imagination. (Christie, 2005, p. 43)

The 'refugee problem' as a provocation for teachers

During the last decade or so, schooling policy has had to increasingly grapple with processes that have a global reach. There is a constellation of issues that appear to be aggregating in new ways including the: struggle over recognition of social, cultural and religious differences; the influence of media culture on civil society, politics and identity formation; increasing contrast between first world affluence and third world poverty; the emergence of global terrorist networks; and the unsettling of the relation between identity and place, exemplified by the global flows of asylum seekers and refugees.

Of course each one of the above themes would be worthy of more research. What this paper focuses on is an investigation into how educational policies and school practices cater for the recognition of social, cultural and religious differences. This is increasingly urgent, as those working in schools are having to cater for the educational needs of increasingly heterogeneous communities, and in part, as a consequence the arrival of refugees. Certainly fear and suspicion of ethnic, racial and religious difference has intensified in recent years. Whilst the arrival of refugees is not a new phenomenon; what is new, and not well understood, is the way the 'refugee problem' is being interpreted in the new constellation of globalising trends. Although Australia has a long history of accepting asylum seekers and refugees, in recent times, concerns about national security have fuelled community disquiet about refugees and asylum seekers. As such the 'refugee problem' is a crucial site for research by those interested in the relationships between a vibrant and socially just society and educational policy and practice.

This paper takes up these issues as part of an Australian Research Council funded project titled *Schooling, Globalisation and Refugees in Queensland* that aims to examine how policies, schools and local communities meet the educational needs of young refugees under globalising conditions. In this field there 'is almost no published research on the education of refugee and asylum seeker children, and how they fare in the system once admitted to school in Australia' (Christie and Sidhu, 2006, p. 457). Of course, as often happens in research of this kind, the original research question gets reframed in the light of some field work . After some recent interviews, the primary focus of our research—how are schools meeting the

¹ Acknowledgements: This paper is part of an Australian Research Council project (DP0559761) *Schooling, Globalisation and Refugees in Queensland*. The Chief Investigators are Associate Professor Julie Matthews (University of the Sunshine Coast), Associate Professor Pam Christie (University of Queensland), Dr. Ravinder Sidhu (University of Queensland), Associate Professor Sandra Taylor (Queensland University of Technology), Professor Parlo Singh (Griffith University) and Associate Professor Robert Hattam (University of South Australia).

educational needs of refugees—for me anyway, shifted to a concern for how schools were offering educational experiences about refugees. And the two problematics are interrelated. I want to argue that, refugee education—that is the education of refugees—cannot be neatly separated from the education offered to the Australian community, and especially young people in schools, about refugees. Given that students and teachers are influenced by the public pedagogy of our Federal Government and media culture, then how the ‘refugee problem’ is being dealt in the mainstream curriculum of schools is worthy of some serious consideration. The experience that refugee students have in schools is very much determined by the way that refugees are thought about, and represented in the public culture. I argue in this paper, that the ‘refugee problem’ has been ‘orchestrated’ by the Federal government as part of its long-term election strategy. As a consequence, Australia’s detention regime involves cruel treatment of so-called ‘unauthorised arrivals’, and most importantly also, the public culture has now been distorted by rhetoric that dehumanises those for whom we should be showing hospitality; those with a ‘well founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion’ (from the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees). I want to ponder, what resources are available for teachers as a counter-narrative to the ‘public commonsense’ (Christie and Sidhu, 2004, p. 34) that still dominates public policy, in civil society and in the media. This paper takes up the ‘refugee problem’ as a provocation for educators to rethink the sorts of conceptual resources that might be useful at this time: What’s an ethical response by teachers to the political manipulation of refugees? What does it mean to teach when fear of others is being manipulated by government? What’s possible for teachers when the politics of everyday fear distorts the public culture, our relationships with others and our soul? What does it mean to teach when populist nationalism is invoked in the ‘national interest’?

Managing the border; who is in and who is not?

By way of an introduction I will briefly recall a number of events that have occurred in Australia during the past decade that have significantly affected the public debate on how Australians understood the ‘nation’, around questions such as: Who are we? Who do we want to include as ‘we’? and How far does the nation go in practicing hospitality to strangers? Because of its controversy and its impact on Australia’s public culture I’ve focused on events occurring around the 2001 Federal election campaign, but then not entirely.

The Migration Act 1958 requires detention of almost all ‘unauthorised arrivals’ to Australia (Attorney-General’s Department, 2005).

As opposition leader in 1988, John Howard called multiculturalism a ‘rather aimless, divisive policy’ and he called for a ‘full and open debate on the direction of Australia’s immigration policy’. This call sparked a fierce debate in the community about the level of Asian immigration in which Howard argued that Asian immigration to be slowed down.

In her maiden speech to the federal Parliament in 1996, Pauline Hanson said ‘I and most Australians want our immigration policy radically reviewed and that of multiculturalism abolished’.

In April 2000, Alexander Downer, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, attacked the United Nations for having a human rights agenda that was too dominated by flaky, unelected (black) African Nations.

Howard reinforced this himself with a speech to the UN General Assembly in New York in September of that year.

In July 2000 the UN Human Rights Committee considered Australia's implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. One of the Committee's concerns was the mandatory detention on unauthorised arrivals (HREOC, 2000).

In April 2000, nightly news bulletins carried images of asylum seekers rioting in the Woomera detention centre. Philip Ruddock, the Minister for Immigration, exploited the issue and on one occasion he warned Australian viewers of four million potential refugees being smuggled around the world, including whole villages of asylum seekers who were on the verge of arriving to spread TB. Around this time, Ruddock introduced the term 'queue jumpers'.

The Tampa sailed into Australian waters in late August 2001 and World Trade Centre was attacked on September 11, 2001.

The Australian government refuses to allow the Tampa to land on Australian territory and establishes offshore detention centres, called the 'Pacific Solution'. Various members of the Federal government refer to the asylum seekers on the Tampa as 'boatpeople'.

