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Abstract

The thesis is an empirical study of how whiteness structures relations between Victoria Police and the local Vietnamese communities. The study aims to uncover and make visible processes of policing that reinforce, maintain or reinvent whiteness in Victoria Police, a predominantly white police force. The main purpose of this thesis is to explore how whiteness influences the policing of Vietnamese Australians, and to examine the production of whiteness within the police force. The research question guiding the study is: How is whiteness reinforced, maintained or reinvented as normal in policing a Vietnamese minority, and how does this contribute to white race privilege? The study makes connections between the theory, research methods and the lived experiences of whiteness, to uncover how it works and what white advantages ensue, in this policing context.

The thesis is situated in the established tension between Australia’s history as a white country and the modern context in which it claims to be an egalitarian multicultural country. Many of the related complexities of identity, power and privilege at the national and State level are illustrated in parallel situations within the police force that are revealed through its relations with the Vietnamese ethnic minority groups. The approach in this inquiry makes links between the historical constructions of whiteness to the current practices of the state police force and examines the key forms of exclusion and racialisation of the Vietnamese communities.

In the US, UK and Canada, studies show many ethnically and racially identified non-white groups experience bias from police forces and that they have less favourable attitudes towards police than do white populations. Studies of the background context indicate that these non-white groups do not have equal access to police services, and that institutional racism exists in policing organisations. This study examines a particular case between a white police force and Asian minority group in Australia. The thesis explores how, and with what
consequences, whiteness affects relationships and policing outcomes for Vietnamese Australian communities. My central argument is that the practices of both local police forces and individual officers reflect and affect whiteness, and that these practices contribute to white privilege.

Using a critical whiteness methodology the study explores whiteness as privilege and normativity. The study draws on 54 interviews with white police officers, 10 focus groups (100 participants) with Vietnamese community members and 19 interviews with Vietnamese social justice workers. Local policing strategies and the approaches and beliefs of individual police towards Vietnamese Australians as colleagues in the force or in policing their communities are interrogated within a critical whiteness framework.

The study concludes that whiteness structures policing of Vietnamese communities in these three PSAs of Victoria Police. The material effects of structural whiteness and the racialised policing practices of individual officers or local forces are clarified through specific examples and themes. The consequences for Vietnamese communities are shown in terms of reduced access to police services and a general lack of concern for investigating crime in their communities. I conclude that exclusion, racialisation and criminalisation are key mechanisms that reproduce whiteness advantage.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

Context of the Study

Relationships between white police forces and ethnic and racially-identified groups have been fraught in many majority white countries. In the US, UK and Canada, studies over many decades consistently show that non-white ethnic and racial groups have less favourable attitudes towards police than do white populations. Minority groups believe that white police officers are biased against non-normative groups, that they do not have equal access to police services, and that institutional racism exists in policing organisations (Phillips and Webster, 2013; Phillips, 2011; Gelman et al., 2007; Tyler and Fagan, 2006; Weitzer and Tuch, 2006; Holdaway, 2004; Tyler and Waksalak, 2004; Sunshine and Tyler, 2003; Bowling et al., 2003b; Bowling and Foster, 2002; Jiwani, 2002; Frank et al., 1996; Bayley and Mendelsohn, 1969). In Australia studies show similar trends (Murphy and Cherney, 2011; Chan, 1997; Chan, 1996; Chan, 1995).

The arrival of the Vietnamese on Australian shores in 1976 irrevocably changed the former pattern of migration by white people, and also forced a new self-conception of society in Australia. Through this transition, the police and other agencies were drawn into societal disruptions and conundrums related to the arrival of this new settler refugee group. Many Vietnamese arrivals had spent years in transitional camps in Malaysia, and had survived hardship, including attacks from pirates at sea and other refugee traumas. These experiences spawned particular needs and services (Nguyen, 2014; Earl, 2008). The first wave of Vietnamese asylum seekers, who arrived in 1976 on fishing vessels were received by a largely sympathetic Australian public. However, as the number of arrivals increased, public opposition grew (Phillips and Spinks, 2011). The Australian Government provided basic housing in three sites in Melbourne: Springvale, Richmond and Footscray. Because of continuing high numbers of Vietnamese residing in these suburbs, it was decided to focus on these three sites in this study. The Vietnamese settlers were the largest Asian group to arrive in Australia in the 20th century. Australians had previously looked to the other side of the world for confirmation of their self-identities, based primarily on ancestors from the British Isles or European countries. These changes in settlement patterns necessitated a new worldview and a different Australian identity.
Jakubowicz (2004) describes the meeting of these different cultures as a ‘cultural collision’, accompanied by rising racism, ‘anomie associated with marginalisation’, and lower socio-economic stratification through concentration in manufacturing work. The term ‘anomie’ as used in this quote is understood to refer to a mismatch or lack of social integration into norms that Durkheim links to societal social organisation, differentiation and change (Durkheim, 1968; Marks 1974). In 1975, the White Australia policy formally ended with the declaration of the Racial Discrimination Act (Hage, 2000). The necessity to incorporate multi-ethnic and new settler groups into multicultural policies was recognised, and was widely adopted in the 1970s (Yarwood and Knowling, 1982; Singh, 2000). Strong Vietnamese migration trends continued through family reunion schemes through the 1980s and 1990s. The number of Vietnamese Australians born in Vietnam was 185,000 in 2011, although this is probably underestimated, as many people did not provide information on their place of birth in (Thomas, 2015a). In 2011 in Victoria, there were 68,000 Vietnam-born Australian residents (Museum Victoria, 2015).

Policing a new settler group that was not white, was Asian, and was comprised of refugees or people fleeing from post war discrimination, posed completely new challenges for the white police forces in the cities where Vietnamese migrants settled. In Melbourne during the 1980s, White (2009) describes the police as hostile towards and suspicious of Vietnamese youth, many of whom were stereotyped as gangsters. According to a study by Lyons (1995), Vietnamese youth were verbally and physically mistreated by police, and harassed through excessive ‘stop and search’ procedures. In the 1990s in both Sydney and Melbourne, Asian ‘gangs’ and crime generated fear among the dominant cultures, and police responded with increased surveillance and policing interventions (Poynting, 2008). Cabramatta in Sydney was renowned for drug dealing of heroin, and the Vietnamese were heavily implicated in this in the media, and were reflected in high rates of drug-related criminal offences. Maher and Swift (1997) describe the police response as harsh and biased, with police imposing zero tolerance campaigns to remove drug users from the streets. The dynamics between police and Vietnamese Australian communities were established from the 1990s around these perceptions of criminality.
The research problem

This thesis investigates the current relations between the still almost entirely white police force and Vietnamese communities in Melbourne. Since the 1990s, there has not been any research in Australia on police relations with Vietnamese communities. No research on policing in Australia has been located in whiteness studies. Some critical criminological studies have examined police’s relations with Indigenous Australians (Cunneen, 2005; Jennet, 2001; Cunneen et al 1997). A few critical race studies have explored policing within the wider context of white Australian society (Colic-Peisker and Tilbury, 2008; Sercombe, 1995). Some other studies have inquired into police’s differentiated relations with ethnic or racially-identified minorities using multicultural or social inclusion models (Murphy, 2013; Murphy and Cherney, 2011; White, 2009; White, 1997). A few experiential studies focused on the experiences of marginalised groups (Perera, 2006; Mason, 2006; Warner, 2004; Mellor, 2003). Other studies have explored relations with Muslim minorities within counter-terrorism policing frameworks (McCullock and Pickering, 2010; Pickering et al., 2008; Sentas, 2006). Some studies have examined white police culture (Chan, 1996; Wortley and Homel, 1995) or policing and social exclusionary processes (Dixon and Maher, 2002). Some related scholarship includes policing in relation to harm reduction theory (Dixon and Maher, 2005; Higgs et al., 2001) and to youth theory (Cunneen and White, 2011; Collins and Reid, 2009; White and Mason, 2006).

Thus this study is unique in the Australian context in examining whiteness-derived policing strategies, and in interpreting how these reproduce whiteness as a societal advantage. Rather than focusing primarily on the minority group, as found in the majority of studies of police relations with ethnic groups, this study’s major focus is on the white subject. Applying this theoretical field to a specific policing problem provides new insights into the mechanisms associated with whiteness and the mechanisms by which they are maintained and reinforced. The study examines whiteness in a white police force’s policing of Vietnamese communities to explore the mechanisms embedded in policing practice and white race privilege.

The problem addressed in this thesis of white police forces difficulties in establishing relations with non-white ethnic groups is important because of increasing numbers of new refugee and migrant groups arriving in Australia from war-torn countries, environmental disturbances and globalisation (Briskman et al., 2008). New non-normative and non-white
settler groups bring their unique experiences and histories, and place increasing pressures on white police to engage with them effectively and fairly. Terrorism has dramatically increased the prominence of the association of crime with ethnic groups who follow the Islamic faith (Dunn et al., 2007). The potential for future damage to relations between the police and minority communities is magnified by the involvement of police and the new Australian Border Force and its officers in counter-terrorism government interventions against Islamic faith groups (Briskman, 2015; Spalek and Imtoual, 2007). Recent events reported in the media in Melbourne show the potential for poor relations between white majority groups and faith-ethnic minority groups, which is likely to disrupt their acceptance by the dominant communities and generate fear of some groups who follow Islam. There is growing concern that their safety is overlooked, and they will not be protected from violence or crime (Iltis, 2015). Around this theme of a growing sense of insecurity, a recent media article asked: ‘Speak to the Muslim community, not at it’ (Gordon, 2015).

This study certainly asks both white officers and the Vietnamese about their lived experiences of policing. Importantly, these experiences are interpreted within the theoretical field of whiteness. This framework acknowledges that power and privilege exist as normative. The study investigates how whiteness as a system of dominance is expressed as an underlying aspect of relations between white and non-white people. In this thesis, I first establish the contention that whiteness structures Australian society, and then, I proceed to analyse the data within a critical whiteness methodology.

**Critical whiteness studies framework**

Whiteness is explored as a key paradigmatic aspect of problems in interaction between white and non-white actors: white forces and Vietnamese communities. The entrenched disruptions to relations and communications over many decades, point to the need for new thinking and different conceptualising of the issues. Here it is mooted that the reproduction of whiteness ideology and the mechanisms of practice within its domain are central to these issues. The whiteness framework in this thesis offers a different approach to understanding the nature of the problem between white police and the Vietnamese communities. Importantly, it exposes some of the usually un-noticed advantages and privileges of whiteness. Although established within this theoretical domain, the study nonetheless has a practical component. Multicultural policing practices and discrimination are reviewed within this framework. All the same, for
police officers who almost to a person denied any existence of racism in the force, the findings will be confronting. Based on officers’ own descriptions, the study demonstrates that police use many strategies of exclusion and racialisation. The consequences for Vietnamese communities are shown in terms of perceived reduced access to police services and a general lack of concern for investigating crime in their communities.

This study is thus novel, as although there has been a new agenda for scholarly research on whiteness studies, the theory has not yet been applied to the policing context in Australia. Whiteness scholarship in Australia has not previously entered the sociological literature, criminological literature, or policing practice literature. The whiteness studies field is still evolving and changing and while this study makes a unique contribution to whiteness and policing, it may be open to reinterpretation as the field of whiteness progresses. It is clear that more research is required on how whiteness structures policing institutionally, relationally and through political and funding links to the State, and on the consequences of this for Vietnamese communities and other ethnic, racially-identified and faith groups.

**Personal motivation**

Most of my work as a social science researcher over the past decade has involved gender, ethnicity and race. Often in these collaboratively-funded empirical projects, the intersectionality has been sacrificed for expediency, in achieving outcomes for the white sponsoring organisation. By ‘intersectionality’, I refer to the interaction between race, ethnicity, gender, class, and other categories of difference in individual’s experiences, social practices, cultural beliefs or institutional structures (Davis, 2008). With hindsight, I clearly see that the white majority group was mostly unchallenged, beyond recommendations that they build better cultural competencies in their managerial relations with differentiated groups. Research on women in engineering and technological industries raised new issues on the intersectionality of race and gender, often with non-white women challenging the white feminist paradigms of the project design. Acker (2006; 1990), an illuminating read at the time, suggested that these technologically-oriented organisations were based on hierarchies that were masculine, and that organisations were gendered. This seemed wholly credible, and it did not occur to me to construct them as race-ed organisations. This omission was starkly brought home to me in a personal sense when I was working on an Indigenous project. I attended a racism conference with Indigenous people in the early 2000s, where I received a
searing comment that marked my identity as a (white-unsaid) ‘Polyanna’. This was not a question, but certainly provoked a re-analysis of my assumptions about our race relations. I became more aware of how whiteness permeated every transaction, whether material, in discourse, or negotiated through the body. Further, this whiteness could not be erased, although this term was not in the academic discourse of the project at the time. In Victoria Police, I found that whiteness was made invisible and race was erased by the policing organisation. This thesis provided me with the opportunity to bring whiteness to centre-stage in order to understand how it frames and directs police officers’ relations with Vietnamese Australian communities and builds white advantage.

**Aim and Scope**

The main purpose of this thesis is to explore how whiteness influences the policing of Vietnamese Australians, and to examine the production of whiteness within the Victoria Police force. The research question guiding the study is: *How is whiteness reinforced, maintained or reinvented as normal in policing a Vietnamese minority, and how does this contribute to white race privilege?*

The thesis rests on the established contention that whiteness has inherent characteristics which maintain it as normal, and that whiteness protects white race privilege (Levine-Rasky, 2008; Levine-Rasky, 2013). The thesis explores how, and with what consequences, whiteness has functioned within the police force. My central argument is that the practices of both local police forces and individual officers reflect and affect whiteness, and that these practices contribute to white privilege. Related to this, in examining policing strategies employed by white police, I argue that racialisation and criminalisation are key mechanisms that reproduce whiteness advantage. In exploring the effects of policing on the Vietnamese communities, I argue that whiteness in policing is experienced by the Vietnamese as exclusionary. The whiteness embedded in policing practice disadvantages Vietnamese Australians and renders their communities dispensable.

The research for this project was conducted between 2008 and 2011. The study was situated in three localities (Police Service Areas) in Melbourne, all of which have historically had high populations of Vietnamese, and currently have the highest populations of Vietnamese. The main actors in this study were the ‘local white police force’, the ‘white police officer’,
the ‘Vietnamese Australian community member’ and the ‘Vietnamese Australian social justice worker’. A narrative thread that connects these actors and runs through the different chapters in the thesis, is to make connections between the theory, research methods and the lived experiences of whiteness, to uncover how it works and what white advantage ensues, in this policing context.

The exploration of whiteness occurs in a context that encompasses a complexity of relations between white police actors and a migrant group. The Vietnamese refugees and settlers brought with them different histories and different relations with power and authorities. The evolution of their communities spanned the era of ‘boat-people’ refugees in Australia 40 years ago, through to more recent migrations through family-reunion, the bride industry, and arrivals through other visa schemes. Furthermore, these communities are not static, but are evolving. Denzin and Lincoln (2011: 12) contend that social research is always ‘biographically situated’ in being a product of specific histories, politics and traditions of knowledge construction. Thus the research is biographically embedded in specific histories and relations of power. These locate the research spatially and temporally, and place limitations on how the research can be understood outside this particular context.

The study is based on qualitative data derived from a four-year Australian Research Council (ARC) Linkage Project¹ (2008–2011) that investigated practical policing strategies to build communication and trust between police and Vietnamese Australian communities in Melbourne. The research was commissioned and funded by the Australian Government’s Australian Research Council and the linkage partner organisations: Victoria Police and the Australian Vietnamese Women’s Association (AVWA). The ARC team included a multi-disciplinary team of five chief investigators. My roles in this ARC project were research manager, field-work researcher, and PhD student. The governance of the project was highly

¹ ARC Linkage Project LPO776899 Exploring the experience of security in the Australian Vietnamese community: practical implications for policing
structured with multiple stakeholders. The analysis for the ARC study was inter-disciplinary across the disciplines of sociology, criminology and policing studies. The findings of the ARC linkage study are well documented and include: a final report for Victoria Police (McKernan & Scambary 2011), a series of 10 working papers presented to both partner organisations (unpublished); four published academic papers (Meredyth et al., 2010; Scambary and Meredyth, 2013; Cherry, 2014a; Cherry, 2014b; McKernan and Weber, 2014); a keynote presentation; and eight conference papers. I anticipate that the impact of this thesis will be enhanced because of the previous research outcomes presented in these reports and published articles, and that some senior police and police educators will be interested in the research and its implications.

This thesis is an original and unique investigation of the ARC data which has not been analysed in this way before in utilising a critical whiteness studies approach. The study is driven by a theoretical and critical disposition that seeks new and different answers to a specific relational problem between police and the Vietnamese communities. My thesis posits that the relations between Victoria Police and the Vietnamese communities is a particular case of a whiteness relationality, which exists within broader white society. Furthermore, these current relations are formed and bounded by the trappings of a white colonial past. The whiteness studies paradigm shifts the main focus onto the white actors: the police officer and the police force. This provides a unique analysis, and highlights the often unseen power and privileges that reside in the white police forces at the local level, as well as through state-granted powers. Relations between police and Vietnamese Australians are enacted within a wider context marked by white communities’ insecurities, white spaces and the stereotyping of groups. These factors exacerbate a policing focus on ethnic, racial and faith minorities. Importantly, the study has linkages to other relational problems between police and racial, ethnic and faith minorities, that have profound and potentially divisive effects in contemporary society.

**Significance of the Study**

This inquiry of how whiteness structures policing in Australia is a new scholarly endeavour. Although a number of important publications in Australia have shown the underlying whiteness of the nation, especially Hage (2000) and Moreton-Robinson (2006a; 2004b; 2003; Moreton-Robinson, 2000), scholars have not examined the functioning of whiteness within
policing or related criminological fields. Weber (2007) is one of the few white scholars to show deeply-entrenched racisms in specific incidents between Australian police and Indigenous people. These scholars related the historically all-white institutions and their colonial prejudices, to racism being embedded in the fabric of policing institutions. They were critical race rather than critical whiteness studies as they focus on racism rather than whiteness mechanisms, ideology and privilege.

This thesis also contributes to the sparse literature on policing a specific case, the Vietnamese ethnic minority in Australia. Many policing studies of ethnic minorities examine relations as if they exist in a vacuum of ideology, while this study of relations with the Vietnamese gives credence to their experience, at the same time situating it within the ideology of whiteness and whiteness practices. The specificity of the study makes a contribution through its in-depth understanding of police relations with one ethnic and racially-identified minority: the Vietnamese. The vast majority of studies in the US and UK treat ethnicity as a generic group, whereby evaluations are made about ethnic groups’ generalised attitudes towards police. The lack of studies of the specific experience of an ethnic or racially-identified community excludes the impact of being biographically situated, as well as the unique and evolving complexity within a community. This qualitative study also differs from many studies in the criminological literature that are quantitative, narrow in focus and often explore established phenomena such as institutional racism. In Australia, Murphy and Cherney (2011) suggest that culturally-specific, qualitative studies should be conducted in order to provide insights into the lived experiences of the policing of groups regarded as ‘other’. This study meets this niche requirement.

In the US and UK, racism and prejudice from police officer colleagues have been found to be major barriers to non-white or ethnic officers joining the police force (Fielding, 1999; Holdaway and Barron, 1997; Delaney, 1996; Hochstedler and Conley, 1986). No such studies have been published in Australia, and while this study does not directly link racist attitudes to the retention of Vietnamese officers or any direct experience of racism, it points out the exclusive and reproducing nature of whiteness in police culture. These very specific accounts of white officers’ beliefs are rarely found in the literature. Indeed, other studies (Leinen, 1984) have shown that it can be extremely difficult to gain officers’ trust, as well as organisational permission to access and research their opinions. This study makes a
contribution through presenting in-depth insights into the beliefs, attitudes and practices of white officers as they themselves describe them.

The thesis both complements these previous studies and disrupts a long-term discourse in the policing organisation, which stated, among other anomalies, that racism did not exist in the organisation. Some recent public and contentious issues involving race in policing incidents have demonstrated a renewed acceptance of race as endemic to relations between Victoria Police and ethnic and racially-identified groups, as well as an apparent openness currently to examining where police and race are in tension. This thesis challenges police officers from all ranks to think beyond the obvious levels of knowing that drive everyday policing to the more subjective elements of practice.

**Structure of the Thesis**

The thesis explores whiteness in white police officers’ policing of Vietnamese communities, and whiteness as experienced by Vietnamese communities in their treatment by white officers. It comprises two literature review chapters (Chapters 1 and 2), four findings chapters (Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7) and a concluding chapter (Chapter 9). The final chapter draws together the insights from the literature and findings to conclude that whiteness structures policing of Vietnamese communities in these three PSAs of Victoria Police. The research question is: *How is whiteness reinforced, maintained or reinvented as normal in policing a Vietnamese minority, and how does this contribute to white race privilege?* Each chapter has a related research question that develops specific and linked aspects of the argument that when considered together, provide the overall analysis in the final chapter.

Chapter 2 is a review of the whiteness studies literature, and of the traditions on which the field draws. In this chapter, I discuss the historical context of whiteness studies, and the key scholars whose work has led to the creation of it as a field of study. I also note the emerging and relatively new status of whiteness in some disciplines. I conceptualise whiteness, taking account of its various interpretations in different disciplines and the mechanisms of whiteness practice. My key argument in this chapter is that whiteness has inherent characteristics that maintain it as normal, and that whiteness reinforces white race privilege. In developing this argument, I illustrate how my study fits into this body of literature and makes an empirical contribution to it.
Chapter 3 provides the rationale for the study. Here I establish that whiteness is a key structure in Australian society, which is an underlying premise of my research question. In order to establish this as the basis of the study, I review the relevant Australian literature. My review includes Australia’s history of whiteness, attitudes and policies affecting Asian migration, as well as the transition from Australia as a white colonial country to a multicultural country. I pay attention to what non-white scholars say about whiteness, and to their critiques of multiculturalism. Because the study is centred on policing practices, I include a substantial review of the criminological literature on policing ethnic and racially identified minorities. In establishing the contention that whiteness structures society and causes tensions between white police and non-white minorities, I thus establish the starting point from which to answer my research question.

Chapter 4 describes the qualitative research methods for this thesis. I present critical whiteness as the methodological approach, and clarify how it is applied in the thesis. I describe sampling methods, recruitment, semi-structured interviews, focus groups, confidentiality, data analysis and the limitations of the research methods. Then in reflexive mode, I consider how my status as a white female researcher might affect the data, and acknowledge that there will be other unseen effects of whiteness.

Chapter 5 provides the first analysis of white police officers’ practice. It takes the perspective of the local police force as an entity, and analyses strategies implemented by them in relation to their local Vietnamese communities. The practices of the local forces in each of the three PSAs in the study are compared and contrasted. My analysis addresses a question related to the over-arching research question: How is whiteness reinforced, maintained or reinvented by local forces in policing the Vietnamese communities, and how does this contribute to white advantage? I argue that the strategies selected by local police forces directly impact on whiteness and advantage whiteness.

Chapter 6 provides the second analysis of white police officers’ practice, this time from the perspective of individual white police officers on the job in terms of their behaviour and approach towards Vietnamese Australians. Through the lens of the individual white officer, I address a question related to the over-arching research question: How is whiteness reinforced,
maintained or reinvented by white officers in their policing of Vietnamese communities, and how does this contribute to white advantage? I argue that whiteness is reinforced through the practices of some officers, and that whiteness is strengthened as normative, which contributes to white advantage.

Chapter 7 presents the third analysis of white police officers’ practice. As in the previous chapter, the analysis is from the perspective of the individual white police officer. A unique aspect of this chapter is that it turns the focus from outside to inside the police force to explore relations between white and Vietnamese Australian officers. I analyse the practices and attitudes of police towards Vietnamese Australian officers in relation to whiteness as described by white officers. I ask a question related to the over-arching research question: How is whiteness reinforced, maintained or reinvented by white officers in their relations with Vietnamese Australian police officers, and how does this contribute to white advantage? I argue that whiteness is reinforced through the exclusionary practices demonstrated by white officers that strengthen whiteness as normative, and contribute to white advantage.

Chapter 8 examines the perspective of Vietnamese Australians. I explore their experiences of ‘being policed’ by white police officers or the local police force. I ask a question related to the over-arching research question: How do Vietnamese Australians experience whiteness from police officers or local police forces, and how does this contribute to white advantage? I argue that from the perspective of Vietnamese Australians, whiteness is evident in policing. Based on this contention, I further argue that whiteness in policing disadvantages Vietnamese Australian communities, and advantages white communities and white police forces.

Chapter 9 concludes the thesis. Here I bring together the analysis situated in critical whiteness theory, and draw on research methods of deconstruction that show how versions of the social world are constructed through discourse and material reality, meaning the practical consequences or material base (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Blanche et al., 2006). This final chapter combines the two literature review chapters (2 and 3) with the four data chapters (5, 6, 7 and 8) to address the over-arching research question: How is whiteness reinforced, maintained or reinvented as normal in policing a Vietnamese minority, and how does this contribute to white race privilege? My response to this question integrates the perspectives of the four actors: the ‘local white police force’, the ‘white police officer’, the ‘Vietnamese
Australian community member’ and the ‘Vietnamese Australian social justice worker’. In this chapter, I demonstrate how whiteness structures these relations, and establish some of the material effects and other advantages to whiteness. I offer some commentary on the practice of policing by a future, more whiteness-aware force. Whiteness studies literature offers two extremes of how to undo or overcome whiteness: abolition or reinvention? At this point, neither option seems possible in the pragmatic realm of the white police force, or for individual white officers, notwithstanding a few notable exceptions. The study’s findings certainly suggest that there are significant advantages for Vietnamese communities when police select strategies that minimise rather than strengthen whiteness.
Chapter 2 Literature review of whiteness studies

Whiteness studies is a relatively new field in which understandings of whiteness are still evolving and expanding. Whiteness is defined here as the processes that reproduce dominance, normativity and white race privilege (Frankenberg, 1997; Levine-Rasky, 2013). The focus of the chapter is to review the literature on whiteness as a field of study by exploring first the emergence of the study, and then the conceptualisation and practices of whiteness. Whiteness studies is a phenomenon often studied in terms of its invisibility to dominant white cultures and how it is enacted, rather than extensive investigation of the theoretical underpinnings of whiteness. A primary concern in the whiteness literature is to make visible this invisibility by exploring whiteness in its various modes of operation.

The literature reviewed in this chapter focuses on the past decade, and is sourced predominantly from the fields of whiteness studies and sociology, as well as from other disciplines where appropriate, such as historical studies. The review encompasses the main methodological approaches generally used by whiteness researchers. This literature assists me, as a white researcher, to focus attention on the white subject rather than the common preference often displayed by white scholars to study ethnic or racial groups. The challenges for white researchers like myself in conducting an empirical whiteness study are explored, in particular the difficulties in studying a phenomenon renowned for its invisibility, being mostly invisible to the white observer. The literature reviewed in this chapter focuses on the conceptualisation, practices, empirical dilemmas and challenges contributing to the analysis of the phenomenon of whiteness investigated in the study. In reviewing this literature, I argue that whiteness has inherent characteristics that maintain it as normal, and as a process that reinforces white race privilege that Pulido (2000: 13) defines as hegemonic social systems that ‘work to the benefit of whites’.

The emergence of whiteness as a field of study

Writers in the field often turn to the scholarship of William Edward Burghardt (W.E.B.) Du Bois, an African-American intellectual leader and activist widely acknowledged as the founding scholar of whiteness (2007). Born in 1868, and a professor of sociology in eras that spanned the 17th and 18th centuries, he wrote prolifically and widely on the ‘Strivings of the Negro People’ (Du Bois, 2007b). Du Bois worked tenaciously to establish the
institutionalisation of Black Studies in the US during the 1930s, and on the re-centring of black scholarship within a black world view. This differed from the Eurocentric scholarship that had primacy in the academic institutions in the US at the time (Rabaka, 2007). Du Bois is renowned within the whiteness literature for his shifting of the gaze to ‘white folk’ and his contention in *The Souls of White Folk*: “The discovery of a personal whiteness among the world’s peoples is a very modern thing” (Du Bois, 2007a: 923). This oft-cited quote is claimed as pivotal as a first seeing of the existence of whiteness.

Du Bois’s dialectic expositions of whiteness explored the contradictions and assumptions in white discourses compared to black, such as those found in contrasts of the ‘White Proletariat’ and the ‘Black Proletariat’ (Watson, 2013). His visionary scholarship drew attention to intersecting global systems of supremacy, and their mechanisms of oppression in European global projects of imperialism and colonisation (Rabaka, 2007). Not only did Du Bois explore the overarching systems of control, but he also located whiteness at the local and interpersonal levels, where he found whiteness endemic in social discourse and personal relations. Other African Americans followed Du Bois to interrogate whiteness, such as novelists James Baldwin (1924-1987) and Ralph Ellison (1914-1994).


**Conceptualising whiteness**

Ruth Frankenberg (1993b) was one of the first white sociological academics to write about whiteness, and her monograph, *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness*, is now in its eighth edition and is a landmark study widely cited to this day. Frankenberg (1993b) and other scholars conceptualise whiteness or white studies as a historically and socially constructed category that is complex and ever-changing (Rodriguez, 2000; Hage, 2000). Whiteness is explained as encompassing a white ideology and white racial identity (Carroll, 2014; Barnett, 2000).
Whiteness ideology

Frankenberg (2001;1993b; 1997) theorises the ideology of whiteness as cultural privilege and in-built structural systemic advantage. White ideology refers to beliefs and behaviours that reflect or express white privilege and is explained by Levine-Rasky (2013) as:

The broad mental and moral frameworks that social groups use to make sense of the world and to decide what is right and wrong, true or false, important or unimportant (Levine-Rasky, 2013: 67).

Dyer (2013b: 2) claims that in white societies, privilege serves white people by protecting their interests and advantage; it is evident in their ‘authority to speak and act in and on the world’. The privileges are unearned, but are powerful in their social, political and economic advantages (Carroll, 2014). Privilege is linked to its counterpoint and opposite experience of disadvantage. According to Rodriguez (1998: 59), these opposites are maintained through forces of domination brought into play by whiteness in the political, cultural and social domains.

Whiteness gives credence to the experiences of marginalised others and importantly, explores how ‘the conceptual practices of power’ are used to manage others ‘in oppressed classes, races and genders’ (Harding, 2004: 22). In positions of privilege, white racial identities are invisible, unlike non-white others (Frankenberg, 1996). Dyer (2013b: 1) captures this privileging of whiteness as ‘other people are raced, we are just people’. Levine-Rasky (2013: 5) suggests that it is only from this site that whites ‘understand themselves in relation to racialized others’. Thus whiteness is its capacity to be invisible because of its alignment with normality. Whiteness scholars agree that white people interpret the norms of their culture as racially neutral, and do not recognise norms as race-specific. Flagg (1998) explores how the failure of black Americans to be promoted in so-called neutral corporate cultures relates to the racialisation of blacks against white norms. The discriminatory processes of these processes, it is contended, result from racialised white cultures that measure blacks against norms that are white (Flagg, 1998).

Dyer (2013b: 1) describes whiteness as a category, and Gunaratnam (2003: 20) echoes the idea of whiteness as a racial category that is ‘socially located, internally differentiated and
unstable’. Whiteness incorporates the notion of a white racial identity that is an embodied form. It is given physical attributes in colour difference and the normalisation of the white body (Rodriquez, 1998; Frankenberg, 1993b). Embodied whiteness is revealed in the normalisation of technologies such as in the production of the standard Barbie doll, which promotes not only whiteness but highly-gendered images of the white woman (Rodriquez, 1998). In Rodriguez’s book chapter, Emptying the Contents of Whiteness, this following quote from Dyer is included (Dyer, 2013a):

The fear of one’s own body, of how one controls it and relates to it and the fear of not being able to control other bodies, those bodies whose exploitation is so fundamental to capitalist economy, are both at the heart of whiteness (Dyer, 2013a: 39)

Here it is seen that Dyer (2013a) emphasises the powerful emotions that can be evoked or generated in response to the concrete bodily forms of whiteness. Whiteness is also described as natural. Levine-Rasky (2013) connects being natural to historical associations with science and religion. In this sense, whiteness takes on some of the symbolism of white in the Christian religion as good, and black as associated with death.

**Whiteness as power**

Whiteness scholars claim that privilege and advantage are maintained through whiteness’s multiple systems of power that control the production of knowledge and ways of knowing behind what is seen as normal and different in societies (Barnett, 2000; Rodriguez, 1998). Further to this, Barnett (2000: 10) suggests that whiteness represents itself as neutral, and operating within a ‘non-racial way of knowing’, it disguises its access to power as the natural way that society operates. Beneath the benign outer facade of whiteness, hegemonic behaviours are employed through multiple normalised societal modes such as globalisation of resources or migrant labour (Giroux, 1997a; Giroux, 1997b).

Foucault argued that power in modern contexts is manifested through the main modalities of sovereignty, discipline, governmentality and biopolitics, the latter being a form of power that regulates populations through social, health and medical controls to shape populations (Borch, 2014). In modern societies, these are operationalised through security mechanisms to control the behaviour of particular institutions such as police, sanctions and governmental strategies (Borch, 2014; Foucault, 1977). Societal police constrained behaviours that deviated
from the normative through roles as varied as in the judiciary, policing or the ‘teacher-judge’, ‘doctor-judge’ or ‘social worker-judge’ (Foucault, 1977: 304). Whiteness acclaims that objectivity is the norm, and denies that race is related to the construction of knowledge in these powerful cultural institutions. According to Foucault, power is implemented through individuals via subjectification, where individuals may be subject to or subjugated to the control of others, such as in the case of criminals or offenders, and through subordination, where individuals place themselves in the control of others (Borch, 2014). Through power modalities, whiteness ideology and practice chooses to recognise or not recognise others, define others, or through strategies such as colour-blindness, deny there is difference (Barnett, 2000).

Foucault theorised power as implemented through a regime of power for the benefit of the nation state (Bevir, 1999). In *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Foucault (1977) interpreted power as a quasi-structural model, and the law as an instrument of power relations on behalf of the nation state (Collier, 2009). Foucault argued that power is manifested through the construction of knowledge that shapes specific behaviours through manipulation of desires and pre-conditions (Collier, 2009). In the late 1970s, Foucault proposed a neo-liberal approach to crime, which brought to criminality an economic lens that viewed power as a form of economic action with ensuing benefits and risks. This conception annulled the criminal as a type, and instead suggested different strategies to take into account economic considerations, as well as floating the new idea of the ‘optimum level of crime’ (Borch, 2014: 14). Modern society was viewed by Foucault (1977) as a disciplinary society where power is exercised through governmentality, and implements controls through surveillance. Rodríguez (1998) claims that critical studies of the pedagogy of whiteness must expose this nexus between power relations and the struggles of racialised others against the mission of whiteness to impose dominance.

**White race and white racial identities**

Race, it is now widely understood, is not a scientific category, as all human beings are part of the same species: homo-sapiens. Race, however, remains a powerful category because of its differentiated relationship to privilege and dominance. Race is clearly not biological but is a socially, politically and historically constructed category that is described by Fields (1982) as deeply ideological in conception. Race accrues ‘meaning by the way it is expressed in the body’ (Levine-Rasky, 2013: 6), and through its performance, which Levine-Rasky compares
to Butler’s (1999) performativity theory of gender production. Race is defined by Gunaratnam (2003: 4) as the ‘organising discursive category around which has been constructed a system of socio-economic power, exploitation and exclusion – i.e. racism’.

The white race is ‘a historically constructed social formation’ (Ignatiev and Garvey, 1996: 9) whose members have a visible white phenotype and can access privileges. The white race is only known, or is able to be self-identified, when it is contrasted with the non-white races. Ignatiev and Garvey (1996) use the analogy of an exclusive club where privileges are passed down through birth rights, and members will be granted privileges providing they comply with the club rules. A white phenotype, however, does not give automatic access to the white club, as the whiteness category is formed out of particular historicisms and social and cultural constructions (Ignatiev and Garvey, 1996). These authors propose that privilege and white racial identity interact so that people are not favoured because they are white, but are defined as “white” because they were favoured’ (Ignatiev and Garvey, 1996: 10). The rules do not demand that members must be open advocates for white supremacy, but that they are expected to defer to or ignore the prejudices of others, must not reveal any ambivalence, and must maintain loyalty if they wish to be receive the clubs’ conferred privileges. The outcome is a ‘racial solidarity’ that spreads conformity on how to respond to dialogue on race (Ignatiev and Garvey, 1996: 36).

Contemporary theories of identity contend that identities are multiple, hybrid, fluid, marked by mixed-ness, fragmented and decentred (Dyer, 2013b; Phoenix and Rattansi, 2005; Hall, 2000; Bhabha, 1994). What this means for white racial identities seems relatively unexplored, in that although scholars of whiteness acknowledge the fluid, situated and fractured nature of identities, their focus is often to generalise the common components of racial identities. For instance, in whitening his skin, the renowned singer/performer Michael Jackson projected a white identity that conflicted with his known racial identity as an African American. Jackson appeared white but never became white; his racial identity was known and he could not escape a black identity (Hollander, 2010). His black identity was not replaced by a white identity, despite the changes in the pigmentation of his skin. Many Australian aboriginal persons with pale skins have maintained a public white identity and hidden Indigenous identity (Smith et al. 2008; Kickett-Tucker 2009). In such contexts the expression of racial identities are situational and contextual. As Fanon (1967) suggests, such black racial
identities in colonised countries exist in two parallel dimensions: one of being black in black culture and the other, black in white culture. The divided identities are captured in the title of Fanon’s (1967) widely referenced book ‘Black Skin, White Masks’ and are the consequence of colonial subjugation. Becoming whiter he proposes, is becoming ‘closer to becoming a real human being’ and a critical factor in whether whiteness confers this is their mastery of the white language and capacity to operate within white culture (Fanon 2012 p.418).

The historical constructions of whiteness have changed over time, so that what was not white has now become white. This is shown graphically in the way that Italian and Jewish people were not considered white in the US in the 20th century, but later gained white status. It is also shown by the Irish exclusions from whiteness in early Australian history in the 19th century (Ignatiev, 1997a; Ignatiev, 1995). Current debates show discussions of Muslim fair-skinned migrants from some Middle Eastern countries being excluded as outside whiteness ideology and identity. Roediger (1991) expounds the emergence of a white working class in the 19th century in the US, an identity that was consciously pursued to differentiate them from non-white workers, and to provide access to work privileges over non-whites.

Barnett (2000) makes the point that whiteness cannot be reduced to white bodily phenotypes via individual examples. Rather in looking beyond the individual, it is the self-interest and power of whiteness that constructs the ‘phenomenon of race’ and how it is perceived. Others argue that whiteness does not address the displacement and poverty of some white groups in modern societies, such as the homeless or ‘white trash’. Harris (1998) claims that disadvantaged white people—unlike black people—suffer in spite of their race, not because of it. While acknowledging that white poverty exists in developed nations, and that many African Americans are financially successful, studies show persistent patterns in wealth disadvantage between white and non-white Americans (Oliver and Shapiro, 2006). Carroll (2014) expounds the enduring hegemony of whiteness as a global phenomenon that ensures dominance and material benefits to the white race. Ignatiev and Garvey (1996: 17) argue that whiteness ‘must be reproduced in each generation’. Dyer’s particular interest is in the representation of race in the media. He contrasts non-raced white people in roles in the media, and films with raced people in equivalent roles such as the ‘black queen’ (Dyer, 2013b: 2). Whiteness is thus expressed in both the subjective and material.
Frankenberg (1993a: 236) argues that because whiteness changes temporally and spatially, it does not have a ‘trans-historical essence’. Instead Frankenberg (1993a) proposes that because the form of whiteness undergoes transformations, it can only be known in a particular form at a particular moment in time. The new constructions involve complex racial interactions that intertwine past relations with the present, and incorporate ‘local, regional, national and global relations’ (Frankenberg, 1993a: 236). Frankenberg uses this quote in her study to describe the racialisation of white women as a process of:

Their senses of self, other, identity, and worldview are also racialised, for they emerged here as repositories of the key elements of the history of the idea of race in the United States and beyond (Frankenberg, 1993a: 239).

Frankenberg concludes that racial identity constitutes one part of their package of ideology and racial identities that contributes to their sense of self as white women, and that each component is inscribed by historic and social ideas of race. Roediger (1991) claims that the marking of a white racial identity was a significant contribution to whiteness studies. It is evident that race is central to white identity constructions, and is a dilemma for whiteness studies that distances itself from phenotypes of whiteness, yet relies on these racial categorisations. Racial identity of a white skin colour arising from particular genetics is biological determinism, and this proposition is incongruent with current identity theory and whiteness theory. Nevertheless, it tends to be stepped around rather than directly confronted in the literature. Levine-Rasky (2013) suggests that the problematic of race in whiteness is a major dilemma for scholars who have to work with and around these theoretical schisms. This is, she suggests, a reason why scholars are discouraged from writing and researching the field of whiteness.

Rodriguez (1998) suggests that whiteness is strategic in conflating whiteness with the category of white racial appearance, because this marks whiteness with visible unnamed attributes, while simultaneously making invisible its social status and history. Whiteness, according to Rodriguez (1998), assures privilege through conflating white racial identity with national identity. Garner (2006) dismisses the relevance of white and black binaries when cosmopolitan scholarship proposes that identities are morphing and forming within new regimes of mixed-ness. Scholars therefore conclude that whiteness does not capture the new post-modern possibilities that denote identities as fluid and multiple, and that it is a
contradictory aspect that limits the theorisation of whiteness studies (Pieterse, 2006; Vertovec and Cohen, 2002).

As suggested by Garner (2006), whiteness scholarship’s use of black and white dualisms does not incorporate the fluid and changing forms of identities; nor does it capture the mixed-ness of contemporary times. While this is convincing in terms of identity, I find it does not equate with distributions of power and privilege: the essence of whiteness. A more general dilemma I see in whiteness scholarship is that it distances itself from automatic associations of whiteness with the white race, while hinging whiteness on belonging to this phenotypically-identified racial group. This raises the problematic of whiteness that situates itself in understanding power and privilege, but cannot divest itself of the dilemmas of race, because it is inextricably linked to white race privilege. It is for these reasons that scholars struggle with the problems that emanate from studies of race based on socially constructed meanings, yet are unable to entirely divest themselves of references to phenotypically identified racial groups.

Frankenberg’s (1993a) study of white women found that although whiteness is negotiated and constructed relationally, the co-construction is asymmetrical. She concludes that the reproduction of dominance, normativity and privilege are enduring features of whiteness. Levine-Rasky builds on Frankenberg’s (1997: 20) conception of whiteness as ‘a practice rather than object’, to describe whiteness as not ‘attached to white bodies’ (Levine-Rasky, 2010: 287). Levine-Rasky (2013) also denotes whiteness as a locus of power and draws on Butler’s (1999) theoretical framing of gender to describe whiteness as ‘a collective resource to be drawn upon for its performativity energy’ (2013: 6). For this thesis I draw on these conceptions by Frankenberg and Levine-Rasky to conceptualise whiteness as: the processes that reproduce dominance, normativity and white race privilege.

**Strategic alliances between racial and ethnic identities**

Ethnicity, it is agreed, is a concept that is constructed relationally, historically and socially, and is given political meaning (Levine-Rasky, 2013; Gunaratnam, 2003; Gilroy, 2000; Frankenberg, 1997; Hall, 1996a). ‘Ethnicity’ is commonly used to mean the maintenance of cultural traditions by groups who have migrated, and thus ‘ethnic group’ converges with the notion of ethnicity, while ‘ethnic identity’ has the common components of ‘descent’ and
‘cultural difference’ (Fenton, 2010: 3). These common usages of ethnicity arise within whiteness, and are constructs that belong to the white dominant group, and are given to non-members as is race (Fenton, 2010). Hall (2000) contends that, as in the case of biological signifiers of racial identity, ethnic identities are similarly but to a lesser extent, constructed and reinforced through discourse as cultural and biological distinctiveness:

The more ‘ethnicity’ matters, the more its characteristics are represented as relatively fixed, inherent within a group, transmitted from generation to generation, not just by culture and education, but by biological inheritance, stabilized above all by kinship and endogamous marriage rules that ensure the ethnic group remains genetically, and therefore culturally “pure” (Hall, 2000: 223).

Thus Hall argues that the conceptual distinctions used to differentiate between ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’ in the sociological literature overlook the commonalities of social and historical constructions of the categories. In ‘New Ethnicities’, Hall (2005) disrupts the common usage of ethnicity as a concept applied to minority groups. Hall (1997) describes ethnicity as the construction of subjectivity and of related identities based on histories, language, culture and politics. Hence he claims that all people are ethnically located, as they are products of histories, experiences and cultures that have occurred in space and time. Fenton argues that there cannot be any sociological theory of ethnicity, but only a theory of the ‘social world, as the material and cultural context for the expression of ethnic identities’ (Fenton, 2010: 2). Hall (1996b) suggests that everyone is ethnically located in a particular context, and that the term is contested because there is no universal conception of ethnicity. White ethnicity as a concept, Hall (1996b) suggests, by-passes the logic of universal ethnicity to remain empowered by making its ethnicity invisible, while aligning itself with nationalism. A key contention of Hall (1996b) was the decoupling of this power alignment of ethnicity with what Hall (1996b: 448) describes as ‘violence of the state’:

We still have a great deal of work to do to decouple ethnicity, as it functions in the dominant discourse, from its equivalence with nationalism, imperialism, racism and the state, which are the points of attachment around which a distinctive British or, more accurately, English ethnicity have been constructed (Hall, 1996b: 448).
Here Hall (1996b) suggests that ethnicity constructions are a mechanism of oppression used by the dominant white groups, many of whom are influenced by British identities, to control non-white groups. White ethnicity is a relatively new identity emerging in the literature, and includes explorations by people identified as white into their British, Irish, Welsh, Scottish, Polish or other identities. Dyer (2013b) thus offers the view that whiteness is a coalition of different white ethnicities; however, within these categories of white ethnicities, some are invariably considered more white than others. Rather than distinguishing between race and ethnicity, Hall (2000: 223) suggests they should be understood as ‘racisms of two registers’. Gunaratnam (2003: 4) concurs with this contention in claiming that although there are analytic distinctions between race and ethnicity, they are frequently used together and interchangeably. According to this argument, the dense interrelations between the categories of white racial identity and white ethnicity arise out of their common identifications and privileges in being aligned with the national identity.

The practices of whiteness

Ruth Frankenberg (1997, p. 20) argues that whiteness is ‘a practice rather than object’. How whiteness is practised is a key concern to the empirical researcher who intends to uncover the mechanisms of whiteness, which are renowned for their invisibility and adaptability (Levine-Rasky, 2010; Frankenberg, 1997). In this section, I explore the practices that scholars suggest are the main modes through which whiteness is reproduced and privilege maintained.

Whiteness as property

Historical studies demonstrate whiteness practices as occupation and possession of lands, subjugation of people and seizure of resources (Levine-Rasky, 2013; Roediger, 1991; Allen, 1994; Du Bois, 1897 (1986)). In Australia, contemporary Indigenous writers confront and unravel the consequences for Indigenous people of British imperialism. These include inferior health, education, housing and lack of native title, which have arisen out of past oppressions, from massacres to stolen children and stolen Indigenous lands. Indigenous people experience continued refusal to redress past injustices, as well as justification of the processes in describing them historically as civilising and colonising, rather than as discourses of occupation and possession (Moreton-Robinson, 2005; Moreton-Robinson, 1998). Moreton-Robinson (2004b) argues that past hegemonic and violent white occupation of Indigenous peoples and possession of their lands is the single most important and irrefutable fact that expresses whiteness in the nation. The 1788 occupation and subsequent
possession of lands in Australia without treaties or negotiation with Indigenous peoples was rationalised through civilising discourses, justified legally on the fallacy of Australia as terra nullius (unoccupied), and based on the belief in the right to possess (Moreton-Robinson, 2005). Property rights and white possession ‘entails values, beliefs, norms and social conventions, as well as legal protection, as it operates ideologically, discursively and materially’ (Moreton-Robinson, 2004a: 1).

Moreton Robinson (2006b) notes the tensions between the loud public political discourse of whiteness caused by racism towards Indigenous people and the silence from whiteness on its materiality: the benefits and privileges accrued by white people particularly in relation to property. As do other Indigenous Australian scholars such as Pearson (2004) and Langton (2004), Moreton-Robinson berates the critical race scholarship for not addressing the core issues of white advantage. Foremost here is the abrogation of white land titles and other properties to white colonisers, and the continuing one-sided immersion of the public discourse in Indigenous disadvantage. Furthermore, white people are viewed as complicit in maintaining white possession of land and resources, while simultaneously engaging in reconciliation and in ‘saying sorry’ for past injustices. Moreton-Robinson puts forward a powerful argument that white possession continues into the present, manifest in denial of white sovereignty, and embedded in property rights of the Crown, common law arising out of British occupation, and whiteness ideology (Moreton-Robinson, 2015).

Harris (1998) proposes that whiteness has transformed from a racial identity in America into a form of property through racially-contingent properties, and these forms of whiteness are protected by the law. Harris contends that whiteness itself is a form of property. Her argument addresses the counterclaim that millions of whites are property-less, as they do possess the property of whiteness and ‘benefit from white supremacy by clinging to their white identity’ (Roediger, 2000: 609). White supremacy is evident historically in the seizure and appropriation of land, and in the treatment of blacks as objects of property through free or indentured labour arrangements and other claims on employment and educational rights for white people. Harris (1998) proposes that affirmative action addressing access to housing and land is a fundamental principle of moving forward ethically.
Whiteness as normal

Normalisation is undoubtedly the most widely-discussed aspect of whiteness. While scholars widely agree that whiteness is built on perceptions of normality, Levine-Rasky (2013) describes normalisation as the major mode in which whiteness is practised. Levine-Rasky (2013: 43) draws on the ideas of Foucault to explain normalisation as ‘the way in which a particular version of things takes on the appeal of the standard, true, or normal’. Whiteness is noted for its capacity to colonise new definitions and imbue them with normality (Haggis et al., 1999). Normalisation operates through various mechanisms, including discourse, and through historical and in-the-moment constructions of truths and lies. It is a mechanism for exclusions, hierarchies and differentiation, and normalises categories with hegemonic meanings (Levine-Rasky, 2013).

