In response to the 2018 exhibition *The Burrangong Affray* at Sydney’s 4A Centre for Contemporary Asian Art, the far-right political party Australia First published an extensive racist diatribe on their website, in which they accused artists and academics involved (all with some degree of Asian heritage) of being “Chinese agents” and of masking their true ethnicities behind Anglicised names in order to mount an exhibition of anti-Australian ‘Digger’ propaganda with ambitions of historical revisionism. The exhibition featured artworks by Hong Kong-born Australian artist John Young (with Australian-Chinese artist Jason Phu), which responded to the Lambing Flat riots of 1860-61, a series of hostile demonstrations and attacks by European, North American and Australian-born miners against Chinese on the Burrangong goldfields (now the town of Young), in the state of New South Wales. The riots lead directly to the implementation of New South Wales’ Chinese Immigration Act of 1861, one of a string of laws in Australia’s colonies that preceded the Immigration Restriction Act forty years later in 1901, the basis of the White Australia Policy, which affectively ceased all non-European immigration, and was one of Federated Australia’s first substantive pieces of legislation.

How best to situate the virulence of this response, directed, as it was, towards an exhibition displayed in a small non-commercial gallery without extensive public reach beyond its own artistic community, and related to an event far removed in Australia’s history? In her research into the Lambing Flat Riots and their significance to Australian myths of nationhood, Australian historian Karen Schamberger described the manner in which the riots have been variously “reassembled” by proponents of both pro- and anti-immigration causes since the time they occurred, coming in and out of public view in accordance with contemporary aspirations to bolster a particular narrative of Australia and its history. The facts of the event were manipulated in their immediate aftermath to highlight a purportedly essential incompatibility between pan-European and Chinese miners, and thereby further the isolationist cause in debates over immigration. Following a three-decade period of absence from official New South Wales history and a general diminution in public awareness, the riots were again disinterred in the lead up to Australian Federation to notate a (presumptively British) collective social body – the unification of Australia’s six individual colonies being a generally stronger drive for Federation than one of independence. Insofar as they evidence an assumed prerogative on the part of the Anglo-European miners involved to literally control and/or oversee their Chinese counterparts, the Lambing Flat Riots were a clear manifestation of the kind of territorial nationalism anthropologist Ghassan Hage describes in his 2000 text *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*, that they were motivated by an image of a national space within which the perpetrator is master and the “‘ethnic/racial other’ [is] mere object” to be controlled. The riots of
course did not materialise unexpectedly, but rather represent a flash point within a broader schema of ongoing resentment towards Chinese miners on the goldfields due to visible cultural differences, anxiety over their cheap labour, and the contrast in their collective mining practices (successful to the extent that the term “Chinaman’s luck” became part of the Australian vernacular during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries). Their incidence thus articulates a will to, and presumption of, a white national space nearly forty years prior to Australia formally becoming a nation, making them of surpassing usefulness in iterative attempts to claim or preserve an idealised mono-ethnic mainstream for Australia’s body politic. As Schamberger further notes, the redeployment of the riots over time has seen them cumulatively cast as the “birth of White Australia.” In light of this history, the response by Australia First to The Burrangong Affray can be understood as an incantatory effort to re-stabilise meaning of a perceived national origin story, to suppress the difference at the point of origin that would displace their ability to locate themselves at the mainstream of Australian history.

Nationalist practices of territorial control that informed both the riots and their subsequent characterisations in ‘birth of the nation’ discourses have also emerged in memorialisations and celebrations that have since occurred in the town of Young, at the initiative of the Young Shire Council and the Chinese Heritage Association of Australia. An annual Lambing Flat Chinese Festival, held since 2013 to celebrate the Chinese presence and contribution in Australia has, on a number of
occasions, relied on Chinese-Australian performers imported from Sydney to realise ‘traditional’ Chinese cultural forms. This fetishisation of ‘authentic’ and static modes of cultural address has come at the expense of contributions by Chinese communities in Young, many of whom have been so longstanding that they are no longer perceived as being ‘Chinese’. Local Australians with Chinese ancestry, of course, a visible or magnifiable difference that would adequately demonstrate liberal tolerance and/or relativism within a multicultural policy of embellishment. As (in)visibly Australian, this community also refuses any capacity for ‘real’ (white) Australians to authenticate their social belonging and thereby retain a veneer of authority over the makeup of the body politic. Here the erasure of heterogeneity within the social fabric occurs not through deliberate eradication of difference, but through the disappearance of embodied experience behind expected representations. Local efforts at museological narration of the Lambing Flat riots have also tended to abridge the experience of the Chinese miners involved. Didactics in the Lambing Flat Folk Museum neglect to include the voices and personal information of Chinese individuals, relying instead on quotations from European miners and officials to represent the events, and so rendering Chinese actors homogenous, dematerialised and without agency. All of which is in keeping with what Australian academic Jacqueline Lo, writing in the catalogue for 2013 survey exhibition The Bridge and the Fruit Tree: John Young, has described as Australia’s reluctance to recognise the extent to which it is “already ‘Asianised’,” an aversion to acknowledging disjunctive cultural expression emanating from the core of the national body as opposed to an appendage to it. That is, if the acquisition of Australianness occurs by a process of accumulation (practices or people being attributed more or less), then, in many spheres of activity Asian-Australians are only able to move so far towards the centre, refused sufficient cultural capital to operate as signifiers of Australianness in and of themselves, in either historic or contemporary terms.