On the 5th October, John Howard, the Prime Minister, called the election for 10 November 2001.

On October 7th 2001, Philip Ruddock, said 'disturbingly, a number of children had been thrown overboard again with the intention of putting it under duress ... I regard this as one of the most disturbing practices of come across. It clearly was planned and premeditated'.

On October 8th 2001, John Howard said, I don't one in this country people are are prepared. If those reports are true, to throw their own children overboard, and that kind of emotional blackmail is very distressing, but we can allow self to be intimidated by this'.

On October 10th 2001, Peter Reith, the Minister for Defence said, 'It is an absolute fact. Children were thrown into the water'.

During the 2001 Federal election, Howard made the following statement about the Tampa episode, 'Every nation has the right as an exercise of its fundamental sovereignty, to decide who comes to this country and the circumstances in which they will come'. (Howard, 2001) 'We decide who comes to this country ...' was used an election slogan by the Howard Government in their election campaign material.

353 people drowned as a consequence of the SIEV-X sinking during the 2001 federal election campaign.

The conflation of the politics of terrorism and refugee issues becomes apparent in John Howard's rhetoric during that election campaign, as an example, on the eve of the 2001 election John Howard stated in an interview with the Sydney Morning Herald: 'Australia had no way to be certain terrorists,

or people with terrorist links, were not among the asylum seekers trying to enter the country by boat from Indonesia' (Allard, 2001). This conflation is even more obvious in the 2004 Federal election.

Philip Ruddock, the coalition champion on refugee issues was moved to the Attorney General's Department after the 2001 election, a move that signalled a shift in the government's thinking, from fore-grounding immigration to focusing on 'national security' issues. Legislation was introduced and passed in the Australian Parliament in late 2005 replaced the old sedition offences in the *Crimes Act*.

The key theme of the 2004 election from the Howard government was national security, a term that of course whistled up all of its previous uses of the refugee issue.

The *Migration Amendment (Designated Unauthorised Arrivals) Bill 2006*, which aimed to send all asylum seekers arriving by boat in Australia, to Pacific detention centres for refugee processing is withdrawn decision on 14 August 2006 from the Senate by John Howard when it become clear that a few of his own party members threatened not to support the passage of the Bill.

What are we to make of the way the Australian government and the media has responded to the 'refugee problem' and its conflation with the so-called 'war on terror'?

Concentrating on the events of the 2001 Federal election, it now seems quite clear, despite the denials by Howard and his supporters, that the Tampa incident was orchestrated by a Government who was worried about their chances in the up and coming election.

In mid-2000, for example, the Government was being described as 'simply unelectable', and on an 'inevitable and irreversible slide to oblivion' Newspoll figures indicating a 39 per cent approval rating for the Government during January-June 2001 seemed to confirm this position (ALP 45 per cent. (Bennett, Newman et al., 2002)

The Federal Liberal party had identified 'illegal immigration' as an election issue well in advance of calling the election and had been talking up, in negative ways, the 'boatpeople' in detention centres who were mostly Middle Eastern or Muslim. As Ward (2002) argues, the media generally played along with the Government's strategy, especially the *Australian* newspaper, and various key talk-back radio announcers who called for 'simplistic and often callous 'solutions' (p. 22). Ward, along with others, explains this form of strategy in terms of 'wedge politics'; a form of politics learnt from the US Republican Party and further developed by Lynton Crosby, Howard's chief election strategist at the time. Marr and Wilkinson (Marr and Wilkinson, 2003) define wedge politics as 'finding hot issues to fracture and opponents traditional support' (p. 175). Alternatively, and more to the point in this case, Oakes {cited in Seccombe, 2000 #1349} defines wedge politics in terms of 'creating resentment among a large group against a smaller one'. This idea of wedge politics is also referred to as 'dog whistle politics' (Manning, 2004) and for this paper, dog whistle pedagogy. Such a political/pedagogical strategy involves forms of speech that appear to mean one thing but is heard differently by a targeted subgroup of the population: some hear it and others don't. Wedge (dog whistle) politics is most often played out around issues of 'race', of playing the 'race' card, of whistling up racist sentiment that is easy enough to activate by the use of a few choice phrases, and the Australian federal Government's handling of the 'refugee problem' is a classic case. But then, the dog whistle only works if some can hear the tone. The public support for Howard's stand on refugees, for Papastergiadis (2004) is indicative of a 'fear of invasion' that is 'so deeply ingrained in the national imaginary that the slightest disturbance to the existing structure can produce the most violent reactions'

(p. 8-9). For Papastergiadis, Howard's aggressive reaction to the refugee crisis indicates a 'new authoritarianism' that is articulated 'through the symbolic and psychic forces of this invasion complex' which are 'loaded with the racist fears of the other' (p.9). Given that Howard is such a fan of Margaret Thatcher, his authoritarianism is probably not so new, rather, citing Stuart Hall (Hall, 1980) is of the populist variety. Howard's authoritarianism is evident in his obvious anxiety with the idea of Australian multiculturalism, and in the way his policy regime subordinates cross-cultural understanding, to the 'induction of immigrants into compliance with Australian laws and traditions' (p. 10). The history of the Australian nation, of Australian nationalism, displays a 'survivalist anxiety', 'a hypersensitivity of the boundary' and a 'hostile construction of the other' (p. 10). In fact, the Australian nation is constituted through strategies of Othering, of sustaining an antagonistic binary between the national 'us' and the foreign 'them'.