Aligned with the notion of normality is neutrality, implying that whiteness occupies an unbiased position (Barnett, 2000: 10). This normativity and neutrality of whiteness, Barnett (2000: 10) claims, is maintained through a ‘coded reliance on coded discourses of race’. Levine-Rasky (2013) agrees, and furthermore claims that racialised discourse is the primary means of normalising people through constructing the dominant group as normal and differentiated from others. Levine-Rasky (2013) draws on Foucaultian ideas to explain discourse as the words, rules of language and the power relations that govern the language. Thus normalisation from this perspective is practised through the dual discourses of racialisation and differentiation (Levine-Rasky, 2013). Racialisation is the process through which groups and individuals are placed into racial categories which have direct material effects from the ‘unequal distribution of power and wealth’ (Nash, 2003: 639). Dyer (2013b) also argues that whiteness normativity is a major strategy of authority rather than a feature automatically embedded in white privilege.

The empirical approach of Peggy McIntosh (1992) suggests the specific skill of learning not to see white advantage is a normative behaviour. McIntosh claims that the invisibility of whiteness privileges does not simply involve the uptake of cultural practices, but that such cultural practices are active processes whereby invisibility is learnt. Although she proclaims that her paper is a non-scholarly analysis based on some personal observations, it has remained a pivotal and widely-cited illustration of the everyday ‘unseeables’. The remarkable perpetuation of the paper is in itself testament to the need to educate people to see privilege.
McIntosh uses the analogy of a knapsack of assets to describe whiteness privilege, and describes its contents colourfully:

I have come to see white privilege as an invisible package of unearned assets that I can count on cashing in each day, but about which I was “meant” to remain oblivious. White privilege is like an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, assurances, tools, maps guides, codebooks, passports, visas, clothes, compass, emergency gear and blank cheques (McIntosh, 1992).

As McIntosh contests, the pathway to see is not popular, and whites are complicit in carefully obscuring uncomfortable truisms. One outcome of new eyes is that it makes one newly accountable for giving up. Naming it carries the burden of relinquishing some power (Levine-Rasky, 2010).

**Colour-blindness as a key strategy of normalisation**

Whiteness scholars describe colour-blindness as a key practice for normalising unequalness (Levine-Rasky, 2013; Ansell, 2006; Lewis, 2004; Rodriguez, 2006; Bonilla-Silva and Doane, 2003). The devious aspect of the strategy lies in its duplicity in appearing to defend the position of normative equality through sentiments such as ‘we are all equal and therefore I do not notice colour’, while at the same time perpetuating inequality. Colour-blindness is often expressed through a dogged insistence that there is no racism, as we are all equal. In a US study of education practices, Lewis (2003) found that colour-blindness was the main mode by which racial inequality was reproduced among students and reinforced by parents. Bonilla-Silva (2013) argues that whites have developed what he calls a ‘non-racial way of defending inequality’ that he terms ‘colour-blind racism’. This practice is a colour-blindness aligned with neo-liberalism and emphasised in its public discourse of equality (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). Whiteness scholars claim that colour-blindness provides the means to violate equality by taking racism off the agenda as a discussion point. Under these conditions, whiteness maintains and manipulates power through an everyday form of racism found in ‘coded language’, ‘diversion’ and ‘re-centring on white narratives’ (Levine-Rasky, 2013: 69). Colour-blindness in workplaces is claimed to be a fair process used in promotion and employment; here colour-blindness is the ‘principle that race should not be taken into account in assessing the individual’ (Flagg, 1998: 87). Managers proudly announce colour-blindness as equality, for instance in interviewing white and non-white staff for promotion, or as
candidates for a job (Flagg, 1998; Flagg, 1995). In these workplace situations, Flagg (1998) suggests that unconscious assumptions are that the norm is the white candidate or staff member, and this is the unconscious and colour-blind norm with which non-white interviewees should comply.

hooks (1992) suggests that colour-blindness is an expression of political liberalism that perpetuates the myth of sameness as a way of expressing equality, while subverting attention from the power of whiteness to ascribe persons as raced or not raced. Colour-blindness incites denial of inequities, and leaves white groups’ greater share of resources unchallenged. Jackman (1996) explores the seemingly benign strategy of patronising behaviours as a means of expropriation of resources from the subordinate to the dominant group. These relations arise out of the relationality of master/slave relations, and are more subtly disguised today as patronising behaviours. While claiming to be complementary relations or mutual obligation, they nonetheless situate the dominant group as having the power to define the needs of the subordinate group. The dominant group members’ position of power assures that they do not have to forego anything that they do not want to relinquish (Jackman, 1996). They benefit not only from appropriation of resources, but also from their claim to the high moral ground in being magnanimous in providing for the needs of the subordinate group; claims often presented as goodwill.

**Racialisation of cultures and people**

The racialisation of groups is an exclusionary practice and a key mechanism of whiteness. Racialisation is the process of social categorisation whereby dominant groups construct other social groups as racial groups based on physical or other characteristics, attributes or qualities (Jayasuriya, 2002). Racialisation processes interact with other forms of whiteness, such as normalisation, to maintain structural, economic, political and social inequalities often demonstrated in unequal access to property, education and social services (Levine-Rasky, 2013; Rodriguez, 2000). These practices co-exist alongside democratic systems that claim equality in societal structures; thus their existence is often clouded and not seen by dominant groups. Of importance to this study is how these processes are reified in policing institutions or the justice system.

The social meanings attached to the racialised groups are historically, politically and socially constructed. Some literature refers to the process of racialisation as the ‘race-ing’ of people,
places and structures. Scholars agree that there are different kinds of racism, one of which is referred to by some scholars as ‘old racism’ and is exhibited in strategies of inferiorisation, inequality and discrimination (Phillips and Webster, 2013b; Jayasuriya, 2002; Sivanandan, 2002). Racism is now regarded as being systematically integrated into the meanings and routine practices of everyday life, and as employing processes in cultural, structural, ideological domains at institutional and individual levels (Feagin, 2001; Feagin and Feagin, 1999).

Institutional racism is structurally embedded racism found in institutional structures where, although equal opportunity mechanisms may claim equality, institutional racism persists as practices and patterns of bias enacted through behaviours and unequal relationships (Feagin, 2001). It is manifest in social structures as exclusionary practices that establish and perpetuate unequal distribution of social status, opportunity, income, wealth and power among racialised groups. In the US and Canada, where race data is collected, studies show structural racism in differences in income, employment, education and poverty (Levine-Rasky, 2013). Because in Australia race is not a demographic in the census or government data, racialised inequalities remain invisible. Critical race studies of institutional racism have shown how white stakeholders benefit from racist systems in terms of opportunities, wealth and privileges.

Another kind of racism is termed ‘cultural racism’ (Jayasuriya, 2002: 40). Here groups are racialised and excluded because of cultural differences based on faith, identity or national symbolism. Cultural racism is closely allied with the dominant group being fearful of or feeling threatened by groups such as those affected by radicalisation. In Australia and Britain, this form of racism is considered a more prevalent form of racial exclusion than old racism (Markus, 2001). These groups are not excluded on the basis of inferiority, but because of their perceived threat to the cultural security of the dominant group and to the nation. In these constructions of racism as a threat, whiteness and nation are overlaying fields. This is exhibited in new trends in Australian discourse of ‘xeno-racism’, which Jayasuriya (2002: 45) claims is a reinstating of a ‘state racism’ that sanctions harsh penalties against asylum seekers and refugees.

**Racialisation of geographies**

Racialisation of geographies is another mechanism of whiteness that has economic and social
consequences, and which leads to physical stratifications of groups (Levine-Rasky, 2013). According to Lipsitz (2007), all built environments are racially marked. White racial spaces are normalised, and the emphasis is on the exclusion of the non-normative populations. The boundaries of spaces are fiercely managed through power relations, and any transgressions to the cultural boundaries are responded to with forceful ‘retribution’ (Levine-Rasky, 2013: 47). Hage (2000) claims that non-white groups can be excluded from public spaces through strategies of subjugation and harassment. Public spaces designated as open to all publics usually actually operate as white spaces, in that whites’ power to exclude non-white groups is defended as the right of the white majority to feel safe, and not fearful in public spaces.

New immigrants are often placed into social housing in suburbs that were already-designated racialised spaces though histories of refugee or other immigrant settlement. These spaces are often associated with crime and disorderliness by the white population. Violence is rationalised by whites as necessary because of the risks they are exposed to on entering these stratified areas, but the risks for the racialised others for crossing out of these spaces into white areas is not usually considered (Levine-Rasky, 2013). The racialisation of the legal system is an interlocking system that reifies separation and operates through multiple mechanisms, including restricted access to permanent residency or citizenship (Weber, 2013). These aspects of racialised space will be related later to the policing of the Vietnamese populations in to the police service areas in this study. The segregations prevent non-normative populations from accumulating property that can be passed down through generations, a practice that is normative for the dominant population. The scope of racialised geographies extends far beyond the white and non-white marked suburbs, precincts or reserves of First Nations people to borders of the nation state and beyond (Nash, 2003).

**Power and control mechanisms**

Roediger (2000) contends that power is invested in a white identity through implementing power over others and an ideology of the right to rule. Power has historically been exercised as acquisition of property and by use of state power to stipulate who qualifies as white (Roediger, 2000; Moreton-Robinson, 1998). In Australia, power has historically been implemented through violence, massacres and terrorising of Indigenous people (Moreton-Robinson, 1998; Moreton-Robinson, 2005). In the US, power and terror were evidenced in slave patrols, lynchings and incarcerations of blacks and First Nation people (Gilroy, 2000; Roediger, 2000; hooks, 1992).
Today scholars claim that whiteness has associations with terror through connections to past oppressions, or through watching current rituals and acts of ‘terror’ against their communities (Rodriquez, 1998: 51; Roediger, 2000). According to Moreton-Robinson (2009), violence by the State continues to be perpetrated against Indigenous people by the police, military and the justice system, although these mechanisms masquerade their intention as protection. The suggestions by some scholars, such as Carroll (2014), that whiteness is associated with goodness and blackness with bad are de-bunked by Rodriguez (1998), whose analysis leads to the contention that terror and acts of violence are often embedded in social relations instigated by white people against non-white people. Rodriguez (1998) further suggests that whiteness implements its control through undermining solidarity from non-whites and that whiteness holds the power to claim a moral self-righteousness and to restrict oppositional discourses or political movements. In post-modern societies, Levine-Rasky (2013: 57) suggests that this exercise of power is embedded in whiteness’s maintenance of control of ‘the terms of engagement’. Here she draws on and extends Martinot’s (2003) scholarship on whiteness control and power as: white discourses that establish belongingness, access to collective resources, and the right to dominate through exclusions such as in residential segregation (Levine-Rasky, 2013)

**Studying whiteness empirically**

Many of the early empirical studies on whiteness were based on personal narratives and ethnographies (Twine and Gallagher, 2008). Recent empirical research on the practice of whiteness has diversified into the social sciences, post-colonial studies, political sciences, education and geography. Often studies revisit the historical and political assumptions that created patterns of domination, and which in different ways continue to uphold whiteness through links to the nation state (Twine and Gallagher, 2008; Twine, 2004; Anderson, 2003; Frankenberg, 1997). A trend in empirical research over the past decade has been to investigate the hidden power relations and racialised processes behind white privilege manifested through ideologies, state, institutional and other practices (Twine and Gallagher, 2008). Bonnett’s (1996: 147) analysis of significant whiteness scholarship places studies into two broad groups: studies of the history of whiteness in class struggles and other oppressions, or studies of whiteness contextualised as a local experience. Twine and Gallagher (2008) contend that recent empirical studies of whiteness seek to interrogate how whiteness is
reinvented and deployed as a form of power, and reasserted alongside progressive social reforms.

**Challenges to whiteness studies**

Ethical challenges arise for white researchers in studying whiteness, in that they may be reinstating new racial categories and re-centring whiteness through generating or contributing to new forms of whiteness (Bonnett, 2008; Bonnett, 1998; Bonnett, 1996). Because white scholars are disconnected from the racialised ideologies they study, they need to be able to reposition themselves within the research process as raced, situated and normative but not neutral (Steyn and Conway, 2010; Dyer, 1997). Twine (2000: 5) found scant information that addressed the challenges to the researcher of the effects of race or racism on the research process in gathering data, analysis or confronting ethical dilemmas. In reviewing the content of Denzin and Lincoln’s (2003) widely-used handbook on qualitative methods, Twine (2000) found that only five per cent of articles referred to race or racism in their methodology statements.

In the US in the 1960s, ‘racial matching’ (Twine, 2000: 6) between a black researcher and a black researched group was deemed essential in the social sciences, because white scholars could not ‘grasp black realities’ (Twine, 2000: 7), and because white and black scholars approached the study of race differently. Thus for white researchers to meet these challenges in contemporary studies, self-reflexivity is considered mandatory to the research approach if white researchers are to see and challenge white privilege (Rhodes 1994; Steyn and Conway, 2010; Clark and O'Donnell, 1999). Reflexivity applies not only to the researcher’s self-knowing, but to acknowledging and questioning how whiteness has influenced epistemologies, and how it affects knowledge production in academic disciplines and institutions (Steyn and Conway, 2010).

**Approaches to studying whiteness**

Levine-Rasky (2013) claims that whiteness studies are based on three main analytic approaches: critical, relational and contextual. Most whiteness studies tend to be primarily critical in approach, in that they seek to expose how social injustices are reproduced over time. Critical perspectives assume that inequality will be found in socio-cultural structures, and seek to unravel the power relations to find what privileges are available to the white dominant group. These studies tend to be transformative, as they seek not only to reveal the
power relations, mechanisms and ideologies that reproduce whiteness, but also seek to change the effects of dominant ideologies for marginalised groups (Mertens, 2007). Levine-Rasky (2013) suggests that critical whiteness study should integrate structural and cultural critiques, employ self-awareness and self-criticism, and show complexity through exploring ambivalences, dilemmas and contradictions.

Relational studies examine how whiteness is constructed relationally. Because relationality is a core aspect of whiteness, it is embedded to some degree in all whiteness studies. Studies that foreground the relational formations of whiteness usually interrogate how whiteness is constructed through differentiation from racialised others. These studies are interested in the symbolic and material inter-dependence between the subjugated groups (Levine-Rasky, 2013; Levine-Rasky, 2010; Levine-Rasky, 2002). The third type of whiteness studies comprises contextual studies that explore how meanings are constructed in specific histories, times and places. These studies explore the histories of social organisations and systemic stratifications and inequities. Roediger’s (1991) renowned study *The Wages of Whiteness*, a study informed by Marxism, explores the construction of the working class in the US. The expectation that class would override race to produce a non-racialised class did not eventuate, and Roediger (1991) found instead that black workers were racialised and exploited to produce a white working class that reflected its superiority against the black working class. This outcome was beneficial to whiteness as the white upper classes were not threatened by a united and powerful working class.

Twine and Gallagher (2008) contend that because empirical whiteness studies are relational, contextual, but also historically located, whiteness scholars should engage with all these aspects. Other scholars suggest that scholars should engage with the intersectional aspects of whiteness, such as how whiteness interacts with gender, sexuality and class. They should at least remain aware and cognisant of these multiple effects on the study (Gunaratnam, 2003).

This study is primarily critical, but employs the relational and contextual because these approaches interact: whiteness is relational and arises out of historical contexts. In taking a critical approach, I explore social injustices and the power relations that support inequalities or discrimination. Thus I next explore key aspects of the history of colonialism in Australia, and how contemporary social differences are marked by and constituted through race. The
learnings, theories and conceptions from this literature provided the starting point for analysis. I also explore policing and whiteness, and their implications for this study, by drawing predominantly on the policing and race literature from the US and UK. This is because there are only a few studies of race and policing, and none to date on whiteness and policing that are set in Australia.
Chapter 3  Whiteness as a structure of social groups and organisations

The literature reviewed in the previous chapter demonstrated that contemporary studies of whiteness need to explore how and why particular histories have been constructed as part of the memory of the nation state, and should reveal the nexus between privilege and power. Whiteness studies aim to unmask the belief systems and privileges that are not seen within whiteness, but which ensure its access to benefits and resources. In this chapter, I explore the Australian context in terms of its history of whiteness and its relationship to Asian migration. Whiteness is also contextualised for this study in the relationship between whiteness and authority and power, as exercised through policing. I argue that in Australia, whiteness is still strongly linked to mechanisms of oppression and control that provide access to privileges to people of white racial identity. Whiteness structures Australian society and within that, its policing organisations.

In this chapter, I explain the different conceptions and commonalities in defining whiteness in Australia. I ground the study within the sociological theoretical literature on whiteness by foregrounding the views of whiteness as socio-cultural and historical and its realisation through power relations. I take on board the advice from authors in the field to ensure that I review whiteness from the perspective of white, non-white and Indigenous academics. I also locate the study in conceptions of Australia as a white country, which although ardently represented by the Government as a multicultural country, has deep roots in a white colonial history. The contradictions and various positions on multiculturalism and whiteness provide the context for the study of policing an ethnic group in Melbourne. The study also responds to criminological literature on policing ethnic and racially-identified minorities. The vast majority of this literature is based on critical race theory that examines racism or other exclusions. Very few, if any, studies on policing in the main English-speaking countries utilise a whiteness framework. Other studies of race are drawn on, because they provide data or draw conclusions that give clues or have implications for whiteness.

Whiteness structures in Australian society

In Australia, whiteness has its roots in British colonisation, and has been enacted through history by exclusions and racism against Indigenous people (Hage, 2000). After occupation in
1788, the white colonisers oppressed generations of the first peoples through seizure of their lands, massacres of tribes and continued oppression (Reynolds, 2003; Reynolds, 1995; Reynolds, 1999; Reynolds, 1987; Reynolds, 1984). After white settlement, the colonies were defined by their Britishness, an identity that continued long after Federation in 1901, when Australia became a constitutional monarchy with Queen Victoria as Australia’s head of state (Australian Government, 2015d). Whiteness ideology and power was used to oppress Indigenous peoples through dispossession of their land, and prolonged violence that structured society for the first 200 years after white settlement, through immigration, economic and social controls.

**Indigenous people, oppressions and whiteness**

The oppressions against Indigenous Australians are fundamental to understanding whiteness as a core structure of Australian society. Indigenous and white writers agree that Indigenous peoples inhabited Australia for more than 60,000 years prior to white invasion and occupation (Reynolds, 1987; Reynolds, 1984). The rich diversity of Indigenous peoples was evident in their art works and more than 500 language groups (Berndt and Berndt, 1997; Blainey, 1975). British colonisers contributed to the British imperial project through conquering Indigenous peoples and plundering their resources. The beliefs of their superiority were steeped in racism, and in their status as civilised people who could oppress uncivilised Indigenous peoples (Reynolds, 2000). Their superiority annulled any guilt for the massacres of tribes and other violence. The beliefs and assumptions of white colonisers made them blind to the rich and complex culture and art of Indigenous peoples.

White superiority supported the political position that Indigenous people did not belong to the nation, and were not entitled to vote until the 1966 Referendum that mandated voting for Aboriginal people in Australia. The Mabo decision in 1992 was a significant symbolic victory for Indigenous people on their right to claim native title to land (Hill, 1995). It was not as much a real win for Indigenous people, because native title could only be claimed for non-titled land where continuous connection to the land could be proven. Thus winning native title claims became almost impossibly difficult, because Indigenous people had been repeatedly dispossessed of their land, and their families disrupted through the ‘Stolen Children’ eras when children were removed from their families and placed in missions (Behrendt, 2003). The Mabo decision dramatically illustrates that property is at the heart of whiteness, and that structural whiteness exerted through the justice system is complicit in
maintaining whiteness as property. For Moreton-Robinson (2003: 35), Australia is a white post-colonising society where belonging for the Indigenous is problematic, and ‘under Australia’s white anglicised legal regime Indigenous people are homeless and out of place’ because of ‘the legal fiction of Terra Nullius’.

The disconnection of Indigenous people from their land, and their continuous exposure to racism, have severely disempowered the first people of Australia. It is evident in multiple disadvantages in health, education, housing and lack of self-governance. Indigenous people are over-represented in the criminal justice system and their highly disproportionate incarceration rates a nemesis embedded in a history marked by regimes of racial segregation, marginalisation and other oppressions (Hogg, 2001). At the highest level of governance, current debate relates to a referendum to amend the Australian Constitution to recognise Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2015). In speaking on television about the current debate on changes to the Constitution, Aboriginal leader and lawyer Noel Pearson expressed the core issue as: ‘We are characterised in the constitution as a different race and we have internalised this ourselves’ (Pearson, 06/07/2015). Currently (in 2015), controversy over the social, economic and political disadvantage of Aboriginal communities is evident in the controversial Western Australian Government public statements on intended closures of 250 Indigenous remote communities. Their poor health and reduced life expectancies are just some of the statistical evidence for the irrefutable demarcation between white advantage and Indigenous disadvantage and major government program and policy failures (Sutton, 2001). An ongoing debate in regard to Indigenous peoples is their lack of control over decision-making within the Government; white people have continued to retain the power to decide on the destiny of Indigenous people. Addressing this structural disadvantage is of crucial concern to Indigenous leaders, who want constitutional reforms to include Indigenous governance of Indigenous peoples. So vast is the gulf between white and Indigenous ownership and identity that Hage (2000) contends that the idea of an Indigenous Australian prime minister is unthinkable.

**Chinese migrants in the 1800s**

The gold rushes in Victoria in the 1850s attracted many Chinese immigrants. Their arrival was viewed as an unwelcome influx, and provoked resistance from white settlers from the British Isles (Fitzgerald, 2007). Anti-Chinese sentiment gathered pace across the colonies as Chinese men filled labour gaps resulting from settlers packing up and leaving their jobs to
find their fortune on the goldfields. Between the 1840s and 1901, 100,000 Chinese migrants arrived in Australia (Fitzgerald, 2007). In 1859, the population of Chinese people in Victoria was 42,000, which represented one Chinese migrant for every 12 to 14 European migrants (Rubenstein, 2003) and was a large group for this period. To curb the flow of Chinese migration, the Victorian colony introduced the Chinese Act 1881 (Vic), which mandated a 10-pound entry tax and imposed other restrictions (Rubenstein, 2003). In two colonies, violence against Chinese erupted, and there was a growing sentiment that Chinese people should be excluded from the Australian colonies (Mellor, 2003). Fitzgerald contends that in the 19th century, Australians distanced themselves from Chinese migrants, whom they stereotyped by denigrating their physical features, language, foods and habits. Chinese workers were prohibited from joining the Australian workers unions, and were forced to form their own trade unions (Fitzgerald, 2007). Industrial action by the white unions in the 1870s to 1880s pressured governments to ban non-white labour (Mellor, 2003).

The resistances in the colonies against the Chinese constituted the driving force that led to the Immigration Restriction Act in 1901 being implemented the year after Federation in 1900, and the Act became widely referred to as the White Australia Policy. The Act permitted discretion without justification for immigration to exclude undesirable immigrants because of their perceived incompatibility with Australian values and culture. The Act included a dictation test, which excluded people on the basis of a test and although potential migrants expected to be in the English language, immigration officials had the discretion to implement the test in a European language (Jupp, 2002). The tactic of imposing a dictation test in Spanish or French for Chinese applicants who appeared competent in English was a blatantly racist practice (Mellor, 2003). The test was a restrictive Federal immigration policy intended to exclude migrants from non-European countries. The policy was retained by successive Australian immigration departments until 1966 (Fitzgerald, 2007). After Federation, there were ‘sixty Commonwealth and state laws and statutes curtailing the rights of non-European residents’ (Fitzgerald, 2007: 6). Asian identity and ideology were positioned as incompatible with Australian identity and ideology. Until the 1960s, Chinese Australians and other non-Europeans could not be granted citizenship, and thus were banned them from property acquisition (Jupp, 2002). Fitzgerald (2007) claims that the argument for the White Australia Policy was driven by the perceived attack on economic, socio-cultural and racial factors that defined an Australian way of life, and Chinese foreigners were perceived as putting this at
risk. A report to the British Government in 1881 refers to the ‘desire to preserve and perpetuate the ‘British type’ in the settler population (Rubenstein, 2003: 7).

**Vietnamese refugees 1975 -1985**

The ending of the White Australia Policy in 1973 and the introduction of Race Discrimination Legislation in 1975, caused a significant shift in national identity. These Acts marked a new racial conception of Australia as a nation state, and opened the way for Asian migration to Australia (Jupp, 2002). Race could no longer be used as the key determinant for acceptance into the nation state. The year 1975 was a significant point for this study, as it was the year in which Vietnamese refugees arrived in large numbers following the end of the war in Vietnam. After the reunification of North and South Vietnam in 1975, large numbers of Vietnamese, who were being persecuted by the new communist regime, fled on fishing boats under perilous conditions. Two thousand Vietnamese arrived on Australian shores by boat, while many other refugees ended up in camps in Thailand, Malaysia and Hong Kong (Viviani, 1984). Between 1975 and 1985, Australia accepted refugees from Vietnam, and some refugees from Cambodia and Laos, through refugee programs and family reunion settlement programs (Australian Government, 2015a; Australian Government, 2015b). Over this period, 80,000 Vietnamese arrived in Australia as refugees, migrants or through family reunion schemes. This was the first mass migration from Asia to Australia (Thomas, 2015b). The arrival of the Vietnamese created a new imperative to find a way to include Asian-ness and other extant migrant ethnic groups into the national psyche. This prompted the redefinition of Australia from a white nation to a multicultural nation.

Geoffrey Blainey (1984), a prominent Australian historian, criticised the Government at the time for what he thought was a disproportionally high level of Asian immigration. He claimed Asian immigrants threatened Australian employment and undermined the national identity, claiming it was at risk of becoming an Asian Australia identity. Blainey publicly called for a pull-back from government policies on Asian immigration (Blainey, 1984; Foster, 1988). His publications and commentary provoked inflammatory responses from both sides of the Asian immigration debate. These race debates surfaced again in the late 1990s with the emergence of another anti-immigration voice from Pauline Hanson’s One Nation political party. In Hanson’s maiden speech to the Australian Parliament in 1996, she stated: ‘I believe we are in danger of being swamped by Asians’ (One Nation, 2015). Following a brief period in Parliament, Hanson’s popularity waned, and she was expelled from her party in 2002.
Hanson remains a symbol of an underlying racist element within Australian society (Leach, 2000).

The 2013 Census of Australian residents included 203,000 people born in Vietnam (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2015). The arrival of the Vietnamese in Australia was often described as a mass migration, as it was the first large-scale migration of Asians to Australia since Federation. Fitzgerald (2007) suggests that a crucial principle defining the period of the White Australia Policy was the tight fit between a white racial identity and compatible values. Since abandonment of the policy in 1975, race and values have been officially dis-associated, and government leaders mostly endorse a public position that immigration must not be tied to race or ethnicity. However, the debate on Asian migration and national identity continues, and is easily re-fuelled. Scholars such as Jupp (2002: 223) argue that Australia is no longer clinging to the idea of a White Australia based on a ‘fear of Asia’. For other scholars, exclusion of potential migrants from Australia on the basis of incompatible values remains as pervasive now as it was in past eras (Mellor, 2004; Mackie, 1997). This contention is explored next as an underlying counter thread to the policy position of multiculturalism, and its proclamations of tolerance and harmony towards ethnic settlers.

Fitzgerald (2007) suggests that although the White Australia Policy was abandoned in 1973, and although race and values are officially dis-associated, and government leaders mostly endorse a public position that immigration must not be tied to race or ethnicity, this does not reflect the experience of many migrants. Fitzgerald (2007) argues that this public argument that people should be excluded from Australia on the basis of incompatible values remains as pervasive today as in past eras.

**Asianness in Australia**

In *Big White Lie: Chinese Australians in White Australia*, Fitzgerald (2007) claims that Chinese Australians have been written out of Australia’s socio-political history, and thereby made irrelevant to the socio-political national story. Their omission is what Fitzgerald (2007: 12) refers to as the ‘Big White Lie’. Far from finding any basis for this racialised exclusion, Fitzgerald discovered instead a selective documentation of Australian history, that ignored Chinese contributions to society and their leadership. Biased historical accounts from whites were defended by cultural arguments that justified the exclusion of Chinese on the basis of their strange oriental traditions and incompatibility with the society (Fitzgerald, 2007). The
incompatibility of the Chinese national values with Australian values was explained by Fitzgerald (2007:viii) as unchanging and ‘slavish, dependent and hierarchical’ that clashed with the ‘individualistic, egalitarian and patriotic’ values of the white settlers. The Chinese continue to be made invisible through white Australian academics’ lack of research on the perspective of Chinese migrants. Fitzgerald (2007) claims that skewed histories are perpetuated through a lack of research interest in the Chinese experience. He found extensive documentation for this in extant archived literature on the social histories of Chinese Australians, which were rarely accessed by white scholars. It was clear that descendants of Chinese migrant played pivotal roles in commercial, social and governmental relations until the end of the Second World War. However, their significant contributions are not acknowledged or written into the white settler story (Fitzgerald, 2007).

According to Fitzgerald (2007), these past silences are perpetuated currently through the sustained disinterest on the part of white academics in moving beyond whiteness in their research. Rather than challenging whiteness, he claims they prefer to take up a white Australia position. This research whiteness is evident in the majority of studies adopting a focus on Australians’ attitudes to Chinese migrants, rather than understanding the experiences of white constraints and prejudices that limit the recognition of their contribution (Fitzgerald, 2007). Fitzgerald (2007) highlights everyday contemporary examples of how whites perpetuate the racial distinctions of whiteness, such as in referring to themselves as Australian, and to Chinese Australians as Chinese. These same distinctions are replicated by the Chinese Australians who refer to themselves as Chinese, and to whites as ‘Australians’. He claims there is ample evidence of the persistence of ideas of a White Australia if people just learn to see what is around them (Fitzgerald, 2007). In ‘The Curse of the Smile’, Ang (1996) refers to Australia’s contradictory relationship with neighbours in South Asia. On the one hand, Australia has a desire to link with Asia for economic benefit, but on the other it demonstrates ambivalence towards Asians as part of the national identity. The same contradiction is played out in this study in terms of accepting the Vietnamese as a refugee group, and yet excluding them from the national identity. Here I argue that despite Australia’s current self-conception as a multicultural and non-racist country, Australian society remains deeply structured by whiteness.

**Multiculturalism, whiteness and belonging**
Australian multiculturalism is a government policy, first introduced into the political lexicon in 1973 by Al Grasby’s reference paper, ‘A multicultural Society for the Future’ (Australian Government, 2015c). Its purpose was to integrate non English-speaking immigrants and other settler groups into a unified multicultural national identity (Pakulski and Markowski, 2014). Multiculturalism was supported by Prime Minister Fraser in the 1970s to include Asians and other non-European settlers as part of Australia’s immigrant population. The changed demographics forced a new imagining of a nation state comprised not only of these white populations, but also of Asians and Africans, as well as other racial groups and ethnicities.

Pakulski and Markowski (2014: 25) describe multiculturalism as cultural pluralism in projecting a national identity that is a composite ‘of many ethno-specific cultures, regional and generational subcultures’. Multiculturalism policy in Australia, according to Pakulski and Markowski (2014), was established out of liberalism’s creed of tolerance as a core approach to different ethnicities. The Australian version of multiculturalism projected a multi-ethnic population as economically advantageous to the nation, which in effect meant to the dominant white population. Specific clarifications of the benefits of new ethnic differences for white-managed corporations became part of the argument for why multiculturalism was good for business; termed productive diversity in the management literature (Cope and Kalantzis, 1997). The scholarship on competitive advantage for institutions and organisations became contested in the 1990s as a self-interested management discourse (Blackmore, 2006). Interestingly, although productive diversity was challenged as framed within managerial and market discourses, scholars did not critique this work within a critical whiteness framework that took into account the benefits to white collar workers, executives and shareholders.

Scholars from the critical race approach claim that multiculturalism avoids race in its conception, as it is driven by the political goal of inclusion. While many groups in Australia are identified as ethnic, others are primarily addressed by racial identifications, particularly as Asian or African. Other immigrant groups are identified by faith, especially the use of Muslim or Islamic identifiers for groups. The avoidance of race dialogue does not expunge racism, but it has successfully excluded racism from strategies linked to multicultural policy. The policy encourages the dominant population to view all minority groups as ethnic. Race and racism, by omission from the discourse, were cauterised and did not exist. Consequently,
anti-racism strategies were not implemented in tandem with multicultural policies. Scholars from this perspective, such as Hage (2000) and Bonilla-Silva (2003), claim that multicultural policies empower officers to deny racism and encourage colour-blindness behaviours. While multiculturalism publicly appears to fit within the ethos of egalitarianism, many notable scholars, whose life experience has been outside whiteness, provide a very different interpretation.

**A multicultural nation**

Australian scholar Jayasuriya (2004; 2003; 1990) argues that whiteness has survived the transition from white settlement to Australia as a multicultural nation. Australian multiculturalism is described by Jayasuriya (2003) as a settlement policy that expects settlers to gain citizenship and the provision of separate and specific organisations to assist with their integration. His position differs from that of Pakulski and Markowski (2014: 14), who present assimilationism and multiculturalism as ‘rivals’, presumably inferring that they are opposite in effect, in that multiculturalism allows ethnic identity, while assimilation hopes to expunge it. Assimilation refers to the progressive loss of ethnic identity and culture, and the uptake of the dominant white culture and identity. Others disagree, claiming that an assumption embedded in the policy of multiculturalism is the expectation that over time, groups would disappear as ethnically distinct, and a cohesion and conformity would arise through inter-group marriage and relationships. Some scholars refer to this model as the ‘melting pot’ (Jakubowicz, 2002; Jakubowicz, 2010). Kymlicka (1998) refers to multiculturalism as conditional, in that the societal benefits are conditional on settlers integrating, speaking English and following the cultural, legal and judicial structural rules. Similarly Canada in the 1970s introduced multiculturalism that was described as building a mosaic of different cultures although scholars disputed this analogy, claiming instead that while the government did not assimilate, the goal was integration that accommodated some cultural differentiation (Potter, 2010; Fleras 2011)

Jayasuriya (1990) claims that multiculturalism promotes an ethnic identity that he sees as problematic, because it essentialises ethnic groups. In this culturalist model, there is a privileged maintenance of the dominant culture and a celebration of ethnic cultures for the minorities. Implicit in this idea is that the dominant Anglo heritage signifies the homogeneous national culture, and the ethnic is the other. Other scholars suggest that dismantling identity groups is unrealisable as a political construct or through the cultural
identification with heritage, as identity groups are sites for activism, and ensure that migrants have access to rights (Snyder, 2012).

Nonetheless, despite the criticisms of multiculturalism, Jayasuriya agrees with the claims of successive governments that it has been a successful past policy model for managing diverse groups of people and the changed social composition of Australian society. His main point is that it has outlived its usefulness as a settlement, because it has remained fixed in the original form, and has not responded to the new social reality of a pluralist society (Jayasuriya, 2008). He believes that a central dilemma exists in reconciling ideas of difference with commonality of belonging, that this marks people as dominant or multicultural. Jayasuriya (2008) proposes a new conception of citizenship and identity that normalises pluralism as the way of being Australian.

**White nation fantasy**

Hage (2000: 18) proposes a metaphorical depiction of Australian dominant culture as one caught in the grip of a ‘white nation fantasy’. This idea, widely taken up by other scholars, refers to ‘a fantasy of a nation governed by White people, a fantasy of White supremacy’ (Hage, 2000: 18). Hage’s (2000) book *White Nation* is one of the most significant contributions to critiques of whiteness and multiculturalism in Australia. White fantasy as conceived by Hage (2000) is not only a subjective experience, but is reified through social structural advantage and reflected in the nationalist discourse on ‘home’ that suggests the privilege and comfort of the home base. Belonging for non-white immigrants under these circumstances is contrary and problematic. Thus in this nation, where multiculturalism is the public face, there is an underlying belief in people’s minds, that is constituted through peoples’ lived experiences, that Australia in essence is a white nation. Hage (2000) contrasts the conflicting views of Australians who experience multiculturalism as a threat to ‘dominant “Anglo” culture’ with academics like himself and Garland (2001), who view multiculturalism as just another way to reinforce white power (Hage, 2000: 20).

Hage (2000) distinguishes between two main types of belonging. The first is passive belonging, which is evident in a person fitting in, feeling at home and having expectations of access to the nation’s resources. The second type is governmental belonging, which refers to the belief that one has a legitimate right to contribute to management through expressing opinions or holding managerial attitudes on how governance should be conducted. However,
it does not refer to formal participation in government (Hage, 2000: 46). Government (or national) belonging is a kind of passive belonging available to the dominant group, which legitimises the expression of their views on whose home it is and who should feel at home (Hage, 2000: 46). Hage (2000) contends that a belief in one’s governmental belonging generates a belief in people’s agency and power to act on behalf of the nation.

Hage (2000) draws on Bourdieu’s (1977) ideas of cultural capital as accumulated ‘material and symbolic goods’ (Hage, 2000: 53). The common understanding that citizenship for new immigrants equals belonging to Australia is turned upside down by Hage (2000). He claims instead that citizenship papers are proof of national non-belonging to the dominant culture (Hage, 2000: 50-51). Formal citizenship status belonging does not give immigrants practical belonging, because this is granted by dominant communities who give higher priority to cultural heritage than legal status (Hage, 2000: 50).

Hage (2000) uses Bourdieu’s conception of disposition as acquired habits, attitudes and tastes to explain practical nationality as accumulated through dispositions that are valued social and physical attributes in whiteness. For instance, they include an Australian accent; white skin; European, British or Irish heritage; being Catholic or Protestant; as well as knowledge of white culture. Some characteristics are more highly ranked in importance, such as generations of family in one location, which endows unquestioned governmental belonging, particularly in rural Australia. Hage (2000) suggests that although blonde hair is a desirable attribute, a brown-haired person with an Australian accent has greater national belonging than a blonde-haired person with a European accent. Thus Hage (2000) claims that it is not just speaking English: national belonging means speaking English with an Australian accent. Hage (2000) proposes that symbolic and cultural capital play a central role in societal power relations, and constitute a form of practical national belonging. Through increased accumulation of national capital, one wins a higher position on the national belonging spectrum, as well as the power of cultural dominance (Hage, 2000).

Police officers have the power over, and give salience to, the management of the boundaries of national belonging. Hage (2000: 44) suggests that being an ‘Anglo’ police officer aligns the actor as ‘spatially empowered’. This is exhibited in how police manage smaller non-white categories within the national space. The relationship between police and racialised others is
based on the ‘physicalness of bodies’, revealed in managing the imagined national space (Hage, 2000: 44). Through such bodily mechanisms, Hage (2000) proposes that police actors absorb and embody these white nation fantasies, which are expressed by police actors as racism against non-white others. The white nationalist can take up with propriety a place as contributor to the national gaze through constant policing and governing of the nation (Hage, 2000: 46).

Hage’s insights and conceptions of different types of belonging are important for this study, because they expose the requirements for belonging and the hurdles imposed on non-white groups. Also important for the thesis is Hage’s (2000) analysis of the unnoticed white privileges in forms that exist as a spectrum of social, cultural and personal attributes that confer a governmental belonging.

**Whiteness in Policing**

Whiteness studies in the US, UK and Australia have infiltrated many disciplines, including history, education, media, sociology, psychology and Indigenous studies, but as yet they have not informed criminological critiques of policing. The majority of studies about policing minorities are explored from a critical race theory perspective, and virtually no studies at all of policing minorities have been approached from a critical whiteness perspective. All the same, many critical race studies explore processes of racism and other exclusions that are part of the package of mechanisms of subordination found in whiteness. Whiteness studies and its effects on policing practices have not been researched in policing studies. The relevant studies from critical criminology literature are drawn on to show how whiteness may be interrogated.

Here I refer to some of the critical criminology studies and critical race studies literature that interrogates aspects of whiteness, in particular studies conducted in the US, UK and Australia. Some scholarship derives from neoliberalism and the sanctity of the State, and others from policing and the justice system, as well as from post-colonial studies of oppressions against Indigenous people. In many of these studies, the focus is on racism and racist attitudes, as few empirical studies directly analyse whiteness. Of interest in these studies is the nature of the power relations that lead to privilege for white officers, and subordination of racialised or ethnic groups. Because of the lack of studies on Vietnamese
experiences of police, or even of South Asian groups in white countries, I draw on the insights and learnings from the wider literature on race and policing. From this I make some inferences about the implications for whiteness on relations between white police officers and racial or ethnic groups.

**Whiteness as racialisation of non-white groups by white police officers**

Here I examine one incident of violence in the UK which, through subsequent inquiries into what happened at the time, propelled race relations between white officers and black communities into the public arena. This act of violence against a black victim became a significant event in the history of policing racialised groups. The investigative accounts are generally sympathetic, and reflect a critical race theory approach although they are not necessarily framed in this way and include anti-racist recommendations. Within this literature, I look for signs of where whiteness was practised or could have been addressed, and how whiteness studies would diverge or converge with the main thrust of this critical race studies work. I have taken this approach because of the lack of whiteness literature in this field of policing minorities.

The act of violence I refer to occurred in London in 1993, when an 18-year-old black student, Stephen Lawrence, was viciously attacked and killed by a gang of white youths when waiting in a bus shelter with a friend (Holdaway, 2003). Following investigations, police apprehended two white teenagers: Neil Acourt and Luke Knight. Later, the Crown Prosecution Service dropped the murder charges and released the youths from custody, based on an evaluation of insufficient evidence to proceed. Lawrence’s parents launched an inquiry which was unsuccessful. Then in February 1997, following an inquest in which the jury’s verdict proclaimed that Lawrence was unlawfully killed, a public inquiry was led by Sir William Macpherson (Cashmore, 2001). The investigation six years later, led by Macpherson (1999), centred around the inadequacies in the police’s inquiries into the circumstances that led to Stephen Lawrence’s death (Murji, 2007). The inquiry into Lawrence’s death found that the police’s investigations were flawed through police incompetence, a lack of leadership from senior officers, and particularly by pernicious, institutional racism. The racism was evident in racist stereotyping and criminalising of young black men, whom the officers constructed as street criminals and drug dealers (McLaughlin and Murji, 1999). Macpherson criticised police officers’ denial of the impact of racialisation on what they saw and how they reached their conclusions about the murder of Lawrence. Police were reprimanded by
Macpherson for their lack of professionalism, and for officers’ concerted attempts to discredit the accounts by Lawrence’s family about the circumstances surrounding the death (McLaughlin and Murji, 1999).

The landmark report (Macpherson, 1999) resulting from the public inquiry became one of the most widely-cited reports in policing and criminology. Macpherson (1999) found that institutional racism was deeply embedded in the institution of policing in the UK, and that this resulted in the collective failure of the police organisation to provide an appropriate and professional service to racialised groups (Cashmore, 2001). The report’s conclusion ratified a new ‘fact’ in the public domain: that institutional racism existed within the Metropolitan Police Service (Murji, 2007). Not surprisingly, this was hotly disputed by the Commissioner at the time, and by members of the police force (Murji, 2007). Macpherson’s report asked why the ethnic or racial composition of the constabularies had not changed since Scarman’s (1981) report into the Brixton riots. An outcome of Scarman’s report a decade earlier was that it was a priority for police forces in the UK to recruit a diversity of officers into their constabularies, and to conduct race-relations training (Macpherson, 1999; Holdaway, 1996; Loveday, 2000).

The reports by Macpherson (1999) and Scarman (1981) continue to be widely cited in the criminology literature. The events that precipitated these reports became symbolic and practicable benchmarks for change, and they continue to influence policing policies and practices in black and ethnic communities in the UK. Macpherson assumed that changing the racial and ethnic composition of the constabularies would make them less racist and more adept in policing ethnic and racial minorities, an expectation that is situated in an anti-racism argument, but not in whiteness. Following the release of the Macpherson Report, a study by Cashmore (2001) addressed the question of whether non-white officers believed that increased recruitment of ethnic and coloured officers would reduce racism in the police force. The study, which was based on in-depth interviews with African Caribbean and South Asian officers in five British police services, found that respondents were polarised. Some expected positive changes, while others believed racist practices and prejudice by white officers were entrenched, unchangeable and a major impediment to the recruitment of non-white officers. Police officers were generally resistant to the recommendations for race training.
Although race and racism were identified in these and similar studies, they did not attempt to reveal or deconstruct how whiteness provides protection and advantage to white officers. Whiteness was not usually interrogated, and could not be seen in the way that it is in the following analysis by Judith Butler of the death of Rodney King.

**Racialisation of seeing**

In a similar contextual approach to the Lawrence death, in that race was a factor in investigations, Butler (1993) examines the case of Rodney King’s beating by police in Los Angeles in 1991 to expose racism and violence by police officers. Butler (1993) reviews the video footage of the event, where police were using batons to beat Rodney King, a black motorist intercepted by white police in Los Angeles. Butler (1993) develops the idea of the term ‘racialisation of seeing’, bringing the study into whiteness and out of the widely-used framework of racism and critical race theory used by the media and by other academics (Jacobs, 1996). Seemingly against all the evidence, including a video of the defenceless King surrounded by police and being beaten with batons, the jury judged that the police were vulnerable, and that the officers’ safety was endangered by King. The interpretation in the court was entirely incongruous with the events as captured on video, in which Butler (1993) noted a defenceless man being threatened and beaten by police officers. Butler (1993) draws on Ruth Gilmour’s description of the beating as seen in the video as ‘nation building’ in subordination of blacks. The seeing is whiteness seeing, which Butler (1993) claims is contestable, because subjectivity orders the seeing and produces a different reading for the white community. In this ‘seeing’, black bodies are viewed as dangerous, and as bodies which Frantz Fanon (2012) claims carry sexual threats. Butler (1993) links this point to the police officers’ testimonies, which over-emphasised references to his ass. Racial schemas are used in socio-psychological literature to explain the mechanism of visual racialisation, schemas being cognitive frameworks for interpreting and organising information through categories. Once established, it is suggested that such racial schemas continue to generate stereotypes, because it is difficult to interpret new information that does not conform to established mental schemas (Cherry, 2015).

Butler’s original and insightful analysis of Rodney King asserts not only that the police were being racist, but that the jury and police saw events through the lens of whiteness, and confidently suggested that in this segment of video footage, they were defending themselves. In this moment, Butler interprets others as seeing the events as participants within a
whiteness system. Butler (1993) concluded that the white police had internalised their role in order to protect whiteness from these racialised dangers. The white officers presented the evidence to a jury, who already knew how to see and enact hegemony in the visual field (Butler, 1993). Butler’s ideas on the police seeing crime through the screen of whiteness that blinded them will be brought again later to the analysis of the different perceptions of white police officers and Vietnamese Australian community members.

**Whiteness as racialisation of non-white police by white police officers**

Studies of non-white police officers in the US are almost exclusively about African-American police officers. Most studies investigate trends in the numbers of black officers, and the prejudices and biases that marked their experiences as officers in US police forces in various states (Weitzer, 2000; Reaves, 1991; Dodge and Pogrebin, 2001). More recent literature has taken up similar studies with Hispanic Americans and a handful of studies of Asian officers (Irlbeck, 2008; Holdaway, 1997; Sutton et al., 2006). The first studies of black police were historical, one example being Reaves’ (1991) ‘Black Cops’, in which he notes the omissions in white policing literature on the contributions of black police. Some studies are autobiographical accounts by black officers, including Runnels (1989). Other studies are experiential investigations of entrenched bias in police culture and promotion systems (Bolton and Feagin, 2004; Walker, 1985; Chan, 1997). These studies make visible the exclusions suffered by black officers in everyday policing, which often led to disillusionment and early departure from the force (Teahan, 1975; Buzawa 1981). Black officers were exposed to racist and stigmatising behaviours from white officers, as well as reduced access to policing roles and promotion. Black women officers were doubly jeopardised through intersecting gendered and racial systems of exclusion (Martin, 1994; Chigwada, 1991; Townsey, 1982).

The study ‘Black in Blue: A Study of the Negro Policeman’ by Nicholas Alex (1969) was significant, as it is one of the few ethnographic sociological studies of the experiences of black officers in American police forces. The study, conducted in the 1960s, was based on extensive longitudinal dialogue with black officers from the New York Department of Police. Alex (1969) found that the police culture stigmatised and racialised black police officers, and they were undermined by a white police culture that regarded them with aggression and suspicion. White police tested black officers by giving them the most dangerous work, and placing them in undercover roles to spy on extremist black groups associated with the race riots. Black officers believed their loyalty was being tested by white officers’ expectations,
because it was expected that black officers would deal aggressively and harshly when policing black suspects or offenders. Alex (1969) found that these tensions placed black officers in the invidious position of being pressured to choose between loyalty to the white officers or to their black brothers: a choice of loyalty to one and betrayal of the other. Alex (1969) described this as a no-win situation for black officers, and concluded that many black officers believed that in joining a white police force, they had forfeited much of their credibility as blacks.

Alex (1969) summed up their position as black officers as being doubly marginalised: within the police force because of their racial identity, and by their communities because of their occupational role. Alex (1969) found irony in the rejections that many black officers felt from their communities when their motivations to join the force had been the ideal of providing protection for black community members from police violence. This was particularly poignant, since Alex (1976) found that the black police he interviewed were ‘extremely competent professionals who used police work as one of the few channels available to them for social mobility’ (Alex, 1976). Although Alex did not use the term ‘whiteness’, because this research pre-dated the emergence of whiteness as a sociological field of study, he nonetheless gave many insights into whiteness. Importantly, he explained how whiteness manipulated black officers into supporting the exclusions implemented by white officers, but did not allow black officers to access white privileges within the force.