The othering that occurs in the invasion complex is consistent with the classical representations of the stereotypical enemy. It precedes by monopolising the ideals of humanity from the self and projecting the other in a dehumanized state. Once the other is constructed in the position of debasement, abjection and evil, then not only are they excluded from the field of human values, civic rights and moral obligations, but the boundary that divides 'us' from 'them' becomes even more crucial. (p. 12)

Howard's populist authoritarianism also works through what Gale (2004) refers to as a 'politics of fear' connected to what is now understood to be a new form of racism. As Massumi (1993) reminds us, [f]ear is a staple of popular culture and politics' (p. vii) and that in the present, we need to be charting the 'saturation of ... social space by mechanisms of fear production' (p. viii). Fear inflected through new racism is fear of difference which has been a recurring feature of the colonial discourse in Australia. Whilst avoiding direct reference to 'race', the new racism is spoken through of discourses of popular nationalism and cultural difference with a view to creating and maintaining the imagined community of insiders and outsiders; and nod, nod, wink, wink, 'we' all know who 'we' are!

My analysis of the manipulation of popular nationalist sentiment in Australia by the Federal Government is necessarily brief, but I hope it at least provides a sketch of the context for the problematic I proposed in my opening remarks. With that in mind, I'd like to move on, and introduce another reading of the 'refugee problem'. This next section provides a personal account of visiting Baxter Detention centre and is my rendering of an interview I had with an education policy activist.

Visiting Baxter detention Centre in 2003

I'd been thinking for about a year that I really should go to Baxter Detention Centre, but it took that whole year to work up enough courage ... I had to deal with fear of the unknown, because I knew that it would be horrible but also I was suspicious of my motives; I didn't want to go there for a vicarious getting off on what's happening there. But I was haunted by the thought that I've got to go there, I've got to, whatever happens, I've got to wear it and learn how to deal with it, and the very first time I went there ... in August 2003 ... I had no idea what it would be like. Before you go to Baxter you have to fill out this incredibly long form ... You've got to request permission to visit ... to fill out all this stuff, you've got to provide the name, ID number, and the building in which the people you were going to visit are housed, and the authorities don't respond to it, so you don't know, you just go to Baxter on hope that it will be OK

I'd seen photographs of it as in, but you can't ... imagine what's its like standing in front of this 20 ft high steel gate, and these massive fences, electric, huge great high fence with razor wire all around it ... and you

stand there and you have to press a button and speak into this thing, and you had to identify who you are and what you are there for, and they would then make you stand there, and stand there, and then someone would eventually come out and press a button and tell you in this disembodied voice, to come through, and I'm really claustrophobic, and you had to walk through six or seven lots of electronically controlled doors, and each one you'd have to press a button, and all this stuff would happen.

And by this stage I've been in Baxter for about an hour and you finally get to the point where they tell you that you have to fill out the next form, so you fill that out, and they then get your original out of the file, your request for permission, the one that they've never bothered responding to, and they compare the two forms just to make sure that everything is the same, then you've got to go through a security scanner like you find at airports, then they come and grab you and spread-eagle you and wave a wand all over you, just to make sure that you haven't got anything that could be taken through. ... then they walk you through to what they call the 'visitor reception centre', and you sit there, and you sit there, ... and then finally you sort of see ... I went over to one of the windows that had black-out stuff on them, and there was this tiny little bit that wasn't blacked out, and I saw this locked mini-bus, drive up to the gate and the driver would go through this rigmarole, they'd open the gate, they'd let the mini-bus in, they'd shut the gate; they would then unlock the back of the van, let these people out, put them in this little sort of claustrophobic corridor, having locked the gate, you know and then let them come into this centre ... but they couldn't walk like human beings, they had to be ... have all this stuff happen to them.

... the first time I was there I met a man ... we just sat and cried, because he had just found out that one of his many hearings about his family had been turned down. I met another woman who was going nuts because she had just come back from a hearing about their appeal for refugee status in Adelaide, and when she got back she walked into the little room that she shared with her husband, who was once a sort of reasonably vigorous active man in his 30s, who was in a catatonic state, and her 8-year-old son had just ... the rubbish bin in the room was full of blood because her son had just been peeling his arms, putting it in the bin - he was going nuts - and I met four kids that day, these four boys who were aged between 15 and 18, and I sort of visited for a period after that, and in the course of those visits, two of those boys, one of them went mad, I could actually see it happening, because when I first started talking to this boy he was an active, you know, despite being locked up and the horrible things that had happened to them, he was a very active, alert, vital kid, and the last time I saw him he was just ... as a human being he'd gone into meltdown, he could barely function, but two of them, two of these four boys that I got quite close to, they were just the most beautiful boys, and one was 18 and one was 17, and they'd been locked up since they were 14, and brought down from Woomera to Baxter ... they remained pretty alert ... one day when I was up there, they would entertain me with a game they used to play ... every time I went there they would talk about 'What I'm going to do when I leave Baxter' and they would say for example, 'I'm going to become the first refugee Prime Minister of Australia, and I'm going to move Parliament... they actually used that language, 'refugee Prime Minister'?

They were very clever boys ... they both came from Iran where, one came from Tehran and the other... I can't remember what city he came from but it was a large city ... they were the children of secular middleclass professionals, and they had comfortable lives, they knew about art, and literature, and they'd learnt English ... and the game would go on ... one of them would say, 'I'm going to become the first refugee Prime Minister of Australia, and I'm going to move Parliament House from Canberra to Baxter so all of them can find out what it feels like', and then he'd say to me 'You have a choice ...', amazing to talk like this, 'You have your choice, you can be my Attorney-General or my Minister for Immigration, just

think about it', and he'd say very excited, 'you're going to be the Minister for Education', and we sort of talked like this, it was really good fun, and then this one particular day when they were playing this game, one of the boys who was then nearly 18, and we'd been doing this game for about 20 minutes, and you'd sort of have a huge lump in your throat while you were playing this game ... and then he looked at me and he said 'Do you know what I really want to be when I get out of Baxter?' and I said 'Nup', and he said 'Fourteen'.

... and I cried all the way back down Highway 1 and for a couple of days after that first visit I could barely function; my hands shook, I cried all the time; every time I tried to talk my throat would close up, and partly it was just an immediate response to something that was really brutal, ugly and inhumane, but I think the thing that upset me and affected me the most was a realisation ... in August 2003 Baxter was still pretty full of refugees, including a lot of kids from Iran and Afghanistan and places like that, and a lots of them had been in Port Headland and Woomera. A lot of the kids that I met had been locked up for two, three, four years, from where they were sort of kids through the early adolescence into their late adolescence ... what strikes after you've been there is the kind of bureaucracy, the rules and regulations, and I do understand that sometimes awful things can happen to people and it's not through any real ill will but going to Baxter made me realise just how totally systematic, totally calculated, totally deliberate, was the process of dehumanisation ... and the dehumanisation was also conducted in the public culture ... after Tampa ... I collected newspaper clippings that showed on the front pages of mainstream newspapers in Australia representation of refugees ... or illegals .. asylum seekers who were throwing their kids overboard, the buildings of Woomera burning, people impaled on razer wire, 'people' with their lips sewn together ... really horrible images, really dehumanising these people, which was a key part of the government strategy at that time ... keeping these people nameless and faceless ... But then *The Age*, in the first half of last year, had a full front page and two full pages in the main feature section of the paper, where they had photographs of every person on Nauru, saying *The forgotten face of Nauru — it can not continue*

Theorising 'community'

At this point I'd like to return to my struggle to make sense of what's happening in Australian public culture as a means of thinking about an ethico-political response by teachers.

By way of an introduction to this section of the paper, the term 'community' is invoked as an explanatory, and normative category in many attempts to explain what's happening in our societies. Our lives are very much under the influence of various versions of communitarianism; those that assert a central place for 'community' in our analysis and our value system. 'Community' is a foundational term in sociology, political philosophy, history, cultural geography, anthropology, politics, education, etc. 'Community' has its own field, community studies, its own activists including community development artists, is the locus for work by Councils, Governments, some of the present buzz words include 'community capacity building', community policing, community health has its own movement, and in mental health the 'community' is the alternative to institutionalisation. The term 'community' is now central in many recent attempts to reframe political thought in response to changes to the nation-state under intensifying globalisation, and the emergence of 'other challenges to orthodox politics', such as feminism, various politics of recognition, a 'new ethical politics' (around such issues as the environment) and to, what Rose calls, 'anti-political' (p. 2) projects. Other related books include Yeatman's (1994) *Postmodern Revisionings of the Political*, Giddens's (1994) *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics*, and his various attempts to

articulate a ‘third way’ including *The Global Third Way Debate* (Giddens, 2001), and Beck’s (1997) *The Reinvention of Politics: Rethinking Modernity in the Global Social Order*. These books predate September 11 and the so called ‘war on terror’ and as such, now have a few serious limitations, but they do provide constellations of conceptual manoeuvres for problematising and theorising the present. In this next section though I want to review the arguments by Bauman in his books, *In Search of Politics* and *Community*, and in the chapter on Community in Rose’s, *Powers of Freedom*. These two authors provide different, but I argue complementary readings of ‘community’ and a rich set of conceptual resources for thinking about an appropriate ethico-politics for teachers in these ‘times’.

Bauman: welcome to the elusive community

Bauman (1999) frames his critique of (post)modernity with an elaboration of a contradictory state of affairs for those of us living in ‘our part’ of the world. On the one hand, the ‘case of human freedom’ has apparently been ‘resolved to fullest conceivable satisfaction’ but then we also suffer from what Taylor (1991) describes as a form of political powerlessness—that there is little we can change’. Bauman summarises the contradiction in the form of questions:

If freedom has been won, how does it come about that human ability to imagine a better world and to do something to make it better was not among the trophies of victory? And what sort of freedom is it that discourages imagination and tolerates the impotence of free people in matters which concern them? (Bauman, 1999, p. 1)

For Bauman (1999), our political powerlessness comes about through a range of factors including:

- the demise of what he terms the *agora*, those public ‘spaces where private problems meet’ for the purpose of alleviating suffering; The old agora has become a theme park as global capital conspires with political apathy to refuse a new alternative’.
- Citizenship has tended to collapse to consuming, and hence any collective sense of individual and collective limits ‘are off limits’ (p. 4) Accumulating more and more (and quoting Castoriadis—the accumulation of junk and more junk’) is the imperative, and [t]o that accumulation there must be no limits’ (p. 5).
- Our extant political institutions, weakened by shifting of power out of politics, seem to be making things worse.
- The triumphalism of ‘Western’ modernity undermines the very possibility of rethinking and renegotiating alternative futures.

In other words: ‘the growth of individual freedom may coincide with the growth of collective impotence’ (p. 2), or put another way, ‘there is no easy and obvious way to translate private worries into public issues’ (p. 2). Which leads Bauman to contemplate the question: ‘what, under the circumstances, can bring us together?’ (p.3) Our sociality, using Bauman’s term, or our coming together in communities around common causes seems to now be ‘unfocused’, ‘lacking in regular outlets’, and ‘shortlived’ occasions for release such as ‘carnivals of compassion and charity’, ‘outbursts of beefed-up aggression’, or ‘synchronized joy or sorrow’. But such occasions seem to do little to actually change things.

Bauman also diagnoses, correctly I think, an aporia of the present. He sees freedom and security as ‘simultaneously, complementary and incompatible’, both ‘equally indispensable’ yet ‘hard to reconcile without friction’ (p. 19).