Alex’s (1969) study was criticised by criminologists, because it did not include the views of white officers. My study acknowledges that white officers’ power, authority and attitudes in relation to the Vietnamese minority officers has to be examined. To capture the view of white officers, Alex (1976) completed a follow-up study, albeit after a gap of 10 years, in which he interviewed white officers in the departments of police in Los Angeles and New York. His study found that white police were resistant to working with black or Puerto Rican officers. They blamed the black or Puerto Rican officers for a decline in standards in policing. In Los Angeles, white officers said the changes to the dental, visual and height-weight requirements were evidence of the erosion of previous standards, and implied that these changes were to recruit people who lacked the normative attributes. Similarly in the New York Department of Police, officers claimed that the height requirement had been deliberately lowered to recruit shorter Puerto Ricans (Alex, 1976).
Alex’s (1976) interpretation was that white police officers saw themselves as members of a beleaguered minority group, and that they presented themselves as being victimised and betrayed by the department, the public, co-workers, the press and the courts. Alex (1976) used the white police officer as ‘victim’ to explain their resentments, defensive behaviours and unwillingness to take risks. He concluded that hostility from white police against blacks and Peurto Ricans went far deeper than superficial rivalry, and suggested that the non-white recruits threatened not only their established claims on a job, but their social mobility (Alex, 1976). He interpreted the motivations behind the behaviours of white officers as mechanisms to keep black officers in subordinate positions within the police agency. This conclusion is entirely consistent with whiteness as a mechanism to maintain privilege.

Alex’s (1969) ethnographic qualitative study stood apart from the predominantly quantitative criminological literature. His approach was not focussed narrowly on variables, and consequently the authenticity of his conclusions was questioned by positivist policing academics. Other criminologists refuted his 1976 insights on the basis of the small sample size (42 white officers) and lack of attention to what was claimed to be prolific available objective empirical data on police conditions (Reppetto, 1978). Bolton (2003) critiques Alex’s studies as being largely descriptive or exploratory rather than theoretically driven. It could be claimed that these criticisms demonstrate that academics generate studies within whiteness that are open to analysis of racist behaviours, but not to the subtle systems of white advantage and privilege operating behind the scenes in everyday policing.

**Institutional structures of exclusion**

Studies of systemic institutional racism expose the ways in which strategies of exclusion brought direct benefits to whiteness. A sociological study by Bolton (2003), based on 50 in-depth interviews with black officers, explored their experiences of policing in 16 different police agencies in the US. Bolton (2003) found that black officers experienced hostile work environments through multiple racisms, including racial jokes, name-calling, slurs and harassment. White officers treated them as subordinates and as incompetent, and retaliated if black officers did not comply with their demands. The effects were accumulative in demoralising the officers and reinforced their outsider status.
Bolton (2003) concludes that organisational racism limited the advancement of black officers and the number of years they spent in the job. He interprets the behaviour of white officers as mechanisms to keep black officers in subordinate positions within the police agency. The attitudinal and institutional aspects of racism, he claims, affected other systemic aspects of policing including training, evaluation and codes of conduct (Bolton, 2003). Bolton’s (2003) view is that persistent racism explained the disproportionate number of white officers in senior ranks in the police agencies. It was concluded that while African-Americans may have gained entrance, they had not gained not full acceptance in the police forces (Bolton and Feagin, 2004).

These same patterns of discrimination were replicated in the UK in a British study by Nigel Fielding (1999): *Policing's Dark Secret: The Career Paths of Ethnic Minority Officers*. Again the study shows that there were limited prospects for the recruitment and advancement of ethnic minority officers in British police forces. Holdaway and Barron (1997) found that virtually all black and Asian officers in their UK study who had resigned from policing did so because of their experiences of prejudice and racism. Ultimately, the decision by non-white officers to resign hinged on the sheer indifference and lack of action by senior police, which was interpreted as senior police and administration condoning a racist occupational culture. Bland et al. (1999) conducted a quantitative criminological study, in which they found that for the particular cohort in their study, it took five months for Asian officers to be promoted, and a further 18 months for black officers to reach the level of their white colleagues. Later research in the UK shows the persistence of discrimination, which stifled the progression of non-white police officers into the upper ranks, and demonstrated that when they were promoted, their performance was judged more harshly (Perry and John-Baptiste, 2008; Cooper and Ingram, 2004; Holdaway and Barron, 1997; Holdaway, 1996).

In the US, UK and Australia, studies have shown how the occupational culture in police forces mediates relations between white officers and non-white officers through reinforcing racial categories and stereotypes that have become normalised in routine police work (Phillips and Webster 2013; Loftus, 2008; Mulcahy, 1998; Chan, 1997). Despite training initiatives in community and race relations, white occupational culture is shown to be resistant to change, with white police officers claiming race relations are irrelevant to police work (Crank and Crank, 2014).
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Holdaway (1996) concludes that non-white officers were seen first as black or Asian, and then as police officers, and that their racial status prevented full up-take of their professional status. A paradox is that black officers were actively recruited into white police, but their acceptance was conditional on denial of their colour (Cooper and Ingram, 2004). A representative of the National Black Police Association claimed that any apparent acceptance by white police of their black colleagues was superficial: ‘We know that if we take off our uniforms, whites would treat us the same way as they do other blacks in Anacostia’ (Williams, 1988). Perry and John-Baptiste (2008: 6) sum this up as ‘race-ing’ of police, which they claim is a normative behaviour in the UK police constabularies.

**Whiteness as police forces reinforcing state powers**

White police officers’ responses to the race riots in the US from 1965 to 1967 revealed that police used violence and brutality in dealing with black political protesters. Criminology scholars found that white police officers were involved in right-wing organisations, and were participants in vigilante attacks on black activists (Sklansky, 2006). Subsequent to the riots, police behaviour in the policing of black Americans was investigated by police review boards. Studies and the media demonstrated that vengeance and lack of organisational control by police had fuelled what some people re-interpreted as a riot by white police. Although these studies were framed within critical race theory, they enable insights into whiteness as they demonstrated the use of police powers in the race riots to oppress black people (Hawkins and Thomas, 1991; Bergesen, 1982). African-Americans were clear that it was a mechanism of white oppression, and that the policing institutions were major contributors to the political and social oppression of black people (Alex, 1976).

**Reinforcing state powers through policing drugs**

The ‘war on drugs’ has been implicated as a key driver in the increased proportion of poorer, non-white offenders in incarceration (Lynch, 2012; Provine, 2011; Alexander, 2010). More blacks than whites are imprisoned for drug offences, which according to critical white or race studies, results from the use of discretionary powers by police, and from the acceptance of policing practices, policies and laws (Lynch, 2012). It is suggested that the ‘war on drugs’ and the punitive policies used to police drug trading aim primarily to reduce the risk posed to whiteness from urban minority underclasses (Lynch, 2012). The exercise of punishment through arrest and incarceration deny and override more morally-derived strategies that aim
for reform (Wacquant, 2009). From this perspective, harsh drug laws are understood as tools of exclusion used to further marginalise inner-city and poorer communities.

Garland (1996) suggests that the ‘war on drugs’ is a manipulative move that feeds into public insecurities, and thus inflates the nation state’s power. The historical nexus between power, the sovereign state and crime management is traced back to a relationship of mutual convenience that formed in the mid-19th century (Garland, 1996). A key premise is that severe punishments have been used by nation states to demonstrate their power: ‘Punishment is an act of sovereign might, a performative action which exemplifies what absolute power is all about’ (Garland, 1996: 461).

The use of punitive regimes of control in policing drugs has been a trend in the US, UK, Canada and Australia. The control mechanisms operate in tandem to reinforce stereotypes and archetypes of racialised offenders (Garland, 1996). Any impression that the ‘war against crime’ could be won has been downplayed since the 1980s, when it became evident that winning was unrealisable. High drug crime rates became a normalised and enduring feature of postmodern societies (Garland, 1996: 448). In the US, UK and Australia, policing behaviours in relation to drugs can be viewed as directly related to national and state drug laws. The ultimate effects of these laws and practices are most harshly experienced by people of colour, and by Indigenous peoples. In a similar vein to Garland (2001), Lynch (2012) sees punitive drug policy discussions as a response of whiteness to the security risks posed by urban underclasses. Through projecting white anxieties onto disempowered people at the bottom of the drug-trading hierarchy, an allusion of containment is created of a problem that is wicked and irrevocable. From this point of view, the punitive expanded criminal justice system is viewed as a form of social control that victimises the already powerless, and further excludes these groups from society. The policing of drug markets victimises dealers at the bottom of the drug-trading hierarchy, and mostly leaves free the global drug entrepreneurs (Dwyer and Moore, 2010). This is pertinent to my study, in which parallel relations of police powers were played out between the dispossessed lower-level dealers and higher-level drug entrepreneurs who were out of sight or beyond the scope of the local police.

**Surveillance and arrests**

Studies in the US and UK show a disproportionate use of police surveillance, ‘stop and search’, and driving checks for coloured or ethnic minorities (Bowling and Phillips, 2007:
Bowling, 1993). When non-white communities experience discrimination through their people being over-exposed to stop and search practices by police, it is felt as disempowerment and humiliation (Office of Public Integrity, 2012; Bowling and Weber, 2011). Ethnic and racial communities consistently claim that they experience bias and a lack of procedural justice from police forces (Weitzer and Tuch, 2005). In New York, the police department’s own research shows that white neighbourhoods have more positive opinions of the police than do black or Latino neighbourhoods (The Economist, 2015). Police conduct their own neighbourhood surveys about confidence in police and often use these to defend their impartiality in policing groups and dispute criminologists’ critiques of racial profiling. Racial profiling refers to the practice of stopping people more from a particular ethnic or racial group more often than the background population (Bowling and Weber, 2011). Minority community members’ lack of power reinforces the status quo, as most people believe they do not have the power to prevent discrimination by police, whether they are a colleague, victim, suspect or witness (Bowling and Weber, 2011).

A study of 50 Vietnamese Australians experiences of racism found a lack of procedural justice and harassment to be typical of their experiences (Mellor, 2004). The study found that Vietnamese Australians experienced racism within the systems and institutions and through verbal and behavioural racism in public arenas. Some participants raised issues of harassment from police and discrimination that was a result of stereotypes officers held of Vietnamese people as drug dealers (Mellor, 2004). In Australia, a Parliamentary Discussion Paper (1995), titled Asian Organised Crime in Australia, purportedly presented an overview of Asian crime, and in particular Vietnamese crime at the time. In the Vietnamese communities, the report caused ongoing furor, because it was perceived as reinforcing negative stereotypes of Asians as criminals in Australia (Ngo, 2010). For all the focus in this paper on Asian criminality, it concluded that Vietnamese syndicates were responsible for ‘only a small amount - perhaps five percent - of the total heroin importation into Australia in recent years’ (Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1995: 5.5). Importantly, the authors of the parliamentary paper note a pattern by police of experiencing each new settler group as problematic. The committee attributes the heightened interest in new ethnic groups as often not a result of abnormally high criminal activity, but more from an increased police ‘operational and intelligence focus’ (Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1995: 5.19). The Queensland Police Service was also criticised around this time, because police officers cast
particular NESB (Non-English Speaking Background) youth as delinquent, and NESB adults as being associated with organised crime (Themal, 1993).

UK studies found that although police officers’ opinions varied on the level of racism in the constabularies, and whether it is more prevalent in the force than in wider society; however, the existence of racism was not questioned (Phillips, 2011; Stone and Tuffin, 2000). Counter-terrorism legislation introduced in the US, UK, Canada and Australia has fuelled racial profiling practices by police forces (Pickering et al., 2008). Based on an evaluation of ‘stop and search’ practices in London, Parma (2011) contends that implementation of counter-terrorism legislation introduced in the year 2000 legitimised unfair policing and the criminalisation of ethnic and faith-based communities. Garland et al. (2007) draws the same conclusions after examining the 2002–03 statistics released by the Home Office of ‘stops and searches’ conducted under counter-terrorism legislation. The data shows that over one year, police ‘stops and searches’ increased by 302 per cent for “Asians”, 230 per cent for “blacks” and 118 per cent for “whites” (Garland and Chakraborti, 2007: 425). In the UK, Asian is used to refer to people from central Asia, including Turkey, Pakistan, Iraq and South Asia. In Australia Asian is used to refer to people from South or East Asia but not people from Turkey, Pakistan or Iraq, the latter groups being grouped as the Middle East and of Islamic traditions. Muslim leaders claim that police operations demonstrate institutional racism targeting people of their faith (Chakraborti, 2007).

In the US, Canada, UK and Australia, studies show a reproduction of state inequalities in higher incidences of racial and ethnic minorities amongst people in prison (Wacquant, 2012; Brewer and Heitzeg, 2008). A key debate related to the incarceration data is whether the over-representation of minorities results from racial profiling or from higher rates of offending. In Australia, Bartels (2011) found higher offending rates for ethnic minorities not born in Australia than for Australian-born citizens, with the highest rates being among Vietnamese, Lebanese, New Zealanders, Turks and Romanians. Vietnamese-born prisoners are the second-highest migrant group (after New Zealand) in prisons, and when compared to total Vietnam-born population size, Vietnamese migrants have the third-highest imprisonment rate, with Sudanese and then Somalis being the first- and second-highest groups proportionally (ABS, 2014). Bartels (2011) warned against making direct correlations between ethnicity and offending rates, claiming that socio-demographic and social
disadvantage are more important factors than ethnicity. Other effects on analysis of crime and ethnicity derive from the lack of data on the cultural backgrounds of victims or perpetrators. For instance in the Victoria Police, ethnic data is not recorded unless the person is not an Australian national. Adding to this, scholars claim a general unreliability of some police data due to police recording processes (Bartels, 2011).

**White officers as violent and employing terror against non-white others**

bell hooks (1992: 177) describes white terror as the association of ‘whiteness with terror in the black imagination’. hooks (1992: 175) vividly describes her childhood memories of experiencing terror when she walked from her black segregated community into a white neighbourhood: ‘We would have to pass that terrifying whiteness – those white faces on the porches staring us down with hate’. In expounding the fear of the ‘oppositional gaze’, hooks (1992: 115) captures the trauma of black enslaved people who were denied the right to look at the white slave-owners. She found in her own experiences of childhood a terror of the gaze when looking at white authorities; direct eye contact was interpreted by whites as confrontational. Based on reading Foucault, hooks (1992) found that similar mechanisms of control and oppression are reproduced temporally and spatially in different contexts.

Scholars agree that still today, whiteness can be experienced as terror by people of colour (Roediger, 2000; Gilroy, 2000). Terror may be evoked through associations of current behaviours by authorities with past regimes of terror. Recent terrors in the US include police shootings of African-Americans that have mobilised large anti-racism demonstrations (Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 2015; Johnson, 2015; Williams, 2014). In the first six months of 2015, there were 547 deaths that were a result of law enforcement, and blacks were killed at more than twice the rate of white and Hispanic or Latino people (Laughland et al., 2015). Government campaigns against terrorism are new forms of terrifying groups. Muslim women, for instance, are reported to fear going out to do everyday normal activities such as shopping, and children fear being ostracised at school (Twine and Gallagher, 2008; Spalek, 2011).

At a recent concert in Melbourne (Friday 17 July 2015), the renowned African-American a cappella group ‘Sweet Honey in the Rock’ included in their song repertories a spoken reflection on the renewed necessity to teach their children about submission to police officers.
For their children’s safety, they must teach them not to look a white police officer in the eyes, but rather to look down; to speak slowly and not make any sudden movements; and, if they are driving, not to quickly take their hands off the wheel. The terror for these women in 2015 is that their children could be inadvertently shot by white officers. In 2014, the killing by a white policeman of Eric Garner, an unarmed African-American, and the subsequent decision of the jury that the police officer was not guilty of murder, caused thousands of New Yorkers to protest in a street demonstration (The Economist 2015). These are real threats of terror, validated by police shootings of black citizens in the US, and the over-representation of African-Americans as offenders and in prisons (Mauer, 1999; Weitzer, 2002).
Undoing whiteness

The literature on how to undo whiteness falls into two main groups. Either, scholars who contend that whiteness can be reinvented, re-articulated or reformed, or, scholars who only support the abolition of whiteness. Much of the scholarship on reinventing whiteness focuses on reforming white actors so that they can acknowledge and recognise their contribution to the reproduction of whiteness (Rodriquez, 1998). The pragmatic solutions in this approach include re-thinking accepted historicisms, and critically evaluating the operations of power that produce beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. Rodriguez’s (1998) ideas were formulated within educational contexts, and consequently have a focus on self-awareness for students in how they were ‘doing whiteness’. This approach suggests that it is possible to reconstruct new modes of being white amidst the current societal norms and ideologies. Scholars such as Rodriguez (1998) thus suggest that change will ensue from white actors gaining new awareness and skills to see and unpack the normalised, and consequently unseeable, aspects of whiteness, and from being able to critically evaluate how whiteness benefits from the racialising of others.

Some scholars consider anti-racism to be a key strategy in addressing whiteness. While anti-racism strategies address racialising processes, because they derive from a focus on critical racism and racial structures, they consequently do not interrogate the historical power relations and mechanisms that reproduce whiteness. Anti-racist discourse focuses on what Ganley (2006) refers to as the other side of the equation: ‘the oppressed, marginalised or excluded’. Ignatiev (1997b) argues that anti-racist work concentrates too much on the groups and individuals who exhibit racist behaviours, but does not address the ways in which the state reinforces racial oppressions. The persistence of colonial policing approaches into post-colonial settings in Australia is one aspect of the persistence of white mechanisms (Trigger, 1992; Cunneen 2001; Cole 1999). Thus many scholars find any reforms to whiteness as unconvincing, and disagree that reform of whiteness is impossible because of its manipulative tendencies and its connivance. Kincheloe and Steinberg (1998: 17) add a salutary warning to re-thinking whiteness: because it is ‘an ideological construction based on power and privilege, it cannot simply be conflated with white people’, as it co-constructs white and non-white consciousness and subjectivities.
In contrast to arguments for the reform of whiteness, abolitionists claim that whiteness cannot be reformed, but must be abolished in societies (Ware and Back, 2002; Gilroy, 2000; Wiegman, 1999). Ignatiev (1997b; Roediger, 1994) suggests that abolitionism is in fact a separate field of study, and not part of US white studies, and also that abolitionism is a strategy against class war and neo-liberalism. Abolitionists work within the big picture, and are less forthcoming on the pragmatics of the abolitionist project. Dyer (2013b: 4) suggests that the politics of whiteness should be dislodged through ‘the project of making whiteness strange’. Rodriguez (1998) argues that whiteness cannot be dismantled and erased, because of its alignment with power. A challenge for scholars is how to expose and dismantle the nexus between whiteness and power, and societal structures. Ignatiev (1997b), in writing for the journal Race Traitor, takes a defensive position in challenging any (white) scholar to provide positive aspects of whiteness. This rhetorical question is inflammatory of course, in that whiteness as privilege is a flawed morality. The absence of a possible response is used by Ignatiev (1997b) to confirm his position that whiteness is oppressive and false, and must therefore be abolished. He may not have asked the most crucial question.

A general conundrum for white scholarship on whiteness studies is whether it will be complicit in enacting another form of domination, because white scholars are captive to knowledge frameworks that have structured their academic experiences (Haggis, 2004; Levine-Rasky, 2002). Thus a dilemma for white scholars is expressed in the question: Will the scholarship produce critiques of whiteness that will subvert the researcher’s own privileged position as the white scholar? (Wiegman, 1999)

Bhabha (1994) suggests that attempts to dismantle whiteness may only lead to the emergence of new forms of hegemonic whiteness. Scholars who dissent from the abolitionists claim that their charter to theoretically, politically and societally banish whiteness is not possible, because it is deeply ingrained and lodged at all levels. Attempts at banishment, it is suggested, will result in re-centring whiteness and accompanying privilege (Warren, 2001; Moon and Flores, 2000). These arguments are similar to those used by the abolitionists to disclaim the possibility of reform and reinvention; that is: they will fail because of the conniving capacity of whiteness mechanisms to adapt. Warren (2001) also questions whether it is realistic to expect that people will resist the benefits of privilege, and suggests that reforms based on such mechanisms will have questionable success. Writing from a feminist
sociological perspective, Jackman (1996: 67) adds strength to this argument with a generalised warning of what she calls a ‘compendium of contrivances’, which dominant social groups employ in many contexts to maintain their dominance over subordinate groups. The repertoire includes symbolic ideological messages from the dominant group to other group members to covertly maintain inequities and protect the stability of expropriated assets. At the same time, the dominant ideology enlists the support of subordinate groups to maintain their privilege (Jackman, 1996). hooks (1992) found reform of her white tertiary students challenging, as they could not see themselves through the eyes of the other. They were bounded by a shared subjectivity that supported their ‘belief in whiteness as the “privileged signifier”’, and demonstrated an inability to ‘inhabit other gazes or recognise hegemonic discourses’ (hooks, 1992: 176).

I find that the arguments for reform and abolition are to some degree formed around ideas of agency and structure and believe that change projects should address both. Anticipated change in individuals’ awareness will falter if the entrenched historical stories, power relations and beneficiaries are not constantly challenged. The abolitionist argument seems utopian, with key scholars redirecting the argument to class wars and Marxist solutions, while the reform argument seems limited in its hope that whiteness will rearticulate to reduce its privilege. Pitching these as oppositional stances in themselves seems problematic, and derives too much from the inward-looking debates within whiteness scholarship. In the Australian context, Haggis takes up Moreton-Robinson’s emphasis on whiteness as property, claiming that whiteness must confront and reform its continuing appropriation of Indigenous country, negotiate a treaty with First Australians, and implement a new vision based on ‘togetherness in difference’ (Haggis 2004 p.8). Haggis (2004) does not take an either/or ‘reform or abolish’ argument, but one more based on the real giving back of stolen rights and properties. Australian scholars, including Hage (2000), Moreton-Robinson (2006a) and Haggis (2004), call for deconstructing of the white subject into the black. This is consistent with the abolition of whiteness project.

**My research question**

This chapter has established that Australian society remains deeply structured by whiteness in social, political and economic spheres. This manuscript focuses on one aspect of whiteness in examining the policing of Vietnamese Australians by a force, mainly constituted of white
officers and that is historically and currently embedded in whiteness. The criminological literature suggests that policing racial, ethnic and Muslim faith communities in white societies remains a point of tension between white and non-white. Establishing these contentions provides the starting point from which to answer my research question: How is whiteness reinforced, maintained or reinvented in policing a Vietnamese minority, and how does this contribute to white race privilege/advantage?
Chapter 4  Research methods

The overall argument presented in this chapter is that critical whiteness methodology provides a framework and goals from which whiteness can be explored in an empirical study. The methodology of critical whiteness seeks to understand what processes reaffirm whiteness, and how they are deployed in response to changed circumstances. The study draws on primary data collected for a four-year Australian Research Council (ARC) linkage study. Whiteness is examined in the relationship between a large policing organisation, Victoria Police and the Vietnamese communities in three Police Service Areas (PSAs). To gain insights into the configurations of whiteness, policing is examined organisationally as a local force, and as individuals police officers ‘on the beat’. Whiteness is also examined inside the force in the relations between white and Vietnamese officers, as described by white officers. I explore these wide-angled views through interviews that combined openness with the process of ‘drilling down’ to build nuance and depth. Focus groups and interviews with social justice workers from the Vietnamese Australian communities examine how members of the Vietnamese communities experience white police.

The chapter first explores the key ideas of critical whiteness methodology and then explains the specific methods selected for the study that will provide the depth and scope of multiple perspectives to respond to the overarching research question for the study. This qualitative study addresses the research question: How is whiteness reinforced, maintained or reinvented in policing a Vietnamese minority and how does this contribute to white race privilege/advantage?

A perspectival methodology

The study incorporates four perspectives on relations between police and Vietnamese Australians. First, is the local police force’s perspective on their relations with their
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Vietnamese communities. Second, is the individual police officer’s perspective on their relations with members of the Vietnamese communities. Third, is the individual police officer’s perspective on the relations with Vietnamese officers in the workplace. Fourth is the perspective of the Vietnamese community member’s on police officers’ relations with their communities. The fifth perspective of Vietnamese Australian police officers, unfortunately could not be included in the study and is a recognised gap in the data. The reason for the omission is because it would have been unethical to include the views of the very small numbers of officers (<10) in Victoria Police. Anonymity could not be guaranteed and their views could compromise their work position. The four different perspectives included build complexity in revealing different aspects of relations between police in the three PSAs in the study and their local Vietnamese Australian communities.

Multiple perspectives tap into de-centred knowledges, and assist researchers to bypass grand narratives. Other scholars, such as Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000), suggest that critical theorists should be flexible and creative in their approach, in order to uncover assumptions and detect underlying subjectivities. This was pertinent for this study based on whiteness, where the respondents mostly remain unaware of whiteness and do not consciously self-report its presence or influence. Many of the tools that scholars suggest assist in the development of the ability to see from different perspectives were incorporated into the analysis. These include the use of contrast, metaphor, disruption of categories and seeing the ‘familiar phenomenon as strange’ (Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2000: 184).

In the following sections, I outline the key frames of this qualitative study’s methodology: its epistemology and methodological paradigms. Then I describe the methods of sampling, recruitment, confidentiality and data analysis, followed by reflection on the methodological limitations. I conclude with a discussion of my influence on the study as a white researcher: on this analysis of whiteness in policing the Vietnamese Australians.

**Critical whiteness methodology**

A critical whiteness methodological approach provides the research framework for the study. It seeks to understand how whiteness operates in the specific context of policing an ethnic minority group in Melbourne. Critical whiteness theory is still a relatively new and emerging methodology; some scholarship refers to it as ‘critical whiteness pedagogy’ (Yeung 2013). It
aims to deconstruct and transform whiteness and to address white privilege. For this reason, Levine Rasky (2013) describes the approach as irrevocably partisan and social justice-oriented, as are all critical theory methodologies. A primary purpose entwined within the whiteness methodology is that whiteness needs to be revealed and identified, and white privilege addressed. Unlike critical race methodologies, critical whiteness methodologies focus attention on the white subject rather than on the outsider group: the ethnic or racially-identified group.

A significant problem in critical whiteness methodology is whether it is a process of awareness-raising to increase understanding of white advantage, or a transformative approach intended to change white people, redistribute resources and redress systemic advantage, or—as claimed by the more utopian abolitionists—of abandoning whiteness altogether. Critical whiteness theory aims to critique racial hegemony and its reproduction through oppressive systems, and should not direct its focus onto white bodies (Levine-Rasky, 2010). Whiteness scholars in education have confronted these issues directly in their attempts to implement whiteness change-oriented programs for white students. These programs have invariably been met with a mix of resistance and anguish from students (Carroll, 2014; Nichols, 2010; hooks, 1992). Some whiteness scholarship suggests that critical whiteness theory should not concern itself with the reform of white people, but rather it should examine the reproduction of the ideology of whiteness and its capacity to maintain whiteness as normative (Frankenberg, 1996). Not surprisingly, some scholarship, particularly from non-white scholars, questions whether whiteness can do anything but defend itself within academia through new and devious means. Aileen Moreton Robinson (2005) theorises the dislocation between the materiality and the political discourse of whiteness, as the absence in Australia of a political discourse about the benefits and privileges passed down from white colonisers, particularly in relation to property.

The research methods incorporate four key premises of critical whiteness theory, which enable empirical whiteness researchers to explore the systems and mechanisms of whiteness. The first premise is that empirical whiteness studies should make links to historical and social constructs (Levine-Rasky, 2013). The second is that they should give attention to the materiality of whiteness, and its power to control the distribution of resources and maintain intergenerational wealth (Nichols, 2010; Lipsitz, 1998). The third relates to the need to
explain the processes that reproduce ‘racialised subjects including whites’ (Levine-Rasky, 2010: 274). The fourth is an evaluation by the research as to whether whiteness could be reworked and reinvented. These premises are incorporated into the research approach in this study.

The Sample

The white police officer sample

Purposeful sampling was used to select 54 police officer interviewees. This method of sampling is defined as:

Purposeful sampling means that researchers intentionally select participants who have experience with the central phenomenon or the key concept being explored (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2007: 112).

Police officers were recruited from the three Police Service Areas (PSAs) where higher numbers of Vietnamese Australians lived: PSA Yarra NW Metro Region, PSA Maribyrnong NW Metro Region and PSA Greater Dandenong SE Metro Region (See Table 1). This in-depth inquiry involved the selection of a relatively small sample of ‘information-rich’ participants. This latter term has been used by Patton (2005) to refer to participants who will provide insights and elucidation on the central concerns in the inquiry. Purposeful sampling of key participants is based on the belief that in-depth knowledge from a small data-rich source will be more illuminating to the study than generalisations from broad-based and more specific data (Patton, 2005). The study used ‘maximum variation sampling’, defined as follows:

Sampling in which individuals are chosen who hold different perspectives on the central phenomenon. The criteria for maximising differences depends on the study, but it might be race, gender, level of schooling, or any number of factors that would differentiate participants (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2007: 112).

The number of interviewees requested was 20 per PSA. Interviewees were selected by the Inspector of each PSA, and were told by their superiors that they would be participating in the study. Inspectors selected the candidates based on the criteria I provided, which stipulated that they should have experience policing Vietnamese-Australians, or general experience in
policing ethnic minorities. Inspectors advised the research team that an additional 10 interviewees would be targeted in each PSA, as officers may be unavailable at short notice due to urgent duties, workloads, shift work, special operations or transfers. This prediction was accurate, with 54 out of a total of 85 selected officers being available to be interviewed. Of these, I interviewed 36 police officers and a co-researcher interviewed a further 18. All except two officers gave permission for their interviews to be recorded. The recordings were transcribed by me, another researcher and a professional transcription agency. All transcribed documents were given numerical identification numbers, and any information that could identify the interviewee was removed from the transcripts. Because police officers are usually in the role of interviewer with suspects or offenders, they sometimes appeared uncomfortable with the role reversal and mildly suspicious of the research process. All the same, only three refused to be interviewed, and interviewees usually responded to the clear process and to the direction of questioning. The major of police interviewed were surprisingly ready to engage in dialogue.

Diversity was sought in the group of officers to be interviewed. This included gender; rank (senior sergeant, sergeant, senior constables, constables); general duties or specialist roles Multicultural Liaison Officers and Youth Resource Officers (MLOs & YROs); and officers from specialist units including the Criminal Investigation Unit (CIU), Traffic Management Unit (TMU), Crime Desk, Sexual Offences and Child Abuse Unit (SOCAU) (See Table 1 for number of specialist officers/PSA). Interviews with sworn (uniformed) police officers were conducted face-to-face at Victoria Police premises, either at the local police station or in the specialist unit. The choice of venue was made by the local police inspectors in each PSA, and was usually at the officer’s workplace, in order to minimise disruption to their policing schedule.

### Table 1. White police officer interviewees by PSA and role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Total interviewees</th>
<th>Senior sergeant</th>
<th>Sergeant</th>
<th>Senior constable, constable</th>
<th>Specialist Units</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yarra</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>TMU = 1</td>
<td>F=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CD = 1</td>
<td>M=17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YO=2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribyrnong</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SOCAU = 3</td>
<td>F=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIU=1</td>
<td>M=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLO=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YO=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of officers selected from each PSA reflected the size of the local police force.

Legend for specialist units

SOCAU Sexual Offence and Child Abuse Unit
CIU Crime Investigation Unit
TMU Traffic Management Unit:
CD Crime Desk
YRO Youth Resource Office
MLO Multicultural Liaison Officer
CLO Community Liaison Officer
YO Youth Officer

The Vietnamese social justice/community workers

Nineteen semi-structured interviews were conducted with purposefully selected Vietnamese-Australians working in the legal, social or community sectors. They are referred to collectively in this thesis as ‘social justice workers’. These interviews were conducted by a co-researcher, and were all in English. Interviewees from the community sector worked in community liaison positions at county courts, for Vietnamese-Australian associations or were voluntary workers at drug rehabilitation or needle exchange centres. The sample of social justice workers included social workers and lawyers. A snowball sampling method was used to recruit interviewees. Snowball sampling is described as:

… when the researcher accesses informants through contact information that is provided by other informants. This process is, by necessity, repetitive: informants refer the researcher to other informants, who are contacted by the researcher and then refer her or him to yet other informants, and so on. Hence the evolving ‘snowball’ effect (Noy, 2008: 330).

Snowball sampling is a recruiting technique applicable to groups reticent about being involved in research (Corbetta, 2003).

Focus Group Sample

Focus group moderators used both purposeful selection, as described by Creswell & Plano Clark (2007: 112), and snowball sampling to recruit 100 participants for the study. An over-recruitment of 20 per cent allowed for the fact that some would not show up on the day.
Participants were recruited from Vietnamese-Australian networks, including committees and volunteers associated with the local Buddhist temple, professional networks, mothers’ groups, community workshop groups, and social networks. Morgan (1997: 38) suggests that ‘homogeneous strangers’ are ideal participants, based on the idea that strangers do not have the same propensity to avoid topics tacitly agreed as ‘no-go’ areas, and that they are more likely to explore issues than rely on ‘taken-for-granted assumptions’ (Agar and MacDonald, 1995). Controlling the degree to which participants knew each other was difficult in a highly-networked ethnic community, and also because recruitment selection was primarily in the hands of the moderators. Also relevant in the selection of the group was the group’s interest and/or ability in discussing the topic.

The homogeneity of the focus groups was based on generation, gender and locality. The focus groups consisted of 8 to 12 participants, and were conducted in the three PSAs. There were four different subgroups of Vietnamese-Australians: generation one women; generation one men; generation two mixed gender; youth mixed gender. The mixed gender groups were recruited from established groups who were comfortable with the a mixed gender group and it also made recruiting easier for the facilitators. For the purposes of this study, generation one Vietnamese-Australians were those born in Vietnam, while generation two Vietnamese-Australians were born in Australia with at least one parent born in Vietnam, as well as including people who were born in Vietnam and migrated to Australia below the age of 11. This definition of generation two accommodates the way respondents thought about themselves, and also incorporates the influence of social and political contexts for determining membership of a generation (Wyn and Woodman, 2006). Youth in this study refers to any respondents who were 24 years of age or younger. Generation one focus groups with female participants had a female generation one moderator. Similarly, generation one focus groups with male participants had a male generation one moderator.

The Methods

The study data collecting methods included semi-structured interviews and focus groups. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with police officers and community social justice workers. Focus groups were used for the Vietnamese community members, since this was recommended by the Vietnamese organisations. Many of the focus groups were conducted in the Vietnamese language.
Semi-structured interviews

The questions in the semi-structured interviews were open-ended, and aimed to explore the lived experiences of police officers and social justice workers. Through the exploration of nuanced descriptions about behaviours, attitudes and relations between police officers and various members of the Vietnamese communities, rich and in-depth data was generated (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009; Creswell and Plano Clark, 2007). The semi-structured interview questions were pre-designed, and guided the interview. At the same time, they allowed for a flexible approach in which prompts could be included where appropriate to invite participants to speak more freely about issues and dimensions of importance to them (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009). Mishler (1986) supports this approach, stating that interviewers should engage interactively with respondents rather than restricting responses to pre-conceived directions. Goodrick (2010a) emphasises the need to establish rapport, and recommends that interviewers adopt Patton’s (2002: 365) conception of ‘emphatic neutrality’, whereby respect and engagement encourage openness, and conscious efforts are made to minimise judgment or collusion. This was pertinent to this study, in which police interviewees were often naturally suspicious of being questioned for a research project on their relations with an ethnic group, and it was important to resist temptations to generate false feelings of security, through expressing common viewpoints. The semi-structured interviews were allocated 60 to 90 minutes. This enabled a balance to be achieved between directional and non-directional questions, while at the same time fitting within the structural boundaries of temporality and breadth (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009). Within these semi-structured interviews, unexpected themes and ambiguities that emerged were further explored. This is because, as Kvale and Brinkmann (2009: 31) suggest, they may point to ‘objective contradictions’ of interest in the study.

Focus groups

Focus groups were the primary method for gathering data from members of the Vietnamese-Australian community. Ten focus groups were held, involving 100 participants. Focus groups were the chosen method because Vietnamese-Australians were reluctant to be involved in research, felt apprehension in discussing policing issues and because they felt more comfortable in group settings, which were the main mode they shared information at the community’s organisation the Australian Vietnamese Women’s Association. Studies show
that focus groups are a useful method to use for hard-to-reach groups, or for discussion of sensitive issues (Biernacki and Waldorf, 1981; Waters, 2014). Community leaders claimed that members of their communities would be more comfortable and willing to participate in focus groups than in one-to-one interviews.

Morgan (1997: 6) defines the focus group as: ‘A research technique that collects data through group interaction on a topic determined by a researcher’. Focus group methodology differs from many other types of qualitative research, in that it is based on a collective understanding of participants’ views. This was important for the research, as the data required was the collective view on policing relations, crime and feelings of safety. Morgan (1997) further proposes that focus groups should be homogeneous and like-minded. This allows topics to be discussed in a ‘known context’, where people similar to each other are brought together as group members. An assumption in focus group methodology is that the participants share everyday life experiences and culture, and that this will form the basis of the interactive nature of the group; thus participants should be selected for commonalities.

Morgan’s (1997) recommendation for homogeneity matched the advice from the Vietnamese community, who suggested homogeneity of gender, generation and preferred language (Vietnamese or English). Four bilingual moderators were found, one of whom was part of the research team. Other moderators were recruited through the team’s professional networks in the Vietnamese-Australian communities, and yet others came from the partner organisation, the AVWA (Australian Vietnamese Womens’ Association). Along with a research colleague, I designed and implemented a three-hour training session held at the university for Vietnamese-Australian moderators, with the aim of attaining a degree of consistency; also to expose any potential cultural misunderstandings in the focus group schedules.

The focus groups for generation one were conducted in Vietnamese and/or English depending on participants’ primary language and preference. All generation two focus groups were conducted in English. All 10 focus group sessions were recorded with the permission of the participants, and were conducted at familiar venues provided by Vietnamese community organisations who administered the ethics requirements and answered questions about the focus group process. The transcription of the recordings and translation of the transcripts from Vietnamese to English were completed by an accredited Vietnamese interpreter and a
post-doctoral Vietnamese scholar. Funding limitations meant that the translations could not be checked. The focus group schedule asked participants about situations that fostered feelings of lack of safety and insecurity in their everyday lives, their reporting of crime, and their views on how police dealt with crime and other issues of concern.

According to the literature, the interactive nature of focus groups is an under-explored aspect of the method. Scholars suggest that the focus group provides a window through which to enter the participants’ worlds temporarily, and to make ethnographically-oriented observations of the ‘interactions and phenomenon’ expressed in the group (Ivanoff and Hultberg, 2006: 127). In focus groups, socially-held normative attitudes are displayed, although individual differences in experiences may be expressed in the discussions. Scholars claim that because focus group research has traditionally been conducted in a positivist paradigm, less attention has been paid to how the construction of knowledge occurs within focus groups, and there has not necessarily been awareness of how the topic was received and grasped (Ivanoff and Hultberg, 2006; Barbour and Kitzinger, 1999). A key design challenge was how to implement focus groups in another language, and how to make ethnographic observations when the researchers were not present at the focus groups. To gather some of this information, I conducted debriefing sessions with the focus group moderators either immediately after the focus group, or as soon as practicable, and this data was used in the analysis. This approach concurs with Morgan’s (1997) recommendation that moderators be included in the analysis process.

Other complexities and problems arise for dominant white research teams in conducting focus group studies with ethnic minorities. Although the literature in the field is limited and varies widely in context, some studies do indicate problems with language and in understanding of the culture. Yelland and Gifford (1995) take an extreme position in suggesting that focus groups may be inappropriate in intercultural research, since they have been specifically developed for use with Anglo-Celtic populations (Barbour, 2007). For focus groups to be effective, researchers and moderators need a detailed knowledge of the cultural context, and the research methodology should involve feedback and collaboration with cultural group members (Barbour, 2007). Participants whose first language is not English, but are nevertheless fluent in English, should be allowed to participate in their first language, as this can generate richer data. Umana-Taylor and Bamaca (2004) recommend bilingual
moderators, even if focus groups are in English, as they found, for example, that some participants preferred to use Spanish terms to express concepts and ideas. If using another language, not all terms may be fully translatable; thus there is a need for researchers to develop a culturally-equivalent focus group guide (Barbour, 2007). Tang et al. (2000) found that Chinese women in their study were unfamiliar with the expression ‘violence against women’. Tang struggled to explain it to the women participants because of the lack of an equivalent the Chinese term for the concept of violence, though the language did have terms for specific acts such as beatings. Chui and Knight (1999) found that in translating some questions, bilingual moderators changed their meaning or emphasis, which affected the content of data generated (Barbour, 2007). They concluded that if using interpreters as moderators, they should be trained in the role of group moderator. These studies support the use of Vietnamese moderators in this study, one of whom was a trained interpreter.

**Summary of the data**

A summary of the data and the key characteristics of the participants and methods used for data collection are shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The data groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Language of data collection</th>
<th>Research method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo police officers</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese-Australian general community members</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Viet &amp; English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese-Australian social justice workers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gender of the officers was known but not included in the data, as this may have made it possible to identify participants. At the time of the study, 12 per cent of officers were women, and the number of women interviewed was the same proportion. Because social justice
workers were interviewed regarding their professional knowledge of crime and policing issues in the community, rather than about their personal experiences as members of the community, gender is the only demographic provided for this data group. Crime data on Vietnamese Australians as an ethnic or racial group was not used in the study as it as data is not collected by ethnicity or race by Victoria Police or other Government departments or agencies in Australia.

**Analysis**

I used thematic analysis to organise, categorise and explain the data. The interpretation of the data utilised the research methods of deconstruction in meaning analysis of the dialogue to show how versions of the social world are constructed through discourse and material reality to determine the practical consequences or material base that constituted white advantage in this study (Blanche et al., 2006; Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Thematic analysis involves grouping segments of the transcript data into themes for interpretation. For this process I used NVivo9, which involves coding (selecting and assigning) segments of data into categories referred to as ‘nodes’. A segment of data was sometimes a few words or a sentence, though more often it was a paragraph or a series of paragraphs. The transcribed data included beliefs, opinions or comments which were expressed by the respondents as statements, observations or questions. The coding involved deconstructing the qualitative information to look for patterns, context, similarities, differences, contradictions or motives. Contradictions and complexities were noted, because as Skeggs (1999) observes, a researcher-driven desire for coherence may obscure socially-significant contributions. For instance, while different stories may not necessarily be true, the differences and similarities in the stories can be revealing.

New nodes were formed and added as they appeared in the data, and were labelled to distinguish them from others. Creating the categories is an interpretative process, which Dey (1993) suggests incorporates relating the categories to conceptual fields. Some nodes related directly to policing, such as the ‘community policing’ and ‘intercultural awareness’ nodes. Other nodes, such as ‘racism’, were conceptual. When further distinctions were evident within a category or node, I divided the primary node into secondary nodes (sub-nodes to the primary node) that had narrower foci or were conceptually distinct. Attributes were assigned to each respondent, including focus group member, social justice worker, white officer,
specialist officer (MLO YRO SA, detective), rank, PSA and gender. These characteristics enabled particular groups of respondents to be cross referenced with the data.

Interpretation, scholars agree, is complex and difficult to pin down. In this research it was gleaned through many forms including insights, intuition, contradictions and assumptions (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2007). I compared and contrasted the data in the categories, and inter-related these to themes and empirical studies in the field of whiteness. Discerning interpretation is described by Creswell and Plano Clark (2007: 144) as ‘making sense of the data’, and by Lincoln and Guba (1985) as the ‘lessons learned’. Sense-making and interpretation of the data led to the significant point that Charmaz (2013) describes as the moment when ‘inequities, oppressions and other signs of disempowerment’ are central to the analysis.

**Ethics**

Prior to the research phase, ethical issues were canvassed and tested. After making revisions requested by the ethics committees, approval was granted by both committees involved (Swinburne Human Research Ethics Committee and Victoria Police Ethics Committee). Ethical principles at the University are aligned with the protocols of the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC). The publication of the thesis raises ethical questions of informed consent, confidentiality and consequences. Rigorous processes for approval by ethics committees protect the researcher and participants by minimising the risk of exposure to physical, legal or emotional harm. Confidentiality issues are formalised in the approval process to assure participants that they will not be identifiable in any documentation arising from the research. For focus group participants, the ethics documents were available in English and Vietnamese. The Informed Consent and the Information Statement documents were translated into Vietnamese by a Vietnamese post-doctoral fellow who provides translation services to Swinburne University researchers. These documents were given to Vietnamese participants by the Vietnamese moderator, and their purpose was explained before they were signed.

**Methodological limitations**

Specific limitations relating to community members were evident in the focus group method, and in the interviews with social justice workers. While the interviews provided a different
standpoint, the data gathered was based on their experiences as recounted by clients; hence the data was filtered through their interpretation and understanding of their client’s issues. While the data was relevant and informative, it lacked the richness, depth and authenticity of primary data gathered in direct interviews. I would take this factor into account in any future study of this kind.

Charmaz (2013) claims that the use of retrospective accounts is a key limitation in many qualitative studies. This was true of this study, since as a researcher, I was bound by what police officers said about policing Vietnamese-Australians. As there was no ethnographic data showing what police actually did in the field, the multiple perspectives provided alternative vantage points from which to draw some pertinent conclusions. Nonetheless, police recognised that they had to traverse issues of ethnicity and race carefully, and avoid making racist comments. A key issue was whether or not police were being frank, especially since the interviews were conducted in their workplace during their working hours. Another factor affecting the data was that the participants were selected by their PSA inspectors, and although they did not have to comply, the interviews were not entirely voluntary. Another factor affecting the data was that the participants were selected by their PSA inspectors or a senior officer. Although police officers did not have to comply, the interviews were not entirely voluntary. The limitations of participants being selected by a senior officer include bias in the sample towards a more culturally and racially aware sample, limitations in openness because of possible consequences if the inspector was given any feedback on the data and the pressure on individuals to give acceptable organisational responses. The data for the study must be interpreted within these limitations.

**Reflexivity in research**

The term ‘reflexivity’ in empirical research refers to an awareness of one’s particular perspective, and how this influences research outcomes. Reflexivity is described by Alvesson and Skoldberg (2008:5) as ‘looking at one’s own perspectives from other perspectives and turning a self-critical eye onto one’s own authority as interpreter and author.’ They outline four elements that guide the practice of reflective research: a rigorous and systematic approach, clarity that the process is interpretive, identification of political and ideological influences, and reflection on the representation of research participants and researcher authority (2000: 8).
Reflexivity is an important aspect of qualitative research. As a researcher, you aim to be conscious, not only of the subjective nature of knowledge, but also about the ways in which your own subjectivity and world view affect what is observed and understood. Gunaratnam (2003 p.7) takes this further, suggesting that research does not simply reflect what we are seeing, but that the researcher and research are active agents in the production and reproduction of social and historical relations through the discursive process. Furthermore, Gunaratnam (2003 p.9) explains the historically-embedded nature of qualitative research on race and ethnicity as ‘marked by these colonial legacies of racial categorization that we need to examine, recognize, challenge and undermine’.

Reflexivity in the data collection phase of the study was exhibited in partnering and empowering Vietnamese Australian facilitators to collect the data from Vietnamese Australians in focus groups. The differences in perspectives were brought to the fore in training sessions and focus group schedules trialled and re-worded to increase their relevance and remove cultural assumptions. After completion of the field work, I found it invaluable to re-read transcripts and re-code some sections. Most evident was that it exposed many of the expectations that had shaped or coloured my selection and understanding of what the participant had actually said. Reflexive techniques not only aid in differentiating between what was heard and what the participant actually said, but also in revealing any self-interest in interpretation of their meanings. The need for self-knowledge is ever present in the research process. Kvale and Brinkman (2009) advise researchers to enact the reflexive process throughout all stages of the project. This, they add, includes monitoring feelings such as intimacy and empathy. These may establish a feeling of false security or rapport, and encourage inappropriate disclosure of information. In the writing-up stage of this project, a concerted effort was made to maintain a reflexive awareness in order to give full expression and power to the voices of the participants, rather than flooding the text with the author’s own subjectivities.

**Role of the researcher**

The researcher’s independence can be undermined if he/she is co-opted by stakeholders or participants. The police partner investigator and the CEO of the Vietnamese partner organisation both formed close relations with me, and at times I experienced tension in managing their different expectations, or I felt pressure to comply with a police perspective.
Some scholars view such relations as precarious, and recommend that researchers maintain a professional distance from partner organisations and participants (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009). However, liaison with both research partners was essential, since the research approach was participatory. In addition, the partner controlled access to their communities and legitimised the research with their social groups.

**The self in the study**

As the researcher, my observations were filtered through a series of lenses: whiteness, language, gender, socio-economic status and ethnicity, to name a few. The categories of self were not independent, in that my whiteness intersected with and was inextricably linked with other identities such as ‘white woman’ and ‘white scholar’. Undoubtedly other identities of self affected aspects of the scholarship, but I was mostly blind to these, and unaware of their impact on the research. Furthermore the research self is ‘biographically situated’ (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011: 12) in being a product of a specific history, politics and traditions of knowledge construction. In situating myself within the research, I recognised these limitations, and acknowledged that I brought my own values and judgments to the inquiry. The data analysis was interpreted within critical whiteness theory, but was selected and informed by my own world view and prior experiences as a white woman. Goodrick (2010b) suggests that further to declaring how the researcher may influence data, one should clearly explicate their views, values and biases; otherwise the research could reinforce the status quo (Goodrick, 2010b). To minimise these biases I used multiple perspectives, thick descriptions and interconnected interpretive methods (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013).

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have outlined the methodological aspects of the study. I first explained the critical whiteness paradigm, and then how the data collection methods of semi-structured interviews and focus groups were used. I described the methods of sampling, recruitment, data analysis and confidentiality. The qualitative methods used generated data that could be analysed within critical whiteness studies to explore dominant ideas of whiteness in the policing institution and among white officers. Within the methods used, I considered the impact that I might have on the data as a white female researcher, and acknowledged that there may be other effects of which I could not be aware.
The use of the focus group method in this study with Vietnamese-speaking participants revealed that research methods tried and tested in white communities may need to be adapted when conducted with an ethnic community. It was found that homogeneous focus groups for gender and generation were effective for generation one participants. Other learnings in relation to this method, such as the role identities of the moderator and structure of the questions, have been explored elsewhere (McKernan, 2014a).