Promoting security always calls for the sacrifice of freedom, while freedom can only be expanded at the expense of security. But security without freedom equal slavery ... while freedom without security equals being abandoned and lost ... (p. 20)

And in terms of my interest in 'community', Bauman argues that 'many forms of human togetherness have been tried in the course of history, none have succeeded in finding a flawless solution' to the required reconciliation. Bauman's analysis is in part a re-reading of Tönnies book, *Community and Society*. Tönnies famous distinction between *Gemeinschaft* (community) and *Gesellschaft* (society) provides us with a framework for giving the term 'community' a bit of specificity. Tönnies argues for a return of the bygone 'community' that had been exiled in favour of society 'during the modern crusade against' 'parochiality, narrowness of horizons and nurturing of superstition' (Bauman 1992: 9). And what Tönnies was arguing for was a bygone 'community' characterised in terms of 'an understanding shared by all its members' (p. 10) and this is not a consensus, but an 'understanding that does not need to be sought let alone laboriously *built* or *fought for*' (p. 10):

... we understand each other 'without words' and never need to ask, apprehensively, 'what do you mean?' The kind of understanding on which community rests precedes all agreements and disagreements. Such an understanding is not a finishing line, but the starting point of all togetherness. (p. 10)

But then, if this is what we mean by 'community' then there are other characteristics that ensue: 'the spoken community ... is a contradiction in terms'—it's self-evident and natural and can't survive any contemplation or scrutiny; is small and self-sufficient – community is the little community; and its distinctiveness must involve 'the division into 'us' and them'' (p. 12). Being small must mean a sense of isolation from others: 'them' and 'homogeneity or sameness' (p. 13).

Of course 'Western' modernity has unleashed conditions that undermine the 'little community'; we now live in elusive or liquid communities. The boundary between 'inside' and 'outside' can be no longer sustained. (Post)modernity undermines the 'natural' community and instead:

... all unity must be *made*; concord 'artificially produced' is the sole form of unity available. Common understanding can be *only* an achievement, attained (if at all) at the end of a long and tortuous labour of agreement and persuasion and in strenuous competition with an indefinite number of other potentialities – all vying for attention and each promising a better (more correct, more effective or more pleasurable) assortment of life tasks and solutions for life problems. (p. 14)

What Bauman refers to as the elusive community involves ongoing reflection and contestation and hence must be considered as a 'rolling contract' needing periodic review without guarantees; and hence is 'fragile and vulnerable, forever in need of vigilance, fortification and defence' (p. 14). And not only is the unmade community hard to find but identity is now its surrogate. "Identity" means standing out: being different, and through that difference, unique—and so the search for identity cannot but divide and separate' (p. 16).

Bauman's argument brings into focus the tension of having both freedom and security as one of the defining characteristics of the times and provides a frame for making sense of contemporary struggles over ethics and politics. An incredulity towards the promises of the Enlightenment isn't just a philosophers esoteric problem but is now manifest in the practices of everyday life. The Enlightenment promise of liberating us from fear and want has lead to the individualisation of security, certainty and

safety. We now find ourselves forming 'elusive communities' for any sense of collective insurance against individually confronted uncertainties, but then, as a moot question, Bauman asks, do these provide anything but a 'momentary respite from loneliness'? It seems highly likely that the elusive communities formed around identity politics can't be a long term solution: identity politics contributes just more 'boundary guards' 'to fence off and defend distinctiveness of the already existing identities' (p. 17) and at its worst we only need to remember Srebreniza as an example of identity politics spun from the myths of 'genesis stories'. Such forms of identity politics forgets that there is, to quote from Stuart Hall (1996), 'no stable core of the self, unfolding from the beginning to end through all vicissitudes of history without change' (p. 1). Putting store in something as unstable as identity, and attempts to form 'really existing' communities around identity is likely only to add to fear and insecurity.

Importantly Bauman provides an account of the demise of bygone community through a Marxist-inspired account of the 'industrial revolution', (read 19th century capitalism). In terms of a contemplation on community though he focuses on a range of themes, including, what he refers to as the 'secession of the successful (p. 50): that new detachment, indifference, disengagement and indeed mental and moral exteriority of those who do not mind being left alone providing that the others, who think differently, don't bid for them to care and above all for a share in the perks of their 'do it yourself life' (p. 51). This form of subjectivity, that seems so central to late capitalism, misconstrues the social nature of materiality for the myth of the self-made person; and with it, a range of reactions to others including 'disgust of dependency' (p. 50). And of course the secession is hardly lonely; 'the escapees are keen to join company with other escapees like them' (p. 52), and to live in 'self-chosen exile'. Of course Bauman cites the obvious examples of the gated communities, but then there are variations on that theme emerging in Australia: if you can, you can pay for security, education, health and simultaneously wreck that system that provides for those who can't afford it.

Importantly also Bauman contemplates the worst case scenario for those interested in 'community'—the ghetto. This analysis, resonates with Castell's (1998) description of the rise of the fourth world that's occurring on the fringes of every large city as well as in Sub-Saharan Africa, or in Wacquant's (1999) examination of the 'social dystopia' of 'urban disintegration' taking place around the world under conditions of late capitalism. This analysis contends that late capitalism needs to be understood as a system that quite literally abandons people. Quoting from Forrester's (1999) evocative analysis: 'Not inferior or even reprehended: just superfluous, and therefore harmful' (p. 10). A multitude of human beings are now surplus to requirements in a system in which the private economy is given 'total permissiveness: unbridled, its logic permeates a waning civilization whose wreckage it is accelerating' (p. 25). Perhaps this is policy indifference. But to turn the world into a giant corporation, call it a vast casino, blackmail is required. As well effective propaganda, through the use of evasive language, seductive terms are hijacked. And apart from the sound of sycophantic approval there is the 'mute consent of a stunned society' (p. 26). But behind the seeming indifference is coercion, 'stern, tyrannical but diffuse, hard to detect but all pervasive' (Forrester, 1998: 38). But this seeming indifference is methodical, organised and said to be rational. Behind this seeming indifference is contempt that manifests as threat. There is the constant threat of the flight of capital, 'do as we say or else we'll invest elsewhere'. Meantime, capital has already escaped most circuits of tax, having made a beeline for tax havens and hence deprives the state's economic and social structures of resources. And it seems that the ghetto is the logical result of such a policy regime; and for Bauman 'ghetto' means 'the impossibility of community' (p. 122). 'A ghetto is not a greenhouse of community feelings. It is on the contrary a laboratory of social disintegration, atomization and amonie' (p. 122).

Rose's genealogy of 'community'

For Rose, the term 'community' is code for the contemporary debates about a 'third way' for politics which he understands is that site of contestation that has opened up as so called 'liberal, democratic and market-based societies struggle over the 'economic arrangements, social institutions and political mechanisms post the collapse of state socialism in the Soviet Union and the rejection of Thatcher/Reganomics. The third way for Rose signifies the contemporary debates over devising a form of government that is waged 'in the territory between the authority of the state, the free and amoral exchange of the market and the liberty of the autonomous 'rights-bearing' individual subject' (p. 167). And this territory called 'community' is the 'solution to problems of government' (p. 170), and is *the* site for the 'reorganization of publicly provided, bureaucratically organized and professionally staffed services' (p.171). This space is distinct from both the market and government but paradoxically also 'a key element in government' (p. 171). But then as Rose points out, this idea itself is not new and has many incarnations: for example, this need to 'remake community' (p. 171) is evident in the 'analyses of the damaging effects of metropolitan life in the 1920s and 1930s' (p. 172) diagnosed as a shift from community to society'; or the community studies movement in the UK after the Second World War . What's different about the contemporary invocation of community, according to Rose, is the conception of community, not as 'a geographical space, a social space, a sociological space, or a space for services' but as a 'moral field binding persons into durable relations'. Rose's analysis here draws heavily on Etzioni's definition of community, which involves two characteristics: community is 'a web of affect-laden relationships' that are reinforced through a 'commitment to a set of shared values, norms, and meanings, and a shared history and identity – in short to a particular culture' (p. 172). Rose uses Etzioni's definition, not because it is one he subscribes to, but because it is defined by a contemporary communitarian, whose views about 'community' has some currency in the third way debates and hence provides a form of rationality that is in use presently.

Rose's key thesis in this chapter is that government is being 'reinvented' through the 'political objectification and instrumentalisation of 'this community and its 'culture'' (p. 172-3). Rose's elaboration of this thesis starts with a fairly standard sociological diagnosis of the crisis of the welfare state. For Rose, the point of departure is Barry Hindess' observation that there are 'anti-political motifs' within contemporary political discourse: that the state is articulating a sense of limits, that its not 'omnicompetent', and hence giving rise to the 'facilitating state, the enabling state or the state as animator' (p. 174). Under this image, all those who can call on the state for services, for respite, for order, security and a job are positioned as 'partners'. 'This involves a double movement of autonomization and responsabilization' (p. 174). All are set free 'to find their own destiny' but at the same time are 'made responsible for that destiny, and for the destiny of society as a whole' (p. 174). And under this double movement, 'community' becomes an essential site for government(ality).

Rose's argues that 'community' is constituted as a site of government if it is known; made technical. He outlines a range of positive knowledges about community that make this possible, and he singles out ethnographic sociology, and 'community studies' as two significant forms of knowledge. 'Communities become zones to be investigated, mapped, classified, documented, interpreted, their vectors explained to enlightened professional-to-be ...' p. 175). At this point Rose argues that what's going here is not the

colonisation of a previous space of freedom (the community), but that community is being instituted, constituted, in its contemporary form as a sector of government' (p. 176), and hence invoking the Foucaultian insight that discourse, and here we're talking about discourses of community, actually constitute their objects. Borrowing from Fairclough (1992) 'discourse constitutes the objects of knowledge, social subjects and forms of self, social relationships and conceptual relationships' (p. 39) and hence discourse refers to 'discursive formations' or 'systems of rules which make it possible for certain statements but not others to occur at particular times, places, and institutional locations' (p. 40)

... in the institution of community, a sector is brought into existence whose vectors and forces can be mobilized, enrolled, deployed in novel programmes and techniques which encourage and harness active practices of self-management and identity construction, or personal ethics and collective allegiances. I term this government through community. (Rose, 1999, p. 176)

In thinking about community as a site of governmentality and as moral field, Rose draws our attention to the culture wars that now seem to characterise the political in 'our part' of the world. And for Rose the culture wars revolve around questions such as: 'How can the security of individuals be promoted without encouraging dependency, and without corroding the self-reliance which is required of the contemporary citizen by a modern, competitive and entrepreneurial nation?' (p. 184). But then the Advanced liberal strategy is in trouble because the traditional sites of moral authority—church, school, public figures—are themselves weakened by the secularisation and the shift to expertise and objectivity that defines 'Western' modernity. As well, such sites of 'moral authority threaten the very basis of economic development of the West' (p. 185). Western economic development being defined in terms of 'the commercialisation of lifestyle and the demands of the free market which had invested so much in the unstoppable enhancement of the commodification of sex, pleasure, leisure and desire' (p. 185).

Rose ponders where moral authority in the form of governmentality might come from if a return to the past seems unlikely. Remember he is arguing that contemporary forms of government(ity) involve an autonomization and responsabilization. Responsibility through 'imposing and inculcating moral codes grounded' in 'tradition or theology' (p. 185) seem bound to fail. The Advanced liberal strategy is 'to use the state itself and its legislative powers to fight the culture wars' (p. 185). This project seems most advanced in the US, with countries such as Australia following its lead, albeit with local variation. Against the relativization of values, promulgated by liberal intellectuals—those arguing for cultural values without foundations—the Advanced liberal state wages a counter-counter culture war 'using illiberal means' (p. 186). Of course a paradoxical situation arises: the state itself pursues an enhancement of its powers in the name of liberty and security of its citizens. The communitarian position provides the way forward in this situation: it promises 'a new moral contract, a new partnership between an enabling state and responsible citizens, based on strengthening the natural bonds of community' (p. 186). Against the crises of 'dependency, licence, idleness, irresponsibility' (p. 186) communitarian thought espouses the civic virtues of 'respectability, moderation, charity, giving, probity' (p. 186) and the like. But such virtues and not imposed from above, but 'organised and sustained through the bonds of community' (p. 186).