In the following four chapters, I provide the findings of my study from four perspectives: local white police force perspectives of policing Vietnamese communities (Chapter 5); white police officers’ perspectives of policing Vietnamese communities (Chapter 6); white police officers’ perspectives of Vietnamese police officers (Chapter 7); and Vietnamese community members’ perspectives of white police officers (Chapter 8). The analysis of the findings from these four perspectives provides a foundation from which to consider how whiteness is reinforced, maintained or reinvented through policing relations with Vietnamese communities.
Chapter 5 Local police forces’ perspectives: strategies for policing Vietnamese communities

In this chapter, I explore the strategies implemented by local police forces to discover why they are used, and how they affect relations with the Vietnamese community. Current policing methods are steeped in historical policing practices. For this reason, past initiatives designed to target Vietnamese communities are explored, and current practices are interrogated for whiteness. Through examination of strategies implemented by local forces in three PSAs, I investigate the relationship between whiteness and local policing practices.

The analysis will address a specific part of the overarching research question: How is whiteness reinforced, maintained or reinvented by local forces in policing the Vietnamese communities, and how does this contribute to white advantage? I argue that the strategies selected by local police forces mostly reinforce or maintain whiteness, and that only a minority of strategies rework or challenge whiteness. Overall, the practices of these local police forces demonstrate that Victoria Police as an organisation rewards the reinforcement or maintenance of whiteness. I further argue that there are direct benefits to local white police forces for targeting Vietnamese drug trafficking offenders, and to the wider white community through the establishment of racial hierarchies of criminalisation.

Policing the Vietnamese at Richmond Police Station in PSA Yarra

Richmond Police Station is in the inner-city Melbourne suburb of Richmond, and is close to a busy Vietnamese trading centre. It is the central station in PSA Yarra, with the PSA’s inspector located here. Based on the 2011 Census statistics, the population of Richmond at the time was 23,814, of whom 60% were born in Australia. The most well-represented groups from non-English-speaking countries were as follows: 5.6% born in Vietnam, 2.5% born in Greece and 1.8% born in China (Qpmz, 2014). Of major concern to the local police force in Richmond was drug trading occurring in the Vietnamese precinct, and a significant proportion of resources were allocated to policing drugs in this area.

Normative practices of policing Vietnamese in PSA Yarra

Crime is defined by Garner (2001) as a ‘social harm that the law makes punishable’. Normative policing practices of the Vietnamese community in Richmond were clearly and
unambiguously focused on interception of crime related to the Vietnamese drug trade. It was assumed that those of Asian appearance involved in trading were Vietnamese. This appeared to be based on the fact that it was a known Vietnamese precinct, rather than actual recognition of people as Vietnamese, or as belonging to any other Asian cultural or national group. To manage drugs, specific trading zones were closely monitored and policed, with the area of priority being Victoria Street, a busy street containing many Vietnamese restaurants and food shops. The police’s focus on intercepting the street-level drug trade in Richmond was driven by particular local issues and signs of social disorder, which had been brought to the attention of the local council (Andrew and Johnston, 2015). Other complaints from the public triggered police action, including those received from non-Vietnamese visitors dining in Vietnamese restaurants, or via phone calls from people travelling through the area by train or car who had observed drug exchanges. Senior police claimed that local drug trading had a flow-on effect, leading to theft and home burglaries in the area. Police claimed that heroin was the main currency in the street drug trade. Cannabis was also commonly traded, but was of much lower priority to the police.

Studies show that Vietnamese-born Australians are over-represented in Victorian prisons for drug crimes. However, whether this is a result of over-surveillance or proven higher crime rates is contested (Le and Gilding, 2014). Police generally described the Vietnamese as a group involved in drug trading, or who knew about it. They often spoke about Vietnamese collectively as having a drug-oriented cultural norm. One officer, in representing the local force perspective of his PSA, expressed the view that the Vietnamese were criminals in Vietnam, and that they continued their illegal activities in Australia:

I think a lot of them at the time, they knew that what they were doing was wrong but they in their own mind they didn’t really think that what they were doing was wrong. It has been explained to me a lot of times by older Vietnamese people who came out here as refugees, to get out here on a boat to become a refugee, you had to [do it through] the black market, you paid these people-traffickers to get over here, and that took money, and money was hard to come by, so they were involved in illegal activities over there, so they were crooks already, so to speak, before they even came here, and once they got here they thought, hey it’s not bad over here, we’re not going to be shot or belted up so they stayed as dishonest sort of people. (INY14)
This officer essentialised Vietnamese boat people, and seemed to believe that the act of paying people smugglers made the refugees criminals. Many referred to the Vietnamese as boat people and these historical associations to some degree, constructed their identity. They were from a different culture that was unknown and associated with exoticism and orientalism (Said 1994; Said 1995; Ang 1996). Police rarely distinguished between subgroups of Vietnamese people, such as the homeless or poor. Neither did they point to other social factors that made Vietnamese Australians more likely to commit drug offences.

Moral panics arise are fear-related public responses to economic or cultural changes that involve perceived threats to societal values and morals (Goode and Ben-Yehuda, 2010; Garland, 2008). Such perceived threats to societal values in the past have often been xenophobic responses to threats to the nation from immigrant groups that are perceived as being criminally inclined (Woodiwiss and Hobbs, 2009). Moral panics distort and amplify perceptions of behaviours that are termed deviant or criminal and folk devils are the perpetrators of these deviant or criminal behaviours (Rothe and Muzzatti, 2004). Carstairs (2012) argues that moral panics in Canada emanating from anti-drug campaigns was racialised in constructing Chinese-Canadians as folk devils who were subsequently targeted by enforcement agencies. The public reasons for moral panics camouflage unacknowledged deeper cultural threats (Cohen, 2002). Goode and Ben-Yehuda (2010) suggest that moral panics are the visible symbols for drug wars, for instance divert attention onto actors constructed as folk devils and away from underlying societal issues such as inequality or racism.

The officers’ views as to whether the drug traders were also drug users were polarised: many police assumed they were both users and sellers; others said drug traders were not users. Police had not attempted to gather any information about trafficking offenders own drug use, and did not find this data of interest. Some officers spoke of the Vietnamese in the collective sense as making strategic moves into new drug markets. For instance, a few officers discussed a recent trend of Vietnamese entering the cannabis market, with the drug usually cultivated in innocuous-looking suburban houses that had been converted to hothouses on the inside. These contentions were supported by the fact that there had been a spate of police raids on Vietnamese hothouses in other suburbs, mostly in Northern Melbourne, even though these did not necessarily relate to local Vietnamese activities in Richmond (Silvester, 2015).
Police officers suggested that cannabis might be more appealing, as it did not have the same stigma as heroin. This suggests that the perpetrators of the Vietnamese drug trade approached decision-making regarding the drug market in an ethical manner. Other police disagreed with this contention, claiming that their observations indicated that heroin was the main drug traded by Vietnamese in Richmond. Officers who held such views based their conclusions on their experiences during street patrols, as the following quote demonstrates:

Oh it's a phenomenal drug market. If you took heroin out of Richmond, Richmond would be a completely different place. Yeah that's everything, everything in our area comes back to drugs, and our number one drug, make no mistake, is heroin. And we would even go, from a policing point of view, go so far as to say that we've got some of the biggest dealers in Australia working out of here, we've got from the highest level to the street level and everyone in between, all in Richmond. (INY15)

This officer builds a picture of a drug-trading centre where big players are involved – not just street traders. Although the officer claimed that dealers working in Richmond ranged from low to high level, most police indicated that the traffickers they apprehended were low-level dealers. It was implicit in these conversations that drug-related crime in Richmond was Vietnamese crime.

Drug-related crime had been a long-term problem, and current approaches were derived from past policing strategies. Whiteness studies scholarship recognises that past formations of whiteness are re-structured in the present, and alerts researchers to illuminate significant historicisms. Such links to the past may be evident in differentiations, exclusions and racial hierarchies (Levine-Rasky, 2013; Levine-Rasky, 2010). Consequently, empirical studies need to interrogate the effects of past practices and beliefs that may be found in cultural norms or institutional structures. One such historicism important in this study was the connection to a past group called the Asian Squad.

The Asian Squad

Formed in 1989 and disbanded in 2006, the Asian Squad had a long-lasting influence on police in Richmond (Victoria Police, 1995). It acted as a symbol for the specialist elite knowledge involved in fighting Asian crime (Victoria Police, 1995). The Squad’s designated role was to investigate ‘crimes committed by persons of an Asian background’ (Tuck, 1995:
2). It was a past institutional structure that left a legacy of myths, desires and exemplars in catching Asian criminals. According to one officer in Victoria Street, Richmond, the Asian Squad had previously had a physical presence in the area:

Because even though these guys were from the Asian squad and perhaps doing fairly high level stuff, they were actually physically down in Victoria Street and putting names to faces and things like that. So they were just doing that high level but also grass roots sort of stuff as well. Like they weren’t dealing with public order, make no mistake, but they were down there and they knew exactly who they were looking at. So from our point of view we thought they did a pretty good job. (INY15)

One Richmond officer, a former member of the Asian Squad, was able to relate his knowledge of the Squad’s past experiences and operations. Another officer, whose brother had been a member of the Squad, also shared many stories about the Asian Squad, which apparently emanated from Asian Squad officers. The police officer who had been a squad member described how the transmission of past experiences to squad members was part of on-the-job development. This officer claimed that he provided crucial information about Vietnamese drug crime, as well as background cultural information, especially to new recruits or officers who had not previously dealt with the Vietnamese:

Because of my background I’m often helping them out and teaching them this is how the names go, this is probably the surname. And things like that so you get that involvement as well. And there’s been a couple of other members over the years with the skills to teach them as well. Certainly there’s a lot more interaction. They’re charging people more and more simply because of the drug problem we have here. Yes. So they gain a lot more experience to how it was back in the 80s when it was just too hard to deal with. At least now we’ve got a fingerprint machine at the station. So if they’ve been charged before you can identify them within an hour, you can look on the machine and see their photo. You didn’t have those things in the 80s. (INY07)

Here it is apparent that the police lack basic cultural information about the Vietnamese, such as the Vietnamese conventions in ordering given and family names. The police officer also believed that more Vietnamese were charged now than in the past. If true, this has the potential to influence trends in crime patterns among Vietnamese. However, the veracity of this perception could not actually be confirmed, because the data was not available for
Exoticism was apparent in stories of the Asian Squad, similar to accounts of the opium dens in Little Chinatown in Melbourne and of new types of crime involving Asian gangs and extortion. Through the re-telling of these stories, police learnt to differentiate between normative crime and Asian crime. Police cultures foster and thrive on police stories and narratives, and it is debatable whether or not they are useful in teaching the craft of policing, or whether they contribute to a police sub-culture (Van Hulst, 2013; Sutton, 2004; Trujillo and Dionisopoulos, 1987). The criminals, too, were differentiated, in that they looked different, but could not be easily identified by facial appearance by non-Asian officers. The white officers agreed that they could not discern facial differences; therefore photographs, tattoos, scars or other physical markers were used for identification purposes. These stories fed into the rich repertoire of crooks and villains that many of the officers felt were the essence of policing. The officers’ accounts essentialised the Vietnamese as a group from a foreign and unknown culture, whose disposition was towards crime.

By 1999, the Asian Squad had grown to a unit of 22 officers, indicating the seriousness of the perceived threat to the white community from Asian crime. Although it carried the name ‘Asian Squad’, its focus on Vietnamese crime fanned the perception of Vietnamese communities in Victoria being crime-oriented (Dixon and Maher, 1992). The Squad developed a database of Vietnamese criminals and identifying features, and this was described as an invaluable resource. Many current officers claimed that the resource would be of great assistance in criminal investigations:

I don’t know what you’d call it now because identification was a huge thing. We used to get every Asian person in the State that was identified by police we got a copy of it. And we started photo books because identification was such a huge issue back then. And we gained a lot of intelligence, or go to a crime oh this is the offender or this is the person I’m talking about. Those photo books were gold to us back then. (INY07)

The focus of the squad in this account was on identifying and catching Vietnamese offenders. Police found that they could not do without photographs and other body markings such as tattoos. Consequently special techniques were implemented to collect data on Asian suspects and offenders. These methods essentialised Asians as different in requiring a specific data
base for identification that included anthropological body markers. Unusual tattoos and scars linked to knife injuries constructed a race marked by exoticism. This data base was later removed as a police resource.

For some police, and perhaps for the public, the name ‘Asian Squad’ implied that the Squad had Asian officers as members. In reality, the only non-white member of the Squad had been a Vietnamese translator, who was not a trained police officer (Victoria Police, 1995). Some officers claimed that the lack of Asians in the Asian Squad demonstrated that the unit was based on a racist premise. This was a valid critique, in that it would be considered ‘politically incorrect’ for instance, to call a squad a ‘women’s squad’ if it were staffed entirely by men. However, apart from this opinion, none of the officers commented on other racialised aspects of the Squad, such as on the ‘criminalising’ of a group. One officer suggested that a specialist squad may be required in the future, and that Victoria Police may need a ‘Sudanese squad’ (INY15). Thus criminalisation was based on race, and in these examples the concerns were about Asian and African groups. The Asian Squad signified to police and to the public that these communities were regarded as harbouring criminals. This points to an inbuilt assumption that white people are not as criminal as Asians. Policing white groups was considered normative. There was no need for a White Squad, because this function was fulfilled by the white police force. Officers subordinated racial groups, and lacked awareness of the related process of white privilege or supremacy.

Not only was the dominant Victorian community threatened by Asian crime, but this was a national trend, since other Australian states followed Victoria Police to establish specialised task forces. In May 1994, the Queensland Police established a special Asian Task Force in response to the seemingly high proportion of Vietnamese on heroin-trafficking charges. Thus Asians became nationally racialised and criminalised through police force structures. Furthermore, the trend continued internationally, with Asian task forces being established in other white English-speaking countries, such as that in Los Angeles. A significant difference with the Los Angeles task force, however, was that its purpose was to build trust and confidence in the police on the part of various Asian populations, including Japanese, Korean, Chinese, Filipino, Vietnamese and Thai groups (Kolarik, 1986). Although the Los Angeles unit did not criminalise Asian populations, it was similarly constructed through whiteness, evident in its reinforcement of the differentiation between dominant and ethnic
populations. Hage (2000) contends that such differentiations form a key premise of multiculturalism policies.

When in 2006 Chief Commissioner of Victoria Police Christine Nixon disbanded the Asian Squad, along with other units, as part of a police restructure, no official reason was given for the discontinuation of the Squad (Victoria Police, 2007). In the local force in Richmond, many police officers rued the day when the Squad was closed down. Some interviewees (INY06; INY07) described the decision as a senseless backward step that had left the police force bereft of data and other intelligence on Vietnamese drug criminals. Many officers idealised the Asian Squad, speaking of it as an exemplary policing strategy for fighting Asian crime. The police did not suggest that Asians and Vietnamese in the community would be impacted by any negative perceptions of from a specialist crime dedicated to Asian crime. The McPherson Report criticised police officers for colour blind approaches that were insensitive and non-discriminating in recognising the needs of ethnic or racially identified groups, failures that were linked to unprofessional behaviours and institutional racism (Anthias, 1999). The Asian Squad left a particular legacy, in that it informed a strategy developed by the local Richmond Police referred to as ‘The Victoria Street Strategy’.

**The Victoria Street Strategy**

The Victoria Street strategy was formed out of historical approaches implemented by the Asian Squad. The strategy was described by police as a community-oriented partnership between the local Richmond Police Station and the Richmond Asian Business Association (RABA). The purpose was to curb rampant drug-dealing in the Vietnamese trading precinct. However, as the strategy had operated in the same area for 20 years, its effectiveness was debatable. A long-serving officer remembered the early days of its establishment:

> Initially, we walked the street with interpreters, our multicultural liaison people, and Asian businessmen who formed part of RABA and explained to everyone, the shopkeepers, what we were about, and it went in the papers and the local radio stations as well. Now they are very very good, the traders…so yes, we’re making headway with the traders because they expect, and they are used to us, and they now know their local, well, I probably should qualify, just with the nature of rosters and shifts and people coming and going, there {now} might be four or five police who deal with one shop. (INY16)
As this officer explained, the original aim of the Victoria Street strategy was to develop relationships between officers and proprietors, and to use interpreters to ensure the strategy was understood by businesses. Under this program, unscheduled visits were made to Vietnamese proprietors by police officers on duty in Victoria Street. The businesses visited were mainly restaurants, supermarkets and other food businesses. In addition, the strategy intended to improve the perception of general safety in the precinct through foot patrols and high-visibility policing. The emphasis on building relations was diluted over time, in that whereas one officer used to visit one proprietor, this had changed so that several officers were assigned to the one business proprietor. The relationships also tended to be short-term, because officers were regularly transferred from Richmond to other PSAs. Although the strategy had been diluted, the focus on gathering information on street drug criminals remained, since this had been the primary reason for developing the program.

In this precinct, whiteness operated to make Asian sellers highly visible and white buyers invisible. Police used their discretion in decisions whether or not to target drug buyers in Victoria Street, and they made no secret of the fact that buyers were not intercepted. Officers described buyers as all kinds of people from across Melbourne and regional Victoria who came to the Victoria Street precinct to purchase drugs. It could not be assumed that they were mainly white, although one officer described them as ‘mainstream’. Drug use in the dominant community was normalised to an extent not reflected in the current legislation, but it had to be managed by police to reinforce the legal non-acceptance. Although the Vietnamese drug traders were powerless, trapped at the bottom of the drug hierarchy chain, and invariably captured in a cycle of crime and poverty, this was normalised. The offenders were punished through fines and incarceration, but were rarely diverted into the reform programs that would normally be offered to the dominant community as a legitimate alternative. Police officers had the power to direct an offender into a diversion program, but this did not often happen for Vietnamese offenders (Scambary and Meredyth, 2013). The dynamics of whiteness operated here to normalise the supply of drugs to white people and others for their benefit, while criminalising low-level Vietnamese street sellers. This not only signified double standards relating to white users and Vietnamese sellers, but it normalised the socio-economic divide in which Asian sellers were maintained in a cycle of poverty, while white buyers benefited from the easy purchase of drugs without any consequences.
The Victoria Street Strategy did not appear genuine in its mission to reduce drug crime. In fact police who had worked in Richmond for a number of years described combatting drug crime as unrealistic and unachievable:

I have many different streams of thought. At an operational point of view you’ve got to keep the focus out on the street. People have to see the police out on the street. Visible police presence is one of the main parts of policing. Interacting with the community, a lot of the community partnerships are great, they’ve got their place in society. But police on the street have to be there. Targeting the high end dealers is also a strong point, as I said I spent four years at the major drug investigation division and we were so busy, I think we did close to 100 investigations a year the whole unit. And to be honest it was a drop in the ocean, it was just a tip of the iceberg. For every one we take off the street, someone else or another 10 people are ready to move in, and that’s just the way it is. (INY10)

According to a senior sergeant, in the face of the high level of recidivism by drug offenders, the sense of hopelessness experienced by police regarding the possibilities of decreasing drug-related crime often led to burn-out in new recruits. This senior sergeant suggested that the point of the Victoria Street Strategy was not so much to defeat crime, but to attract new recruits to the police force, and to maintain their enthusiasm for ‘catching crooks’. Again it was evident that inherent in references to drug crime was the assumption that the perpetrators were Vietnamese. This traditional representation of rank-and-file policing as involving ‘catching the bad guys’ is contrary to community-oriented policing that uses problem solving and multi-agency approaches to address the underlying issues (Grabosky, 2009). To manage the disjuncture between expectation and reality, many young and enthusiastic officers were moved on before they became disillusioned by the recidivism and endless cycle of street drug crime.

Another problem with the Strategy was the lack of trust by police in the Vietnamese business proprietors, whom police suspected were not informing them about crime in Victoria Street. Community policing is difficult to define as the term includes different types of practices and is interpreted differently according to the particular police force’s history, culture and location. Scholars contend that community policing usually adheres to some common principles: responding to community security and safety concerns; problem solving;
accountability and transparency; community involvement; and, organisational decentralisation (Cordner 2014; Brogden and Nijjar, 2005; Chappell 2009; Skolnick & Bayley 1988; Murphy 2008; Reisig and Kane 2014). One officer in this study inadvertently represented the local strategy as ‘hopeful’, rather than being built on key components of community policing – monitoring and evaluation (Brogden and Nijjar, 2005):

With the uniform members downstairs, they’ve been allocated shopkeepers to be the liaison point for. And so that’s to try and, and that’s the shopkeeper can hopefully ring up, and I’m not sure how successful it is, but they can hopefully ring up and say look there’s this drug activity here and hopefully develop some sort of person on the street who the police can use and hopefully the shopkeeper can get value out of the police as well. (INY15)

The officer appeared unconvinced that shopkeepers would report drug activity, though this was the central idea of the Strategy. Some police implied that this was not simply an omission on the part of shopkeepers, but rather there was some degree of complicity in drug crime. A few officers even expressed uncertainty about the honesty of the over-riding business group RABA, with whom Victoria Police liaised on the Victoria Street Strategy. The officers were suspicious that they were not telling police the truth, and some even suggested that the Vietnamese could be liaising with drug dealers. Others hypothesised that some dealers were using police for their own purposes to get rid of rival sellers near their premises. One officer raised doubts about the authenticity of a person referred to as ‘Grandpa’, often found sitting in front of one of the Vietnamese shops, suggesting that he might be on the lookout for police so as to be able to warn drug traders. Drawing these kinds of conclusions was not out of character for local police, who described themselves as ‘naturally’ suspicious: ‘Coppers are very suspicious people, that’s the nature of the beast’ (INY11). In terms of formal liaison with RABA committee members, police claimed that despite the expectation that they would participate in RABA meetings, they were neither invited nor provided with minutes:

I’m talking specifically about the Richmond business people here, and it’s not a criticism, but RABA don’t have monthly meetings or set meetings or take minutes. They’ll bump into each other in the street ‘cos they all work there anyway and say, hey we’ve got a problem, we need to have a meeting tomorrow night, so then they will ring here, they will
ring me or my offsider and say, there’s a meeting on tonight, but if you’re not here, it could be done better. They’re happy, they’re pleasant, they will chat to you, you can go there any time you want. But you can say to them a thousand times over, bring me to your meetings, and you get to not many. That, I haven’t got an answer to that. It’s not that they don’t want you there, it’s just that, they say we’ll have a meeting now, and their meeting could be over lunch. (INY16)

The police officer’s comments here demonstrate that in spite of the fact that the Strategy had been in operation for 20 years, they had still not worked out how to engage successfully with RABA committee members. Although police had not built co-operative relations with the Vietnamese business leaders, this had not influenced claims by police that it was successful or resulted in changes to implementation to improve Vietnamese input.

It was apparent that local police knew very little about the Vietnamese business members of RABA. For instance, it was not known whether they held community leadership positions, or how they were involved in the local Vietnamese community. Police showed no interest at all in this cultural information, which left unchallenged their self-generated subjective assessments based on ethnicity and related associations of criminality. The prime reasons for the Victoria Street strategy appeared to revolve around a demonstration of being tough on drugs, and opportunities for police to catch crooks. The partnership with the RABA was clearly tenuous, and was undermined by a lack of trust on both sides.

**Crackdowns**

Crackdowns in Richmond demonstrated police’s authority and power over drug users and traders. The crackdown operations required extra police to be brought in to assist local police, as well as other additional resources. The general thrust of the crackdown was to charge as many street-based drug traders as they could before they fled, and then to drive out the drug sellers, drug users and other ‘undesirables’. Crackdowns were military-like, and consistent with this, they were given code-names such as ‘Operation Higguana’ (Kaila, 2012). In the criminological literature, crackdowns are a form of ‘zero tolerance’ policing that involve assertively confronting all – even minor – offenders, and any anti-social behaviour (Burke, 1998). In this strategy, power teamed up with exclusionary practices to reinforce the already-criminalised Asians or Vietnamese, as well as other marginalised groups such as homeless people. Police agreed that crackdowns were temporary in their effect on crime, as they only
pushed drug offenders into other nearby suburbs such as Footscray. In most cases, they soon returned to their former territories.

As was the case in this study, zero-tolerance strategies are usually justified on the grounds that, left unchecked, minor incivilities can lead to serious crime (Innes, 2004). One officer expressed the common view among police that they were holding back a possible influx of criminals, and that if they did nothing, they would be overrun:

So it keeps the undesirables in society honest so to speak. As you say, every time we run an operation, we clear them out and then there’s always someone else to fill the vacuum and come in behind them. But what are the options. You can’t not do anything. Whether we are winning or not is not the point, you have to continue to do what you have to do for the community’s sake and because if we did nothing, we’d be overrun. (INY10)

This officer argues that other criminals soon fill the vacuum left by those caught, but simultaneously claims that police are holding back a tide of crime for the community’s sake. The ‘community’ to which he refers is not specified, however, implying that the attempt to slow the crime rate is for the sake of the normative community.

The crackdowns interfered significantly with community support programs. Staff from the local needle exchange centre claimed that during crackdowns, police officers hung around outside the centre and confiscated clean needles obtained by IV drug users. Thus crackdowns exacerbated rather than alleviated social issues faced by offenders, and did not take into consideration any underlying social problems. Protecting the dominant community from deviants was the priority, rather than the social problems experienced by drug users or others caught up in the physical eviction from the area. The strategies reinforced the racialisation of physical spaces through driving out Asian and other drug users and traders.

**Racialised criminalisation**

The Victoria Street Strategy and crackdowns were local institutional structures that racialised and criminalised Vietnamese people. ‘Criminalisation’ refers to the proposition that ethnic groups are more likely to commit crime than natives, while ‘racialisation’ is the process whereby the dominant white community reinforces the racial distinctness of a group already identified by race (Bosworth et al., 2008; Levine-Rasky, 2008). In the UK, Bowling and
Phillips. (2007) found that the persistent intelligence gathering and surveillance by police of problem areas in black and Asian communities in the UK resulted in their criminalisation. Similarly, the use of constant patrols in the Richmond area near Victoria Street contributed to the criminalisation of the Vietnamese. This criminalisation of a community has a feedback effect in increased attention by police, and studies have found that this contributes to higher arrest rates (Goodey, 2001). The Vietnamese were criminalised by non-Vietnamese visitors to Victoria Street restaurants, who made complaints about the drug crime ‘signals’ that implied to them social disorder in the area. For individual officers, the constancy of daily encounters with dealers, along with the seemingly endless supply of new Vietnamese offenders to replace the people they arrested, reinforced the stereotype that the Vietnamese were associated with drug crime.

Racialised spaces/geographies

The public housing estates in Richmond were referred to by police officers as Vietnamese enclaves. Public housing marked the community as outsiders to property ownership, and thus to the powers conferred through ownership: a key differentiation in whiteness (Moreton-Robinson, 2005; Harris, 1998). Furthermore, the flats and high-rise buildings were criminalised as physical spaces for criminal activity. Police had observed the changing ethnic origins of high-rise flat dwellers over the decades, with some officers claiming that despite changes in the ethnicity of residents, criminality was an ongoing issue:

I was stationed in Collingwood in the late 1970s and along Collingwood it used to be all Turkish, and they were dealing drugs. Victoria St has always historically been a place to deal drugs. So the Turks were doing it back in the 70s, and possible early eighties and also in my view there was a strong Turkish representation in all the flats, the Collingwood flats and the Richmond flats and obviously with the Asian refugees coming in, the flats, they've done a bit of a 180° so now over time it’s now Asian. (INY19)

This officer’s view was that the arrival of the Asians (Vietnamese) in the 1970s simply displaced the ‘Turks’ from the local drug trade, and that there was an inevitable link between new ethnic groups, high-rise public flats and drug crime. It was claimed that the high-rise housing estates were rife with drugs, with one officer estimating that one in five tenants of the estate were drug dealers. Officers considered the high-rise estates to be impenetrable,
overcrowded and alien environments. An officer expressed his opinion that the high-rise flats provided the perfect location for drug dealing and drug users:

You have that huge population with the high rises and the walk-ups [smaller public housing units that are three or four stories high and have no lifts]. You would have six or seven thousand people living in these five blocks. So it’s like a big town, only not spread out – it’s like every corridor on every floor of those units is like a street in a suburb…You’ve got three railway stations. You’ve got the high rises and the walk-ups and the fire escapes. It’s perfect for dealing drugs, using drugs. (INY17)

The officer’s description conjures up images of overcrowded ghettos. Similarly, another officer linked the location with drug crime, and stereotyped Asians living there as criminal:

It’s very hard. Because the difficulty is that you’ve got known drug areas, and they are highly populated with Asians. Now I know not all Asians are drug dealers, you know, I mean, I’m sure only a very small percentage are, but, perceptions whether they’re right or wrong, you’ve just got to go to Smith St, over the flats here, Richmond, there are a lot of other drug dealers arrested, but I’m sure if you look at the stats you know the Asians would be well represented. So that’s always going to be a difficult one because if they live in these high drug areas where people buy drugs, they live there; it’s always going to reinforce it, isn’t it? So my view would be that the only way they could deal with it is to move out of the area, and that way they wouldn’t be associated with the flats or whatever. (INY19)

Although the above two officers differentiated between an Asian majority who were not criminal and a small criminal minority, both agreed on the inevitable association police drew between high-rise flats and drugs. The second officer (INY19) suggested that the only way to overcome being stereotyped was to move out. While the first officer (INY17) claimed that the community should not suffer adverse consequences from the perception, the comments in effect implied that the on-going association of these areas with drugs, the over-crowding and the police’s general sense of disorganisation in these communities reinforced their assumptions.

The officer’s commentary on the residents of the flats implied that they were ‘strangers in our midst’ (Forrest and Dunn, 2006: 167). Racialised spaces are ‘distinctive geographies’ where
racist values and prejudiced attitudes towards ethnic and racial groups persist over time (Forrest and Dunn, 2006: 167). Public housing estates were perceived by police as stratified through the continued presence of the Vietnamese since the 1970s. Studies of Vietnamese habitation in the 1980s and 1990s in Melbourne and Sydney have debated whether the Vietnamese were forming permanent enclaves, or whether it was a transitional phase, as had been the pattern for earlier European migration, who were segregated prior to spatial and cultural assimilation (Forrest et al., 2006; Healy and Birrell, 2003; Jupp, 1993). Studies have shown that ethnic segregation is a consequence of the intersectionality of economic disadvantage, as well as of a lack of access to the housing market and other factors (Jacobowitz, 2010).

In Richmond, some residents in the flats had lived there for up to 20 years, and many benefited from the positive aspects of collective habitation shown in other studies, including group security, avoidance of language barriers and maintenance of cultural traditions (Forrest and Poulsen, 2003). Police judged local Vietnamese negatively for their lack of acculturation, and for higher rates of crime than in the wider Melbourne population, and not as immigrants experiencing social and economic disadvantage. The mostly-white officers at the local station were part of the mainstream geography that positioned Vietnamese as occupying a distinctive, racialised and criminalised micro-geography. The strategies implemented in PSA Yarra were a reaction to the disorder and threats to public safety interpreted within a whiteness framework. Their overall effect was to reinforce whiteness through mechanisms that racialised and criminalised the Vietnamese community.

How crime and safety issues with the Vietnamese community were dealt with in the other PSAs provides the opportunity to examine the assumptions and processes that reveal whiteness at work in the local context. The next section is an exploration of these relations in PSA Maribyrnong.

Policing the Vietnamese at Footscray Police Station in PSA Maribyrnong

PSA Maribyrnong is much smaller than PSA Yarra in terms of the number of police officers and the size of the population policed. Footscray Police Station is the main station in the PSA. Footscray is in the western suburbs of Melbourne, and has been historically identified with manufacturing, the working class and ethnic minorities. The population of Footscray at
the time of the study was 13,203, with 41% being Australian-born. The principal non-
English-speaking groups were as follows: 9.4% born in Vietnam, 7.3% born in India, 4.8%
born in China and 2.1% born in Bangladesh (Qpmz, 2014). The multicultural history of the
area was central to how officers spoke about their police work, and many officers identified
with the working-class roots and diversity of these suburbs.

**Normative policing practices**

As in Richmond, officers in Footscray claimed that Vietnamese-Australians were more likely
to be involved in drug crime. As in Richmond, there was racial differentiation between Asian
drug sellers and white buyers, and the same tendency by police not to target the buyers:

That would generally be the white Australian that buys and the Vietnamese that sells and
to support his habit the white Australian does all the house burglaries so everyone has
their niche (INF01).

The above quote shows that racial boundaries in relation to buying and selling drugs were
clearly defined: the Vietnamese was the drug seller and the white person the buyer. While
this racialisation of crime was a factor in how officers spoke about Vietnamese, it was not the
only story told regarding Vietnamese community members. Senior sergeants, constables and
specialist police officers collectively referred to multiple types of engagements with local
Vietnamese. One historical initiative that influenced current practices was the Footscray
Police Ethnic Unit.

**Footscray Police Ethnic Unit**

Formed in 1990, this unit aimed to build relations between Vietnamese people and police
(Tuck, 1995). The local Vietnamese Traders Association was credited with the initiative to
establish the unit, which was located in a house donated by the local council. Over time, the
unit became a highly-visible and active hub in the Footscray shopping precinct. Along with
the Vietnamese Traders Association, Vietnamese businesses supported the unit through
donations of equipment and the establishment of community networks. Strategies in the early
years of the unit included a Vietnamese language phone-in, a summer camp for Vietnamese
teenagers, and collaboration by plain-clothes police with social workers to interact with
Vietnamese youth in local hang-outs such as amusement parlours (Western Metropolitan
College of TAFE, 1992).
An indication of the importance attached to building relations with Vietnamese and other ethnic communities in the 1990s is shown in the paper ‘Policing Multicultural Australia’ (Comrie, 1995). In this report, the Chief Commissioner of Police (CCP) describes the significant benefits of cooperative ventures with new settler groups, since they foster ‘harmonious community relations and co-operation with the ethnic communities concerned’ (Comrie, 1995: 4). The CCP’s emphasis on harmonious relations with ethnic communities reflected governmental policies of multiculturalism with a focus on inclusion. The Footscray Police Ethnic Unit later became the Footscray Police Multicultural Liaison Unit, whose aim reflected the original goals of the unit of developing positive relations with local ethnic communities (Tuck, 1995). The Footscray Police Multicultural Unit was staffed by two officers, one a Community Liaison Officer the other a Youth Officer. The appointment of a Community Liaison Officer was locally funded to continue the tradition of building relations with Vietnamese and other Asian traders, as well as with the Vietnamese community. The unit was positioned within the Footscray market, a location that gave it a strong identification with the Vietnamese and other Asian market traders.

**Neighbourhood policing strategy**

The neighbourhood program is a state-wide police initiative, with 1,300 areas in rural and urban Victoria. The aims include increased reporting of crime and suspicious behaviour, crime prevention and reduced fear of crime (Victoria Police, 2014b). The main approach to policing in this PSA was a neighbourhood model, whereby a sergeant was assigned to each residential or business ward. It was inclusive, in that all communities were treated equally in terms of access to police officers. The police sergeant in each ward worked in partnership with the councillor, and was responsible for a team of constables and senior constables. The field-work for each officer in the team was to ‘get to know’ the people in their ward, and to be visible through foot patrols, car patrols and meetings with local businesses. In Footscray, the neighbourhood model was supported strongly, and was viewed as an important crime prevention strategy. A new neighbourhood area was established in the vicinity of a large new Vietnamese temple, the Quong Ming Temple, which was a significant meeting site for Vietnamese people. Officers were committed to a community neighbourhood model, and some were passionate about reaching their ethnic communities, as the following dialogue demonstrates:
But the community are our eyes. And we love the neighbourhood policing program we’ve got here…[We want to] get back to the old days of policing, where everyone knew the people in the community. And you would go to a panel beaters shop, or you would go to a chemist and say hello every now and then, get the after-hours details, update our systems, and get to know people. Because if you know someone, you are more likely to talk to them and give us something back. And that’s what we’ve been pushing here for some time. It’s worked overseas, and we’re keen for it here, and we really push it. (INF03)

This quote exemplifies that community policing was presented as integral to the police work of the local force, and that it was important for officers to get to know local people. Footscray police spoke confidently about involving their local Vietnamese shops and businesses in the neighbourhood model:

[Our program] also involved our crime prevention office and neighbourhood watch office, involve them in it as well, to talk on safety for the shop owners. So we have a few things on at times. (INF02)

Community policing was widely researched in the 1980s and 1990s with many critiques in the criminology literature contesting the usefulness of the strategy, often on the grounds that it incorporated many different kinds of policing (Connell 2008; Bullock and Tilly 2002). Some scholarship questioned whether it was more of a philosophical position or change management process rather than a specific category of policing practice (Brogden & Nijhar 2005; Chappell 2009; Engel & Worden 2003). Disparities in the implementation of community policing produced inter-departmental conflict in some police forces in the US (Rosenbaum & Lurigio 1994; Schwartz & Clarren 1977). Skogan (2004a; 2004b) found community policing was devalued and rejected by many officers for being too soft on crime and consequently, not real policework. Other factors that prevented implementation were competing organisational challenges in meeting rapid-response times and responding to urgent calls. Other scholars (Chappell 2009) pointed to the lack of organisational performance measures for community policing as the major barrier to implementation. Despite these significant challenges, studies found community policing had a positive effect on praxis in that police officers were more engaged and satisfied with their job (Yates and Pillai 1996, Greene 1989; Pelfrey 2004). Other studies showed that officers’ commitment to community policing was a critical factor in the success of the strategy with individual or organisational resistances being the main impediment (Giacomazzi & Brody 2004; Wycoff and Skogan 1994, Ford et al 2003, Chappell 2009).
Many officers in this study claimed an attachment to the Footscray area, and a sense of community that reflected a community policing approach. Officers’ attachment to the area appeared to be not so much as years in the locality, rather a feeling of identification with the diversity of the western suburbs. Officers commented on the different ethnicities in Footscray, with one officer describing the Vietnamese as a shrinking population:

> Well even in the three years I’ve been here, I reckon the Vietnamese community has gotten smaller, but that is still a large portion. We’ve got a large Indian community here as well and also Sudanese/Somalis as well. There’s some Caucasian Anglo-Saxon people thrown in amongst it as well. So they more or less would be our four main groups. (INF24)

In outlining the ethnic mix of people in the local communities, the officer included Caucasian/Anglo-Saxons, rather than explicitly contrasting whites against ethnic groups. This implied that Caucasian/Anglo-Saxon had white ethnicity, and thus that all people have ethnicity. Inclusion and participation were the main underlying themes in the dialogues of police officers from Footscray Police Station.

**Vietnamese offenders**

Some officers demonstrated a willingness to try to understand the world of the drug dealer, rather than the more usual outright dismissal of them as society drop-outs or undesirables. One officer described drug dealers’ lives as experiencing never-ending uncertainly, and as being at risk from stabbings and other forms of violence. Their drug profits were often stolen, and payback for debts was the norm:

> If you were dealing drugs and you got stabbed or you stabbed someone you don’t really want to bring attention to yourself I suppose. To them, that’s not, I don’t know if, what would you say if you’re dealing drugs, someone’s stole off you or taken money off you, haven’t paid you, there is a lot of violence inside but that’s very rarely reported to us unless it’s a serious injury and they’re hospitalised and that way we’re obliged to step in if it’s a serious injury. Co-operation would be – they don’t want us to find out who did it. (INF01)

As did others at the police station, the officer above spoke with understanding about the dangers and lack of control experienced in the lives of drug dealers. Officers understood that
dealers chose not to involve police because of fear of retribution: the consequences for them could be dire. Thus police were generally aware that when known drug offenders were victims of assault, they seldom cooperated with police investigations. One officer claimed that despite the lack of information on violence among offenders, the local police always endeavoured to solve the crime:

If there’s other witnesses or there’s other ways…other investigative techniques where we can identify them, we’ll charge them because you can’t consent to a serious injury obviously so we’ll still prosecute them if we know but if we’re reliant solely with the assistance of the victim they won’t give us much at all. (INF01)

Another officer claimed it was important to maintain an open mind about crooks and not to stereotype them. Although the officer still used the word ‘crook’, he indicated there would be equanimity in his dealings with them:

You can’t always be that hard copper and just locking people up and talking to them like they’re crooks. Not everyone’s a crook, even crooks…My personal philosophy is you show your crook a bit of courtesy and in expectation that they’ll give you some respect. (INF26)

In Footscray, police made an effort to find out some of the personal circumstances of street drug traders that kept them trapped in a cycle of criminal activity. Officers from Footscray Police Station questioned some of the taken-for-granted assumptions about drug offenders, and attempted to break down the dichotomy of non-crooks/crooks. Although the Vietnamese were viewed as more likely to be criminals, an understanding of some of their personal circumstances avoided a more blatant racial categorisation of Asians or Vietnamese as criminals. This approach was distinctly different to policing in PSA Yarra.

**Engagement with Vietnamese community**

Footscray police implemented a number of initiatives to work cooperatively with the Vietnamese community in public or religious events. A senior officer proudly recounted how the local community had asked him to speak at the opening of the recently-built temple. These experiences helped police to recognise and appreciate the complexities of the community, and consequently to break down barriers between the dominant white
community and the ethnic community. At Footscray, senior officers claimed they were committed to connecting with Vietnamese leaders and elders. Community activities organised by their CLO (Community Liaison Officer) were supported by other general duties officers. One officer described police involvement in the Vietnamese New Year Festivals as rather unusual occasions for police, because it was when the ‘good [Vietnamese] people came out’ (INFO3):

And that’s a huge festival that we have down here, which is firecrackers going off everywhere and the kids running around, and it’s well behaved, it’s the good people come out. (INF03)

This comment indicates the importance of police engagement with all parts of an ethnic community to build understanding, as opposed to allowing views to be based only on the criminal element. One example of a commitment to reaching the local Vietnamese community was the implementation of a basic Vietnamese language program for officers. The idea, generated by the CLO, was that all police should learn a few basic Vietnamese words and phrases, though it was more a symbolic gesture of goodwill than a real commitment to language acquisition. In the past, Victoria Police ran language courses for officers, but they had been discontinued in the 1990s. During an interview with a senior officer at Footscray Police Station, he drew my attention to a sign hanging above the office door: ‘Welcome’ was written in Vietnamese. Beyond these gestures, there was no incentive or opportunity for officers to learn Vietnamese or any other language. One police officer claimed that police would not be capable of learning another language, and that it did not really matter: speaking Vietnamese was not a core function of policing:

I think it’s really hard to allow the time that’s required to get that job done. To learn another language, I consider it right up there with the hard things to do, unless you’re absolutely blessed with intelligence, and you see some people that can speak 12 fluently and crazy things like that, and you just think how does that brain work, because mine, I struggle with English. I don’t think it would help to offer the General Duties Police, more time allocated, considering what our core function is and what we have to do, and how we are doing what we are doing with what we’ve got, without putting something that big on top of it. So no, I don’t think that’s going to help us out that much. (INF03)
The officer’s argument that they could not be expected to learn languages was a ‘red herring’, in that obviously police could not be expected to learn up to 12 languages. They used the colour-blind argument to defend their monolingual status. Because Vietnamese were the dominant group in all three PSAs in the study, it might have been prudent to prioritise the acquisition of Vietnamese language by at least a few officers. The local initiative of learning some basic Vietnamese words had merit, in that it demonstrated a commitment to inclusion, but it did not address the key need to investigate the safety issues or lack of understanding of the law for generation one Vietnamese Australians. People who spoke only Vietnamese or other non-English languages were disadvantaged. They were not the recipients of white privilege that accrues from knowledge of the legal justice system and its laws, all of which have been formed within English traditions.

Neighbourhoods, multiculturalism and whiteness

The key premises of multiculturalism were evident in the normative policing approaches at Footscray Police Station. They promoted social inclusion of ethnic minorities and thought that cultural traditions should be respected and preserved (Jupp, 2002). Jayasuriya (2008) contends that policies focussed on inclusion are diversionary tactics that avoid confronting how ethnicity is managed by the dominant culture through formal settler governance structures. According to this argument, multiculturalism does not promote active participation by the settled groups in self-determination mechanisms of governance. The model at Footscray was based on building understanding, inclusion and tolerance, and thus was consistent with the mainstays of multiculturalism.

At the Footscray Police Station, multicultural approaches had evolved from the historical operations at the Footscray Police Ethnic Unit to the current whiteness organisational structures of the CLO and local multicultural unit. All were framed within multicultural discourse and policy. The different histories of relations in the PSA Maribyrnong and PSA Yarra, along with the community-oriented approach, had established a framework for action based on tolerance and inclusion. As emphasised by Hage (2000), such multicultural approaches are not an abrogation of whiteness, but constitute yet another form of whiteness that maintains ethnic groups as ethnic. Such maintenance of whiteness was consistent with state and national policies of multiculturalism.
Having illustrated those aspects of policing relations in PSA Maribyrnong and PSA Yarra that impacted on whiteness, I now turn to the third location, PSA Dandenong, to explore whiteness relations and policing practices.

**Policing the Vietnamese in PSA Dandenong**

Two police stations in PSA Dandenong were included in the study: Dandenong Police Station and Springvale Police Station. Of the two stations, Dandenong was the largest, and was central to the PSA as it included the managers of the region and the PSA’s Multicultural Liaison Officers. Springvale Station was smaller, and located in the midst of the main Vietnamese community. These two stations are described separately, because they differ demographically and operationally in regard to policing Vietnamese. In comparing the two approaches, I argue that the strategies implemented at Dandenong Police Station reinforced whiteness, while at Springvale Police Station some officers maintained whiteness and others challenged it.

**Normative practices of policing the Vietnamese at Dandenong Station**

Police at Dandenong Police Station emphasised the diverse nature of their community. Offices claimed that at the time of the study, of all Melbourne suburbs, Dandenong had the highest non-English-speaking population (51.9%) (Glenn, 2012). The population of Dandenong in 2011 was 24,919, with 30.4% being Australian-born. The main non-English-speaking countries of origin were India (11.2%), Afghanistan (6.6%), Sri Lanka (6.2%), and China (3.2%) (Qpmz, 2014). The settlers were from 150 different countries, and 55% of settlers were from non English-speaking countries, which is double the average of 26% for metropolitan Melbourne (Greater Dandenong Council, 2014).

One officer explained the demographic of Dandenong as including white Anglo Saxons plus 120 different national groups. Consequently, officers were constantly encountering different cultural groups:

> Your whole day can be spent where you don’t speak to a white person, like an Anglo Saxon. There’s not one particular thing that brings us into contact with one particular population, and it’s just all day everyday here, we’re just constantly going to different things. In my experience, there’s not one particular thing where you hear a job and straight away you can think well that job’s going to be, the people there are going to be of
this nationality. Because we have, I happened to be looking at some census data the other day, and there’s something like one hundred and twenty different nationalities in the city of greater Dandenong, which is Dandenong and Springvale. So we never know you’re, who we’re going to come across. (IND14)

The officer’s comment that in any one day not a single white person may be spoken to indicates that the officer differentiated between normative, white Anglo Saxons and other nationalities.

At Dandenong Police Station, relations between police officers and ethnic communities were assigned to Multicultural Liaison Officers (MLOs). As part of a state-wide strategy comprising two MLOs and a manager, Dandenong Station had a newly-implemented proactive unit onsite. The station was fortunate in having the two MLOs located there, but as they pointed out, this more hands-on involvement could not be replicated elsewhere in the region:

Whether they work in different locations purely because of the geography could be an issue but we stay at Dandenong because it’s just their regional headquarters. We’re all here but if we need to go out into East Gippsland we will, but if not we can concentrate our work around here. But in saying that, I guess you’re going to have multicultural officers like you do in the other regions. We have one out at Swan Hill to service that community because there’s a direct need. We don’t have that down in our rural areas, we don’t have that need and that’s why we’re all based here (IND01; IND02)

A major limitation of deferring community liaison to MLOs was that two MLOs were responsible for a region, which is a vast area comprising rural and metropolitan suburbs, as well as many police stations. It was not possible for the MLOs to have an active presence at all these stations, or to manage relations with the vast and dispersed ethnic, racial and faith-based communities in the region. MLOs claimed to be under-resourced in dealing with the complex problems of so many different groups. Any strategies for change by MLOs involved working with other agencies and community workers.

When asked about police relations with the Vietnamese, general duties police responded as if they were surprised to be asked about this group. Others said they could not comment, and
some were clearly disinterested. A number of officers advised me that I should speak with the multi-cultural liaison officers (MLOs) instead. General duties police differentiated themselves from MLOs; they usually did not want to engage with community associations, social workers or other professionals. One officer claimed working with communities was something that police used to do in the past:

It is a lot different but now we’re a bit tighter you just don’t get that. We can’t get out as much and go and talk to people and go and talk to the majors of shops and just go and say hello so that they know we’re there. I mean I used to go in all the time to the shops. Didn’t matter which one on the main street, just to say good-day, pop our heads in and say we’re here just to get a feel of who was in the area so they knew us. (IND18)

For this officer, connecting with the local community used to occur when officers had more time to chat to shop proprietors or with publicans. The officer did not consider whether non-white groups might be found at the pub.

Dandenong Police Station used a model based on MLOs as community policing experts. This model of multicultural specialists is widely used, not only in Victoria Police but in police forces in other Australian states. It mirrors the diversity management models built into government and education structures during the 1980s and 1990s in Victoria. The models are criticised for having a narrow socio-psychological lens on identity-based discriminatory practices, and for their failure to attend to structural inequities and unequal distribution of resources (Zanoni et al., 2010). Organisational specialist diversity roles were often filled by members of minority groups as cultural representatives, or by white Anglo people committed to the principles of equity and inclusion. Despite their passion for the job, their effectiveness in the role was limited by a lack of organisational power to affect change (Ahmed, 2007). This was the case for MLOs, whose career paths in the police organisation were limited. Their work with ethnic and racially-identified groups was described by police officers as not ‘core’, but rather outside mainstream policing. Police careers in traditional whiteness roles were the norm and provided more assured promotion trajectories. General duties officers were not threatened by having to take on the multicultural components, which were assigned to devalued roles. Through these whiteness mechanisms, structural advantages were protected and not challenged by the changing demographics.
Most general duties officers claimed that the huge diversity of ethnicities and disadvantaged groups made the task of building relations with all ethnic groups daunting and unrealisable. This argument was used to defend against any questions from the researchers about the Vietnamese community. In contrast to this general disinterest, one officer suggested that there was specialist knowledge among the police at Springvale Station, particularly on the part of one senior sergeant:

“There’s a sergeant over at Springvale who is excellent with the Asian communities. He’s right in there and if you’ve ever got any questions about Asians you go and see him, he can tell you everything what’s going on and who’s who and all sorts of stuff. (IND16)

This senior sergeant, along with other officers at Springvale, were the next to be interviewed for this research project. In crossing from one suburb to the next, significant differences were noted in the local knowledge acquired by officers and in the approaches implemented to connect with the local Vietnamese community.

**Normative practices of policing Vietnamese at Springvale Station**

Springvale Police Station appeared like a satellite station, located in the midst of a densely-populated Vietnamese community, and seemingly disconnected from other police stations. Police officers at Springvale Police Station demonstrated distinctly different attitudes to many officers at the ‘big brother’ station, Dandenong Police Station. At Springvale, many officers spoke of their connection with the community, and unlike Dandenong’s reliance on MLOs, Springvale police appeared to have no contact with the MLOs, and some officers claimed ignorance about their role. The PSA’s MLO structure was invisible at Springvale, and did not influence how they went about policing the local Vietnamese community.

The total population in Springvale was 19,771, and although the Australian-born population of 29.5% was similar to Dandenong’s, the ethnic population mix was entirely different. The main groups from non-English speaking countries were Vietnamese (21.2%), Indian (10.5%), Cambodian (5.2%) and Chinese (4.9%) (Qpmz, 2014). Springvale had the highest proportional density of Vietnamese-born residents of any locations in the study. At the time, the main shopping street in Springvale was described by police as relatively free of drugs compared with the 1990s, when it was infamously known as ‘a drug hotspot’, a reputation it held for 15 years (Police Life 2008 p.20). Two officers spoke of the ‘out of control’ peak
periods of heroin street-trading in this decade. One officer described a typical scene experienced when he was first appointed to Springvale Police Station:

When I first hit Springvale ten years, nine years ago, drugs were really, they’re still prominent now but it was just rampant in the streets then, you could walk down the street and be offered, in plain clothes and people would offer you deals but it’s certainly changed in that regard. (IND20)

Interestingly, this above-quoted officer did not identify the ethnicity of the drug traders, although other officers at Springvale did sometimes connect drug trading with the Vietnamese. Thus this officer did not contribute to the reinforcement and reconstruction of the link between drugs and Vietnamese through constant repetition in dialogue.

Over the decade of the 1990s, in collaboration with the Crime Investigation Unit, the local police reduced drug issues in the streets. Many past strategies at Springvale were the same as those employed in Richmond: repetitive street patrols, driving drug dealers out of the area, and building up enough convictions so that repeat offenders eventually were put in gaol for extended periods (Carnovale, 2008). Compared with the 1990s, police reported that crime rates in Greater Dandenong in 2006/2007 had decreased by 23%, and drug offences by 90% (Carnovale, 2008). A few officers reflected on these bygone days as having been exciting and full of police drama. One officer described being in the situation of never knowing what would happen from one hour to the next:

I just enjoy being busy and you just never knew from one hour to the next what was going to happen and it would be nothing unusual to, at the old police station with about four interview rooms, where you’d come in, join a shift halfway through a shift and there’d be 15 offenders in the station. They’d be literally handcuffed to chairs, sitting behind tables, sitting behind lockers, and we just ran out of room and it was just day in, day out, nonstop. And the van would go on the road, they’d be back in 15 minutes with four or five offenders and it was just out of control. We’d clear them out of Safeway’s driveway and they’d move elsewhere, by the arcade. Four months down the track they’d be at the underpass at the railway station, four months down the track they’d be at an amusement parlour up the road, and it was just a nonstop battle of trying to clear them out. (IND04)
These comments express the attraction of catching crooks, as well as the traditional policing of ‘baddies’. At the time of the research, according to one officer, although street trading still existed and had not been eradicated, it was under control and did not impinge on the safety of shoppers and businesses: ‘You might be lucky to find one or two small cap dealers sitting on the street’ (IND04). Another officer expressed his view that it was not that drug trading had stopped; it was just done differently:

No it’s just, it just means that they’re smarter, people are smarter about it as well, or moved on to different suburbs, or across the way, I don’t think that’s a problem that goes away. (IND05)

The previous two quotes from officers capture the paradox: policing to keep up appearances of social control versus the reality. Nonetheless, the police maintained that the drug scene had moved, and trading was no longer visible in the streets of Springvale, which police used as a measure of their success.

Although officers were restrained, and did not repeatedly criminalise the Vietnamese in dialogue, one officer expressed the view that the Vietnamese and Cambodians were ‘definitely the more drug trafficking type culture, that’s where it seems to be coming from’ (IND13). Another officer claimed that the majority of Vietnamese drug traffickers were users, and that they were typically associated with committing burglaries to support their addiction:

Well as I said with the plain clothes drug investigations I did, there was sort of, there was certain Vietnamese groups that came under attention, but that’s not to be stereotypical about their nationality or anything. But typically if there was crime related to Vietnamese, it would be drug related or person to have got a, for trafficking or people that have got an addiction that are then supporting their habit, so doing residential burglaries, breaking into cars, those sort of things to get money, to get some quick money so that they could then get the gear (INDS06).

As did this officer, many were careful to mention they did not want to stereotype Vietnamese or any other group. Nonetheless they showed that they did associate the Vietnamese with drug crimes. Despite the positive changes achieved in Springvale, for many officers the
reputation of Vietnamese as drug traders stuck. At Springvale, a number of officers explained how they had used their own initiative to build relations with the local dominant Vietnamese community. One senior officer emphasised that this knowledge was often useful in solving crime, because closer relations sometimes led to accessing significant intelligence. An example of this was provided by one officer, who claimed to access higher-level information on drug trading through Vietnamese contacts:

If you know where you’re going and what to ask, they’ll fill in the gaps. But they won't tell you if you don't know where you’re going. And that’s, like, there’s people here who are more... There are Cambodian Vietnamese people in the community here who aren’t part of any organisation. They’re informally leaders of the community, but you’ll never find them. You’ve got to know who to speak to about certain things. And you find if you lock up a shopkeeper for some particular reason, it might be a drink driving or whatever, you’ll get a phone call. (IND04)

This officer’s narrative indicates that gaining intelligence was a subtle process of knowing the right person to ask, and knowing how to ask the question in the right way. It was considered to be cultural knowledge that was not easily learnt, but which grows out of experience. Also apparent at Springvale Station was a general concern by officers for the underlying social problems and disadvantages suffered by Vietnamese families, some of whom they recognised as caught in cycles of crime that were generated by issues such as gambling or a child with a drug addiction. One officer gave an example of a specific request received from a local Vietnamese woman who sought assistance from police:

One thing that I’ve noticed in the whole time is that some of the wives come in to say their husbands, complaining their husbands have got gambling problems, at the casino and they want us to do something about that where we can’t but that is a, that must be a big problem in their community I think, the gambling. (IND14)

This call for assistance with a family gambling problem by the Vietnamese woman was significant in the study. It showed a level of trust, since Vietnamese rarely make gambling issues public outside the family (Le and Gilding, 2014). However, the officer did not appear to take the important step of connecting the woman with local Vietnamese gambling support agencies. Other officers at Springvale witnessed the trauma experienced by Vietnamese
families in struggling to control children with serious drug addictions. Again, families did not seek help from community members or support agencies, because of the cultural practice of ‘saving face’ that contained drug problems within families. The sense of bewilderment experienced by families who did not know how to intervene when a child or other family member had a serious drug addiction led in some cases to extreme action:

The ice, the real good heroin traffickers have been on the gear for eight, nine, 10 years, and moving fair amounts of heroin and using heroin for a long time. They’ve been in jail, come out of jail, for whatever silly reason they get on the ice and in a matter of a week, two weeks, they are totally out of control. And I’ve got wives and defactos who are doing the same thing, chaining them up and locking them in rooms at home just to get them off that ice and to try and break that habit. It’s a terrible thing and we’re seeing more and more of that at the moment. (IND04)

In recounting his experiences, this officer showed compassion for the plight of the Vietnamese people who were trying to manage drug addictions in their families. The officer did not advocate taking punitive action, but did inform the families that it was illegal to chain or lock people up. Once again, the officer did not say that he had linked these families with drug assistance agencies. This following narrative is a moving account of the plight of a young Vietnamese drug offender:

Tan wasn’t born here so like I said, when I first met him he was 14 so I’m assuming you know, in his younger years he would have been - came out a very young child maybe and - I mean, he spoke English; he probably went to school here. I mean, I don’t know all the details of his background sort of thing but he was just one of our regulars…

Virtually the first time I ever met Tan was about - it’d have to be like 16, 17 years ago and he would have been about 14, 15, that sort of age bracket at the time; maybe 16. It’s that long ago, anyway. But virtually, what happened was we got a call for a domestic. He’s got a brother called Tuong and his brother had used the phone to ring the police and the scenario is we go to the house and we’re sort of shown into his bedroom and it’s a wooden floor and, in the middle of the floor, there’s a bob been driven down through the wooden floor and Tan has a chain around his leg and he’s virtually chained to the floor, right…
So needless to say, we had a big, long chat with Dad and explained that, in Australia, I appreciate that he might be hanging around with the wrong people, but we don’t have the power to lock our kids up, chain our kids up; whatever the case may be. And Dad was really good about it, like Dad, “Yeah, new culture. Sorry, sorry” you know and all that sort of stuff. Vietnamese, yeah, Vietnamese. So the chain was unlocked and virtually the matter was sorted and about two, maybe three days later I arrested Tuan in Springvale Road trafficking in heroin. And I always sort of thought to myself, “You know, if I would have let Dad keep the chain on then he wouldn’t have got into the trouble that he ended up getting in” because virtually over the last 15 years, Tan has been in and out of gaol charged with everything from trafficking in heroin, robbery, usually drug-related offences…

And like I said, I got the news the other day, we - I was working the divisional van about two or three nights ago when a detective [called] - can the Springvale van go around to this address in Noble Park and try and hunt down the relatives of a deceased male that we’ve got here that’s died of an apparent drug overdose and was found in a creek bed or something…And then he virtually said that the name of the deceased was Tan and gave his date of birth and the address and straight away I’ve gone, “Hang on a minute. I know him” and I was able to tell them straight away that, “Listen, there’s no good looking for his parents because they both died in a fatal a couple of years ago” sort of thing. Like it’s sort of - it’s the sort of thing that - I mean, it might sound funny but like because if you work at the same police station for a long, long time like I probably see more of his family than I see my own extended family, you know what I mean, because you know I have contact with him a lot or his brother’s an offender too and I have contact with his brother and stuff like that. He’s got a couple of siblings that aren’t in trouble, you know what I mean? But I know the whole family, I’ve known the whole history, I’ve you know bumped into Tan 100 times over the last few years sort of thing.

I mean, that’s what you sort of - it strikes you funny sometimes that you know, like, especially with the you know minorities that we get around Springvale, that people travel halfway around the world, you would expect, for a new start and a great beginning only to find within months of arriving the kids are getting involved in heroin addiction and sort of offending and all that sort of stuff, you know what I mean. (IND07)

This senior officer showed a depth of knowledge of this particular family and the Vietnamese community that was accrued over many years through community-oriented policing. It
demonstrates a sincere attempt to understand the issues from a Vietnamese-Australian perspective and to respond with culturally-sensitive policing. The officer’s story leaves one with a sense of his integrity. The case of Tan raised personal dilemmas for the officer, and left him with questions that could not be resolved. It was part of this officer’s job to learn to live with these memories.

The knowledge demonstrated at Springvale Police Station of how to engage with a Vietnamese community did not appear to be shared by the managers at Dandenong or in the Victoria Police. Nevertheless, officers at Springvale, who had made a personal commitment to understanding security and safety issues in the local Vietnamese community, did not feel rewarded for their efforts. This knowledge was not of interest to the Victoria Police, which was structured on whiteness, and consequently focussed on meeting the security and safety needs of mainstream communities that conformed with whiteness. Because these approaches did not conform with the whiteness organisational structures of promotion and recognition, their achievements were not visible, or were devalued.

**Policing and whiteness in the PSAs**

In this chapter, I investigated whether the strategies implemented in the three PSAs by the local police forces reinforced, maintained or reinvented whiteness. I also explored how the strategies led directly or indirectly to white advantage. In all PSAs, it was evident that the strategies implemented by the local police forces directly affected whiteness. Some strategies strongly reinforced whiteness and others operated to maintain whiteness.

Whiteness was strongly reinforced at Richmond Police Station, as it was in some of the local force’s practices at Dandenong Police Station. Policing at Richmond Police Station reinforced whiteness through the racialisation and criminalisation of the Vietnamese community through strategies that had grown out of historical approaches. Crackdowns were employed at Richmond Station, and these were swift and forceful public demonstrations of the police’s power and authority over criminalised others. The police perspective of Victoria Street as a hub of crime and as a site for training police to catch crooks sat in sharp contrast to the use by local Vietnamese of the street as a hub for shopping, meeting people, eating out or buying take-home food. As found in other studies, intensive surveillance and intelligence gathering further criminalised the Vietnamese, and reinforced the sense of the area as viewed
from a white perspective (Bowling and Phillips, 2007; Bowling et al., 2003b). This reinforcement of whiteness was added to through the racialisation and criminalisation of the entire nearby high-rise estate, where most local Vietnamese lived. Dandenong Police Station also reinforced whiteness as normative. However, this was less through force and surveillance; rather it was through exclusionary practices that dismissed the Vietnamese as being irrelevant and associated with the past. The Dandenong police’s interest in settler groups was generally temporary, which acted as an exclusive mechanism that reinforced whiteness as normative. Their latest interest was in the threat posed by African groups, who were being racialised and criminalised by some officers.

Multicultural models at Dandenong Police Station and Footscray Police Station maintained whiteness through viewing communities as either ethnic or normative. At Dandenong Police Station, general duties officers passed on any issues deemed ethnic or multicultural to the MLOs, of whom there were only two for a huge region, and who could not possibly attend to the array of issues that arose across 150 communities in the PSA of Dandenong. This model restricted the attention of officers to identity-based discrimination by officers, and MLOs lacked the power to reform structural bias and inequities, which is a problem found more broadly in organisations (Zanoni et al., 2010). While at Footscray Station the policing strategies were similarly based on multicultural models that maintained whiteness as normative, an important difference was the local commitment demonstrated by the funding of a CLO to assist with inclusion of the Vietnamese community.

Virtually no strategies were observed that reinvented whiteness. At best, some could be described as a starting point for re-thinking of traditional identities and practices of whiteness. At Footscray Police Station, neighbourhood policing minimised the boundaries between white and other groups through ensuring equitable policing resources across neighbourhoods. In contrast to the dismissal of drug criminals as drop-outs at Richmond, Footscray officers were encouraged to try and understand the social issues trapping offenders into cycles of crime, and to be sympathetic to the dangers of street life. According to Kinchenloe (1999), reinventing whiteness must start with a critical understanding of social justice issues and commitment to change. In Footscray, it was apparent that officers were willing to move in this direction. At Springvale Police Station, senior officers made concerted efforts to understand the plight of the Vietnamese, and showed compassion and empathy for
their struggles. These valiant efforts were subsumed within the whiteness organisational structures.

The focus at Richmond Police Station on a criminalised racialised group, as well as on over-surveillance, provided opportunities for increasing the force’s arrest rates and meeting targets on crime. It also served to reinforce whiteness. Footscray Police Station was at a disadvantage in this regard, in that it did not pursue drug arrests to the same degree and through increased crime reporting from ethnic groups that produced poorer reporting targets. Richmond Police Station also benefited from opportunities to intervene and arrest suspicious characters, and this was being replicated in Dandenong with Africans. Whiteness made Asian sellers visible and white buyers invisible, and normalised these supplier/buyer transactions. The marking of Asians and Africans as criminal groups helped maintain white populations’ superiority through being less associated with crime. These obvious payoffs for the local forces from whiteness supported white advantage within the force, as well as in the wider white community. Overall, the study showed that Victoria Police as an organisation rewarded local forces for the reinforcement or maintenance of whiteness through crime targets, and sanctioned policing approaches and multicultural policies.
Chapter 6 Individual police officers’ perspectives: relations with Vietnamese communities

In this chapter the attitudes, beliefs and behaviours of individual police officers are explored, with particular regard to choices they make, their implementation of the law, and their interactions with Vietnamese communities. Through analysis of officers’ dialogue, the chapter aims to examine how whiteness shapes, or is evident in, practices employed by individual officers as they describe how they go about their everyday work in policing Vietnamese communities. Through a focus on the individual white officer, the over-arching research question is addressed: How is whiteness reinforced, maintained or reinvented in policing Vietnamese communities, and how does this contribute to white advantage? Thus pertinent to the study is how police practices and attitudes interact with the mechanisms that construct whiteness: Is it reinforced, maintained or reinvented? I argue that whiteness is reinforced through the practices of some officers, who use exclusionary mechanisms that strengthen the notion of whiteness as normative.

Traditional cultures as non-normative

Police described Vietnamese culture as bound by and bonded to the traditions brought with them from Vietnam. These traditions include festivals such as the Vietnamese New Year Festival and Vietnamese Children’s Lantern Festivals, for which police are often asked to provide traffic management. Burke (2011) contends that the focus by ethnic minorities or racialised groups on festivals and food is a ‘consumption-based approach’ (Burke, 2011: 647) whereby ethnic experiences add to, but are not part of, normative white culture. Similarly, Carroll (2014: 100) criticises the ‘foods and festivals’ approach for its essentialising and simplification of non-white cultures. These events are experienced as different and unique or quaint, because they are contrasted with normative and internalised ideas of superior cultural events:

I think it’s great to see the cultures, I mean, 30 years ago you would never have had half the number of restaurants that we’ve got if we didn’t have multiculturalism and that’s terrific, but I think it is only fair that you live in Australia, you’ve got to move towards our ideals. (INY11)
For this officer, although ethnic restaurants were a positive consequence of multiculturalism, as was the opportunity to experience a different culture, the non-normative nature of traditional cultures was emphasised. Police were unanimous in their criticism of older Vietnamese for their lack of spoken English, another aspect that emphasised their non-normativity. Police claimed that language and cultural divides contributed to ineffective communications between Victoria Police and the Vietnamese communities, and that this was particularly true of the first generation. Officers described Vietnamese families as adhering strictly to traditional family values, and often commented on the obedience of Vietnamese children. The inter-generational and extended nature of families was noted by police, which they had observed on those occasions when they entered family premises on police business. In one such situation, an officer found many generations living together, and observed their traditional ways of cooking. The general ambience was captured as ‘homey’:

But like saying that there’s a lot of big families, I guess, when we do a, say araid for instance you come across and there’d be a big household with maybe brothers and sisters and their children living there and still Grandma who is probably came over years later after the original parents came to Australia in sort of the ‘60’s, ‘70’s, and cooking out the back, and real good homely sort of environment so, and very nice people I found as well and very, quite easy to deal with really. (IND06)

Surprisingly, in conducting the raid, the officer was able to note some admirable aspects of traditional life. Perhaps this was because the officer found the people ‘very nice’ and ‘easy to deal with’ (IND06). The officer also commented on the compliance and helpfulness of Vietnamese people:

They’re wanting to assist you, if they can – this is the general public I’m talking of – and even offenders that you do catch out, they’ll, they won’t play up or give you a hard time. (IND06)

Here the officer indicates that Vietnamese offenders are not antagonistic towards police, which he attributes to their cultural values. Respect was believed by many police to be a core value in Vietnamese communities, an opinion based on officers’ observations of the respect shown for elders and people in authority. Some police contrasted the respect they received from Vietnamese with the often disrespectful and abusive behaviours they experienced from
members of the white public. While Vietnamese traditional culture was respectful, the same was not identified in white culture. Scholars claim that traditional cultures are constructed as bounded, and stand out against the invisibility and unboundedness of white cultures (Perry, 2001). Other scholars suggest that whites contend that their own culture is culture-less or neutral, because it acts predominantly as a palette against which other cultures are made visible. According to Perry (2001), assumptions of neutrality and invisibility hide pernicious processes that maintain institutional powers and white privilege.

Some officers disagreed with the proposition that Vietnamese people respect the police. For example, a senior sergeant suggested that it was deference rather than respect for authority. A few other officers said they found Vietnamese suspects or offenders overly obedient – even obsequious – and implied that they did not respect the Vietnamese for this. One police officer described Vietnamese people as superficially polite and submissive, behaviours which appeared to hide their real feelings:

The Vietnamese, that is in my dealings, they are very polite and very courteous and they respect authority and in fact for them it’s a bit submissive. They won’t argue with the police. They won’t tell you. They won’t co-operate but they won’t – there’s a sort of passive resistance. (INF01)

Use of the word ‘submissive’ indicates that power relations were at play in interactions between white officers and Asians. The withholding of information and passive resistance were part of a traditional culture police did not understand. The word ‘submissive’ and its companion opposite ‘dominant’ imply assumptions embedded in the white culture that defines relationships between police and Vietnamese. Traditional dogma is more often imposed on minority ethnic groups by dominant white cultures through the imposition of stereotypes, essentialising behaviour and cultural simplification that imply internal homogeneity (Briggs, 1996). Further, Briggs (1996) argues that constructions of cultures as ‘traditional’ suggest erroneous perceptions of past connections, and are mostly imaginary inventions rather than being representations of past realities. Instead it is asserted that cultures are ‘made in the present’ (Briggs, 1996: 435). Furthermore, this author argues that imposing traditional categories on ethnic or racial groups is a form of cultural imperialism:
It can be a form of cultural imperialism to claim the authority to apply traditional constructions to other communities, usually without the detailed knowledge of the practices or languages in which they are embedded. (Briggs, 1996: 436)

Related to Briggs’ ideas was a perception that the Vietnamese are a hard-working group. Although the trait of being hard-working appears positive, it was a class categorisation that stereotyped the Vietnamese community within the trades and in lower socio-economic jobs such as manufacturing.

Yeah, well they are hard-working I think, I haven’t worked with them, but just their general, I think just the general opinion of them is that they are hard-working people. They don’t complain unlike a lot of Australians do, they do hard labour in poor paying jobs. And they just do it, they don’t drone on or anything like that. (INF26)

This officer makes the distinctions between advantaged white people, who do not have to work hard, and Vietnamese, who do. White people are in well-paying jobs, while Vietnamese are in poor-paying jobs. Jakubowicz (2010) describes such work stratifications as white systemic discrimination against ethnic minorities. Only a few police could recognise the Vietnamese work ethic, and only occasionally did officers comment on the low wages and substandard work conditions in sweat shops. For instance, one officer recounted a scene in a sweat shop set up in a ministry of housing flat:

I’ve seen some of those ministry of housing flats that have been turned into sweat shops. Just a flat with 30 sewing machines in them. And they wouldn’t be earning more than $20 or $30 a day but they’re there from 6am to 6pm. Because a lot of them don’t understand that just because you are just in this country illegally it doesn’t mean that they’ll automatically deport you. (INY01)

This officer was confronted by a crowded illegal sewing venture in this flat. She assumed they were illegal immigrants, but did not feel obliged to report her suspicions. These sorts of so-called traditions, with their underlying theme of unregulated work and lowly-paid manufacturing jobs, are evidence of the imposition of traditions at a site where there are conflicting needs for white and Vietnamese cultures. In this example of ‘contested fields of interest’ (Briggs, 1996: 435), the dominant group fails to mention Vietnamese mobility in the
workforce and cheap white labour, because Vietnamese sweat shops fulfil the broader economic needs of white society. These wider themes shape the experiences of white police and Vietnamese people.

Carroll (2014: 99) uses the term ‘whitespeak’ which is ‘the euphemizing of white racism through coded speech’. Whitespeak presents dominant, socially-normative behaviours. Through the use of euphemisms, leaving critical and socially-disturbing aspects unsaid, and sanitising critical language into palatable everyday bites, inequities are reinforced as normal. In this way, uncomfortable ‘truths’ about oppressions can be dodged with words such as ‘discrimination’; a word that has become so commonplace that it is losing its impact. Other oppressions may be presented in a palatable way as ‘minority issues’ or stereotypes used to maintain a dominant position. Thus the police perpetuated marginalisation, rather than first trying to understand the economic and social factors that confine sections of the Vietnamese communities to enclaves. Police officers did not in their discourse acknowledge these contributing factors or try to redress discrimination within the domain of policing.

**Exclusions based on resistance to acculturation**

A common view among police was that the Vietnamese were not only maintaining traditions, but that they had failed to adapt to the dominant culture. Police were openly critical of Vietnamese communities for maintaining their separateness, and officers tended to speak as if they were inhabitants of a closed world. One officer argued that it was the responsibility of settler groups to assimilate, rather than that of the dominant culture to adapt to them:

> They don’t think anything of it. And that’s what I struggle with a bit, with communities who don’t make an effort to assimilate, and they want to preserve their own culture entirely, just in Australia. I don’t think that that is fair…I just get a little bit jack of it seeming that it has always got to be me that has got to adjust, it is always my culture that has got to adjust, I mean hang on, you’re coming to my country. I’d just like to see a little bit more give on their behalf. (INY11)

One officer implied that it was a conscious choice on the part of the Vietnamese not to acculturate, because their priority was to preserve their own culture. This officer’s dialogue reinforced whiteness as normative, and all non-dominant groups were collectively excluded as ‘them’. The views expressed by the officer above did not comply with multiculturalism, in
that they did not exhibit tolerance and acceptance of cultural difference; rather the officer wanted to extinguish difference. Another officer presented a similar view, that these non-white groups should adjust, though his opinion was based on the length of time they had been in Australia. This officer implied that only communities in the category of ‘new and emerging’ – used by the Victoria Police and the Victorian Government – should be excused from expectations of acculturation (Victoria Police, 2005). In the end, all groups should adjust to white cultural norms, and the change should be evident in the next generation:

They’re not a new and emerging community, they’ve been in Australia 10-15 years and we’re getting into the second generation. So they’ve got to be able to adjust a bit more than what they currently are. (IND17)

As did the previous officer, this one expected that over time, cultural differences should disappear in favour of whiteness norms. Strategies to hasten assimilation were ‘education, getting the kids together’ (INY11), which the officer predicted would be a great ‘leveller’ (INY11), though an inbuilt assumption was that the ‘level’ playing field was the normative white one to which new groups should conform. Ironically, those officers who stressed assimilation did not see any contradictions in the fact that they enjoyed taking part in cultural traditions involving food. Collective behaviours were often described as inward looking, though one officer described the Vietnamese as both inward and outward looking:

So they probably looked inwards for their own support and their own strength and who could blame them really. I think since then they’ve, while they are still fairly inward looking in my opinion, they’ve obviously, they’re outward looking in some parts of the way they relate to Australian society. (IND03)

This officer recognised that cultural support was found from within the group but not without. Unusually, the following statement by one officer suggests that perhaps the white Anglo culture, rather than the Vietnamese, is the problem:

They had a lot of trouble adapting to our language, and with our culture, where we might go to the pub for a beer, and socialise after work that way, we don’t often see them in hotels and anything like that. Probably, because it’s not what they’re used to. (INY14)
It was extremely rare to find an officer who recognised the existence of white culture and its exclusive domains. Some officers who saw the preservation of distinct Vietnamese communities as evidence of a failure to adapt nonetheless valued the collective nature of the community. One such agreed that Vietnamese Australians might want to sustain aspects of their original culture:

Well, like I said, with a lot of those sort of cultures, it’s sort of - I mean, they come to Australia and the older generations want to keep a little bit of their - what they had over there, you know what I mean; their community spirit, their community culture (IND07).

This officer interpreted the maintenance of culture as preserving a ‘community spirit’, though expected that it would be only a ‘little bit’ of their culture. It was unusual for police to comment on cultural dilemmas – their own or others – and in this case on the dilemma for Vietnamese of wanting to maintain aspects of their culture while still trying to fit in. Cherry’s (2014) study of Victoria Police officers found that ambiguities, dilemmas and more confronting aspects of policing were strongly felt by many officers, but were not shared in a culture in which heroic policing stories proliferated.

Police usually thought of assimilation as a process of total absorption into Australian culture rather than an interweaving of different components. Their key proposition was that migrant identities would, or certainly should, evolve over time into ‘Australian’ identities. A US study found that while socio-cultural assimilation invariably develops among the second generation with a shift in language and cultural inclinations, it is not straightforward (Portes, 1999). Portes (2005) suggests that the question is not whether assimilation will or will not occur, but rather to ‘what segment of the society’ (Portes et al., 2005: 1000). The ‘segmented assimilation’ hypothesis proposes that adaptation does not follow a single predictable route, but has many trajectories. The key determinants that open up or close off possibilities reside with the host culture, and include discrimination, equal employment opportunities, cultural exclusions and marginalisation (Portes et al., 2005). Acculturation for the second generation is described as ‘additive’ (Portes et al., 2005: 1001), whereby some elements of the host culture may be taken up, though enduring strong affiliations with their parents’ culture are maintained.
Models of segmented assimilation were not evident in police dialogue, with many officers viewing assimilation as the eventual elimination of any cultural differences. The police who spoke most strongly about assimilation made their acceptance of the ethnic others contingent on assimilation and conformity with white norms. Overall among the police officers, there were few gradations in the degree of acceptance of non-white norms. Their reductionist attitudes did not take into account the complexities of Vietnamese-Australians’ experiences; rather they provided a simple justification for exclusion.

**Exclusions based on limited communications: They don’t report crime to us**

A view strongly held by most police officers was that Vietnamese-Australians were reticent to report crime. Forty-four police officers (82%) agreed that the Vietnamese did not report suspected criminal activity or contact police as victims to the same degree as the normative population. Police claimed the Vietnamese people did not give them information. There were some differences in officers’ views as to whether this applied to all crime, or if there were distinctions between the reporting of serious crimes (such as murders or physical threats) and minor crimes. One officer claimed that the reticence applied to all crime, whatever the level of seriousness:

> Anything from an offender for a deception to drug traffickers to a stabbing to even assisting us in, ‘Tell us how this stolen car got to the front of your house, it’s been parked there for a week, did you see anything?’ Just any form of information. (IND13)

Another officer held a different view:

> I haven’t struck any more in them than others. No, I would say, in my experience, no. No, they’re quite willing to try and do the right thing and supply information. (IND14)

To control disorder and reduce crime, policing in white democracies relies on the public’s willingness to report crime (Murphy et al., 2008). Furthermore, the authority and effectiveness of the police rely on the public’s consent to comply with the law and to voluntarily provide information to the police regarding suspicious behaviours or crime. Murphy and Cherney (2011) contend that police agencies in Australia face significant problems in gaining voluntary cooperation and reporting of crime from ethnic minorities. They attribute this problem to poor relationships between police and the ethnic communities.
Thus the reluctance by Vietnamese to report crime had real implications for their safety through lower levels of policing.

Police predominantly associated the lack of crime reporting among Vietnamese communities with the first generation. One officer attributed this phenomenon to the Vietnamese cultural characteristic of not wanting to be seen or heard liaising with or reporting crime to police. The officer did not see it as showing disrespect, but could not offer an explanation beyond it being a feature of the culture:

> With the Vietnamese, the culture, when I say culture the older ones, the ones who have been brought up here, are more accepting the western way of life but with the older community, they seem to tend to hold back, don’t want to volunteer information to the police, at the same time they have good respect for authority, there is no disrespect, they just hold back, don’t want to volunteer information or give anything that might publicise themselves. (INY12)

For this officer it is clear that the non-reporting behaviour is believed to be entirely cultural and not related to the police force. Police have noted that there were some crimes where Vietnamese did not report at all. Of particular surprise to police was the lack of reporting on drug crimes – a crime of major concern to police. In a presentation I gave about this study to senior managers in one of the regions, many were incredulous that the Vietnamese had not named drugs as the major crime of concern to their community. The reasons for this ‘silence’ on drug crimes were not well understood by police:

> Most of my contacts with the Vietnamese people are down the street, in the mall, and what I’ve found is that they tend to keep their family issues in-house. They’re fairly reluctant to ring the police, they just don’t ring. You don’t really often hear about trivial family matters which other people will be on the phone with in a matter of seconds. You just won’t hear about it. If there’s disputes with other business, or other people, in relation to businesses or neighbours and all that and they’re Vietnamese, they just keep it inside the community. The only time I’ve been to a Vietnamese house is for family disputes when people have had knives or things like that and it’s been quite serious, but other than that they just keep to themselves. And I don’t know if that’s a trust thing, or whether it’s just a cultural thing of just keeping it within their own community. (INF26)
Here it is evident that the officer has tried to understand the Vietnamese cultural silence on reporting crime, but beyond the cliché of ‘keeping it to themselves’, he remains perplexed, only offering the suggestion, almost as an after-thought, that it could be the ‘trust thing’. Presumably this related to the oft-cited Vietnamese lack of trust in police, rather than vice versa. Generally, the police attributed the low level of crime reporting and lack of trust in authority to the negative experiences of Vietnamese people with police and authorities in Vietnam. This narrow conception of the cause of the lack of trust contrasted with the multiple determinants found to influence the trustworthiness of police by Vietnamese Australians across the dimensions of reputation, performance, appearance and accountability (McKernan and Weber, 2014). For many police, the lack of trust was linked only to their past experiences in their country of origin and officers’ beliefs were reinforced by the widespread acceptance of this explanation in the dominant white cultures. Officers usually associated the lack of trust and lack of reporting with the first generation, and the majority of police officers expected it would be – or was already – different with the second and third generations:

The older generation of the Vietnamese, there was reluctance and that’s through their police force bad experience over in Vietnam, things like bribery and taking money to do things, so I think there was that initial reluctance, but mostly for the older generation that actually grew up in Vietnam. But I think it’s probably fair to say that a lot of the Vietnamese in Australia now have grown up, if not born in Australia have spent many years here and I think they’re quite not reluctant or quite willing to report matters to the police. (INF22)

Here the officer alludes to a direct relationship between normative culture and crime reporting, which led the officer to conclude that only through acculturation would the Vietnamese change their behaviour to report crime. As well as being unwilling to report crime, there was a widespread resistance among Vietnamese to act as witnesses in court. Officers suggested that reasons for this included community pressure, possible payback for non-compliance with community expectations, or fear of reprisal from criminals:

They’re very closed and when it comes to assisting police investigations, particularly when it comes to being witnesses for something, they all of a sudden have amnesia. (IND13)
This officer interpreted this Vietnamese behaviour as not wanting to help police, a common normative expectation in white culture. Two detectives said that it was challenging to solve crime in Vietnamese communities, and that many crimes were not solved because of their lack of cooperation as witnesses and lack of crime information. One detective said that for information, he relied on a Vietnamese translator who acquired reports of crime from the community. For most officers, the safety and security issues in Vietnamese communities were neither well known nor well understood.

No communication of family violence crime

Family violence crime, which officers almost unanimously referred to as domestic violence (DV), a term previously used in government sectors, was very rarely reported, if at all. Family violence is defined by Victoria Police as:

‘any behaviour that in any way controls or dominates a family member and causes them to feel fear for their own, or other family member’s safety or well-being. It can include physical, sexual, psychological, emotional or economic abuse and any behaviour that causes a child to hear, witness, or otherwise be exposed to the effects of that behaviour’ (Victoria Police, 2014a: 13).

Twelve officers (22%) claimed that family violence was a substantial problem within their local Vietnamese communities. Bui’s (1999) study of domestic violence in Vietnamese communities in the US found that women were prevented from reporting incidents, because wife-beating was a Vietnamese cultural norm of masculinity. One officer related experiences of being called to incidents involving Vietnamese women who had clearly been beaten, but would not cooperate even when police explained that it is illegal:

You’ll go to houses because there’s been a report of domestic violence there. You’ll turn up, she’ll have a black eye, there’ll be a smashed plate on the ground and she’ll say I slipped, fell, I dropped the plate and I hit my eye on the ground as I fell, and we all know that’s crap but they don’t want to report it. And then when we, because of the family violence legislation that we have in place, we have to act on something like that and when we do neither party like it, the victim doesn’t like it, the offender doesn’t like it and then you’ll be lucky if they turn up to court for the intervention order hearing which nine times out of ten they don’t unless we tell them you have to go. (IND13)
Based on personal experiences and those of colleagues, this officer was convinced that the Vietnamese would not comply with family violence legislation either by reporting incidents, going to court as witnesses, or carrying through intervention orders. One officer claimed that the lack of domestic violence reporting was a much more significant issue in Vietnamese and Asian communities:

There’s a lot of stuff they don’t come forward and tell us. We don’t go to many Asian domestics either, whereas all the other communities, we go to a lot. (IND16)

Consequently, most calls for assistance in cases of domestic violence were from the white population, where attitudes to reporting had changed. The following account shows that another officer agreed with the officer quoted above in stating that Asians and Africans do not report family violence:

As far as, take domestic violence for instance, nine out of ten times you go to deal with domestic violence it’s going to be Caucasians. The Vietnamese don’t report it, Sudanese, Africans don’t report it because they keep everything in-house, inside their families. (IND13)

Some officers assumed that issues arising from family violence were dealt with inside Vietnamese communities. The assistance could be either from Vietnamese organisations or other informal groups. One officer found that family violence was reported to organisations such as the Australian Vietnamese Women’s Association (AVWA), and they only chose to involve police when it could not be managed within the community:

They tend to seek support from each other before they’ll go to us. If I hear about an issue, family violence, I might hear about it second or third hand. It may come from a worker from the Vietnamese Women’s Association, it won’t come internally. They probably won’t ask for police assistance unless it is completely out of hand. (INY18)

This differentiation of police services meant that police resources were most available within whiteness, and few resources were directed to ethnic and racially-identified victims and perpetrators of family violence. The corollary was that whiteness was advantaged and their safety issues prioritised as more important.
Other factors affecting communication of crime

According to some officers there was a different pattern of reporting crime for home burglaries as this type of theft was often reported to police. One officer claimed that in reporting burglaries, the Vietnamese did not always give truthful accounts of what happened. He did acknowledge, however, that this was also true of ‘Australians’, by which he presumably meant white Australians:

My experience is that they are more than happy to tell you that their house has been broken into … Now you’ve got the next generations coming forward and they know if something happens, you call the police. That’s why they have Triple Zero on their phone. They know well and good that if they want to report crime, we get involved, and usually, sometimes you’ll get a bit of shady deal with some of them, because they’ll spin things a little different to the way that it actually is, but we do that as Australians too, and anyway, they are renowned for it. So it’s not a matter of whether you are Vietnamese or not, it’s not a race card. (IND09)

Thus this officer reinforces racial hierarchies between Australians and Asians in his use of the words ‘they’ and ‘we … Australians’. In so doing, Vietnamese are differentiated, and are also marked as being ‘not Australian’. Curiously, the officer proclaimed that he was not playing a ‘race card’, which is a distinguishing variable, and is a common type of ‘race denial’.

A lack of trust in the confidentiality of Crime Stoppers – the state-wide phone-in number for reporting crime – was another oft-suggested reason for Vietnamese non-reporting. This hotline is widely promoted in the mainstream media as anonymous, in that it does not record the telephone numbers of incoming callers. Police were not sure whether the hotline was known to Vietnamese communities, particularly to non-English-speaking Vietnamese, and did not know whether this information was available in the Vietnamese newspapers or Vietnamese television channels.

Anonymous crime-reporting options for Vietnamese communities are an important consideration. A study in Vietnam found successful strategies for reporting crime were those that allowed anonymous reporting such as the boxes in markets or other public places where hand-written information could be deposited (McKernan and McWhirter, 2009). In line with this mode of passing on information, one police officer recounted how information had been
sent to her in an anonymous letter written in the Vietnamese language. This was treated seriously, with all the information translated and then followed up. One officer had tried another innovative, confidential approach to get beyond the lack of communication:

Oh, you can do things where, say, if you’re just looking for information you can say, look, I’m not going to take down your name, not going to take down your address, I’ve got no details of you, I just want to know what happened, and usually nine times out of ten they’ll tell you what happened as long as you don’t take down those details so it doesn’t come back to them, but at least that gives us a start in an investigation. Sometimes that’s what you’ve got to do. A lot of the time, just reassuring them that the information is not going to come back to them. (IND13)

This officer found that by assuring people that their names were confidential, he was more likely to access information on crime. The main consequences of the lack of crime reporting are ‘hidden’ crime statistics and fewer policing services for Vietnamese communities. The scarcity of information on crime was compounded by the lack of available police data on crime rates by country of birth, ethnicity and languages spoken at home. The impact on the community was summed up in the following account:

We don’t get involved with a lot of their issues. Certainly, the only times we are involved mainly are things like if there is some shoplift going on, or some criminal activity that is against their person or against their business. That’s about the only times we have a lot of or real individual contact with them. (INF02)

In this and other police accounts, there was no mention of any official agencies to deal with these safety and crime issues. Some officers suggested that crimes, including family violence, were dealt with in the community by unspecified ‘in-house’ processes. Whether these views were reality or fiction, it did not appear as if there had been any attempts to discover whether in fact Vietnamese communities were doing their own policing in their own way. Nor was there any apparent scrutiny of safety or legal consequences. Conversations relating to this hypothetical proposition are explored in the next section.
Doing their own policing: dealing with their own issues

Nineteen officers (35%) commented on the existence of Vietnamese in-house criminal processes, but were unable to provide specific examples. Police spoke about in-house policing as if it were self-explanatory. It was clear that if in-house processes existed, they were accomplished without the police’s active knowledge or monitoring. They were unknown, secretive and beyond formal policing. It appeared that police were working on a hunch or a popular idea generated among colleagues, and the lack of concern about this was somewhat surprising. Very few police officers appeared worried about these in-house processes, which, if indeed they existed, would be illegal. Four officers even gave tacit approval to the practice:

Well, I know the Vietnamese community is very strong with their family values in terms of their large groups of families. It goes all the way to the extended families, etcetera. I’m sure that a lot of things would get dealt with in-house like that, however, if that works, why not, type of thing? (INF25)

This officer speculates that the Vietnamese use elders as role models or advisers in dealing with certain crime issues and associated problems. An officer with self-proclaimed knowledge of South-East Asian cultures extends the hypothesis of in-house practices to other Asian and African cultures:

Given the sometimes insular nature of the different communities – and all the communities are like that, the Indian community in Dandenong and the African community and the Vietnamese and Cambodian and Chinese communities in Springvale – given their insular nature, they like to often deal with problems, where they can, within that community. And sometimes dealing with it was as simple as kicking people out of community organisations and things like that, a bit of shame. (IND15)

This officer proposes that sanctions would probably be imposed on culprits, inducing shame. Most of those officers who suggested that Vietnamese manage the control and punishment of culprits in their own way, appeared not to have thought about the implications. Some officers linked this hypothesis to low crime reporting by Vietnamese communities. Unlike the dominant community, other communities were not engaging police to implement the law, but officers were unconcerned about this.
The hypothesis of the existence of in-house processes for dealing with crime arose out of a whiteness ideology, as officers did not find it necessary to ascertain whether there were safety issues in these non-white communities that should be dealt with. The ‘other’ communities were outsiders who did not impact on, or participate in, the dominant policing ideology and justice system. The question arises: Why would police allow Vietnamese communities to implement a culturally-specific mode of policing without any intervention? Clearly police were not referring to restorative justice programs, in which they have the discretion to recommend access to programs as alternatives to court, which may include giving lay people authority to make decisions within a criminal justice process (Cunneen et al., 2003; Daly and Hayes, 2001). In contrast, these in-house practices were envisioned as unauthorised activities outside the criminal justice system. Racism was evident in the police’s disinterest, and in their turning a blind eye on an outsider group. Also evident was the implication of exoticism and intrigue about practices that ‘they’ may conduct in their unknown lives – ones marked by high levels of secrecy and criminality. At a pragmatic level, the acceptance of the idea that such a system might exist without intervention by the white police force may put citizens at risk. Whether in-house practices were fact or fiction is not the point. Turning a blind eye is an abrogation of the rights of Vietnamese communities to be ‘dealt with’ by a legal and fair justice system.

**Impact of white officers’ culture on communications**

One officer prided himself on his good communications with Vietnamese people and on being welcomed into their homes. Respect was apparent in the officer’s description when he shared stories of his cultural experiences in visiting Vietnamese homes. The officer indicated that police had occupational boundaries to maintain which sometimes did not comply with Vietnamese cultural norms:

> Like sometimes we get asked to take our shoes off at doors, doesn’t happen often but now and then, and we go yes that nice thanks, but we can’t do that, health and safety. We can come in and do your job or we can stay out here all day and chat about it. Get to the point. And they take offence at that obviously, but they don’t show it to us. We deal with broken glass and stuff, have to climb up a ladder or whatever, you know, nah. And I would flatly refuse anyway, because I’m working. They called me, I didn’t call them.
I’m happy to provide a good service and I do respect their ideas and beliefs but there is a line that got to be drawn too. (IND09)

Here the officer is clear about his reasons for not agreeing to remove his shoes: it contravenes Occupational Health and Safety (OH&S) rules. Among officers more generally, there was a pattern of non-acceptance of culturally-different norms. Police often defended their views on the basis of standards or criteria for policing practice. Frequently they employed the colour-blind argument to defend their stance: their approaches could not be modified to accommodate a particular group. In contrast, another officer expressed the view, with evident sincerity, that listening to minority groups and learning from them, was the most important aspect of building relations:

But I think, certainly with the minority groups, I think you’ve just really got to make an effort to listen and to really explain what the police process is, what’s going to happen, so they’re fully well aware of what the options are and what going down a certain choice path might mean to them and just really listening to what their concerns are. Sometimes their concerns might be different to the average person. You can’t just assume that might be that they’re worried about going to court or whatever, it might be – so I think you’ve just got to take, especially if you’ve got a language barrier, you’ve just got to take that extra time. (INF08)

Studies support the idea that listening and self-reflection, as displayed by this officer, should be a mandatory skill for white officers if they are to recognise how cultural privilege and power are inscribed in policing practices (Furlong and Wight, 2011). One officer commented on the sorts of gender and cultural differences that affect police’s interactions and communications with other ethnicities, faiths or racially-identified groups:

Usually the mum is the authority in the family. Obviously with other groups the men very much run the show, and there are times you notice we’ll turn up to, and it’s more Middle Eastern type families, but the females just won’t speak to us. Sometimes they’ll speak to another female, if they can be alone in a different room, but they just won’t speak to us at all. And it’s purely the husband’s role to speak to us, and the female shouldn’t even be addressed type of thing. (IND15)
In the situation described by this officer, policing is occurring within the complex interactions of authority, crime, gender, hierarchies and cultural differences. Officers like the one above appear to have learnt how to negotiate many of these complexities on their own, on the job. Another officer showed a good-natured amusement and engagement with the Vietnamese:

And the funniest thing I have noticed is that if you have a sip of beer, they will have a sip of beer, they will not do anything different from what you are, so if you have a can of beer or a cup of tea, they seem to sip when you sip and drink when you drink. Now, I don’t know whether that is for everybody they do that with or because we are police and we are supposed to be the people who know best and how to drink and that sort of thing, but it is quite humorous. (INY14)

However, it is still apparent that in the face of a lack of knowledge, this officer drew his own conclusions and relied on his own assumptions about the protocols of communication with Vietnamese people. White Anglo officers’ uncertainty about how to communicate across different cultures sometimes meant they unintentionally insulted Vietnamese families. Examples from police accounts where they may have caused offence include incidents of officers incorrectly addressing family members as ‘grandma’ or ‘aunty’, or not speaking to the most appropriate person, usually the head of the family. Other issues arose from officers asking bi-lingual children to translate for them without realising that it was culturally inappropriate for children to discuss policing issues with elders:

Well generally there’ll be someone in the family that can speak English as well, if there’s these extended families. May not be the old grandmother that lives at the house, but her son or the grandson may ring and we go down there and they assist with the interpreting and things like that. (IND06)

In PSA Yarra, the Inspector organised a workshop about the Vietnamese community, which was facilitated by a Vietnamese officer. The Inspector’s intention was to improve cultural understanding. However, the use of Vietnamese police officers to inform others of Vietnamese culture brought personal affiliations outside work into the domain of policing. It also imposed the role of trainer on general duties officers, assuming that being from the same culture made them adequately qualified to fulfil this role. The approach operated outside the professional training framework. Grossman (2013) draws on arguments from anthropology to
expose some conceptual flaws in cross-cultural models based on normative behaviours rather than cultural complexity. Grossman (2013) suggests that instead, police recruits and other training of officers should be ‘immersive’ and ‘interactive’.

**Stereotyping by white officers**

Stereotypes are categorising mechanisms that utilise visible characteristics or superficial indicators to differentiate social groups (Fiske, 1998). Thirteen officers quite blatantly stereotyped Vietnamese people in the interview dialogue. They stereotyped Vietnamese Australians as drug dealers and drug users. Rather than exhibiting bias, police officers spoke as if their comments were based on ‘facts’, and did not consider negative stereotyping to be a form of prejudice:

> I mean, from my work dealing with drugs all the time, I can tell you right now, 20 out of 21 people are going to be Vietnamese or Cambodian that’s trafficking the drug, whereas most of the stabbings you go to, especially in public areas like parks, streets, that sort of thing, seem to be the Sudanese as of late, or Maoris. And the Maoris and Sudanese don’t tend to see eye to eye. (IND13)

This officer not only constructed the Vietnamese as a criminal community specialising in drugs, but also criminalised the Sudanese and Maori communities as specialising in physical assaults with knives. Another officer expressed similar sentiments about the Vietnamese as drug dealers:

> But it’s definitely, without being racist or anything like that, there’s definitely a significant link between heroin and the Vietnamese community, there’s just no doubt. (INF26)

Officers generally absolved themselves of responsibility for stereotyping behaviour. Often they blamed the media, including television programs on policing, as key players in promoting Asian drug-trafficking stereotypes through news reporting on drug crimes and popular crime. One officer claimed that the perception of Vietnamese-Australians as drug traffickers was widespread in white Australian communities:
They know it’s giving them a bad name and collectively, you speak to a hundred so-called Australians, western-type Australians, Caucasians, and ninety per cent of them will say, the Vietnamese, oh, they deal drugs, it’s just an inherent perception that we have [which has grown] over a period of time. (INY14)

The officer in this case justified stereotyping as a normative, neutral belief in white Australian culture. Scholars concur that stereotypes are learnt culturally, and that the mainstream media is an important source from which dominant groups receive social norms and messages about who ‘we can like and not like’ (Stagnor, 2009: 9). In an Australian study of police attitudes, Chan (1997) found that 10% of police respondents showed racial intolerance towards Indigenous people through derogatory stereotypes. Spalek (2008) claims that race influences perceptions of crime for police and the criminal justice system through the normalisation of discrimination and stereotyping in policing practices. While it is evident that stereotyping arises from general community attitudes beyond policing, Bowling and Phillips (2003) suggest that police should take an active role in enforcing equality rather than in the maintenance of discriminatory practices within society. Bowling and Phillips (2003) also contend that police can be even more discriminatory than the wider community.