Towards a pedagogy of friendship

What do Bauman and Rose's critiques offer to the set of questions I outlined in the opening move of this paper? How can they help us think through an ethico-political response by teachers to the 'refugee problem' in Australia?

Baumann argues that 'Western' modernity has unleashed conditions that have undermined the 'little community', which means we are freed up somewhat from the narrowness of horizons and the authority of dogma. But with that, our new freedom is inflected with what Taylor (1991) refers to as the malaises of modernity which briefly put are individualism, a technocratic rationality and political powerlessness. On the one hand, old boundaries dissolve but then we feel insecure and collectively impotent. Living in elusive or liquid communities, some of us salve our angst in identity politics, putting effort into being different, which of course is fine for those who can afford it. But, then for some, identity is forced upon them, and their difference is vilified, dehumanised, and they find themselves on the wrong side of the fence or simply abandoned by 'faster capitalism' (Agger, 2004, p. 1) and its cheer squad.

Rose also understands the present in terms of a trade-off between freedom and security. Under Advanced liberalism, the question is how to ensure security of individuals in ways that don't undermine the self-reliance required by the entrepreneurial nation. On the other hand, Rose argues that 'community' is now the key site of contemporary third way politics. 'In our part of the world', the nation-state, in its struggle with ungovernability pressures from within and outside of its borders, discursively constitutes 'community', as the solution to problems of government. Community becomes an essential site for governmentality which is constituted as a moral field that is (re)invented under the double movement of autonomisation and responsabilisation.

For Bauman, the ethico-political challenge of the present is to find ways to counter 'atomised society' and its pathologies, and to work against the trends to seek biographical solutions to systemic contradictions. Whilst 'investing in self preservation' (p. 145) seems like the wisest bet, it is 'unlikely to bring the results we are after' (p. 144). For Bauman, now is not the time to give up on 'community', and he argues for a form of politics based on nurturing a 'sociological imagination'—that is 'individual liberty can be only a product of collective work' (p.7); and it seems the only sensible way of resolving the contradiction between individual freedom and its inherent insecurity. This means a politics that is with and against the nation-state and its institutions. In the case of refugees, the nation-state, seems capable of a very limited form of hospitality, certainly a long way short of an unconditional hospitality defined by Derrida (2000; 2002) and others (Kristeva, 1991; Irigary, 2002), or the form of hospitality defined by the Geneva Refugee Convention. But then whilst the nation-state might not be able to accomplish unconditional hospitality, hospitality can only be offered by the state. As such, it is imperative to continue to argue the right of refugees to conditional hospitality, and to strengthen the case for a 'cosmopolitan ethic of alterity' (Savić, 2005, p. 77).

For Rose the challenge is responding to the culture war. Convincing the population of the Advanced liberal project requires that the state itself fight in counter-counter culture war, talking up the virtues of the new moral order, which of course also demands discourses of derision, and dehumanisation. And it's not only the truth that is being struggled over in this culture war, but how we understand what's 'good' and especially what it means to be a 'good' citizen. But then it has a problem; virtues can't be imposed from above, it has to convince us all of our obligation to think ethically hence it's 'on the terrain of ethics that our most important political disputes' are being fought (p. 188). What Rose is most wary of here though is those 'switch points where opening turns to closure', where the vocabulary of ethics becomes merely a 'recoding of strategies of social discipline and morality' (p. 192). Rose distinguished an ethico-politics in two forms: at the pole of morality which 'seeks to inculcate a fixed and uncontestable code of conduct' (p. 193) and the other at the pole is ethics whose 'ethos is a reluctance to govern, that minimizes

codification and maximizes debate' (p. 193). And of course the context for such considerations is the possibility of multi-culturalism within a single political community.

For those of us who are teachers, this means political work in educational institutions. What this means for teachers has been taken up by Christie and Sidhu (2004). They remind us, that any thinking about what's possible in schools, has to confront the fact that 'schools propagate and normalise the essential myths on which Nations are built, and normalise ways of thinking about 'other' people and 'other' spaces' (p. 35). But then schools are potentially places for the learning about others and developing 'a sense of moral connectedness to them in a global civil society' (p. 35). As a starting point, Christie and Sidhu (2004) argue that it would be useful if 'teachers [had] a fuller understanding of the global dynamics propelling refugees and asylum seekers and understanding of a complex life situations of refugee children young people' as well as 'a repertoire of curriculum and pedagogical approaches to dealing with difference in the classroom level' (p. 35). As they go on to point out, recent research in Queensland indicates that such pedagogical approaches are weekly developed in many classrooms. Drawing on Foucault's notion of fearless speech, Christie and Sidhu (2006) propose following Foucault's (2002) advice on confronting governments on human rights issues. He proposed three principles to 'guide such an initiative' (p. 474) and to summarise: to recognise that there exists an international citizenship, which has rights and duties, which obliges one to speak out on behalf of others against abuses of power; 'it the duty of this international citizenship to always bring the testimony of people's suffering to the eyes and ears of government' (p. 475); and 'to affirm the right of citizens to act and to reject the assumption that only the government has the prerogative to take action' (Christie and Sidhu, 2006, p. 462).