Stangor et al. (1994) claim that when stereotypes form part of discourse, they tend to be ‘self-fulfilling prophecies when left to circulate unchecked’ (Stangor and Lange, 1994: 365). Stereotypes applied to already-stigmatised cultural groups are internalised by the dominant group, and reinforce the differences in status between cultures (Jost and Hunyady, 2005). Bowling et al. (2003a) found that stereotypes of African-Caribbeans and Asians held by police in the UK were the basis for indirect racial discrimination by police. In this study the Vietnamese were widely stereotyped by police officers as drug users or dealers.

Scholars argue that the denial of racism found in interpersonal communications, institutions and political responses is a modern form of racism, commonly used to protect the accuser and justify their accusations as rational and as firmly belonging to the ‘other’ (Nelson, 2013; Augoustinos, 2007; Van Dijk, 1992). The Macpherson Report (Macpherson, 1999) found that institutional racism was a consequence of the behaviours and attitudes of individual officers, while Scarman (1981) categorically denied that institutional racism existed in the UK police forces. McPherson (1999) differentiated between the actions of individuals and
organisational policies, the latter which he claimed were not racist (Anthias 1999). The UK police department and constabularies denied racism (Sim 1982). Similarly, this study found that the denial of racism by the organisation, local forces and individuals and yet racism was revealed in their use of stereotypes and other bias in their dialogue relating to Vietnamese communities.

**Profiling and other bias in policing Vietnamese communities**

Although police acknowledged that they viewed Vietnamese cultures as associated with drug crime, they disagreed that negative consequences arose for procedural justice. Almost unanimously, police strongly defended the position that they did not racially profile members of the Vietnamese-Australian community or any other ethnically-identified group:

> I’ve been accused of being racist plenty of times. But I mean … So sometimes you get it. Like, I’ve pulled over guys driving down the street in cars and you can’t even see them until they wind down the tinted window and they say, ‘You’re only pulling me over because I’m black’, and you go, ‘Mate, I didn’t even know who the hell you were. I pulled you over because you were doing fifty km/hr over the speed limit through a school zone’ or something like that. (IND07)

This officer claimed that it was not racial profiling that caused him to pull the driver over, because he could not see the driver before doing so. The officer’s defence was that everyone is treated in the same way, and that they could not detect the colour of the person when noting the traffic infringement. Studies in the US show that black drivers are more likely to be pulled over than white drivers (Lundman and Kaufman, 2003; Weitzer and Tuch, 2002). Some criminological studies argue that ‘the practice is so pervasive that it should be referred to as the crime of “Driving While Black”’ (Warren et al., 2010: 264) or even ‘walking while black’, which suggests that a person might attract police attention because they are black and walking in a particular way.

Parmar (2011) contends that the deliberate absence of a ‘reasonable suspicion’ requirement in the UK’s Terrorism Act 2000 has legitimised an increased exposure of ethnic, racial and religiously-identified minorities to increased ‘stop and search’ policing and other discriminatory processes, including an increased expectation to provide intelligence. In 2008 and 2009 following the July 2005 terrorist attacks in London, blacks and Asians (including
Muslim Asians) were among the minorities exposed to increased stop and search processes (Parmar, 2011). Scholars warn of the longevity of damaged relations and loss of trust when members of racial or ethnic groups become victims of discrimination from authorities entrusted with their safety (Cultural and Indigenous Research Centre Australia, 2013; Stangor and Lange, 1994; Terrell, 1993). An officer in this study described his equanimity in dealing with all members of the public as arising out of respect: ‘I always try and approach them with that respect and also get that feedback’ (IND06). When police were asked directly if they profiled Vietnamese or any other cultural groups, particularly in stop and search procedures, they strongly refuted any possibility of racial or ethnic harassment or profiling:

I don’t think there is any prejudice against the Vietnamese. There are a lot of drugs offenders who are Vietnamese, but I’ve never seen an incident, it’s not – I have never heard anyone [ie a police member] say ‘Let’s target the Vietnamese, let’s target Africans’, whoever. But, you know, you are always going to approach a group of people who are hanging out near the flats at 3 in the morning, and ask them what they are doing.(INY20)

This type of explanation was a common defence by officers in response to public criticisms. They maintained that they either picked up people randomly, or because of reasonable suspicion. In their view, citizens perceived bias where there may be none. In the UK, statistical studies show that bias is not imagined but a reality, with higher rates of stop and search interventions for black and Asians than for white populations (Phillips and Bowling, 2003). The entrenched thinking and stereotyping of black and Asian communities as criminal led to heightened suspicions and to more stop and search interventions (Miller, 2010; Scarman, 1981). Criminological research links crime and delinquency rates to the macro and structural characteristics including social disorganisation and physical structures of the urban communities (Shaw and McKay 1962; Klinger 1997; Kane 2002) A study by Kane (2005) in New York City linked profiling to variations in violent crime in communities described as extremely disadvantaged.

A rare exception to police officers’ general denial of bias came from one general duties officer, who conceded there was a public perception that police profiled Asians for drug crimes. The officer tried to excuse the targeting of Vietnamese as a response to the history of drug crime in their communities:
Going back, the reason why people seem to think that Asians got picked [on] more in relation to drugs, there was an influx of drug activity in those years, Asians, Vietnamese were often doing the importing, exporting and dealing, and the way they used the kids [in their own community] as well. But as to whether they were picked on, that depends on how you see it as well. Yes and no. Yes and no. And it still goes on a bit too, nowadays. You’ve got to understand, you don’t single out a group, but it’s mainly because they are involved so much, you’ve got a high percentage, you just tend to generalise a bit, you characterise that group as targets for policing. (INY12)

This officer agreed that Asians and Vietnamese could believe they were ‘picked on’ (INY12), but explained this as perception rather than reality. For this reason, Bowling (2007) recommends that police forces provide improved data collection on stop and search procedures that include the reasons why people were intercepted. He also contends that the person intercepted should be provided with a copy of the relevant data.

Police respondents in the study denied that there were any unfair policing consequences such as profiling and other discriminatory behaviours. Police were unanimous that they treated everyone the same, and prejudice did not influence policing. Scholars attest that colour-blind ideology in white developed countries reproduces structural privilege and justifies the maintenance of the status quo, as proponents and beneficiaries claim that it represents equality, not inequality. White actors in colour-blind ideology claim not to notice colour, therefore they treat everyone the same. People operating within colourblindness deny any participation in racialised discourse (Rodriquez, 1998; Frankenberg, 1993c). Sefa Dei (2006) captures the main contradiction within colour blindness as: ‘We Cannot Be Colour-Blind’. However, the police in this study illustrated these colour-blind contradictions in claiming they were not influenced by colour and treated everyone the same. At the same time, nevertheless, they selected Vietnamese and Asians as groups they identified as more likely to be engaged in drug-related criminal activity.

**Profiling and other bias in policing African communities**

A study of African youth in Springvale, Melbourne found they were exposed to racial harassment by police and to overuse of stop and search interventions (Smith and Reside, 2010). Studies by Phillips and Bowling (2012) show that black youth continue to be profiled
by police because of criminal stereotyping, and loose interpretations of the term ‘reasonable suspicion’ (Choongh, 1998). In a public forum in Melbourne on 30 March 2012 (Flemington & Kensington Community Legal Centre, 2013), Bowling recommended to the African community that this data should be collected by Victoria Police. More recently, this proposal was supported in a report for Victoria Police (Grossman et al., 2013). Police responses in Melbourne as in the UK indicated a lack of motivation to collect the data. The police claimed they do not have the time or resources. Currently there is no information from Victoria Police on stop and search, because this data is not collected by the police force.

The study found serious problems existed in Melbourne in the policing of Sudanese and other communities from the Horn of Africa. In all PSAs, there were some officers who spoke disparagingly about African groups. Overall, the discourse of 24 (44%) officers indicated intolerance or prejudice towards other ethnically or racially-identified communities or faith groups. The majority of general duties police officers claimed that African youth were violent. They described African youths as aggressive, and as exhibiting intimidating behaviours towards officers. One officer said that they ‘screamed’ (IND08) at police; another said that ‘they hate the police’ (INY05), and yet another that ‘they’re abusive, they yell, they’re very disrespectful’ (IND16), especially towards female police. One officer claimed not to have had ‘a single positive experience’ (IND14) with African communities. Another officer contrasted the respect police received from Sudanese elders and parents with the aggression and violence coming from Sudanese male youth:

The second 12 months the Sudanese rolled in. Geez, I don’t even know where to start. It’s very volatile, very violent. Most of them are the younger generation, we’re talking from the age of 12 into the mid to late 20s. No respect for anybody. Not police, not authority, not civilians, no-one. The elders, lovely, absolutely very respectful, we’re talking more parents. I mean, mostly kids that we come in touch with have actually been born here and that surprises me. Especially with their attitudes, they don’t go to school, they hang around in gangs and, yeah, when you speak to most of them and ask them where they were born they were actually born here so that surprises me a little bit. Yeah, the first 12 months I had a lot of workmates that were hurt, sent to hospital and things like that, due to the violence that they were showing. (IND18)
This officer was surprised to find they were not foreigners as assumed, but that many were born in Australia. Smith and Reside (2010) found that officers designated the youths as threatening outsiders. These authors asserted that police acted on behalf of the majority white population to exclude foreigners from white public spaces (Smith and Reside, 2010). A similar expectation from the public is found in this officers’ account:

And there are cultural things with them walking the streets at night and things like that. Apparently that’s something that they do, they used to do it at camps at home, young men would gather and walk around at night. And of course when that starts happening in Melbourne in Australia, people get frightened, because there are groups of six or ten tall, scary, black men walking around in the middle of the night who appear to be up to no good. When sometimes they can just be walking to a friend’s house, but people start calling us to them and that sort of thing. (IND15)

This officer racialised the Africans as ‘tall, scary, black men’ who were a threat to mainstream culture in mainstream spaces. Some MLOs claimed that general duties police inflamed problems through their own intimidating and aggressive behaviours:

We get a lot of criticism for; the robotic, angry police; who generally are pretty short [in approachability], arrogant people. I think it’s about positive attitude. It’s about participating in events that are not just based around reacting to Triple Zero calls. So it’s going that step further and interacting with the community on a very, very personal level, offering a human face to policing. (IND01_02)

This MLO believed that more community-engaged styles of policing would counteract the police anger at the youth. Occasionally, general duties officers conceded that it was possible they exacerbated problems. For instance, one officer agreed that police had to learn to talk to African youth:

Talk to them, find out what they’re doing for the night. Let them know that we’ll be around, and if there is trouble that we’ll come down on them, and at the times when there is trouble, act on it, don’t just step around it and ignore it, just act on it I guess. (IND06)

This officer’s view that police should speak to African male youth carried with it the threat that otherwise they would act forcefully – they would ‘come down on them,’ ‘when there is
trouble’. Other general duties officers claimed that it was not their problem, but rather a matter for ethnic community leaders to solve, suggesting that they should project a new image of themselves to police and to the public. These accounts of biased policing are consistent with the extant criminological policing literature in Australia that claims police are not biased and do not profile racially or ethnic groups (Chan 1997; Chan 2007). The majority of general duties officers expected MLOs to act on behalf of the whole policing organisation and to liaise with the communities:

Again it’s the multicultural people, they have to get out there amongst the communities and sell the idea that the police are here as a service to assist them, because unfortunately in some of their police forces they are corrupt. (IND12)

A senior police officer in one PSA referred to the ‘wake-up call’ that occurred when Africans demonstrated against the police’s mistreatment and targeting of them. The initial response from police was apparently denial, but this was followed by acknowledgment of their racism and implementation of a community-oriented program that involved the African groups:

We had Operation Napier which was about five years ago where 250 members of the African community marched on this police station. And that was to do with the perception by the community that we were no good and that we were targeting them, and we were basically racist towards them. That was a big opener for us, we said, well, look this can’t be happening, because it’s not true. But if their perception is that it is, well, therefore it is. So we needed to address that. And that’s where we started to work harder. The program we put in relation to driving without L-plates, they have no idea, they think as soon as they get the learner’s permit they can drive. Well, they can’t, you have to have someone next to you who is a full licence holder. So a pamphlet was made in relation to that and distributed amongst the communities. We’ve done DVDs, and so pretty much engaged them in those areas. (INF03)

In using the expression ‘wake-up call’, this officer displayed a willingness to review police behaviour. The preventative action of designing and distributing a pamphlet regarding driving with L-plates showed a proactive rather than reactive focus on issues that needed to be addressed in the community. However, the officer did not indicate that police had reflected and acted on the role played by the dominant culture – the invisible fabric of whiteness. For
the majority of police, the problem was attributed to the other rather than to inadequacies in police officers’ own practices, or to factors related to the governance of new settler groups. The police were repeating patterns evident in their history of relations with the Vietnamese in that a new settler group was being exposed to criminalising and racialising processes.

**Patterns of racialisation**

Police emotions and problems surrounding the policing of Africans often made it difficult to maintain focus on the Vietnamese. Instead officers were eager to speak about challenges with the more recently-arrived African groups. Vietnamese people were not on the agenda anymore, with officers expressing this as Vietnamese being ‘under the radar’ (INF08), or ‘yesterday’s news’ (IND03). Compared with Africans, Vietnamese were reflected as being withdrawn and self-sustaining. In contrast, African-Australian communities were constructed as being unpredictable and uncontrollable. Interestingly, Alexander’s (2009) UK studies found that Asian identities were described in the public domain as ‘static, bounded, internally homogeneous and externally impenetrable’ (Alexander, 2009: 214), and that they were contrasted with the volatility, fluidity and evolving characteristics assigned to black African-Caribbeans. One officer in this study contrasted Asians and Africans on the basis of whether they submitted to officers’ requests or were defiant:

> The Asians, to their credit, they don’t shit in your face, they won’t be openly defiant to your face. They don’t shit in your face, where the Africans are just in your face. (INY19)

Another officer contrasted the physical and visible attributes of Africans to Asians:

> It’s pretty interesting. You’ve got the Sudanese culture how different with that they’re big and visible and they’re totally black skin they stand out that being different. But the Vietnamese remain as being a puzzling group. (INY06)

Asians who had similarly stood out in the past did so less, having been superseded by Africans, who were defined by their colour and described as being highly visible. Another officer said that their colour made them ‘stick out’: they were not part of the white dominant group, but were different, and were viewed as outsiders:
But the problem also is, they are very black, their colour is . . . they stick out everywhere, you know. Like, I live in an area where there is a higher Asian population but they don't, but you put a couple of Africans there and they just stand out you know. (INY19)

An officer with many years’ experience in the Victoria Police remembered the past reputation of the Vietnamese community as being violent, and noted that this had been a pattern with both groups. In the current context, police perceived differences between African and Vietnamese youth. Africans had more ‘freedom’, a lack of parental control, more disposable income and a culture of street alcohol consumption. Some officers seemed particularly naïve, prejudiced or resistant to understanding the circumstances of street youths and refugees. One officer suggested that they were financially well off, and another suggested that they were modelling themselves on the black American street culture:

They’re wearing better clothing than I could afford, absolutely. All the nice American hats and the big nice American clothing, and the hoodies, good runners. (IND06)

There is a small group within the Sudanese community that think that they’re, rather than African Australian, they think they’re African Americans and they’ll wear all that homey style clothing and they watch one too many American movies. (IND13)

Both these officers suggested that African youth had agency, and that their control was evident in the way they managed their images. Another officer interpreted the relations entirely differently, linking the attitudes and feelings of these Africans towards police in Australia to their past experiences with authorities in their country of origin:

When it comes to some views towards police, they can be scared, and that’s a lot to do with where, what I think where they came from. I mean, you just had to look at, it’s run by the army and you look at one of them the wrong way and you’ll be taken out the back and dealt with, either shot or beaten or whatever the case may be. And here obviously that doesn’t happen, very different, very civilised here, but that’s the precursor they’ve had whereas, but they’re scared of, they’re scared of us. (IND13)

Unusually, this officer noted the fear Africans had of police and assigned the cause to prior experiences and trauma in African countries. Whiteness scholars link this terror to continued feelings of subjugation in the presence of authorities and power (Gilroy, 2000; hooks, 1992).
Structural whiteness

Many officers experienced the management systems employed by the police force as disempowering. Officers described the electronic and paper performance measurement systems as unwieldy and overly time-consuming. These systems, driven by the priorities of the State Government of Victoria, prioritised the solving of reported crimes as the key statistic, whereas officers claimed that statistical measures distorted priorities. Community policing activities were neglected in favour of less valuable but measurable activities. Performance measures based on reducing reported crime discouraged preventative approaches which did not generate the required statistics. Officers pointed out that such performance measures did not encourage the discovery of unreported crime in Vietnamese communities. Increasing the proportion of unsolved crime would result in judgements that police were less effective:

The police department doesn’t want to know about the unreported crime. Because our stats go up. If all these people come forward to say I’m the victim of sexual assault, I’m the victim of extortion, yeh I’m been you know, kidnapping has happened here and I know about this. If they come forward and reported all that what would that do to the crime statistics in this State. That’s the reality. If you start asking questions be careful what the answer is…Cos the Chief Commissioner boasts about the crime figures. And with the Government, part of her contract is decreasing crime. (INY01)

This officer above agreed that racial bias was produced because Vietnamese and some other groups did not report crime to the same degree as the white population. Furthermore, the Victoria Police was not interested in taking action on the under-reporting of crime by minorities. Another officer claimed that police performance targets based on ticking boxes to provide the statistics for senior management meant that police did not have time for community-oriented policing. Furthermore, the officer said that there were no performance measures for community-oriented policing and that relationships with ethnic communities could not be measured:

The answer is simple. Can you measure public rapport with the community, with anyone? With figures? You can’t. With stats? You can’t? You just have to go out there and do it. And the result you see is how the community responds to policing, you can’t put it on a piece of paper. In relation to ticking boxes, it is ridiculous… It’s still increasing, those
boxes still increasing, there’s more forms to fill in, and this is just on patrol. The operational members are basically just ticking patrol time. I don’t know, there has just got to be a different way of measuring results in relation to policing. You can’t really measure public relations. (general duties officer. (INY12)

This police officers’ comments were reinforced in a report by the Ombudsman for Victoria (Brouwer, 2009). The Ombudsman found that recording practices for crime and police activities in the Victoria Police were antiquated, time-consuming and unsuited to policing in the 21st century. Moreover, the Law Enforcement Assistance Program (LEAP), a database used by Victoria Police based on crime categories determined by State Government legislation, had serious deficiencies, including impediments to information sharing, and a limited scope in data capture (Brouwer, 2009). Police reform was actually held back by these limitations of data capture, because many incidents were excluded. The Ombudsman referred to the public debate around the issue of distortion and inadequate statistical representation of citizens’ crime experiences, which created public distrust in the policing institution. These priorities are directed by the State, and are often fuelled by the dominant public’s fear of crime, as well as perceptions of increasing incidents of crime, rather than by actual crime rates (Brouwer, 2009). In this study, it was clear that crime data for Vietnamese communities was excluded from the statistics through non-reporting and non-policing.

**White technologies**

Whiteness in technology software design was noticed by a general duties officer with a graphic design background. The officer had worked in the Victoria Police design unit, which produces images for police computer facial recognition software and generates pictures of suspects or persons of interest to police. The software constructs images of faces based on the features of suspects as described by citizens. The officer noted racial bias in the limited options for developing a computer-generated image of an Asian face compared with a white face:

> Even based on our data-base, which is always continually updating, you don’t have many options as say for Caucasians. Like you may have 120 examples of different eyes for Caucasian, but they’ll only have about 30 for the Asian population. I mean that comes down to us updating our data base and having the resources available to update it. (INY09)
This officer was the only one to comment on racial basis in the facial recognition software. The officer attributed this problem to a resource shortfall, rather than stereotypes of Asian faces. The same officer explained how the software technology was used by police:

If I logged on to a computer I could show you what we actually do. But yeh, it’s more a case of putting everything together like a jigsaw puzzle and then doing further alterations to make it look more like the person they saw not just a bunch of pieces stuck together. Maybe his eyes are bigger or wider. Or his smile’s crooked or something like that. And then you just go from there. Until the person’s memory is exhausted and then go well look, yeh it looks like him, it’s about 80% of what he probably looks like. Well you say well how can I make it look more like him? And they’ll say well I don’t know, I can’t remember. That’s the end, that’s all I can do. (INY09)

Based on this officer’s description of putting jigsaw pieces together to construct a face, the process appears highly subjective. Given that Asian faces had already been simplified by the software, their use in criminal investigations raised ethical issues about the extent to which members of the white public could be accurate in identifying Asian faces by using this computer-assisted technology. The cultural bias inherent in this software results from the stereotyping of facial features during the process of software design – presumably by white officers. Asian facial features were simplified, and did not show the complexity of white faces. Hall (2005) found this a common form of racism: black people are the same because to white people ‘they all look the same’ (Hall, 2005: 445). Asian faces are viewed as all looking the same. Their features are not presented as having the same subtle differentiations as are white faces. This points to an absence of mixed racial input into design.

Police database management systems such as the problematic LEAP (Law Enforcement Assistance Program) database system, whose inadequacies have been widely discussed in the media, not only reported on police activities, but also directed policing actions and priorities. Some authors refer to the new era of ‘technology-led policing’ or the ‘new technologies of crime prevention’ (Den Boer, 2011). Policing in advanced white countries is now dependent on soft technologies such as databases to manage sex offenders and others categorised as a risk, such as terrorists, as well as the technologies to monitor phones and the internet. The soft technologies defined as ‘information-based technologies’ (Byrne and Marx, 2011: 17)
are used in conjunction with the hard technologies defined as ‘material-based
technologies’ (Byrne and Marx, 2011: 17) such as video cameras, mobile data centres, and
laptop computers in patrol cars. Technologies are used to profile high-risk people, a practice
which Byrne and Marx (2011) claim institutionalises disparities of race and class.
Technological innovations that now drive crime-control strategies are not free of social
inscription.

The sociology of technologies has shown how political and other cultural choices arising out
of dominant masculinity are embedded in the design and selection of technologies (Wajcman,
1991). The intricate meshing of technology databases with police officers’ work conjures up
the connections of organism to machine in Haraway’s (1992) conception of cyborgs as an
imagined reality; a materiality; a reworking of nature and culture; the one can no longer be
the resource for appropriation or incorporation by the other’ (Haraway, 1990: 192). The
millions of dollars spent on failed attempts to upgrade the crime data reporting system, along
with millions more promised by successive state governments, attests to the power invested
in the cyborg of policing, where technology and officer merge in the delivery of policing on
behalf of the State. Other weapon technologies such as lasers, guns and technologies of
mobility such as marked patrol cars symbolise and actualise the power and forceful capacities
of the police force, as well as the direct role of police in controlling the hegemonic power of
the State.

**Whiteness practices by police officers**

In this analysis of white officers’ behaviours, beliefs and approaches, I explored whether the
individual officers in this study reinforced, maintained or reinvented whiteness through their
policing. The interpretations I made of the dialogue was not representative of all 54 officers
in the study, as some officers did not volunteer personal opinions or explain their policing
challenges in relation to the Vietnamese community. However, in the dialogue of the many
officers who gave their personal opinions of challenges in policing the Vietnamese
community, I found that whiteness was generally maintained through some common beliefs
and practices of white officers, and was strongly reinforced by some exclusionary practices.

The reinforcement of whiteness occurred through the use of the exclusionary mechanisms of
racialisation and criminalisation. The Vietnamese were stereotyped as criminal, and were
racialised as a distinct group, identified as Asian. Other exclusions were based on the assumption that the Vietnamese had not acculturated, and remained attached to their own cultural traditions. Consequently they were judged as failing to comply with white norms. The stereotypes imposed on the Vietnamese were that they were traditional, submissive in nature and working class. These stereotypes, used extensively by white officers, reinforced the exclusion of Vietnamese people from mainstream culture. Through these exclusionary mechanisms, whiteness was strengthened as normative.

The majority of officers (82%) maintained whiteness through their unquestioning acceptance of the perception that the Vietnamese did not report suspected criminal activity to the same degree as did the normative population. Many officers in this study did not appear to believe it was their responsibility to find out more about the unreported crime. The Vietnamese in this study provide a specific example of the general contention by Murphy and Cherney (2011) that in Australia, ethnic populations do not voluntarily cooperate and report crime. Related to this was the hypothesis proposed by one third of all officers, that the Vietnamese conduct in-house policing. Although the suggestion was not substantiated, its circulation among white officers served to strengthen the boundary between normal policing practices in the dominant community and the less visible – and possibly illegal – self-regulating practices in the Vietnamese community. Policing in Australia is built on the norms and traditions of crime reporting in white societies, and in this study, it was clear that police felt the Vietnamese were not conforming with these. The consequences of the lack of policing resources available for Vietnamese meant that many safety and security issues in their communities were not being addressed. White privilege was advanced through the use of policing resources to maintain the safety of the dominant community.

No officers raised the concept of the reinvention of whiteness. White officers all stated that they were not racist, which placed a blanket of silence over dialogue that could have led to addressing anti-racism in the force. A few officers agreed that it was possible police could be interpreted as profiling the Vietnamese, but suggested that these were impressions only. Some officers noted structural whiteness biases in state crime targets, in suspect identification technology and in performance measurement processes that discouraged community engagement strategies. There were some instances of officers showing a degree of willingness to engage more directly with Vietnamese cultural norms if encouraged. However,
these were isolated cases, as overall, police showed a widespread lack of reflexivity and capacity to meet the Vietnamese on their own terms. When considered within the wider cohort of officers, these isolated contributions were overwhelmed by the behaviours, beliefs and approaches of white officers that served to maintain or reinforce whiteness.
Chapter 7 White officers’ perspectives: working with 
Vietnamese police officers

This chapter ‘listens’ to and interprets the perspectives of individual white officers as they speak about Vietnamese officers within the Victoria Police. Their attitudes, beliefs and behaviours exhibited towards Vietnamese officers are explored. It is acknowledged that in speaking about their thoughts and behaviours, it is likely that police officers would have aimed to transmit a favourable impression of themselves. Of interest is whether white officers reinforce, maintain or reinvent whiteness in their relations with Vietnamese officers. Pertinent to this study is how the practices and attitudes of white police interact with the mechanisms that construct whiteness. The lens of whiteness is applied to the scripts of individual white officers to assist in answering the research question: How is whiteness reinforced, maintained or reinvented in white officers’ relations with Vietnamese officers as a specific subset of the Vietnamese community. Also considered is the impact on white advantage within the force. In this chapter, I argue that whiteness is reinforced through their constructions of Vietnamese officers, primarily through normalising processes and exclusionary practices.

Vietnamese police for policing Vietnamese communities

The majority of officers firmly believed that the greatest benefit from recruiting Vietnamese into the force was their inherent capacity to police Vietnamese communities. The literature on policing presents contradictory positions on whether or not ethnic police bring cultural skills to policing, and on whether police organisations are colour-blind. The rationale behind the strategy of employing Vietnamese police is that this might reduce the social distance between the police force and the Vietnamese community. Policing organisations in Australia have learnt that it can be counterproductive to place ethnic police in PSAs to police their own ethnic communities. The Police and Community Multicultural Advisory Committee (PACMAC) (the advisory organisation to Victoria Police and other state forces and the Australian Federal Police [AFP]) released a recommendation in 1997 that ethnic officers should not be automatically assigned to police their ethnic communities (Victoria Police, 2010). However in this study, the vast majority of police strongly the practice of ethnic police policing their own communities.
One of the main reasons for this provided by general duties officers was that this would help overcome many of the cultural barriers. White officers found that their access to Vietnamese communities was minimal. It was assumed that Vietnamese officers would have the cultural knowledge to gain the trust of Vietnamese-Australians, and would be able to improve communication, as well as the flow of crime information from these communities, to the Victoria Police:

You are dealing with a lot of people in Richmond and they’d be able to speak the language if you have that little bit of upper hand when you’re dealing with the others. Cos you know they understand the culture a bit better, they maybe the language that sort of thing. So I don’t see it as an issue, I think I see it as a benefit if there’s other people like that in the community? (INY04)

As in the case of the officer above, most police assumed that Vietnamese officers would speak Vietnamese. Among generation two Vietnamese, only 40% speak Vietnamese at home. It could not be assumed that all second generation Vietnamese speak Vietnamese fluently (Ben-Moshe and Pyke, 2012). One officer used the metaphor of a ‘tool in your belt’ to show that Vietnamese officers were considered a useful resource:

But Vietnamese, Sudanese, doesn’t matter what, there should be more in the job, because it would make it easier to deal with these issues that we have from time to time when we have to draw on them, they should be straight to the front line with us, working out in the road, dealing with the people that they are able to communicate with better than us. If you’ve got something that a tool in your belt, you have to use it, you use it, simple as that, and we are not smart. (IND09)

This officer suggested that ethnic officers would have the capacity to build bridges to these communities, and that this would be an advantage to the police force. The officer also felt that ethnic officers would assist white officers by educating them about the different cultures. Similar claims were made by another officer, who said he wanted ethnic officers to be rostered on the streets:

They put them into a field where they’re hidden away and they’re doing other things but they’re not out on the front line helping members, which I think they’re much more
beneficial because they educate the uniform members as well as being out in the public eye. (INF21)

This officer’s references to the idea of not being ‘hidden away’ and out of ‘the public eye’ link directly to ideas of visible differences. The officer suggests that an officer with a normative identity might have a different impact on the public than one of ethnic identity. This differentiation between normative and non-normative officers is also evident in the officer’s use of the pronoun ‘they’ to refer to Vietnamese officers. There was an expectation ‘they’ would ‘help members’, the latter referring to the majority normative officers.

The officers from the Sexual Offence and Child Abuse Unit (SOCAU) had direct experiences of the benefits of a specialist team that included officers from different cultural backgrounds. One officer at the unit explained that it was helpful even in the case of Greek and Italian groups, who were now widely considered to be part of white mainstream Australia, to have officers with these European backgrounds:

But I know in (SOCAU) we have (name) up there who is Greek and it’s great, like her knowledge has been great for us up there because that’s another branch that we didn’t have. So any community, or any people that come in, (name) is able to sort of give a bit more of an insight into the way they think. (INF21)

This officer, whose work was largely focussed on working with victims, found it important to have officers on the team who could understand issues from different perspectives. A general duties officer had a different opinion, based on the pressures that could be exerted on ethnic officers in local forces. This officer was cautious about recommending that Vietnamese officers should police Vietnamese communities:

There’s not that many of them and everybody knew who he was and there was a lot of pressure on him, he would get spoken to every time he went outside his door to go to the market, he would have the community members asking him questions, legal questions, stuff that they should have had the confidence, or the get up and go to ring their police station or go to their police station. (INY14)
This white officer noted the pressures placed on the Vietnamese officer, not only to provide assistance with policing matters, but also in other areas unrelated to the core work of a police officer. An officer claimed that the advantages of recruiting ethnic officers had to be balanced against the pressures resulting from a cultural minority status in a white police culture:

 But I’d imagine the pressures of the women in the early days would be similar to the pressures of any you know cultural minority or whatever trying to join the police force now, you know what I mean. (IND07)

For this officer, there were strong parallels between the past exclusions faced by women officers and the exclusions other minorities may have to confront. In contrast to most general duties officers, MLOs did not agree that it was necessary to have ethnic minority officers to police ethnic communities. MLOs’ brief included increasing the inter-cultural competencies to improve the police force’s adeptness in managing minority communities, whether ethnic, racial, gay, lesbian, bisexual or transsexual groups. MLOs agreed that general duty officers generally had not achieved these competencies. Cherney and Chui (2010) found that police in liaison roles increases the community engagement but also creates conflict in accountability towards either the community or to the police organisation, particularly for ethnic officers. Chan (1997) found the role of liaison officers in Australia de-valued and in career dead-ends. A few general duties officers also disagreed with the need for Vietnamese officers, often as for the following officer, on the grounds that they had already established good relations with the local Vietnamese community:

 I don’t think it’s an absolute necessity because the Asian community, they’re all pretty happy to deal with the police. (IND12)

Thus as in this case, police thought they were either already skilled in policing minorities, or alternatively that it was either the role of MLOs or of ethnic police. The placement of Vietnamese officers into Vietnamese-dominated communities restricted their work opportunities, unlike white officers who could apply to work in any PSA. This ethnic role also gave Vietnamese police the dual responsibility of targeted policing of the Vietnamese community and general policing in response to calls from the wider community. White officers were advantaged in not having these two sets of expectations. The pattern of
marginalisation was repeated within the force, with normative and non-normative roles and identities.

**Vietnamese officers as role models for Vietnamese youth**

A few officers wanted to improve the recruitment of Vietnamese officers. Their opinion was that the Vietnamese community would be proud to see Vietnamese officers patrolling their local streets. The idea, extrapolated from their own experience as a white officer, was that Vietnamese police officers would gain status in their communities. It was also an assumption that Vietnamese officers would be role models who might subsequently encourage Vietnamese youth to join the police force. One community liaison officer had the personal goal of trying to recruit more Vietnamese and African groups into the force:

> My dream is to see someone from Vietnamese background, an African background, in uniform doing a foot patrol through the streets of Footscray, they would be role models, people would be, they’d look at it and they’d say ‘Isn’t this wonderful?’ (INF04)

This white officer’s view that Vietnamese officers would be proud role models in their communities does not accord with studies showing that policing is not valued as a profession by Asian and Vietnamese groups in white cultures (McKernan, 2008). Vietnamese parents often refused to allow their children to join Victoria Police. The assumption that an Asian police officer would be proud of being in a white police force was positioned within whiteness. White officers could not envisage policing outside the paradigm of whiteness.

**Fast-tracking Vietnamese officers into specialist roles and units**

Many officers were critical of the ‘fast-tracking’ of Vietnamese officers. ‘Fast-tracking’ was described as a non-normative process whereby Vietnamese officers were moved out of general duties into specialised units, such as the translation unit or the drug squad. Whether or not this is true could not be substantiated; however, these officers claimed that this was commonplace, and they strongly disagreed with the practice. Officers openly condemned the police force for favouritism or ‘special treatment from the management up high’ (IND15), and that ‘they’re not being seen as thrown into the mix and just the same as the rest of us’ (IND15). This officer extended this claim of special treatment not only to the Vietnamese, but to all ethnic minorities:
There’s as far as the organisation goes, we’ve got, there’s been a bit of a problem where people from particular minorities have joined and the perception is they get special treatment because they’re of that minority, therefore they can used as an example or as a liaison between the [police and the] community. (IND15)

This officer reflected a common view among officers in that fast-tracking was condoned and implemented by senior management in Victoria Police, and that it disadvantaged the majority of officers. The perception of an unfair distribution of opportunities led to negative categorising. This aligns with Deaux and Reid’s (2000) study, which found that groups were threatened by the perception of unequal access to positions, even when the positions were not of higher status. Mummendey et al. (1992) also linked intergroup social discrimination to differential allocation of resources to groups. The special treatment was not necessarily related to promotion, but it posed a threat from the out-group, and prompted a counter-claim from white officers about their exclusion. The officers clearly demonstrated that they were not colour-blind by making demarcations between white and non-white officer advantage. However, only the advantages not accessed by white officers were seen or discussed. The advantages accessed by white officers, demonstrated by higher rates of promotion in the force and access to promotion via networks, were not mentioned.

Some officers proposed that fast-tracking had a negative effect on workplace relations. They claimed the movement of Vietnamese into specialist areas removed Vietnamese police from street work, where they were most needed. Other officers claimed that they were denied the opportunity to benefit from their knowledge of Vietnamese people. One officer expressed the removal of Vietnamese officers in terms of the impact it had on him personally, claiming that he was disadvantaged, because he ‘was trying to interact with these people’ (INF03). This comment served to reinforce the differentiation between dominant and other groups. However it was clear that some specialist jobs were highly prized, such as being in the drug squad (since disbanded). One officer claimed that this disadvantaged those white police who wanted to work in the drug squad:

So you’ve got the Vietnamese guy that’s running around with the drug squad and doing jobs that these other guys are desperately wanting to get, but they’re not Vietnamese. (INY16)
This officer indicated that for the high-status jobs, police were extremely resentful if Vietnamese police officers were placed into these jobs. Using the metaphor ‘jumped the queue’, the officer implied that the queue comprised white officers but not Vietnamese. The officers exhibiting the most prejudice were those who claimed that they were under attack from management. One officer asserted that senior management was not supporting the rank-and-file members: ‘We’re getting picked on a lot’ (IND15). Another stated: ‘Virtually no operational coppers trust command to back us up’ (INY11). The pressure exerted by the white officers was discriminatory, and aimed to prevent the progression of Vietnamese officers beyond general duties. This is just one mechanism among many in policing institutions, as shown in other studies (Cooper and Ingram, 2004; Perry and John-Baptiste, 2008).

An officer suggested that the claims of disadvantage arose because of a lack of information about the job: ‘[If they knew] it is actually quite boring and mundane, then perhaps they wouldn’t be so resentful’ (INY01). This officer thought that if officers understood what the work entailed, they would have a different view, rather than acknowledging the underlying exclusion of non-white officers, which other studies suggest as the root cause (Cooper and Ingram, 2004; Deaux and Reid, 2000). Another officer explained the tension positively as competition for a scarce resource. The officer felt that it ‘would be understandable’ that Vietnamese officers were sought after by specialist units for their skills (IND09). However most officers who raised fast-tracking as an issue showed a lack of interest in whether or not Vietnamese officers wanted the positions in specialist units. One officer suggested that from the perspective of a Vietnamese officer, it could be an alienating experience to be separated from colleagues in general duties:

    My own experience with Vietnamese recruits is, if I join the police force to become a police person, I’d be pissed off if the minute I graduated I was taken away from my squad mates, taken away from the duties that my fellow graduates do, to go and be an interpreter, work in a multicultural unit, be used as a, listening to transcripts, phone taps. (INY16)

The officer above assumed that Vietnamese officers felt they belonged to the mainstream policing culture. The view nonetheless supported the idea that these opportunities should not be given to minority officers, albeit for their own sake. Generally officers’ responses were aligned with Alex’s (1973) conception of the beleaguered white male officer. In his study of
white American officers in the Department of Police in New York he found resistance to new cultural groups in the force, whom were viewed as threats to white officers’ assumed rights to promotion. The behaviours of white officers in Melbourne emulated those of police in the New York study in protecting their opportunities within the force.

**Undercover police officers**

Some officers thought that Vietnamese officers were necessary for undercover police work. Unlike other specialist roles, there was no obvious resentment of the placement of Vietnamese officers in this job, perhaps because undercover work was described as dangerous and risky. Police agreed that if Vietnamese officers were placed in undercover roles, it would be more difficult to achieve the essential anonymity:

> I know that the two Vietnamese police that I know, virtually as soon as they got through the academy they were recruited into undercover work. So they don’t hit the streets virtually. In fact it’s the opposite they try to keep them away from the streets in uniform because they don’t want them to be known. If they’re working in undercover, obviously. I know two blokes that that’s happened to, two Vietnamese fellows. (IND14)

Although the officer thought that Vietnamese officers would have to be placed into these roles immediately following recruitment, this was not described as fast-tracking. Thus because they were not desirable positions, white officers did not present these ‘opportunities’ given to Vietnamese officers as a threat to the status or promotional opportunities of white officers. Moreover the job of undercover policing would place Vietnamese officers in insecure relations with their Vietnamese communities, because their work identity should not be known:

> If a Vietnamese officer was going to be of value in undercover they couldn’t have the officer ‘walking around in uniform, particularly in a small community where everyone knows everyone. (IND14)

From this perspective, Vietnamese undercover officers were even more vulnerable than mainstream undercover officers because of the smaller, more tightly-connected Vietnamese community networks. Thus they would be at higher personal risk in maintaining parallel lives and relations with community members, and the police force would be unlikely to be able to
protect them. As undercover officers, multiple new identities are enacted, and their police officer identity has to be kept secret. Garcia (2008) describes undercover identities as borrowed identities whereby undercover police occupy a liminal zone; it is a field of treacherous trust-relations between police and the criminal communities. Garcia (2008) suggests that in the double-dealings and manoeuvrings between informers, police and criminals, it is always uncertain who is betraying whom. One officer pointed out that the risks for Vietnamese Australian police are much higher because of the increased chances of being recognised. The undercover roles for Vietnamese officers were associated with danger, disposable identities and duplicity. Further to this if their undercover identity was revealed in Vietnamese communities, the officers could be accused of betrayal, and be subjected to violence or other payback:

Then putting them back into working in the Vietnamese areas, if they know people working in the Vietnamese community often they can be threatened or intimidated with their family. (INY07)

This officer indicated that undercover work could even be portrayed as an act of betrayal against the Vietnamese officer’s own community. Stinchcomb (2004) contends that undercover officers live with the pervasive risk of being betrayed, and with a sense of betraying others. Undercover identities were terminated when their real identities became known to Vietnamese criminals. White officers spoke of Vietnamese undercover officers as being of limited usefulness: ‘Even his undercover life, his life, there’s a usefulness as an undercover agent, he’s got a sort of limited, I’m sure a finite time’ (IND03). Burnout often followed an undercover assignment for Vietnamese officers, as an emotional response to the sense of have letting other people down, and because of feelings of ‘betrayal of criminal friends’ (MacLeod, 1995: 241). Not only was it more dangerous, but undercover officers could not remain long in this role.

Vietnamese officers’ loyalties were placed under the spotlight, albeit by a few white police. Vietnamese officers’ identities were not ensured among white colleagues as trusted members of the police force. Conducting covert police operations in the murky, shadowy criminal world created impressions among white officers that Vietnamese police in undercover roles would be confronted with divided loyalties: Vietnamese community members versus the police. The emphasis on the parallel boundaries of white/non-white and trusted/not-trusted
reinforced whiteness as empowered, safer and more trustworthy for colleagues. This is another form of white advantage.

**Discrimination, intolerances and languages**

A significant proportion of officers said that Vietnamese officers’ communication skills in English did not meet expected standards. They claimed that English skills, such as clarity of speech and speed of delivery, were indispensable attributes, and that Vietnamese officers lacked these skills. Due to the extremely small number of Vietnamese officers in the Victoria Police, most comments were opinions rather than comments based on experiences with Vietnamese officers. White officers were not asked directly about the skills of Vietnamese officers; rather their opinions were volunteered by police in commentary on policing, Vietnamese communities or the recruitment of Vietnamese officers.

Some officers claimed that Vietnamese officers’ unsatisfactory levels of competency in the English language jeopardised other officers’ safety on the job. They suggested that poor communications, particularly in critical situations or life-and-death scenarios, could lead to misunderstandings and endanger lives. One officer claimed that he and others could not understand Vietnamese officers on the radio: ‘We actually can’t understand what they’re saying’ (INY15):

> The biggest problem with that is from a safety issue, which they just don’t get, that the chief just doesn’t understand, because once you get on a radio it is hard enough to understand [in ordinary circumstances, when you are fluent] because your ears aren’t tuned to it. I’ve been doing it for 20 years so I can hear pretty well, but even so with the static and the change in the voice and that can be hard enough, but if you also don’t have completely fluent English with an accent that is able to be understood then it’s a safety issue because potentially no one is going to know even where you are. (INY11)

Here the officer makes expectations clear: they have to be fluent, and even an English-speaking officer with a strong accent was considered a potential risk to safety. Neither did policing excellence shield officers from discrimination on the basis of language, as was demonstrated in the case of a Vietnamese officer renowned for his police work. One officer, who described the Vietnamese officer as: ‘a sensational copper (INY18)’ said almost in the same breath: ‘When I read his emails I piss myself cos he doesn’t know how to write
English’ (INY18). Another officer claimed to acknowledge the value of speaking another language, seeing it as an ‘amazing skill’ (INY06), and as a resource to ‘quell a lot of problems’ (INY06). At the same time, the officer made the racist claim that Vietnamese officers may not be ‘able to do the job’ (INY06). One officer suggested that standards at the Police Academy had been reduced to the extent that now ‘you only have to get five out of fifty and there’s no need for your first language to be English’ (INY15). Another account by a white officer showed a patronising attitude towards non-white recruits:

His English was very, very bad but they bent over backwards to try and get him through and they actually put him here for about 3 months just to sort of mingle with us so that he could bring his English up to scratch and he went back to the academy. (IND07)

Language was used as a symbol for the superiority of mainstream officers over minority officers. These criticisms resonate with other studies of minorities in white forces, which suggest that minorities are positioned as inferior (Leinen, 1984). Similarly, another officer indicated that poor English skills are generally found in new recruits from non-English speaking backgrounds:

One of the biggest problems I have seen with recruits the ones who are coming through that have graduated, is that here are some that can barely actually speak English. (INY11)

The officer suggested that new recruits were allowed through the training process without having reached the required standards in English. Other officers concurred that the Academy had lowered standards because of the pressure to recruit from ethnic minorities. In the following example, an officer makes discriminatory comments about the language skills of all ethnic minorities for whom English was a second language:

The ones that I’ve encountered, they can’t even string enough English words to put a statement together that reads well, but if I had to work with that person, the frustration would drive you insane’. (INY01)

Here the officer makes it clear that white English-speaking officers do not believe they should have to tolerate people without similar levels of fluency in English. One officer
explained his personal struggle to gain entry into the Victoria Police to justify his resentment that Vietnamese officers did not appear to have to meet the same standards:

They can’t even speak the language. They can’t even communicate with people….How come, why did you get in and I had to struggle. I had to go and do a course to learn maths or whatever it is you have to do to prepare yourself for the police force that TAFEs offers and stuff like that. So you can just imagine the resentment that that breeds amongst their own ranks. (INY01)

This officer strengthens the divide between himself and others by his use of ‘they’, as well as the differences in English language skills. Another officer tried to stress the differentiation between white officers from other cultures selected as recruits for their ethnicity:

All I can say is at the end of the day the proviso for joining Victoria Police should be that if you fit the psychological profile, you’re smart enough, you’ve passed the exams, you’re physically fit and you’re at the top of the tree as far as educational requirements and intellectual requirements, then you should really choose the smartest people, and the best people that score the highest. I think you start getting into dangerous ground if you’re gonna start accepting people from other cultures just to get them in there to represent those cultures, if their marks are lower than somebody else. (IND12)

Here the officer idealises the skills of mainstream white officers’ who had passed these tests, thus positioning them as being ‘smart’, ‘physically fit’ and at the ‘top of the educational tree’. New recruits from other cultures were not meeting these standards. Officers’ discrimination was evident in a general assumption that they were uneducated. Officers who made derogatory comments about one particular Vietnamese officer’s language skills, did not know that he held a tertiary qualification in engineering from Vietnam. Neither was it acknowledged among white officers that many Vietnamese officers spoke Cambodian or Mandarin as well as Vietnamese. White police officers emphasised that communication was the essence of the job. One officer summed up the importance of language as follows:

That’s the great thing, language – language is everything, it’s communication, and communication is the whole box of dice. (IND07)
The officer assumed that all police communications would be in English, and would reach the various communities they had in mind. Some officers emphasised that policing messages had to be delivered by English-speaking officers to an English-speaking public: ‘It is great that these people have second languages, that’s fantastic, but 90 per cent of the people we are dealing with speak English of some description’ (INY11). Census data for Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011) shows that in 2011, 80 % of Australians spoke English only, and that only 32% of newly-arrived migrants spoke English at home. The officer’s claim that 90% of the community spoke English did not capture the groups within which only a minority spoke English competently. On occasion, officers such as the one quoted below did express an appreciation of languages other than English on the job:

But I mean any second language I think is a real bonus. I think they encourage that anyway when people join, if they’ve got a second language it’s a good bonus. It’s a good skill to have I think. (INF07)

This officer supported the idea of having a second language, but considered it a bonus rather than a necessity. Most officers assumed that an English-speaking officer would be able to communicate with everyone in the community, either in English or through access to police translation services. The findings resonate with other studies that relate discrimination against new settlers with limited English skills to core beliefs about who belongs and who are outsiders or strangers. Lee (2004: 1273) contends that the emphasis on the ‘English language standard’ is representative of standards more generally, and in employment, it has the effect of excluding non-English speakers. Because English language interweaves with culture and identity, national origin and race, white employees may communicate more effectively with a white public, and these alignments reinforce and strengthen whiteness as normative (Lee, 2004). In the absence of racial differences, accents may be an attribute that is used to discriminate against people, and can become a boundary for exclusion and disadvantage. Incompatible speakers are constructed as culturally-incompatible employees. These practices advantage white employees by marginalising workers for whom English is not their first language.
Discrimination as ‘trophies’

White officers accused senior management of treating Vietnamese officers as trophies by profiling individuals as success stories for the Victoria Police. Most officers claimed it was a cynical exercise aimed at creating the impression of a multicultural force:

And I know the police force is very interested and wanting of different cultures and they’re some of my reasons. Whatever reason the big picture has, maybe just make themselves look good on a poster. (INY06)

This officer suggests that management’s motives in highlighting Vietnamese officers or other ethnic groups in the media are disingenuous and self-promoting. One officer made similar claims about other non-normative groups in the force:

Muslim, Vietnamese member or whatever, they would find themselves on the front page of the Annual Report pretty quickly’. (IND15)

The officer both racialises all non-normative groups and suggests they are merely window dressing, and superfluous to the real business of policing. Some officers implied that ethnic women officers were particularly sought out by management for photo opportunities. Through exaggeration and emphasis of ethnic cultural difference, such as a specially-designed part of a uniform, these majority group members contrasted and differentiated themselves from the minority group members. The media focus on the redesign of an appropriate hat for a woman Muslim officer was widely criticised by white officers:

That’s perceived very poorly within. Contrary to what command would want to hear. Allowing a member to wear that garb even though it’s important to that person to wear it….But why do you have to change our uniform for one person? (INY01)

The officer could not accept any change to the police force uniform, believing that recruits should conform to the normative dress. Officers described the Victoria Police’s interest in ethnic groups as transitory. In this way, they denigrated the stories published about the officers’ work in the force. One termed it a ‘flavour of the month’ (IND12) approach, and proposed that new ethnic groups would be the future trophies. A few officers suggested that it was counterproductive for ethnic officers themselves to be placed in the limelight:
That might prevent someone who is of a minority feeling comfortable joining, because they may not want to be put up on a pedestal as the shining beacon light of the Victoria Police’s new multicultural recruitment drive, they may just want to be a copper. (IND15)

Here the officer suggests that police with ethnic identities could desire a professional identity as police officer: just to be ‘a copper’. The dominant group did not have to struggle with this dual identity and the associated dilemmas of being an ethnic officer. Another officer claimed that feature stories on ethnic officers were not appreciated by the Vietnamese communities, and that they were ‘doing the community a dis-service’ (IND12). Some officers thought that the promotion of ethnic officers in the media embarrassed ethnic officers, and that this discouraged rather than encouraged potential multicultural recruits.

Although officers appeared to be driven by resentments against out-group members, their proposition regarding publicity of ethnic officers has some theoretical support from Kanter’s (1997) theory, which proposes that profiling minorities in a white organisation causes negative feedback. Using principles based on contrast, visibility and cyclical effects, Kanter (1997) suggests that giving more attention to minority groups leads to heightened visibility, that can create extra pressure to perform. The proposition that the Vietnamese and other ethnic officers did not want to be profiled in the media did not address the fact that white officers are regularly profiled in the police magazine Police Life, though this is invisible and normalised. The use of the derogatory term ‘trophies’ by white officers reinforced the racialisation of ethnic officers.

**Racialised bodies**

Police culture was embodied as one of ‘big boys’ (IND15), and when police joined the force, they joined ‘the club’. The idealised physical status symbols for police officers were the attributes of tallness, and to a lesser degree, strength. Radical changes implemented under Chief Commissioner Nixon’s reign from 2001 to 2009 (Australian Women's Archives Project, 2014), including ending height requirements for recruits, had not changed attitudes; height remained important and integral to police officer identity. These cultural attitudes and physical embodiments of officer identity were not open to change: ‘As much as they try to change it, it’s a pretty big boys club, and it’s a pretty big Aussie boys club’ (IND15).
The Vietnamese male body was racialised, contrasted, and inferiorised against the normative white male body. Vietnamese male bodies were contested, because white officers queried ‘whether they’re suited, they tend to be quite short and slight, light frames’ (IND03). These perceived threats to the police officer body are consistent with other studies, which show that threats to in-group identity produce stereotypes and distortions (Haslam and Ellemers, 2011; Brewer and Gardner, 1996). Furthermore, racialised bodies in the force were perceived to be at risk of racial abuse from an Anti-Asian public. One officer proposed that Vietnamese officers’ authority on the streets would be compromised by a lack of assertiveness:

And maybe that’s the thing with police from an Asian background, they’re used to people who are a bit subservient, I guess. And their culture works well, for them. The police are dealing with passive people. But when you’re dealing with Anglo-Saxon idiots, and you don’t know how to take charge, you’re going to get into trouble. (INY17)

The officer stereotypes Vietnamese officers as passive and unable to deal with aggressive Anglo offenders or public nuisances. Notwithstanding the reforms to physical and fitness entry requirements, it was clear that barriers persisted to exclude Vietnamese officers. The bodies and physical attributes of Vietnamese male officers were described as inadequate for policing white populations.

**Exclusions from white culture**

Police often referred to culture as an important site for belonging, and as one that reinforced white officer identity. Officers agreed that visible differences in police culture would ‘stick out like a sore thumb’ (IND15). The officer further spelled out the cultural requirement: ‘The impression would be that, well you’ve got to be a white Anglo-Saxon to join the job’ (IND15). Another officer used the unusual metaphor of the snowman to signify the difference that managers were trying to bring into the organisation:

We’ve got this special someone, we’ve got this snowman, for want of a better term, just someone who’s completely different, look now how we’re catering to the snowman population of Australia. (IND15)

The above use of the allegory of a snowman indicated that the officer had whiteness and difference in mind. Explanations of exclusion based on cultural difference align with
scholarship on new forms of racism found in rejection of alien cultural values and judgments of moral character (Pedersen et al., 2004; Fraser and Islam, 2000). The officers’ propositions of ‘cultural incompatibility’ reinforced national belonging, and the white police force as steeped in Australian values (Babacan and Babacan, 2007).

Male mateship was spoken of as the essence of culture, cultivated by many officers through after-hours socialising. As found in Chan’s (1997) study of Australian police culture, white officers bonded with like-minded colleagues. In this study, it was clear that Vietnamese male officers were not considered to be part of police mateship or collegiality. The only instance of a declared collegiality with a person of Vietnamese heritage was from a detective. This was in reference to a professional relationship with a Vietnamese unsworn member of the force. Officers agreed that it was difficult for others to join in, but defended the exclusion as being unintentional. As one officer explained: ‘But we can’t help that; this is the way it is’ (IND09). Another officer agreed that the culture was exclusive, but again suggested that police should not be judged harshly for this, because it was not deliberate act:

> So I don’t know how comfortable people from other ethnic backgrounds are going to feel coming into that. So it may be that they join, and it’s not that they’re deliberately excluded, but it’s just coming from a different background they might find it uncomfortable. (IND15)

Here the officer is not colour-blind; the officers cannot fit in because of their cultural difference. The officer did recognise that a Vietnamese officer could feel uncomfortable. This was unusual, as male general duties officers rarely commented on how Vietnamese officers might feel. In contrast, it was evident to women officers that Vietnamese officers would find police culture ‘a pretty hard slog’, and that most likely, they would ‘feel like an outsider’ (INY06).

In the Victoria Police, drinking after hours with colleagues was the main social activity cementing and fostering mateship. Infamous stories from the past were circulated among officers. They contained elements of machismo, and were heroic accounts of behaviours inconsistent with professionalism. Police claimed that the past extreme aberrant behaviours related to alcohol consumption were history, as the culture had reformed and was now more professional. A general duties officer explained:
It’s a different environment; what was acceptable then, is not acceptable now. You know, turning up to work drunk is not acceptable things like that. (INY5)

For this officer, the cultural change meant that officers could not arrive at work drunk. It seems extraordinary and alarming that this might previously have been culturally-acceptable behaviour. Although officers stressed the cultural changes, they confirmed that going to the pub with other police after hours still earned acceptance into the male culture. The white officers agreed that this excluded Vietnamese officers, as they thought they did not go to pubs or drink alcohol:

It wouldn’t be intentional, I don’t think. But I think you’re typical Australian male you know, knocks off work and probably goes and has a few beers after work. Whereas say a Vietnamese male, well, I don’t know what they do, so you’re going to struggle to fit into that background. (INY05)

Again the unintentional nature of the exclusion is emphasised, as shown in the claim ‘I’m not racist but’. This is termed ‘race talk’ by Bonilla-Silva and Forman (2000), who argue in their article entitled ‘I am not a racist but…’ that these terms are used by white people to avoid appearing racist. They describe ‘race talk’ as shields to deflect criticism, and that the arguments used generate a new form of competitive racism based on racial attitudes that effectively safeguard racial privilege.

Similar cultural patterns are shown in extensive studies of police culture in in the UK and US over many decades. Loftus (2010) found little change in the underlying culture and world views of officers from those described in earlier ethnographic studies (Banton 1962). Skolnick (1966) linked the risk of danger, feelings of alienation from the public and role authority to a culture of officer group solidarity. Reiner (2000) describes an enduring core aspect of police culture as officers’ sense of mission in upholding societal values and ridding it of criminal undercurrents. Reiner (2000) frames other core characteristics within masculinity, one of which is being motivated by the forceful physical drama of catching criminals without attention to broader contextual issues. Other core characteristics of police culture were secretiveness, intolerance, suspicion and group solidarity. Reiner (1992; 2000) also found that machismo attitudes promoted drinking, sexist behaviours and prejudice
towards ethnic minorities. Loftus (2010) agrees that informal police culture norms influences officers’ behaviours in the public domain, particularly their interactions with groups marked by difference. Racism was found as a critical element of culture by Manning and Van Maanen’s (1978) in their study of the customs and rituals of police culture in New York City and Kansas City. They found that prejudice and perception shaped white officers’ interactions with ethnic and black minorities. Klockars et al (2006) map the evolving views within the force on police integrity and suggest some general improvements within the force when more recent attitudes towards homosexuality, race, domestic violence and women officers are compared with previous decades.

In Australia, Chan (1997) found police resistant to change and intolerant of non-white officers. Chan’s (1995; 1996) study of New South Wales (NSW) police exposed an unfavourable police culture bound by traditional male behaviours, such as drinking and playing pranks. A longitudinal study of police recruits in Queensland and NSW found that the occupational culture promoted ethnocentrism and racism (Chan et al., 2003). The findings in this study are consistent with the international literature and with Australian studies. Trends were evident in the Victoria Police, where male Vietnamese officers were viewed as external to the macho white male police culture.

**Multiple exclusions: Gender ethnicity and race**

At the time of this study, there was only one Vietnamese woman officer in the Victoria Police, and no female Chinese or South Asian officers (McKernan, 2008). Overall in the Victoria Police, 21% of all sworn officers were women, and this was the second-lowest proportion of women in all State and Territory forces in Australia (Criminology, 2006). To understand the exclusionary behaviour that Vietnamese women officers could experience from some white male officers, I asked white female officers to describe the current barriers and racialised exclusions from white male officers towards non-white female officers.

White female officer interviewees in the study were generally reticent about participating in gender debates on policing, and it was sometimes difficult to generate discussion on these topics. However, some women officers commented on the culture, saying that it was masculine and non-inclusive of women. A common experience of the women officers was
being judged by male colleagues as inferior in their policing skills in comparison to the average male officer:

I think it’s no way as bad as what it used to be obviously, but I think yes definitely. It’s still there. They think some women are useless in this job. (INY5)

Through mechanisms of exclusion, this woman officer was made to feel ‘useless’. One male officer agreed with this sentiment, as he had observed how women officers were more harshly judged:

I make a small mistake, you know what I mean, like say - say a crook runs away and I don’t catch him, you know what I mean, nobody’s going to say boo to me ……but a female under the same circumstances it’d be like, ‘You see who she let go this time’. (IND07)

Officers in the dominant white male culture were permitted to make mistakes, but this was not allowed for outsiders. Consequences included being inferiorised and exposed to discriminatory remarks. For instance, male officers were sceptical that women could jump over a two-metre fence or handle violent situations. A male officer asked the rhetorical question: ‘Two women on a van, is that smart?’ (IND09). This officer echoed the opinion of colleagues in describing women as a liability in general duties, and that when on duty, they would need a male officer alongside them to be effective. Others claimed that women officers threatened the safety of male colleagues. Rather than being excluded from the culture, the white women officers said that they excluded themselves from the social culture through a conscious choice to remain outsiders. Women officers said they were not interested in drinking or socialising with police after work. One female officer emphasised her need to separate her public life from her private life; after hours was ‘my own family time’ (INY01).

For ethnically or racially-identified women officers, the challenges and exclusions were magnified. This position is often termed ‘the double jeopardy’ in the gender literature. None of the women interviewed had a non-white background. Within Victoria Police, there was a small number of women designated as different by virtue of their race, ethnicity or faith. Despite their low numbers, these women were frequently targets for defamatory comments by white male officers. One male officer’s description of a female officer with a different
cultural background infantalised the officer as a girl and highlighted her faith as a key identity trait:

There’s a young girl here who is, she has a Muslim background, I don’t know what nationality she is, she wears a bib, and it’s got Victoria Police on it, they were doing a physical profile, so they had to lock everyone out of the swimming pool while she swam, and she wears headgear and you can’t see her face and hair, she came out here to police at Dandenong, and they took her and put her, I’m not saying she didn’t want to go there, but they took her and put her straight away into the Multicultural Liaison Unit. (IND09)

This officer discriminated against the female officer on the basis of gender, faith and non-Australian nationality. This is in accord with a UK study by Loftus (2009), who found that despite reforms, a masculine crime-oriented occupational identity persisted. Loftus (2009:2) reported on a culture that challenged and defended against any attacks on the status quo of male officers. Another officer racialised an Arabic officer and inferiorised her police work:

We’ve got one girl who is an Arabic woman, she joined the police force and went straight to basically proactive policing, that is, going to speak to Arabic women and all that sort of stuff, as opposed to going and joining the police force to be a police person, work the van, do the jobs, go to the assaults, car accidents. (INF03)

Here it is evident that the officer discriminated on a number of levels. He applied gender discrimination in designating her as a ‘girl’; hence she could not perform real police work. He also displayed bias in the judgement that her police work with Arabic women was not real policing. While the Vietnamese male officers were criticised for being fast-tracked into the more desirable specialist jobs, the work of the ‘Arabic’ woman officer within her community was degraded, and not presented as desired or valid police work.

It was apparent that whiteness was hierarchical: white men claimed superiority over white women, and positioned the ethnic, racial or faith-identified women as being subordinate to both white men and women. Ethnically or racially-identified women officers were exposed to multiple exclusions based on gender, race or faith, and this had material effects in terms of their access to positions and policing experiences. For any Vietnamese woman officer who decided to join the Victoria Police as a police officer, these were significant exclusions.
Loyalties and trust

A small group of Anglo officers suggested that Vietnamese officers had divided loyalties in that, on the job they may have to choose whether to be loyal to the police force or to their community. This was described by one officer ‘as a sort of betrayal zone’ (IND03). The lack of understanding between police and the Vietnamese community created the sense of separate communities, and established the possibility, from white officers’ perspectives, of divided loyalties.

According to the white officers, loyalty was black and white; it was not a grey area where it may be possible to be loyal to both groups. The white officers suggested that in some policing situations, Vietnamese officers would have to choose between loyalty to white officer colleagues or to Vietnamese community members. Another officer compared relations between police and Vietnamese communities to police’s relations with Aboriginal communities, in that both communities did not trust police. Consequently, the officer surmised that as ‘Aboriginal people do not like police, it would be disrespectful to your family if you did [join]’ (INF26). This officer suggested that this might also apply to Vietnamese communities, where joining the police force was not viewed favourably as a career. Another officer suggested that joining the force might represent a rejection of kinship values: ‘It was like one of his own turning on his own sort of thing’ (IND03).

Two officers disagreed that expectations for favours was a characteristic of ethnic cultures only, suggesting that similar expectations could be found in all communities. One white officer claimed that all police have an ‘in-grown family commitment’ (IND04) and ‘friend commitment’ (IND04), whereby police are ‘protective’ (IND04) of family and friends to some degree. Other exceptions came from officers who had worked in rural communities. One such officer disagreed with the basic premise that Vietnamese communities had different expectations than white communities in relation to favours, asserting that this was something that both white and Vietnamese officers had to learn to deal with.

Other studies have shown that ethnic or racially-identified officers in white dominant forces may be accused of betraying their communities (Zauberman and Lévy, 2003). O’Neill and Holdaway’s (2007) study in the UK of relations between white police actors and those with African-Caribbean or Asian heritage found that accusations of betrayal was a factor because
of the fragility of relations. Similarly, white officers in this study believed that Vietnamese officers were faced with the dilemma in their allegiances:

> The Vietnamese community is one where everyone knows everyone, so if you’ve got a Vietnamese police officer who turns up to a crime or a domestic or something and they know these people, it’s going to put him in a compromising position. (IND13)

This description implies that a Vietnamese officer could be compromised in attempting to implement the law ethically, because of pressure from the Vietnamese community to protect them. These differentiations between the assumed loyalty of white officers and unknown loyalties of Vietnamese officers place the latter group under heightened scrutiny. These tensions fuelled uncertainty in relations between white and Vietnamese officers. The overall implication of the above comments was that the expectation for favours was normative for Vietnamese cultures, but not for white communities.

**Whiteness and the constructions of Vietnamese police officers**

The purpose of this chapter was to address the research question *How is whiteness reinforced, maintained or reinvented in white officers’ relations with Vietnamese officers; and what are the implications for white advantage?* To answer this, I explored white officers’ constructions of Vietnamese officers through assigned roles, identities, capabilities and characteristics. It was found that officers widely maintained whiteness through normalisation processes, and that some officers strongly reinforced it through exclusionary processes.

Whiteness was reinforced through the exclusionary practices of racialisation and the inferiorisation of Vietnamese officers’ competencies. These processes reinforced white officers as the norm, and as superior. White officers demonstrated resistance to Vietnamese officers, because they threatened their white promotional rights. Exclusionary practices were mediated through white police culture to maintain whiteness via the unequal distribution of social status and opportunities. Racialisation processes by some male white officers were applied to Vietnamese officers’ bodies, their language and culture, and through their constructions of Vietnamese or other ethnic officers as ‘trophies’.

Whiteness was widely maintained through the normalisation of mainstream policing and its differentiation from ethnic police and ethnic communities. The majority of white officers
suggested that Vietnamese officers should be located in PSAs with Vietnamese communities so that they could police Vietnamese Australians. This informal role was presented as valuing Vietnamese officers. Nevertheless if it were implemented, and if an adequate number of Vietnamese officers could be recruited, this would assign them a non-normative ethnic role. Such an expectation applied restrictions to work opportunities for Vietnamese officers, which did not exist for white officers. The ethnic role also gave Vietnamese police the dual responsibility of targeted policing of the Vietnamese community and general policing in response to calls from the wider community. White officers were advantaged in not having these two sets of expectations. The analysis did not yield any signs that white officers attempted to reinvent whiteness through their relations with Vietnamese officers. In fact the contrary was true, in that all officers normalised, maintained or strongly reinforced whiteness through their constructions of Vietnamese officers.
Chapter 8  Vietnamese communities perspectives: experiences of ‘being policed’ by the local force

This chapter foregrounds Vietnamese-Australians’ expectations, experiences and resistances to being policed. Their perceptions towards the white police force coalesced around their histories of being policed in Vietnam, their experiences of being policed in Melbourne and their cultural norms. The ‘inherited’ cultural behaviours relating to communication with police continued to influence behaviours of subsequent generations in Australia, although attitudes were being modified through direct interactions with police in this country. As immigrants, many of whom had fled Vietnam as refugees, they had high expectations and hopes for police in Australia. To the Vietnamese in Australia, police were seen as an integral part of the democratic system, and their expectations of police officers were that they would treat immigrants with equality and fairness.

The experiences of the Vietnamese covered in this chapter were drawn from themes that emerged in focus groups with community members, and in interviews with social justice workers. Relations with police were affected by Vietnamese Australians’ normative attitudes to crime and policing, fear of crime and criminals, and their experiences and perceptions of police. Reviewing these themes within a whiteness framework reveals insights into the mechanisms that maintain racial hierarchies and racial advantage. Through this analysis, I address three related aspects of the over-arching research question: How do Vietnamese community members experience policing? Is whiteness reinforced, maintained or reinvented? And, how do the policing approaches affect white race privilege? Here I argue that from the perspective of Vietnamese communities, whiteness was evident and experienced by Vietnamese as criminalisation, racialisation and exclusion of their communities from police services.

Normative responses to police

Most normative practices of Vietnamese-Australians are viewed from a whiteness perspective as directly related to the culture in Vietnam. A lack of trust in police is often linked to prior experiences of authorities in Vietnam, which many fled after reunification at the end of the war. Not directly involving oneself with police is another normative behaviour in Vietnam, where crime is often reported anonymously, written on paper and dropped into a collection
box in the market or other public place (McKernan and McWhirter, 2009). In Vietnam, extortion and gangs control territories and exert pressures that prevent the reporting of crime to police. Both of these normative practices are examined in a white culture and the follow-up question considered: How do these practices contribute to white advantage?

**Not reporting crime and not getting involved**

Vietnamese community members widely agreed with police’s proposition that they were reluctant to report crime. It was not, however, a blanket refusal to report all crime, as incidents such as those crimes that the Vietnamese-Australians designated as ‘serious’ would be reported. Some that were less serious, such as home burglaries, were also reported. The reasons given for not reporting certain types of crimes were not always willingly discussed, and the explanations that were given differed by generation and gender. Generation one women did not report drug-related crime for fear of reprisal from criminals:

> I suppose my neighbours are selling illegal goods, such as marijuana, heroin. If we report this to the police, they will kill us. I’m really scared. Long time ago, my neighbour next-door had a kid just coming back from jail. Then the police went around my area asking, but I decided not to say anything. I was afraid that the police might tell my neighbours that I reported their kid to them. I surely will be dead or they will burn my house. For this case, it should not report to the police. I wanted to report, but I did not dare to. (FGS02_3)

> Many times I really want to report to the police but I just do not dare to. (FGS02_2)

> In general, we all really want to inform the police, but we are just too scared, not that we do not want to let them know. (FGS02_1)

The women’s fear related to the threat of violence from criminals: they may be ‘killed’, or have their houses burnt down. The women quoted above stressed that they wanted to report the crime but feared the consequences. Even when a criminal act was directed at young children, the women were fearful of reporting crime. One woman discussed repeated incidents of indecent exposure by a man in her neighbourhood:

> There was this guy, he always unzipped his pants and tried to show his sex organ on the street... It was horrible!...I used to clean my garden every morning. He often went past my
house and whenever he saw me, he put off his pants immediately. I was very angry. I was holding the knife, just wanted to cut off his.... (group roar with laughter). Those old woman living there, told me not to touch him, or else he might beat me. He always aimed to girls, or little boys. There was this girl living next to my house, she was standing at the fence when the guy put off his pants in front of me, and she was afraid also. Therefore, she called the police but that guy ran away. (FGS02_3)

Here it is seen that although the Vietnamese woman was outraged, she was too fearful to report the man. The incident reveals generational differences, in that older Vietnamese women were reluctant to report. By contrast, the young girl of unknown cultural background reported the incident with confidence to police. Another factor that prevented crime reporting was the lack of ability to speak English well enough. Respondents agreed that there was a community-wide reluctance to act as witnesses for police in criminal investigations. One generation one woman explains why she refused to act as a witness:

That day, the police arrested these thieves then they came to our place. They said that I should be a witness in order for the house’s owners to claim insurance, however, I refused. I said to him ‘I told you already that I do not want to let people know that were me, I hate the thief, so I called you. You help people and please do not call me!’ The police called me again that night and asked if they could bring 2 photo albums to my house, but I refused to let them come over. (FGS02_1)

This woman apparently had reported the crime but would not be a witness. From her perspective, catching the thief was the police’s responsibility, and if she acted as a witness, she believed she would be vulnerable to violence. When focus group participants were asked directly: ‘Would you report crime?’ generation one women and men agreed that they should or perhaps would in the future. Despite some statements of intention, it was often not convincing that they would report crime, because the cultural attitudes that led them to believe that there would be payback reinforced non-reporting. It became obvious across the focus groups that some women had never tried to contact police. For some Vietnamese-Australians it was because they did not know how to contact police, while for others it was because they did not know whether there was a Vietnamese-speaking service at triple zero (the emergency police/ambulance/fire number). In other cases, people had kept cards with inappropriate, out-dated or incorrect police telephone numbers.
Making direct contact with a police officer or going to the police station was particularly daunting for many generation one Vietnamese women. One woman had chosen to live near the police station for security reasons. However, despite her close proximity to the police station, she did not know how to contact the local police: ‘Every time I go to the police station it is always closed.’ (FGF07_1). Another respondent explained: ‘There is a bell on the front door of the police station, when you ring this bell, someone will come over and greet you, and they work inside the police station.’ (FGF07_3). This was understandable, because in conducting the research, I had found this particular police station intimidating. It was an old building that was grim and unwelcoming, and the door appeared locked. Upon entry, one was confronted by a front desk with dark one-way glass behind it, but no police, leaving the visitor eerily uncertain whether police might be watching. Both generations one and two women described the prospect of walking into any police station as ‘very intimidating’ (FGFAC09).

Generation two respondents were more willing to report crimes to police, but like generation one women, they did not want to be witnesses or have any further contact with police. They too were constrained by the fear of payback. In one case, a generation two male said he would be too frightened to be a witness, as his life could be endangered by retribution from the offender’s gang although, overall in this study, gangs were not raised as a threat:

We should just report what we feel is happening and then hang up the phone; we should only cooperate with the police to that extent. In the event that the police ask us to remain there and be witnesses, I would not do so as if the gangs see me calling the police, I would be a dead man. (FGF08)

For the generation two young man above, it was dangerous to report crime. He too said he could be ‘a dead man’ if he complied with police’s request to be a witness. Adopting a no-contact approach with police prevented further visits from police to their premises, and stopped further requests for information. Many Vietnamese said they feared payback of damage to their property such as their car windows being smashed in the public housing car-park. Some participants claimed they did not report crime because it was a cultural preference not to get involved: ‘People usually think that since this does not concern us, we should not get involved’ (FGS04). Other participants explained non-involvement as being non-
judgmental, which emanated from a Buddhist outlook. Many crimes and insecurities were kept hidden within the Vietnamese community, and community members were disadvantaged by fear of crime. An advantage for white police officers was that they did not have to struggle with implementing new strategies that could encourage reporting, and the police force was advantaged in that they believed the crime rates were lower than was the reality.

Not trusting police

It was significant that 40 years on from the first settlement of Vietnamese refugees in Australia, a lack of trust remained between Australian-Vietnamese communities and the Victoria Police (McKernan and Weber, 2014b). There is a debate in the existing literature about whether the lack of trust is a cultural behaviour resulting from Vietnamese-Australians’ mistreatment by police and authorities in Vietnam, or, as argued in social justice literature, whether policing practices in Australia has contributed to the distrust (Dixon and Maher, 2002; White, 2009). Past and current officers from the Department of Police in Vietnam were described as puppets of the communist regime, and were frequently referred to as bad people: ‘Police [in Vietnam, we] have a negative image of them: evil. In our country the police are negative, very bad.’ (INC01). Both the past and present police in Vietnam were thought to be untrustworthy because of their character, their relationship with the government or corruption. When asked if there was any similarity between the local police in Australia and police in Vietnam, one social justice worker responded as follows:

Nothing at all. We are only afraid of [Vietnamese police]. We don't respect them and we hate them because we think that they have all the powers and they can do anything to you any way they want. So normal people would avoid the police and the criminals would buy the police. (INC02)

This social justice worker’s clear view that Victorian police were unlike police in Vietnam was widely supported by focus group respondents. Officers from the Victoria Police were usually favourably described when compared to police from Vietnam. However, the agreement among Vietnamese community workers that the Victoria Police was unlike the Department of Police in Vietnam did not in itself confer trustworthiness. Community members’ comments varied across a wide spectrum, and some were clearly distrustful: ‘I feel the majority of Vietnamese community, majority 80 per cent, 90 per cent don’t trust and don’t like the police’ (FGFAC09). This focus group member claimed that the police were not
liked or trusted, while others were ambivalent: ‘We have to trust them’ (FGS03_1), and at the very positive end of the opinion spectrum: ‘I have not encountered any bad policemen, I usually meet with good police officers so I trust the police highly’ (FGS03_4). The predictions by police officers that the daughters and sons of the first settlers would be acculturated, and would thus reflect mainstream attitudes towards police, including higher trust in them, was not supported by the Vietnamese respondents in this study. The views of generation two were closely aligned with those of their parents in their reserve towards police officers, and in their belief that police were biased. A generation two respondent described some police as biased, and others as friendly:

> You can see on the news, they’re aggressive and some of them are really nice and asking you questions and they really want to know what’s happening. The others are like, no, I accuse you of this and I’ll just do whatever I want so it depends on the person and if they had a rough day or not. (FGY11)

The experience of this individual is supported by other generation two respondents, who felt that police bias was an individual rather than systemic discrimination. Generation one members were more distrustful of police than were generation two, though within generation two, there was large variation between groups. As recognised in the literature, negative past experiences with police in Vietnam play a significant role – sometimes even unconsciously – in attitudes of Vietnamese-Australians towards Victorian police (McKernan and Weber, 2014; T. Tyler. et al., 1989). The Vietnamese Department of Police in Vietnam was not trusted, and the Victoria Police was not trusted entirely. The persistence of low levels of trust in police among the first generation of Vietnamese-Australians, and to a lesser degree, among generation two, shows that the communities are disadvantaged through feelings of insecurity because of the lack of police services that they believed they should be able to rely on for protection.

**Crime, danger and threats to safety**

Fear of crime affected the lives of many Vietnamese people in this study. For generation one women, the fear was profound, and often not speaking English was a contributing factor. Fears regarding crime and other safety concerns also varied according to the age, gender and locality of residence. Some participants categorised subgroups of the community as having particular insecurities: ‘Women are afraid of rape and the people who go to work on public
transport are afraid of assaults and robbery. Every group has a particular insecurity’ (FGF07_F). Theft was a concern to many Vietnamese Australians: ‘It’s funny how it’s like you’re walking down [the street in] Richmond, you’re clutching your bag’ (FGY11 gen2). Most of the crime threats to Vietnamese-Australians raised in this study were not reported to police, and were not acted upon by local police forces.

**Drug crimes and drug use**

Concerns about drug crime and drug use were a common topic in the focus groups, particularly in groups with participants from the Yarra and Springvale areas:

> I live in public housing the building where I stay they sell heroin everywhere in the building. (FGY06)

> Everybody agrees that drug dealers and users everywhere. They all agree. They go into the public housing building…That’s the reason why because they know their situation. Drug dealers they are usually Vietnamese, speak Vietnamese so they are not generation who are born in here. Some live in the high rise, and use other Vietnamese to go around and do the selling. (FGY06)

A number of participants who were living in the high-rise public housing were exposed to drug-related incidents on a daily basis. The residents referred to an ever-present scene of intravenous drug users and drug dealers who hung around the building, often surreptitiously gaining access through the security doors. If a police patrol arrived, they disappeared, only to reappear immediately after the police left the premises. Repeated incidents of theft and intimidation created insecurity: ‘The drug addicts, and drug dealers. I’m afraid of them’ (FGF07_ 1). Intravenous drug users had threatened two women by holding needles to their throat as a weapon:

> Those drug addicts that use their needles to rob people. I’ve seen this happened once near a school. This white woman was walking then they came and pressed the needle against her throat. The woman had to give them her handbag. (FGY02_2)

A woman resident described being unnerved when she and her husband were woken up in the middle of the night by people yelling outside their flat and banging on their door, because they wanted to buy drugs:
Once or twice at midnight, my husband opened the door, the man just produced money and asked to buy heroin [we said] we don’t sell don’t deal never come back. (FGY06)

Not surprisingly the respondent found these behaviours intimidating, and the incidents impinged on her family’s self-respect among other residents: to be mistaken for drug dealers was shaming. Some residents noted more regular police patrols in the local area, and commented favourably on the increased presence. Others claimed it simply shifted the drug use elsewhere, such as into the vegetable garden or inside the flats in the corridors:

The problem in public housing in the high rise building, you can see them drugs in there, injecting and throw the syringe in the lift, in the laundry sell there and use the drugs there. Because the street is patrolled more often now than in the past. Now the drug users use the high rise buildings. Security does not help. (FGY06)

Some mothers said they had complained to the housing estate managers about intravenous drug users injecting drugs outside their doors, in the corridors and in other public spaces. However, this was to no avail as the incidents continued, and police did not patrol the corridors, as this was reputedly not allowed by the Department of Housing. Mothers were disturbed that their children were exposed to scenes of drug-use every time they entered or left their flat:

I think at Richmond new housing area here they complain, most people coming to see most of the time, majority of the time is about drug problem. People using drugs and the needles everywhere and drinking problem, but not only that, it creates your robbery problems and stealing problems, because they are desperate for money to do drugs like that. (FGFAC09)

You know what? Two weeks ago, another friend of mine called me and told me she was so scared. There were a few drug addicts using drugs right in in front of her house, and the thing is that her children were going to finish school soon. And they are really afraid of this. She called me because she did not want to call the police. She was afraid that the drug addicts outside the house would eavesdrop on her if she called the police, and take revenge later. I knew they lived in Government housing so I helped her to call the building security to come and take those drug addicts out of her place. (FGY01_F)
Common spaces, including laundries, were problematic when drug-users routinely inhabited them:

My neighbour was a Western guy, his house was right next to mine. Every time I opened the main door, I always saw him doing drugs right in front of my house. My family shared the laundry room with others and the room was located outside the house. I did not let my daughter to go out and do laundry, but had my son to do it instead. However, I was still very scared whenever my son went to the laundry room as the western guy always did drugs there. We were afraid that if he was arrested, he might think that my son had just went in the laundry room, saw him doing drugs then reported to the police. I was so frightened, therefore, we moved to this area. (FGS02_6)

They afraid for their safety, but also they are afraid their children get into that problem, because of people around. You mentioned about the laundry in the public housing, they go in there and using drugs and people they not to come in. (FGFAC09)

The drug use incidents as described by the two respondents above reveal serious risks for children through exposure to drug use and from potential threats of violence if they reported the incidents. Parents were deeply worried by drug use among Vietnamese youth:

Even when they are in school, they are afraid of bad influences persuading or selling drugs to them. There are many Vietnamese families whose children are on drugs, so they are afraid of this. (FGF07_4)

As is shown here, Vietnamese families were concerned that their children might be cajoled or pressured into selling drugs. Some parents worried that their teenagers would be pressured into drug use or selling by other school students:

I feel especially insecure when they go to school as we can’t exercise any control over them anymore, this being because that they are at school while we are at home and cannot be sure whether they are actually in school. There are also times when their undesirable friends come to my house and ask my children out. It is therefore very dangerous. (FGS04_3)
This parent viewed the school environment as a risk to their child and an environment they had no control over. A social worker proposed that a number of children living in the high-rise estate had been placed at risk through a lack of supervision after school hours. Often this occurred because both parents worked long hours in factories, or some in bread shops in faraway suburbs or in other employment. According to the social worker, some young children in the high-rise flats had been put at risk of being exploited by drug dealers. Strategies to protect children’s safety had not been implemented by police or other agencies. The dealers preyed on the children, enticing them to transmit drugs from one point to another in return for money.

In many cases in which a youth had a serious drug addiction, the whole family became implicated. Shame was crippling for families, because of the supreme importance in the Vietnamese community of saving face. Usually these families did not seek assistance from drug counselling services. The secrecy and containment within families of the drug issue exacerbated stress and isolation. Some parents reputedly resorted to extreme and sometimes illegal measures to keep their daughters or sons from leaving the home premises. Focus group members recounted incidents of parents who had sometimes locked their son or daughter in their room. Some of these incidents had been relayed to police officers. Occasionally, under intense duress, parents had chained their sons or daughters to a household fixture, or had threatened to do so, to prevent them leaving the premises to buy drugs: ‘and I see some of the parents they are very strong willed, they almost chain them to the table’ (FGFAC09). Another strategy used by parents was to buy the drugs for their sons or daughters:

Some families who were trying to get their children to go back to Vietnam for detoxification, that they would actually buy drugs for them in order to keep them in the house, because they knew if they went when it was coming time to go, they wanted to keep them in the house. So they would actually buy drugs for them, because then they know they would stay and they’d be able to find them when they had to leave, it was really sad. (FGFAC09)

In these situations, parents became implicated themselves in illegal drug activity through attempts to protect their sons or daughters. The isolation and vulnerability of these families was increased by the absence of interventions from police and/or support from social service agencies. A favoured strategy to deal with the problem of a child with a drug addiction was to
send them back to Vietnam to detox under the supervision of relatives or respected elders. The parents believed that reform would inevitably follow if the youth were removed from ‘bad influences’ in Australia. The accepted treatment for heroin addiction in Vietnam was enforced abstinence from drugs in secure military-style re-education institutions. Although families did not send their children to these severe institutions, they believed in the approach of total withdrawal, and consequently many parents did not support the methadone programs used in Australia.

Women respondents held contrary opinions on whether returning youth to Vietnam achieved the desired outcome. They recounted stories from their networks, saying that in some cases, the youth never returned. One woman endorsed the practice: ‘There are many kids need to [get away] from their friends, sending them to Vietnam is good’ (FGS04_2) However, most believed that the method failed, and in one women’s focus group they concurred that ‘treating in Vietnam is no results’ (FGS04). Or, as one woman said: ‘Sending them to Vietnam or anywhere is the same; the patients must have strong will to give up’ (FGS04_1). A participant recounted a tragic situation that unfolded when a parent sent their seriously drug-addicted son back to Vietnam to reform:

Then she started to tell me because the son involved in drug problems and I sent him back there to try to keep him away from his friend, bad company here. And the son pass away over there because of drug overdose and now he left one or two children over there, because kind of like one night stand, defacto relationship like that. But the problem with me is she wants to sponsor, but when she showed me the son’s birth certificate the father’s name is not there, how can you sponsor your grandchild when there’s no proof of relationship? I tried to explain I can’t help, but I feel very sorry. (FGFAC09)

In this most unfortunate ending to the parents’ quest to end their son’s drug addiction, ongoing grief resulted for the mother not only from the loss of her son, but also because of her inability to bring her grandchild to Australia. These findings resonate with a PhD study by Naomi Ngo, (2010) who found that Vietnamese families do not access services in Australia, and the hardships experienced by families through a family member’s illicit drug use is a symptom of dislocation from the dominant culture. Sometimes these dilemmas led to Vietnamese-Australians pursuing illegal migration options to bring grandchildren or relatives to Australia. Usually white officers did not understand these complex cultural circumstances
and socio-economic factors that intersected with the migrant experience. One exception to this was the situation of a police officer from Footscray who had been informed of a Vietnamese scam operation that organised illegal immigration of grandchildren if grandparents payed an exorbitant fee. In this case, the police intervened to protect the Vietnamese grandparents. More usually, whiteness obscured the non-normative safety issues, and police did not find out about these insecurities and related crimes that were hidden within Vietnamese communities.

Another serious criminal drug incident that threatened the safety of Vietnamese mothers was recounted by participants in a focus group of young mothers from high-rise flats in an inner-city suburb. They had been repeatedly exposed to pressure from a Vietnamese woman to hide drugs in their babies’ rooms. The young mothers, all of whom were recent migrants from Vietnam, were targeted because they were single mothers on welfare benefits:

Psychologically they approach especially single mothers because they are benefits, stay-home dealers approach them to induce them to sell for them to induce them in their activities. (FGY06)

They claimed a Vietnamese woman assailed them as they were leaving their flats, often yelling at them to gain their attention, and repeatedly making offers of large sums of money – some said $2,000/month – if they agreed to hide drugs in their babies’ rooms:

You are only one person living here with the two young children. Let me share one of the rooms, she said no we can’t let people live here my children will later. I only need to store one small block (round) of heroin here. I am going to sell it, when I need more merchandise I will come and get it. You are a single mother if you let me leave this piece of heroin here I will pay you $2000 for a month. Because my young children are tired I have to put them into bed. You are on benefit you don’t have much money, you live here on benefits. (FGY06)

The Vietnamese generation one mothers who were being harangued by the drug-trading entrepreneur were at risk because of on-going pressure. The facilitator of the focus group, who was a social worker, subsequently spent considerable time alerting them to the consequences of agreeing to the woman’s proposal. None of these criminal incidents had
been reported to police, and the lack of police knowledge about this type of crime, as well as their failure to intervene, increased the vulnerability of the young mothers to crime.

Drug crimes among generation one Vietnamese adults were often linked to gambling. A social worker suggested that gambling debts among generation one women and men frequently precipitated drug dealing or drug habits to recoup the owed money. The reverse also happened in that drug debts could lead to gambling:

The very obvious problems with the Vietnamese community I can see is gambling and drug problems. The people get into trouble with gambling and can have a different reason, some people get into gambling because they have a drug problem, so they want to try their luck, or some people can be getting into drugs because they have a problem, with a gambling problem. (INCO6)

The link by this community worker between drugs and gambling was clearly known as a problem in the community, but was not openly discussed in the focus groups. Community workers agreed that there were significant gambling problems in Vietnamese communities. Vietnamese-Australians constitute one of the largest groups of gamblers at Crown Casino in Melbourne, and gambling debts were often linked to drug crime:

Yes, because I’ve seen when they open the Casino, and a lot of TAB around the country and when the people they start gambling and they lost their money, so what they started to turn to another way to earn money, quick money. (INC16)

The observations by the community worker of links between gambling and crime are investigated in Lee’s (2014) study of Vietnamese women offenders. The study of offenders in a Melbourne prison tracks the interweaving of gambling, debts and drug-trading that led to the women being incarcerated (Le and Gilding, 2014). Vietnamese women have the highest incarceration rate of any non-Australian-born group (Munro, 2010). The counselling of past-offenders and proactive schemes to prevent the apparent vulnerability of some women to exploitation and crime were predominantly provided by the Australian Vietnamese Women’s Association and other groups within the community (Earl, 2008).
Abduction

Abduction was raised as a concern in one women’s focus group. One woman said she was fearful of young Vietnamese children being kidnapped for organ removal, and the subsequent sale of their organs on the black market:

With children, we fear kidnapping. I have heard something which I’m unsure if you all have heard, but there has been news that there have abductions of young children in which the kidnapper removes the heart and other internal organs of the children for sale (FGF07_4).

Another woman reiterated the same fear of abduction of children for organ removal, but in this case her fear was for her 20-year-old son:

I have heard of a few cases. I have two sons. I heard that there have been a series of abductions in which the kidnappers target boys in order to remove their kidneys for sale. I saw this in a newspaper and that this occurred in Brisbane. It was terrible… I have two boys and am always worried about them. I have persuaded them not to go clubbing for fear that they might be tricked. The man was not young, he was over 20 years old. He could not believe that after drinking with his new friend, he had his kidney removed. (FGF07_1)

These fears were difficult to understand, and appeared somewhat unbelievable in a white Anglo-Australian context, but the terrors were real for these two Vietnamese women. Other women in the group did not dismiss or condone the validity of these fears, so it could not be ascertained whether or not others shared their fear of abductions. Kidnapping for organ removal in Australia is virtually unheard of, and has not been reported in the dominant public media. However, a report in a British newspaper (Swinford, 2013) refers to the rise in human trafficking in the UK, where children are being abducted by Asian gangs from Vietnam (95 Vietnamese in a group of 371 children), and are then sexually exploited and used as slaves. Another report covers the rise in trafficking of human kidneys to the tourist trade in the Middle East, Asia and Latin America, where the medical operations are performed. The kidneys are sourced from kidney sellers, an ‘invisible population of anonymous supplier bodies’ in Vietnam, the Philippines and China (Scheper-Hughes, 2014). The networks
through which these Vietnamese women respondents gained their information did not include the dominant white cultural media.

In Australia, the lack of proficiency in English of many generation one Vietnamese women excluded them from English-speaking social networks in Australia. The local police news and the public media, in which particular types of dangers are normalised and become known, were not accessible to many of these women. It was evident that these unlikely – though not impossible – dangers had put such fear and insecurity into the hearts of these women that they fretted when their sons or daughters left their home premises. The perceptions of some of these women were formed within a context of unfamiliarity with wider white Australian society.

**Disciplinary measures and family violence**

Because many of the expectations and moral codes for behaviours for their children were different to those of Australian youth, many parents experienced generational conflict. Some Vietnamese families implemented harsh disciplinary measures that did not comply with the law. Some parents claimed that the police did not understand or support Vietnamese families in dealing with children did not abide by their rules. Parents accused police officers of taking the side of their children because they drew on Australian cultural rules around behaviour. The following story by a respondent describes how generational conflict was experienced in her extended family:

> I have a niece who was very well behaved. I am not too sure but she recently started smoking or using drugs. One day, she spent the entire night out and after that, she went out every night. One day, she wanted to spend the entire day outside but her parents did not allow her to as she is a girl. Within 6 months, she changed from a well-behaved girl to someone who goes out for entire nights and does not obey her parents. She even called the police asking them to help her get out...The police here help the young people and do not pay heed to how the Vietnamese community feels about the upbringing of the children. We have our own ways of teaching our children and we do not abuse them. The police feel that by preventing them from going out, we are denying them their freedom. (FGF07_F1)
Here the police are described as complicit in defending the actions of the youth as exercising their individual rights, and as speaking from a position of white individualism that does not acknowledge the collective views of Vietnamese families. Vietnamese youth who wanted the freedom that existed within white youth culture sometimes accessed the police to endorse their rights. This left youth without the familial and other networks of their Vietnamese community, but at the same time possibly marginalised within the dominant culture they sought out for protection. Although the parent claimed that their controls did not involve family abuse, it may well have been the perspective of police that the daughter was at risk of family violence. Another case of a family dispute between parents and their child indicated that family violence was the underlying issue, but this was not considered by the parents to be a crime:

> We know that here, we are not allowed to scold our children but when a child’s behaviour is unacceptable, parents have to scold them. In this case, when the son shouted at his parents, his father thought that he was being disloyal to the family and said that he wanted to beat him to death for he could not accept such a son. Parents love their children and scold them when they’ve done something wrong so that they may turn out to be good people. (FGF07)

In this account, the father would presumably not have intended to ‘beat him to death’, though the comment does imply the severity of physical punishment in some Vietnamese Australian families. In the case of the family cited above, one could reasonably assume that the son absented himself from the family because of the risk of violence. Only two officers knew about these extreme incidents of physical restraint and informed the parents this was not legal or socially acceptable, however because they understood the parent’s fear they were not judgemental.

A family violence community worker said that Vietnamese women constituted the largest group of ethnic women seeking services, and claimed that the trend appeared to be increasing. In the previous year, ‘70 Vietnamese women out of 600 ethnic women’ (INC21) sought assistance from the support organisation for family violence. This community worker found that the most vulnerable women were those brought to Australia as brides, a trend sometimes referred to as the ‘bride industry’. Vietnamese-Australian men often travel to
Vietnam to find a partner, marry, and then bring their new partners to Australia on spouse visas:

[The men go] back to Vietnam to marry and sponsor their partner, fiancé, or your partner’s spouse coming here and the condition of living in Australia for two years in Australia to have the entitlement for permanent resident, that is the largest number of Vietnamese women being abused, financially, emotionally, physically, sexually because the men control over them. They know that you are vulnerable. If you don’t listen to me I’ll send you back to Vietnam. I don’t do the sponsor paper for you, then you can’t stay in Australia and back to the women at the same time, control them, abusing them because of that reason and the majority of that reason. So since that scheme started then Vietnamese women who came to Australia being sponsored by spouse, being abused and increasingly the number of domestic violence. (INC21)

When a wife’s immigration to Australia is guaranteed and their husbands abuse them they should also be reported to the police. People in our community rarely report this. Even the people suffering the abuse do not dare to report this to the police. (FGS03_2)

In the above cases, it is evident that women were vulnerable in these relationships, and were too fearful to leave, with some being threatened with deportation. The uncertainty of their rights in Australia, their visa conditions and their lack of English meant that women were often captive in their houses, and too frightened to seek assistance, even from Vietnamese community groups. A generation one men’s focus group agreed that this was an issue of concern that was typically not reported:

People in our community rarely report this. Even the people suffering the abuse do not dare to report this to the police’ (FGS03_2)

Another community worker claimed that violence was regularly used by male partners against ‘spouse visa brides’. The women were additionally disempowered, because they tended to come from rural regions in Vietnam:

The husband threatens them that they cannot go out, cannot speak to anyone. They don’t want them to find out about their rights or information from anyone. Tell them I’ll send you back to Vietnam. Keep them at home, don’t let them listen to the radio or talk to
other people. They don’t know what their visa means or their rights. They don’t know that the man cannot have them sent back to Vietnam. When they do find out their rights, they leave. (INC18)

This community worker stated that some Vietnamese men who had brought Vietnamese spouses to Australia deliberately isolated women in the home. They did not want these women to get ideas from Vietnamese-Australian women about their rights. Neither did they want them to learn English, or to access other community support systems. Two other community workers claimed that family violence against women was not only found in the case of spouse visa brides brought to Australia, but was deeply endemic in the community:

> It is that in our culture we believe that Vietnamese men are having more power than the women so a lot of cases where the husband abuses the wife, but then it’s not reported because a lot of people still believing that it is our culture. (INC02)

> Vietnamese men would see that it is their right to discipline…I have to discipline my wife, discipline my kids then there’s a lot of problems with that. (INC17)

Because these normative attitudes of Vietnamese men towards Vietnamese women persisted in Australia, family violence issues were often not reported, and consequently the extent of family violence in Vietnamese communities was unknown to police.

**Experiences and perceptions of police**

In all engagements with police, Vietnamese communities judged police on their fairness, professionalism and effectiveness, and on the respect shown for them as citizens. Of importance in their relations with police was whether police responded to the crimes they reported, and how police demonstrated that they understood the perspective of Vietnamese-Australians. Other factors strongly impacting on relations were officers’ ethics, and whether police demonstrated that they valued them as community members.

**Protection by police from crime**

Police were judged as ineffective in policing drug crimes. Generation one and two gave different reasons for poor police performance. Generation one men disagreed with policing methods, sentencing periods and the too-comfortable jail conditions; they claimed that none
of these methods were deterrents. Generation two did not agree that harsher penalties would solve drug-related crime, and instead supported a multi-agency response. The descriptions of Vietnamese people’s perception of risk areas showed that their mode of scoping the environment for crime risks was different to that of the police. This was most evident in Richmond, where police foot patrols and vehicle patrols routinely targeted Victoria Street, because it was known in the dominant white community as a ‘hot spot’ for policing drugs. In contrast, the local Vietnamese did not mention this street’s shopping strip as a high-risk locality. For the Vietnamese, it was their street, one in which they regularly shopped, met friends and acquaintances and frequented the local restaurants. Some Vietnamese viewed the policing of street drug-traffickers and drug-users cynically, saying it placated Anglo-Australians (INC05). Police agreed that it was often Anglo-Australians visiting or passing through the area in cars or trams who rang triple zero to report drug crimes they observed. It was not that the local Vietnamese disagreed there was crime, but they viewed it differently. They also had some common concerns with the white visitors or commuters about theft:

> When withdrawing money from an ATM machine, one has to be careful, especially making sure not to withdraw money at night. (FGY01)

The quote above represents a more common attitude of the local Vietnamese about crime in Victoria Street: they had to be vigilant in the street in case of theft, but they did not discuss the issue of whether or not drug sellers led them to feel unsafe. It may well have been that the presence of police in Victoria Street contributed to their feelings of safety, but focus group respondents did not comment on the effects of regular street patrols. In contrast to the police’s view that Victoria Street was the most insecure site, many Vietnamese residents in Richmond felt that sites in the immediate vicinities of their flats or residences were the most insecure. The public spaces, corridors or laundries where people conducted drug deals, or that were occupied by IV drug users, were sites associated with threats and insecurities. Most Vietnamese-Australians experienced crimes associated with drug dealing at night-time, when police did not have a presence and were not called to attend crimes.