I agree with Christie and Sidhu's arguments for fearless speech but there is still the question of pedagogy? What pedagogy can unsettle the 'public commonsense' that is distorted by a politics of fear, fuelled by populist nationalism? The pedagogical challenge is to establish the conditions in which dialogue is possible in a 'terrain of affect' (West-Newman, 2004, p. 190), a terrain saturated with negative emotions, such as fear, and especially fear of the other, anger, and 'white defensiveness' (Aveling, 2002, p. 125). In response to this challenge, Hattam and Atkinson (Hattam and Atkinson, 2006) propose an 'post-indignation pedagogy'. They argue that being angry at injustice and cruelty might be appropriate responses, it might not be the most skilful pedagogical move. They argue for a post-indignation pedagogy framed by reconciliation; that is pedagogical practices that are 'inflected by notions of restorative justice, reparations, apology rather than persecution, incrimination and confrontation. In a similar vein, Albrecht-Crane (2005) ponders the pedagogical issues of teaching in, what she refers to as 'a conservative environment'.

Bauman does challenges us to think about getting past identity politics, of getting past our own obsession of constantly constructing our own identity. This point is taken up by Foucault, in a series of interviews with editors of gay journals, rabid no summarises Foucault's argument succinctly in the following few sentences:

The search should not be the secret of one's identity, but how to invent new modes of relationship and a new way of life ... what was needed was not a means of making everyone the same that of creating new modes of been together' (Rabinow, 1997, xxxvi-xxxvii)

Foucault argued that, whilst it still important a struggle for basic human rights and protections, the real target of politics is the general impoverishment of social relationships in contemporary society. (p. xxxvii). Albrecht-Crane (Albrecht-Crane, 2005) takes up this provocation of Foucault, in a contemplation of pedagogy as friendship. The term friendship here, in code this possibility of new modes of been together.

This it seems to me provides a general direction at least for future thinking about the issues raised in this paper: how can we think about and enact a pedagogy of friendship?

References

- Agger, B. (2004). *Speeding up Fast Capitalism: Cultures, Jobs, Families, Schools, Bodies*. London, Paradigm.
- Albrecht-Crane, C. (2005). Pedagogy as friendship: Identity and affect in the conservative classroom. *Cultural Studies* 19(4): 491-514.
- Allard, T. (2001). *Cooking up Howard's knockout punch*. Sydney Morning Herald. 16 November.
- Attorney-General's Department (2005). *Migration Act 1958*. Prepared by the Office of Legislative Drafting and Publishing. Canberra.
- Aveling, N. (2002). Student Teachers' Resistance to Exploring Racism: reflections on 'doing' border pedagogy. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 30(2): 199-130.
- Bauman, Z. (1999). *In Search of Politics*. Cambridge, UK, Polity Press.
- Beck, U. (1997). *The Reinvention of Politics: Rethinking Modernity in the Global Social Order*. Cambridge, UK, Polity.
- Bennett, S., G. Newman, et al. (2002). *Commonwealth Election 2001. Research Paper no. 11 2001-02*. <http://www.aph.gov.au/Library/pubs/RP/2001-02/02rp11.htm>, Parliament of Australia.
- Castells, M. (1998). *Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture - Volume 3, End of Millenium*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Christie, P. (2005). Education for an ethical imagination. *Social Alternatives* 24(4): 39-44.
- Christie, P. and R. Sidhu (2004). How we treat our strangers? Working in schools. *Education Links* 68: 34-37.
- Christie, P. and R. Sidhu (2006). Governmentality and 'fearless speech': framing the education of asylum seeker and refugee children in Australia. *Oxford Review of Education* 32(4): 449-465.
- Derrida, J. (2002). *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. London, Routledge.
- Derrida, J. and A. Dufourmantelle (2000). *Of Hospitality*. Stanford, Ca., Stanford University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Forrester, V. (1999). *The Economic Horror*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Foucault, M. (2002). Confronting governments: Human rights. *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*. J. Faubion. London, Penguin.
- Gale, P. (2004). The refugee crisis and fear: Populist politics and media discourse. *Journal of Sociology* 40(4): 321-340.
- Giddens, A. (1994). *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Giddens, A., Ed. (2001). *The Global Third Way Debate*. Malden, Mass., Polity Press.
- Hall, S. (1980). Popular Democratic vs. Authoritarian Populism: Two Ways of Taking Democracy Seriously. *Marxism and Democracy*. A. Hunt. London, Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: who needs identity? *Questions of Cultural Identity*. S. Hall and P Du Gay. London, Sage.
- Hattam, R. and S. Atkinson (2006). Reconciliation as a frame for rethinking racism in Australia. *Social Identities* 12(6): 683-700.
- Howard, J. (2001). *National Press Club Address*. <http://www.pm.gov.au/News/speeches/2001/speech1324.htm>.
- HREOC (2000). *Australia's Human Rights Record Reviewed by the UN Human Rights Committee*. http://www.hreoc.gov.au/human_rights/un_committee/index.html.
- Irigary, L. (2002). *The Way of Love*. London, Continuum.
- Kristeva, J. (1991). *Strangers to Ourselves*. New York, Columbia University Press.
- Manning, P. (2004). *Dog Whistle Politics and Journalism* Sydney, Australian Centre for Independent Journalism.
- Marr, D. and M. Wilkinson (2003). *Dark Victory*. Cross Nest, NSW, Allen & Unwin.
- Massumi, B. (1993). *The Politics of Everyday Fear*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota.
- Papastergiadis, N. (2004). The invasion complex in Australian political culture. *Thesis Eleven* 78: 8-27.
- Savić, O. (2005). Figures of the stranger: Citizen as a foreigner. *Parallax* 11(One): 70-78.
- Taylor, C. (1991). *The Ethics of Authenticity*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

- Wacquant, L. (1999). America as social dystopia: the politics of urban disintegration, or the French uses of the "American Model". *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*. P. Bourdieu and e. al. Oxford, Polity.
- Ward, I. (2002). The Tampa, wedge politics, and a lesson for political journalism. *Australian Journalism Review* 24(1): 21-39.
- West-Newman, C. L. (2004). Anger in legacies of Empire: Indigenous peoples and Settler states. *European Journal of Social Theory* 7(2): 189-208.
- Yeatman, A. (1994). *Postmodern Revisionings of the Political*. London, Routledge.