Home burglaries were reported by Vietnamese-Australians, and it was apparent that in most cases they judged police performance as poor. Community members were particularly critical of the police’s slow response to their calls, sometimes hours or days after the theft, and in some cases police did not respond at all. A slow response time by police to a phone call about
a burglary was interpreted as a lack of intention to catch the offender or find the stolen goods. A further loss of faith in police’s intentions occurred when the thief was intercepted, but then released rather than being taken back to the station in the van, though presumably police had taken their details. Some Vietnamese interpreted the process as letting the offender go without recrimination:

I personally think that the police have their own laws. The laws here will punish the thief if he/she is considered dangerous, and however, if the thief is not dangerous, the police will release him/her despite having caught them. (FGS04_3)

In referring to the police using ‘their own laws’, this Vietnamese woman interpreted the problem as the combined effects of weak laws and police’s discretion to let offenders off. According to another woman, the consequences of this were that thieves ‘did not [have] fear of the police’ (FGS04_06). In contrast, although not often recounted, stories of prompt attendance led to a good impression of police performance, even when they had occurred many years previously. The following incident is one example of this:

Burglars also broke into my house ten years ago. At the time, the police came right after I called. They were good and enthusiastic. The burglars broke my door to get in the house so the door was locked from inside. The police were willing to get in through the window. … The police seemed nice; they were quite big but still went through the small window to get in and opened the door for me. (FGS03)

This respondent shows that the Vietnamese were willing to re-evaluate their views on police when they responded to issues they believed were important, when attendance was prompt, and when they were treated fairly. Police tended to regard home burglaries as crimes that did not warrant their immediate attention unless they involved harm to individuals. When police officers stated that stolen possessions were unlikely to be returned, the Vietnamese interpreted this as a statement of poor performance.

In Australian homes, attendance at a household burglary was linked to house insurance requirements for a police report on the theft. According to focus group respondents, this assumption did not apply to Vietnamese-Australian households, because many people did not have home property insurance: ‘Usually our people they don’t have any insurance’
Consequently, Vietnamese-Australians had different expectations concerning the policing of burglaries from those of Anglo-Australians, the majority of whom report burglaries so as to be able to submit an insurance claim; they do not necessarily expect an immediate police response.

In Vietnamese households, the stolen goods – often cash, gold jewellery or other items – were usually peoples’ savings. Respondents claimed that it was common for Vietnamese people not to put their savings in the bank; instead they kept cash and other valuables hidden in the house. Some kept jewellery and gold, as these were a traditional means of securing investments. Data on Australian household burglaries shows that money (19%) and jewellery (18%) were the most commonly-stolen items (AIC, 2011). Vietnamese claimed that police showed disregard for their savings, and perceived their motivation to pursue thieves as sadly lacking. The police response to home burglaries was appropriate for the average white Australian home burglary, but not for a Vietnamese-Australian home burglary.

Police’s non-attendance or lack of follow-up inquiries to calls from Vietnamese-Australians was understood by respondents as evidence of police’s lack of concern for Vietnamese-Australians. One respondent explained: ‘I call them up, but they don’t seem to care and help’ (FGS05). Another claimed it was racism: ‘I think it’s more likely racial discrimination, if I were white they would come quickly’ (FGS03). For one person, failure to attend a crime was experienced as a failure to help them:

When you call the police, they not going to come, or they can’t solve this problem, so half the Vietnamese they have this same perception too, or they have this incident and they call, they’re not coming, so they’re not helping. (INC16)

The above Vietnamese community worker claims that many Vietnamese people do not understand why police have not responded to their calls. Consequently they drew their own conclusions, and primarily the perception was that police were not interested in helping Vietnamese people. In one focus group, five different participants agreed that they would have to wait unless it was a major crime:

The police always take more than an hour to arrive. (FGS02_1)
They say the people won’t come quickly if there isn’t any murder. (FGS02_6)

Same with car accidents, if there isn’t anyone dead then you’ve got to wait. (FGS02_3)

If car accident occurs, we’d better go somewhere else to talk, rather than stopping the car right in the middle of the road, if the police comes they might even fine us. (FGS02_2)

It is pretty annoying. (FGS02_4)

These perceptions reinforced normative views that police were disinterested in them. The perceptions had the feedback effect of further discouraging the reporting of crime, already at a lower level than in the dominant population. One man said that the lack of interest on the part of police acted as a disincentive, and caused Vietnamese people to feel ‘tired’, and that they could ‘not trust police’ (FGS04). Another person believed it would lead to a more insecure and dangerous society: ‘If incidents like this keep increasing then it would be really dangerous, society should take a serious view of this matter’ (FGS04). The accumulated effects from repeated incidents of crime were expressed by this respondent:

Although it's a minor incident but if it is allowed to continually happen again and again, it will reduce our confidence in relying on police security. This time we may have lost our property, but in the future, it may be our lives that are lost. (FGS04)

This respondent understood repetitive incidents of crime and failure of police to address their concerns as a sign of social disorder. The Vietnamese residents did not distinguish home burglaries from serious crime in the way that white officers and the wider population did. The lack of response to calls regarding home burglaries and some other crimes increased Vietnamese-Australians’ feelings of insecurity, and police responded as if their expectations and behaviours were non-normative. In many instances, white expectations and practices overrode and blinded police to the Vietnamese-Australians’ expectations and security issues.

**Embodied whiteness in officers**

Vietnamese generation one women found the general countenance of white officers frightening. One Vietnamese woman spoke of the conflicting feelings of fear of, and yet respect for, the work of police, as this example illustrates:
I respect the police, I admire the young women police…….. I saw the young women police, I wanted to talk to them but they had a cold face. I know they need to be strong to do their job. I wanted to tell them that ‘Oh yes I support you. I wanted to’. (INC01)

The above incident shows the Vietnamese woman’s intention to engage with the white woman police officer, but that on approaching the officer, she could not do this because she found the officer’s physical demeanour intimidating. Another participant contrasted the frightening aspects of the physical appearance of police officers with their verbal communications, which she did not find frightening: ‘They're big, they look scary, when they talk they don't talk like that’ (FGFAC). Unlike this woman, who could contrast appearance with verbal communication, women who could not speak English did not have the opportunity to experience officers’ potentially more positive attributes.

Some generation one male respondents who had fought in the South Vietnam army in the Vietnam War described white police officers’ physical attributes as inadequate. They described police officers as unfit and lacking in muscular strength, which they perceived threatened their capacity to defend civilians or catch offenders. Strong bodies and high levels of fitness were attributes that promoted confidence in their ability. Australian police were compared unfavourably with police in the US. American police were stereotyped as strong and athletic in appearance, and Australian police as weak and overweight with ‘very big bellies’ (FGS03). Another respondent in the same focus group suggested: ‘Our police need to improve to be stronger, be athletic and more muscular’ (FGS03). These comments by Vietnamese generation one men emanated from a position of disempowerment, and appeared to be a reaction against the perception of the Vietnamese body as unsuited to policing. Jackman (1996: 270) contends that the resistances of a subordinated group may appear superficially hidden, but their feelings of alienation can ‘bubble up in acts of petty sabotage, dissembling or infractions of the dominant will’. Below their courteous façade, Vietnamese men were insulted by white officers’ opinions that their bodies were unsuitable for the Victoria Police, particularly for those men who were former soldiers in the South Vietnamese Army. The criticism of white officers’ bodies appeared to be a mild sabotage by Vietnamese men of the assumed superior physical prowess of white police bodies.
Bias and discrimination
Vietnamese-Australians claimed that they were discriminated against by the police force, either in general or by individual officers. Studies show that Vietnamese-Australians experience discriminatory attitudes and behaviours from police in Australia (Dixon and Maher, 2005; Maher and Swift, 1997). The bias most widely commented on was that police stereotyped their community as a drug-crime culture. People claimed that it was not only the Victoria Police but average Australians who showed this bias and perpetuated stereotypes of Vietnamese-Australians as drug traffickers. In particular, they blamed the media for casting Vietnamese in drug-related roles in television police dramas. Some Vietnamese-Australian respondents claimed that when police intercepted them, they were treated as guilty rather than innocent from the outset. Others said that police pre-judgments were racial: ‘They think of crime and the Asians’ (FGY11):

> Just say if they’re white, then they’ll treat them with respect and it’s like us Asians, they’d be like downgrading us and just not respecting us’ (FGY11).

For this respondent, being Asian was sufficient grounds for being criminalised by white officers. The use of the word ‘downgrading’ also implied racism in that they were considered ‘less than’ and ‘inferior’ to white officers. Past offenders all agreed that being recognised as having an Asian or Vietnamese identity meant that you would be targeted by police as drug dealers or users: ‘Asians are drug-dealers or drug users and that’s the perception of the police officers’ (INOF11).

Respondents in this study claimed that they were disproportionally selected in traffic and alcohol checks. Another typical site of discrimination discussed by Vietnamese-Australians was in minor car accidents involving both Vietnamese and Anglo drivers. Vietnamese-Australians claimed that when officers attended the site of the accident, police invariably gave preference to the white person’s account of the incident. They said that Australians would be forthright in giving their opinions, and usually managed to gain the full attention of police. Vietnamese-Australians were softly spoken, and preferred to speak only when asked questions by an officer rather than volunteering information. A generation two Vietnamese person commented on her mother’s belief that she would be discriminated against in a car accident that involved a white person:
I think my mum talks about how she doesn’t feel confident that people will; say for example she got into a car accident with a white person, she’ll feel disadvantaged there, because they’ll take the white person’s side. (FGS10)

The mother believed that white officers would take the side of the white person in a minor accident. They were further disadvantaged in their attempts to explain the technical aspects of traffic laws without an interpreter, as police did not contact interpreters for minor car accidents. This lack of opportunity to tell their side of the story to police led to a strong sense of unfairness. Studies show that fairness is the main criterion used by ethnic and racially-identified groups to judge whether police are discriminatory (Skogan, 2005; Tyler, 2001).

Respondents generally believed that the shortage of Asian and Vietnamese officers in the force contributed to discrimination: ‘Here the policemen are almost exclusively Western, we are Vietnamese, Asian, and so we feel that there is a certain degree of discrimination’ (FGS04). Generation two Vietnamese were divided on whether it was the entire police organisation that demonstrated bias and discrimination against Asian or Vietnamese people, or just individual officers. Some generation two respondents described the Victoria Police as not structurally prejudiced against Vietnamese people, but that there were individual police officers who were:

But I think there are still misunderstandings. I think in a group when I think of the police aren’t like that, but I think it does come down to individuals as well and some may not be as exposed to different cultures or have an understanding there (FGS10).

This respondent believed that some officers showed bias, and others lacked understanding of non-white cultures. Other respondents similarly noted the cultural divide in interactions between their parents and police: white officers operated from a white cultural perspective, and their parents from a Vietnamese one. The distinctions they made between interpersonal and institutional biases demonstrated in the above account allowed generation two Vietnamese-Australians to accept a degree of racism exhibited by certain officers without developing a negative view of all police. Their bicultural position enabled them to make
observations from Australian and Vietnamese cultural standpoints, while noting the lack of this skill in many white officers.

Male youth (18-24) spoke angrily about police bias. They claimed that police discriminated against them in ‘stop and check’ processes on the streets or in public places. Youth claimed that police officers routinely targeted them when they were walking around with groups of friends. More male youth than female youth said that police officers were prejudiced, and male youth expressed the most negative views of police. The most positive views of police were expressed by female university students, who believed that some of the treatment Vietnamese youth complained about was simply police following normal procedures:

But I reckon it’s also say police now have structure and procedures. Sometimes it doesn’t go according to how they feel like it should go and they feel like they’re getting targeted, but it’s actually just procedures some of it’ (FGS10)

Generation two’s better understanding of the mechanisms and operations of the police force allowed them to make distinctions between operational practice and the ways in which the personal bias of officers could distort practices. The perceptions of being targeted on the basis of ethnicity, race or visible appearance, whether true or not, damaged their trust in police.

**Disrespect towards Vietnamese people**

Respectful behaviours by police for all people, whatever their background, was an important expectation of all Vietnamese people, and was often linked to the Buddhist beliefs of many respondents. In Australia, 58.6% of Vietnamese-born people belong to the Buddhist religion (Ben-Moshe and Pyke, 2012). Disrespect from police officers was widely commented on in various settings, including the family home, the streets and a Buddhist temple. The main concerns of Vietnamese-Australians were the police’s use of inappropriate language, and that they insulted people by ignoring their cultural traditions. Participants commented on officers’ swearing in front of other family members, or not following cultural rules of address which insulted the entire extended family. One young woman described the behaviours of police when they came to search the house when her family was present:
When they did the house searching they swore as well. In my family it’s my mum, my dad, my auntie and my brother and they called my auntie a grandma, even though she looks old, but she’s not a grandma and I feel as though there’s no respect. I’m like she’s my auntie, at least use the person’s name, don’t call her grandma. I’m not happy but they still call her [grandma] non-stop. (FGY11)

This generation two young woman said she tried to intervene for the sake of her aunt’s respect, but was ignored by police. A generation one woman explained her experience of disrespectful behaviours from a police officer:

The police officer just waved his hand and did not answer her question implying that we are of lower class in this country. (FGF07)

This respondent understood the lack of respect as the result of the police perception that Vietnamese people were from a socially-subordinate group. Social justice workers recounted numerous incidents of the extreme disrespect shown in police officers’ treatment of Vietnamese drug offenders. Respondents from varied subgroups in the Vietnamese communities agreed that being shown respect was an important factor in feeling as if they were being treated fairly and equally. A report on the Victoria Police’s relations with ethnic communities targeted inter-cultural communication skills as lacking, and as a priority for future action (Grossman et al., 2013). White values were reinforced as normative through the scant regard given to ensuring that all communications with Vietnamese-Australian people were respectful.

**Whiteness factors**

Whiteness was maintained through police officers’ disregard for the safety and security issues resulting from crime and drugs in the high-rise flats. The safety of the Vietnamese appeared to be of little concern, confirming their non-normative status. What stood out was the lack of interventions to address the often worrying crime that surrounded children, mothers and the elderly, and the lack of police knowledge of these crimes. It points to gendered discrimination in the lack of action to protect women. Police had not implemented strategies to uncover or solve these crimes and insecurities. Police reacted to what was reported, and these incidents were mostly not reported. In the case of home burglaries, when they did report crime, police usually did not respond immediately or even within a reasonable time frame. The lack of
police response to calls for assistance further confirmed their position as outsiders. In taking on this idea, Vietnamese displayed a notion described as ‘double-consciousness’; some considered themselves as being unworthy, and this maintained their position as not mainstream. Police were advantaged in not having to waste time on what was considered low-level home burglary crime. Their norm was that these crimes were insurance issues, and that by not insuring their properties, Vietnamese were operating outside these norms. Vietnamese community members felt there was widespread lack of respect by officers for them, and for their protocols for addressing elders. This disrespect was understood as not being treated as equal with the white dominant community, and this further maintained whiteness.

Whiteness was reinforced through the mechanisms of criminalisation, racialisation and exclusion of their communities through reduced access to police services. Aggressive or disrespectful behaviours by police towards Vietnamese-Australians or other non-normative groups reinforced racial hierarchies. Vietnamese-Australian respondents found that police stereotyped their community as a culture of drug crime, and when police intercepted community members, they were first treated as if guilty rather than innocent. Others said that the pre-judgments by police were racial: ‘They think of crime and the Asians’. People claimed it was not only the Victoria Police, because the average Australian also showed this bias and perpetuated the stereotypes of Vietnamese-Australians as drug traffickers. Some generation one Vietnamese women found the embodied white officer frightening and confronting, and consequently did not feel comfortable speaking face-to-face with white officers. This finding raised new research questions about fear and power in the officer’s physical embodiment of whiteness. However, it is not within the bounds of this study to address these.

It is clear that none of the experiences or views of Vietnamese-Australians in this study indicated attempts by white officers to reinvent whiteness. On the contrary, from their perspective, all officers were strong representatives of white culture in their physical presence and attitudes. Through their policing, white officers generally maintained whiteness, with some officers reinforcing it. For Vietnamese-Australians, race and ethnicity were ever-present in interactions with white officers, and they believed that police were biased in their
judgments and disinterested in their safety. Whiteness ideology presented the Vietnamese as non-normative, and this view was enforced and strengthened by policing.

**Chapter 9 Conclusion on whiteness as a structure of policing**

In this chapter I address the overall research question for the thesis: *How is whiteness reinforced, maintained or reinvented in policing a Vietnamese minority, and how does this contribute to white race privilege?* Here I argue that the previous four chapters, when taken as a whole, demonstrate that whiteness structured policing in the three PSAs in this study. In those chapters, I drew together analyses of how whiteness was maintained, reinforced or reinvented as normal by white police officers in policing Vietnamese Australians, and in their work relations with Vietnamese Australian officers. In order to uncover the mechanisms of whiteness and white privilege, these findings are synthesised alongside the data on how Vietnamese Australians experience whiteness from Victoria Police force. Whether or not whiteness was maintained or reinforced varied according to the whiteness mechanisms embedded in local strategies, or in officers’ attitudes and dialogue.

The key mechanisms employed by white officers or local white police forces were as follows: racialisation and criminalisation of people, their geography and their culture; colour-blindness; stereotyping; and normalisation. The multiple perspectives showed the complexity of relations, and provided insights into ways in which police implemented these whiteness mechanisms to structure racial hierarchies. I conclude that the iterative whiteness garnered through the police’s state-sanctioned powers and the authority bestowed upon their role, in conjunction with the whiteness mechanisms embedded in local strategies, reproduced whiteness as normative and dominant. It also provided benefits to the white police force and the dominant white community. Racialisation strategies operated across the three PSAs. I found that racialisation and criminalisation were used together in one PSA to strongly reinforce whiteness as dominant. However, inclusive interpretations of multicultural policies at the local level to some degree ameliorated these racialising processes, which appeared inherent in the force in general. In one PSA, where multicultural and inclusive community-oriented approaches were the priority mode, whiteness was normalised but not enhanced. Vietnamese officers within the force were strongly racialised and discriminated against, albeit
by a vocal minority of white officers. The effects of whiteness mechanisms on the Vietnamese community being policed included exclusion from services, being the ‘eyes and ears’ of the police, and being part of the normative community. I discuss each of these mechanisms in turn.

**Criminalising and racialising Vietnamese Australians**

When police imposed them together, criminalisation and racialisation were found to be powerful whiteness mechanisms, meaning the practice of whiteness. When used by white officers, their prime effect was to construct Vietnamese Australians and Asian Australians as more criminal than mainstream white Australians, and consequently to reinforce whiteness as normal, and Vietnamese ethnicity or Asian, as other and deviant. Individual white police officers mediated these exclusionary practices in their everyday work through the use of the stereotype of the Vietnamese drug dealer. Other Australian studies have claimed that police practices stereotype and criminalise the Vietnamese as involved in drug crime and drug use, although these studies have used health or youth frames (White, 2009; Dixon and Maher, 2002; Maher and Swift, 1997). While officers in all PSAs described the Vietnamese as associated with drug crime, they were most strongly criminalised and racialised by the officers in PSA Yarra. The identity of ‘Vietnamese drug dealer’ was used interchangeably with ‘Asian drug dealer’, and this served to generalise the criminalisation of Asians. Police’s inability to distinguish between Vietnamese and other Southeast Asian cultural groups meant they often used Asian as a default identity, and this conflation reinforced ‘Vietnamese’ as a racial category. Some officers acknowledged that their view was based in a skewed perspective that arose out of their over-exposure to drug offenders. Police officers justified their use of stereotypes as a normative belief in white Australian culture that was assumed to be neutral.

The dominant culture was the central point from which other cultures were judged. Australian white culture was not marked as a criminal culture and neither was there a ready-made available discursive identity of the ‘white Australian drug dealer’. It seemed contradictory that many of the buyers were white, but this criminality was overlooked and not policed. The asymmetry of police attention such as that found in PSA Yarra is described by Frankenberg (2001a) as ‘the mirage of an unmarked whiteness’. This refers to double standards found in whiteness that operate to over-scrutinise non-white people, while white people and whiteness
are unexamined. Whiteness was enhanced through the power assigned to the white police forces and the authority taken up by white officers, reinforcing the racialisation and criminalisation of Vietnamese Australians. The stereotypes assigned were archetypes of what Garland (1996) terms the racialised offender. The co-implementation of these whiteness mechanisms reinforced a racial hierarchy of criminality whereby white people were not perceived to be as criminal as the Vietnamese.

The language of stereotypes used by the white officers, and the related criminalisation of Vietnamese communities, raise doubts about the capacity of officers to deliver unbiased policing. In police encounters with the Vietnamese, it could be reasonably proposed that police saw what they expected to see, rather than being open to the unexpected. Nash (2003) supports this contention with the claim that whiteness ideology and whiteness practices cannot be separated. During the interviews, police were frequently asked if they could deliver unbiased policing to Vietnamese Australians if they considered them to be of a criminal disposition. It was always the same response: a resounding ‘yes’. As far as the police were concerned, they were not discriminatory in their everyday practices. Their self-proclamations ran counter to other studies, which contend that the expectations arising from stereotypes are difficult to modify, even in the face of contrary evidence (Baker, 2001). Criminological scholars have shown that racism impacts on whomever is intercepted or charged by police (Phillips and Webster 2013; Bowling and Weber, 2011; Bowling and Phillips, 2002).

Whether it was true that Vietnamese Australians committed more drug-related crime could not be assessed, because the Victoria Police do not collect crime data by ethnicity or race. Thus for the white officers in this study, their criminalisation of the Vietnamese was based entirely on their opinions, and not on police data. A long-term debate exists in the criminological literature regarding whether or not higher crime rates by racially-identified groups result from over-policing or over-offending. In this case, the salient point is that the criminalisation resulted from the widespread acceptance of the stereotype of the Vietnamese or Asian drug dealer. Prejudice studies confirm that stereotypes assimilate the mind, thinking and belief systems (Baker, 2001). The mechanisms of racialisation and criminalisation, along with the inherent powers accrued through whiteness and state-sanctioned powers and authority assigned to white police officers, were cemented-down in the local police culture as exclusionary practices.
Vietnamese Australian respondents were united in their view that the stereotypes held by white police affected how they were policed. They strongly believed that they were disadvantaged and treated unfairly. Being viewed as criminally oriented demeaned their communities, and was perceived by them as major discrimination and oppression that they collectively suffered. When police intercepted Vietnamese Australians, some claimed that they were treated first as if guilty, rather than innocent. Others said that pre-judgments by police were racial: ‘they think of crime and the Asians’ (FGY11). Vietnamese Australians agreed that it was not only the Victoria Police but also the media who perpetuated the stereotype of the Vietnamese drug trafficker. However the police had the power to make real the drug stereotype through targeting and arresting this group. The white officers believed that the Vietnamese drug traders were a scourge and a threat to white suburban values, and what they saw and found confirmed their beliefs. The bias against Vietnamese was supported by another study of 50 Vietnamese Australians. It found that a lack of procedural justice and harassment were typical of their experiences, and they believed this was the result of stereotypes officers held of Vietnamese people as drug dealers (Mellor, 2004). The drug-related stereotypes kept alive in the dialogue of white police officers simplified and essentialised the Vietnamese communities as being oriented towards drug crime. Whiteness structured these relations through the policing authority having the resources and power to define the less powerful, and these processes had material effects on the communities’ self-esteem and on their relations with police.

Criminalisation and racialisation were not only mediated via individual officers, but in some PSAs, they were embedded in the local police force’s strategies. In PSA Yarra, the Victoria Street strategy was based on the historic unit the Asian Squad, and the current strategy had inherited core assumptions about Vietnamese and Asian criminality. The approach involved repetitive and intensive surveillance and intelligence gathering, practices which the studies of Bowling and Phillips (2007) in the UK link to the criminalisation of black groups. It was evident that the local police force in Richmond saw the Victoria Street precinct as a hub of drug crime, whereas to the local Vietnamese community, it was their main shopping area and a hub for community. Ironically, the police referred to the Victoria Street strategy as a community-oriented strategy, in that they sought the cooperation of Vietnamese proprietors to report any low-level drug crimes. The cooperative aspect of this strategy was undermined by the lack of trust generated through the criminalising of the Vietnamese community.
Whiteness was shown in the racialisation and criminalisation of the Vietnamese and the geographies they worked and lived in. These whiteness processes had material effects on Vietnamese Australians in reduced trust, and in a lack of confidence that policing services were fair and unbiased.

Military-style crackdowns were another whiteness strategy used by the local police force at Richmond. As described by police, the purpose of the crackdowns was to drive out offenders, drug users and others exhibiting anti-social behaviour. The surprise tactics and the sheer size and force of these operations demonstrated the police’s authority and power over the already criminalised and racialised others. The unwanted, as judged by the dominant white society, were expelled, and many were Vietnamese drug users or drug dealers. Police justified the strategy as holding back an ‘influx’, implying that normative dominant communities would be overrun by these undesirables. These focused interventions were based on zero-tolerance strategies as used in New York City to reclaim the streets for law-abiding citizens (Greene, 1999). The crackdowns in Richmond did not achieve any long-term goals of safety and security, and as agreed by the police themselves, the effects were temporary. The offenders soon returned, as did other drug users or marginalised people, and if not, the gap was soon filled by others. However, the strategies were a visual and public display of white police power that strongly reinforced the criminalisation and racialisation of already-victimised people, and reinforced the racialisation of physical spaces.

There were benefits to the local police force at Richmond in constructing the Victoria Street shopping precinct as a crime hotspot, not only for the police but also for the dominant community. The long-term Victoria Street campaign was conceived within whiteness and benefited whiteness by reinforcing racial hierarchies. The official police force’s reasons for the continuation of the strategy were not clear, because it had been in place for 20 years and had clearly not significantly reduced drug crime. The different frameworks used in most policing literature support hotspot policing, which is a zero-tolerance strategy, although a minority of scholars and reporters suggest it may make things worse because of potential claims against police violence (Greene, 1999). In Richmond, social justice community workers claimed that abusive attitudes and behaviours were exhibited by white police officers towards their Vietnamese clients with drug addictions or drug offences. The effectiveness of the police campaigns against drug crimes were viewed by the Vietnamese as entirely
unsuccessful, and the police agreed that drug crime was not reduced. The processes did, however, placate the wider white community, whom the local police said made most of the complaints. The local police force in Richmond benefited through employing hotspot policing in Victoria Street as a means of training new recruits in catching crooks. They were rewarded for this by the wider white community for targeting drug traders in a street visited by many white people wanting to dine in Vietnamese restaurants. In interpreting this hotspot policing in Richmond from a whiteness perspective, the exclusionary mechanisms of criminalisation and racialisation of the Vietnamese and Asian drug dealers were found to be both drivers and consequences. Through these exclusionary mechanisms, whiteness was strengthened as normative.

A general finding was that through carving off the social justice domain from the police’s view, they only saw the suspect or offender and any clues of criminal behaviour. This demarcation of seeing left officers unchallenged in reinforcing whiteness through the constricting processes of criminalisation and racialisation. This supports the proposition by Briggs (2012), who examined riots in the UK, that ignoring socio-economic status leads to narrow constructions of criminality. The oft-cited work of McIntosh (1992) suggests that the specific skill of learning not to see white advantage is a normative behaviour that is actively learnt rather than being a passive uptake of cultural practices, and she provides examples of everyday whiteness privileges. In a similar vein for this study’s context of a criminalised Vietnamese culture, white advantages are played out in a myriad of unseen micro-events. For instance, if I, as a white person, reported a drug crime to police, I do not make the call feeling shame that my community is already seen as a drug crime culture and that the information I provide will reinforce the stereotype. If I am at the scene of a crime, the white police will not automatically pick me out to be treated with suspicion. If I am in a minor car collision that involves a Vietnamese driver, the white officer will not always give priority to the Vietnamese driver and ignore my account of what happened. And when I approach a white officer on the street, I do not feel fear and pre-judgement.

Reinterpretation or any re-working of whiteness was not on white officers’ agendas. The majority of officers dismissed any necessity to find out about the contributing social factors that led to the offender’s circumstances, such as socio-economic status, addictions, housing or health. Kincheloe (1999) suggests that such knowledge is vital to any re-working of
whiteness. The finding that whiteness structured policing to normalise the criminalisation and stereotyping of Vietnamese Australians by police in Victoria adds to the limited literature on whiteness, racism and policing. The pioneering work on racism in Australian police forces by Chan (1997), who showed racial intolerance by police towards Indigenous people through derogatory stereotypes, has been expanded on in some later studies of racism (Grossman and Sharples, 2010; Grossman et al., 2013). The whiteness framework as applied to policing in this study is a novel approach, from which I examined policing relations with the Vietnamese through focused attention on the white subject.

**Colour-blindness as a key strategy for white police**

The way in which white officers described their approach to different racial and ethnic groups was as if they were colour-blind, a phenomenon found to be prevalent in white communities and white police forces (Brewer and Heitzeg, 2008; Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Ansell, 2006; Sefa Dei, 2006; Lewis, 2004). They claimed to treat everyone the same, whatever their background. This was a self-belief that was not borne out by the data. In white officers’ dialogue and descriptions of their practices, they showed themselves to be acutely responsive to racial identification. When police were asked about bias, they were adamant that they did not profile or discriminate against any groups, a position that implied colour-blindness on the job. In all their dealings with the public, they claimed that colour or race were not factors. However, much of their discourse showed the contrary: racial identification was foremost in their observations. The Vietnamese were clearly visible to police as Asians, and in terms of drug crime, were constructed as more troublesome to police than white people. Vietnamese youth claimed that white police saw them first and foremost as people of Asian appearance, and that this made them a target in stop and search procedures. Profiling of Vietnamese youth most often occurred when they were on the street with their friends, and for first-generation Vietnamese, profiling was claimed to manifest in over-selecting them for driving checks. There was no doubt that race was intrinsic in interactions between police and the Vietnamese. This was also the case for the more recently-arrived African groups, but police did not discuss or acknowledge that race could enter the subjective terrain; they said they were guided by facts.

Police were immune to claims of bias, and stuck doggedly to their defence of treating everyone the same way. It was a moral position that did not equate with the experience of
most Vietnamese participants in this study, who believed they were not treated the same way as white Australians. In the absence of any quantitative studies to prove the contrary, white officers stayed with their self-proclaimed myth of colour-blindness and equanimity. Criminological scholar Skogan (2006) shows that if bias is believed to be manifested, it is damaging. Proving the reality of the bias does not matter: it is the belief in bias that is damaging. This is relevant to this study, which did not have to prove the existence or otherwise of bias; the important point was rather that the Vietnamese believed that police discriminated against them. It is noteworthy that colour-blindness was the key defence used by police to support race-denial. This was unrealistic, but it was their safe zone to return to. Sameness was part of their protective investment from community accusations of discrimination. Denying difference they believed, protected them from claims of being racist, as one officer expressed the idea, he was not playing the ‘race card’ (IND09).

Police were not colour-blind, however, in suggesting that Vietnamese officers should police Vietnamese communities. This advantaged white officers, who encountered difficulties in policing Vietnamese suspects or offenders, or who did not want to engage more directly with Vietnamese communities. In this case, it was an advantage not to be colour-blind. Thus police were either adamant that they were colour-blind, or when convenient and advantageous to whiteness, they lost their colour-blindness. Certainly police used colour-blindness as an equity expectation to defend their white claims to advantage in the organisation. They proposed that Vietnamese officers were given special treatment by senior managers, and this process was reified with a name that gave it some authenticity amongst peers as a practice: ‘fast-tracking’. White officers’ claims that they were disadvantaged did not align with the low-status roles minority officers were supposedly fast-tracked into by senior managers. The officers also claimed that trophy scoring by managers was an example of management not adhering to colour-blindness. It was apparent that many officers resisted organisational attention being paid to the minority Vietnamese officers. Any racialised focus heightened white officers’ perceptions of colour-visibility, and strengthened in-group/out-group divides, and this was so whether or not the rewards for Vietnamese officers were significant. White officers were restating their implicit advantages, which should not be tampered with by the organisation. The duplicity was evident in the use of the colour-blindness argument to defend a case of racial differentiation. Colour-blindness was activated when they believed their privileges were threatened.
The employment of ethnic police in itself raised issues of colour-blindness. If the organisation was colour-blind, how could ethnic police be targeted, and how would it be decided that they were ethnic or racially different? This dilemma of seeing or not seeing difference was played out across the organisation. Colour-blindness was upheld as a principle of egalitarianism, and used pragmatically to structure whiteness ideology, but in practice it was based on contested practices. The analysis in this study led to the conclusion that police were conveniently colour-blind, in that they chose to use it or not, to maximise whiteness. It was found to be a significant strategy to structure whiteness in policing; it was implemented or not according to whether whiteness was advantaged.

**Constructing the Vietnamese as inessential**

White police considered the Vietnamese communities to be profoundly different, and thus non-normative, and many aspects of their behaviour related to safety and security were not understood. Of most significance was the fact that police did not find it necessary or important to investigate and understand the safety needs of the community. It was found that through multiple modes of non-practice or through discourse, the Vietnamese communities were not only non-normative, they were inessential.

Apart from Victoria Street, the crime experienced by Vietnamese people did not enter the police’s radar. In fact some police had described the whole community as off their radar, and this was demonstrated by the fact that Vietnamese security and safety threats in the local area were completely ignored. It was also discovered that the Vietnamese did not follow normative white cultural behaviours around reporting crime. However, this does not excuse police from their responsibility of implementing investigations to find out about crimes that they knew existed but which remained unreported. These crimes appeared to be concern to police, as no strategies had been deployed in three of the police stations to find out which crimes threatened the safety of the Vietnamese community. Innes et al. ask whether white officers can ‘see like an ethnic or racially different citizen’ (2009), and intervene to protect them from fears such as payback from criminals. The public gaze that most informed policing was that of the dominant white public, whereas the gaze of the Vietnamese communities in the study was neither volunteered nor sought, and thus appeared inessential.
Innes et al. (2009) claim that community members are the eyes and ears of policing. This view was reiterated in this study by a senior officer in one PSA, who recounted the reliance on local communities as the eyes and ears for police. The functions of citizens seeing and police responding are closely knitted together in policing, and are confirmed in its history, literature and current practice. This is a historical process arising out of policing within whiteness. The behaviour of telling police what is seen or heard has been paramount in framing the white model of policing since its early conception as the British constabulary, from which Australian policing has evolved (Stead, 1985). The police agree that they are response-driven in reacting to phone calls made by citizens to the emergency phone number 000, or to the direct reporting of an incident to an officer by someone on the street or at the police station, or perhaps to an observation made by an officer in a van, though mostly police respond to citizens or other emergency services. The criminology literature maintains that the original adage still holds: the public are the eyes and ears of police, and this sentiment was reiterated by a senior officer in the study (Innes et al., 2009; Innes, 2005). Unknown and unseen crimes threatened peoples’ safety, but appeared to be inessential knowledge for the police.

Whiteness was maintained through police officers’ disregard for the safety and security issues that emerged through drug-related and other crime in the high-rise flats. The safety of the Vietnamese appeared to be of little concern, confirming their non-normative status. What stood out was the disparate understandings between the often worrying crime that surrounded children, mothers, or the elderly and the lack of police knowledge of these crimes or dedication to finding out and solving these issues. Police reacted to what was reported and these incidents were mostly not reported. When they did report crime in the case of home burglaries, police usually did not respond immediately, or even within a reasonable time frame. The lack of police response to calls for assistance further suggests the position of Vietnamese people as outsiders. The Vietnamese had taken on this idea in a way that has been described as double-consciousness; some considered themselves as unworthy, and this maintained their position as being non-mainstream. Police were advantaged in not having to waste time on what white state targets depicted as low-level home burglary crime, since their norm was that this should be an insurance issue, and Vietnamese were operating outside these norms by not insuring property. Vietnamese community members also felt a widespread lack of respect by officers for them and their protocols in addressing elders. This disrespect was
understood as not being treated equally to the white dominant community and further maintained white privilege and dominance.

**Normalisation and multiculturalism**

The Victoria Police’s statewide multicultural policing normalised whiteness in differentiating white from ethnic communities. This empirical finding adds strength to the long-term debate led by scholars such as Hage (2000) and Jayasuriya (2008) regarding whether multiculturalism supports differentiation rather than integration of ethnic groups. Police officers’ relations with normative white communities were structurally differentiated from their relations with multicultural communities. Multicultural Liaison Officers (MLOs) were responsible for liaison with the non-white communities, while general duties police were responsible for policing all communities. Job titles also emphasised the difference: there were general duties police (13,000 for the State) and multicultural police (22 for the State). Between these two categories, there were differences in power and status, and in the lack of promotional opportunities that restricted career paths for MLOs. White advantage was demonstrated by the fact that there were only two MLOs allocated for each vast region comprising many suburbs, and in PSA Dandenong, the two MLOs were responsible for 150 ethnic communities. Members of white communities could contact any one of the large contingent of local police at their local station. Of course, the white community could argue that the ethnic communities could approach any white police officer, but as was found with the Vietnamese, many refugee groups and other ethnic minorities tend not to contact police. The multicultural police dealt mainly with community issues or identity-based discrimination by police officers, but lacked the power to take any action with officers apart from running information workshops on strategies for communicating with ethnic and racial groups. White hegemony was further supported in that the MLOs, as spokespersons for the multicultural communities within the organisation, lacked the power to reform structural bias and inequities in the white policing organisation; a problem that Zanoni et al. (2010) found more broadly in organisations.

Multicultural policing approaches when integrated with community-oriented programs were more inclusive of the Vietnamese. When local police forces combined a multicultural state model with a local commitment to the local Vietnamese community, general duties officers adopted a more inclusive approach. Although whiteness was maintained as normative, the
differentiation was tempered by the commitment to inclusion: ethnic communities were different, but welcome. In contrast, the Richmond police station (PSA Yarra) de-emphasised or ignored the role of multicultural officers, with many police not even knowing who they were. In the vacuum created by a lack of any ideological model with which to address ethnic and racial inclusion, the contrary approach was implemented, and racialisation was strongly reinforced. Although establishing this as a robust generalisation would require further research, the findings suggest that when combined with community-oriented strategies, multiculturalism minimises rather than enhances whiteness.

Vietnamese ethnicity was used by police as a racial and ethnic category in the way that Ang refers to Chineseness as a racial and ethnic category (Ang 2005). In identifying Vietnamese Australians, white officers did not distinguish between Vietnamese ethnicity and Asian race, using the two terms interchangeably. When officers described the social and cultural category of Vietnamese ethnicity, it was fixed as traditional, and Vietnamese ethnic identity was not recognised as being constantly renegotiated and rearticulated. The ethnicity of Vietnamese officers was racialised by white officers through references to their lack of ability to speak English, and to their inferior writing capabilities as non-native speakers. English language ability as a coded signal for non-normativity was a frequently-used reference point in the racialised discourse of police. The racialisation of Vietnamese police officers’ bodies and their culture strengthened the normativity of whiteness. Hall’s (2000: 223) proposition that race and ethnicity are both embedded in racisms was illustrated in his empirical study of white policing. In contrast for white police officers, their white ethnic identity and white racial identity were both aligned with privilege within the white force, and were consistent with their Australian national identity.

Reinventing whiteness

Local police forces and individual police officers were mostly unaware of whiteness as privilege, structural advantage or as a way of seeing policing incidents. Police’s unanimous opinion that they did not exhibit any racist behaviours fostered defensive attitudes. These resistances pre-empted the possibility of examination of racialisation processes generated through local policing priorities or in their conversations, and reinforced the hierarchy of racial groups. Few officers noticed the structural disadvantages to non-white communities found in police technology or in the setting of crime targets. While community-oriented
programs supported a more inclusive multiculturalism, they were conceived within whiteness and constituted a white strategy. While criminological critiques suggest that community-oriented policing is more of a philosophy than a practice that can be mobilised and evaluated, few scholars question whether white officers, without training and development can partner, liaise, problem-solve and prevent crime in ethnic communities that they struggle to understand culturally. Innes (2009) touches on this dilemma when he suggests the issue lies more deeply with the inability of most police to ‘see like a citizen’. The hurdles are infinitely higher for white officers to see like a non-English speaking Vietnamese person, whose culture they find unfathomable and foreign. Community-oriented policing, devised by white officers to police both white and ethnic neighbourhoods, arises out of whiteness, and this may be its key limitation. These approaches fail to reinvent whiteness, because as posited by Grimes (2002’ p.385), they ‘appear progressive because difference is recognised, yet ultimately, whiteness remains centre stage, resulting in superficial organisational change’. This raises concerns about the likelihood of any structural devices being able to disrupt white hegemony in policing organisations where whiteness, state power and personal role authority are so tightly aligned, and will be co-opted and reframed by whiteness to evade threats. After-all, whiteness is renowned for its devious and manipulative modes, and for its capacity to invent new invisibilities (Twine and Gallagher, 2008; Levine-Rasky, 2013).

**Conclusion**

This thesis makes an original contribution to the literature on empirical critical whiteness studies by exploring how whiteness structures the practices of white police forces. The study contributes to the lack of qualitative criminological research on whiteness in Australia as a key factor in relations between white police forces and ethnic or racially identified groups. The study also provides an experiential account of relations between one ethnic group, Vietnamese Australians, and the dominant white police force. It thus provides a platform for policy makers and police command to review practices and new directions in communities where new cultural and racial groups are the norm.

A key finding of this study was that in policing Vietnamese Australians, whiteness was reinforced through the mechanisms of criminalisation and racialisation and maintained through multicultural practices that normalised whiteness. The findings demonstrate a complete lack of the reinvention of whiteness in Victoria Police in the three PSAs. While
multiculturalism did not disrupt whiteness, when it was implemented with a commitment to
the inclusion of Vietnamese communities, the power differentials between white officer and
Vietnamese Australian citizen or offender were softened through concern being expressed for
the other. When multicultural approaches when taken up not only by MLOs, but by the
entirety of the local police force, they acted as a ballast against the extremes of racialisation
and criminalisation. Thus in Richmond, where multicultural models were not present, the
vacuum in the framework had been subsumed by local crime fighting initiatives that
strengthened racialisation and criminaliation of the local Vietnamese community.

Whiteness is based in established ways of thinking and for it to not negatively affect minority
communities in the context of policing, it requires a re-working of accepted practices and
policies. At a practical level for policy makers, this study offers the potential to solve some of
the contradictory aspects of policing, which are escalating rather than diminishing as new
racial challenges emerge with renewed ferocity. Within the period of the study, the more
recent racialisation and criminalisation processes were directed towards the Africans. As this
study concludes, the current intensification of terrorism and Islamophobia is increasing the
pressure on whiteness policing, making it ever more urgent to do whiteness differently in
policing. A retreat by officers into self-illusory colour-blindness will not meet these new
challenges posed by the growing racialisation of some Muslim groups and their faith. In this
study, the whiteness lens has shifted the focus from the marginalised other to the racialising,
normalising and criminalising processes employed by white officers. Thus it can be claimed
with authority that the white officers all engaged in whiteness mechanisms to preserve their
white advantage, and this was the driving force behind the reification of racial hierarchies.

This thesis has argued that in relations between Victoria Police in three PSAs and the local
Vietnamese communities, whiteness structured policing. The mechanisms that reproduced
whiteness by the police force were racialisation and criminalisation of people, their
geography and their culture, colour-blindness, stereotyping and normalisation. Thus this
conclusion responds directly to the over-arching thesis research question: How is whiteness
reinforced, maintained or reinvented in policing a Vietnamese minority, and how does this
contribute to white race privilege? The mechanisms of racialisation and criminalisation
reinforced whiteness as dominant, and provided advantages to the police force in a readily
available and proven training ground for white officers. Dominant communities were
advantaged through their normalisation as less criminal than the Vietnamese communities. Foucault (1977) is pertinent here in noting that the perpetuation of the criminal type around the drug dealer, for instance, and not the economic criminal, creates an axis for the control, power and maintenance of a disciplinary society. When police forces implemented inclusive, community-oriented strategies within the PSAs in this study, the effects of racialisation were ‘softened’, but not ameliorated. Vietnamese Australian officers, currently a tiny minority in the force, were racialised and excluded in the dialogue of a minority but nonetheless, significantly sized group of white officers. These were strong mechanisms of exclusion, and they indicated that it would be an unwelcome environment for new Vietnamese Australian police recruits. This would be particularly so if they were required to work alongside those white officers who contributed their views to this study.

Hage (2000: 44) provides a salutary warning not to overlook the importance of white police actors’ focus on the ‘physicalness of bodies’, which he contends is an expression of the exclusion of non-white police actors. Further, he suggests that these relations are an aspect of the management of the imagined white national space (Hage, 2000). Through such bodily mechanisms, Hage (2000) proposes that police actors absorb and embody these white nation fantasies, which gain local expression as racism against non-white others by police actors. Thus, viewed from within this wider lens of the national space, the processes within the Victoria Police force are one aspect, albeit one with a high degree of invested power, that ensure the reproduction of white advantage for the white force and the wider dominant community. Bold and different approaches are needed by a white senior command of the police force or policy makers if whiteness structures in Victoria Police are to be disrupted.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Interview schedule for police officers

Preliminaries

1. Can you tell me a little about your police career? When joined? Motivations for joining police? Areas of work/experiences?
2. How would you describe the ethnic make-up of the Yarra region?
3. What do you understand about the history, culture and issues for Vietnamese Australians in this area?

Vietnamese police

4. What do you believe are the difficulties in recruiting and retaining Vietnamese police members to Victoria Police?
5. What experience have you had of working with Vietnamese or other ethnic minority police members?
6. Based on your experience, how does working with police members from different cultural backgrounds affect policing practice? Can you give an example?

Vietnamese and community policing

7. What approaches have you employed to:
   a. solve crime and local problems involving Vietnamese Australians?
   b. prevent crime involving Vietnamese Australians?
   c. build relationships with Vietnamese Australians?
8. How have multicultural officers contributed to community policing with Vietnamese Australians?
9. What crimes and local problems would you say are of most concern to Vietnamese Australians?
10. What have been the most significant challenges for this station/unit in crime prevention and problem-solving in the Vietnamese Australian community in Yarra?
11. Studies in Australia, UK and US show that minorities can be over-policed. What strategies do you use to ensure there is not over-policing of minorities, and to reduce perceptions of over-policing?
12. In what ways is the implementation of community policing with Vietnamese Australians the same or different to the approaches used with other communities?
13. How do you assess whether community policing with Vietnamese Australians has been effective or ineffective?
14. How have you worked with other agencies or groups to dealing with crime or safety issues with Vietnamese Australians?

**Trust and relationships**

15. What are the critical incidents, current or past, that have affected how you think and act in response to policing Vietnamese Australians?
16. Tell me about your experience of the trustworthiness and honesty of Vietnamese Australians in this area?

**Vietnamese and other ethnic minorities**

17. You mentioned that there were other ethnic groups in the Yarra region, apart from the Vietnamese. What have been the successes and barriers in building good relationships with these other ethnic groups in this region?

**The future**

18. What changes would you recommend to make policing of Vietnamese Australians more effective?
Appendix 2: Interview schedule for social justice workers

1. Could you describe the work that you do to assist Vietnamese Australians with social problems.
2. What networks, community groups or organisations are you linked to, in your role of assisting Vietnamese Australians?
3. Do you think that Vietnamese Australians need specific services to meet their needs?
4. In your experience what services or social support agencies are accessed by Vietnamese Australians?
5. What are the main social or economic issues that make particular groups or individuals vulnerable to insecurity or crime?
6. What security and safety issues or crimes would you say are of most concern to Vietnamese Australians? Are the police responsive to these issues, in your view?
7. Do you usually work with families or individuals?
8. What types of behaviours or approaches create positive or negative relationships between Vietnamese Australians and the police?
9. What crimes do Vietnamese report to police and what crimes are not reported?
10. Could anonymous ways of reporting crime be more effective?
11. Who do families turn to, when they have social issues?
12. What approaches for dealing with social or criminal issues are supported by the Vietnamese community?
13. What strategies could be implemented by police or other agencies, to help people in situations of insecurity or vulnerability to crime?
Appendix 3: Focus group schedule

Preliminaries
1. Can you tell me a little about your family background? How did your family come to migrate to Australia (refugee or voluntary migrant)? If you were born here, what has your family told you about the experience?
2. What networks, community groups or organisations link you to other Vietnamese Australians?

Vietnamese and policing
3. In general, how would you describe relations between Vietnamese Australians and the Victoria Police?
4. What crimes and local problems would you say are of most concern to Vietnamese Australians? Are the police responsive to these issues, in your view?
5. Have the police in your neighbourhood made much effort to establish good relations with Vietnamese Australians? Explain.
6. Have you ever had any dealings with the police? Can you describe the experience? Did it change your view of the police, and if so, in what ways?
7. Are Vietnamese Australians treated fairly by police? What supports your views?
8. If your house was burgled or your car was stolen, would you have any hesitation in calling the police? What other problems might you approach the police for help with? Are there any problems which you might hesitate to report to the police?
9. Have there been any major incidents in the past that have positively or negatively influenced the relationship between Vietnamese Australians and the police?
10. Which groups or individuals in your community are most vulnerable in terms of feeling safe and secure?
11. What approaches, behaviours or attitudes from police are important in establishing their trustworthiness with Vietnamese Australians, and what erodes perceptions of trustworthiness in different situations?
12. From a police perspective, drug trading is a major crime in the Vietnamese community. Are you satisfied with the approaches taken by the police to reduce drug-dealing crimes?
13. Can you tell me little about the police in Vietnam? How are they regarded? How are they similar to Australian police? How are they different?
14. Would you encourage a member of your family or friend to join the police?
The future

15. What things could the police in your neighbourhood do differently to improve the level of trust and cooperation with Vietnamese Australians?
Appendix 4: Publications by PhD candidate related to the thesis

Books


Journal articles


Conference papers


Conference presentations


Reports


Working papers prepared for Victoria Police