For the artist John Young, the The Burrangong Affray was the most recent project in an ongoing body of artworks dealing with the history of Chinese diaspora in Australia—drawing out stories of their presence since pre-Federation. The central axis of each project consists of a gridded installation of layered and degraded archival photographs and chalkboard works of multilingual quotations, intermingling historical voices in a manner that pursues a strategy of fragmentation rather than counter-narration, the artist refusing to either figure or occupy a succinct historical subject. Despite this non-totalising affect, as a cumulative effort The History Projects (variously taking as subject matter, the radically divergent destinies of two young men of ethnic Chinese origin who arrived in the colony of Victoria in the mid-1800s seeking their fortunes during the gold rush, whose lives bookend the Chinese diaspora experience of nineteenth century Australia, 1866: The Worlds of Lowe Kong Meng and Jong Ah Siug in 2015; cosmopolitan Shanghai-Australian women of the 1930s, Modernity’s End: Half the Sky in 2016; and Chinese immigrants and miners who walked from Darwin to Queensland’s east coast during the late nineteenth century in search of gold, a perilous and unmapped journey of two thousand kilometres that resulted in many deaths, None Living Knows in 2017) work to enrich the history of nineteenth and twentieth century Australia, reinserting a consistency of presence even through a legislated White Australia, from 1901 to 1973. This might best be understood as the formulation of a supplementary question (in the mode of Bhabha): an interjection from the non-dominant that introduces a structure of belatedness into the fabric of the social, and so reveals a lack in its original articulation. Framed in this way, the radical destabilisation posed by The Burrangong Affray comes not from the enunciation of a straightforward multicultural ethic or reality for contemporary Australian society (even one that is retroactively applied), but rather, in
its archival basis, the revelation of the act of forgetting that occurred at the moment of Australia’s constitutional formation, which haunts the contemporary at the point of origin with a belated interjection of incontrovertible presence. As Bhabha notes, this is the “mote in the eye of history, its blind spot that will not let the nationalist gaze settle centrally.”

Each project’s standardised grid form refuses any overriding point from which a linear narrative might be determined, and for the same reason refuses a perspectival imperative that orders the gaze of the viewer. The grid as a grammatical structure furnishes a visual reciprocity of elements; each becomes subject to its logic of standardisation. In the absence of any foreground to catch that gaze, the entire work becomes the ground, and so the gaze remains restless. The viewer’s eye is empowered to move freely across components, to combine and dismantle individual elements in accordance with subjective impulses, enacting a deferred authorship. The treatment of the archival images reinforces this effect. Uniformly rendered in halftone, the photographs align themselves with norms of traditional newsprint, and allude therefore to documentation. This consistency across source material produces a perceptual recession, muting fluctuation in immediacy such that the images can be collectively read on a cerebral level. This delay in perception, deflected from the level of affect, allows the photographic images to be read simultaneously with the more visceral chalk drawings. The two registers work in duality, with the grid ensuring that neither comes to dominate the overall work. The renunciation of a central site of articulation within the work is then a minor reflection of the broader point that history always lacks a legitimate perspectival centre (thus invoking Bhabha).
These projects did not stem directly from any motivation on the part of the artist to rewrite Australian history with multiculturalism in mind, but rather from his particular preoccupation with specifically transcultural actions or expressions. Much of Young's interest in the Lambing Flat Riots is held by the actions of John Roberts, a local farmer who sheltered over one thousand Chinese miners and their families on his property after they were chased off their allotments, an example of the kind of cross-cultural ethical action that has preoccupied the artist for years. This is elsewhere explored through series of artworks that deal with the role of foreigners during Japanese military forces’ Rape of Nanjing in 1937, and German theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s anti-Nazi dissidence informed by his time spent with African-American parishioners in Harlem in 1930, and is a general extension of Young’s ongoing interest in the conjunction of distinct cultural epistemologies (specifically Chinese and Western). In his 2011 text, first published for *Art & Australia*, Dutch-Australian art historian Thomas Berghuis proposes the concept ‘Situational Ethics’ to describe artworks or practices that aim to effect an ethical and not purely communicative role for art, a classification for which Young’s *History Projects* are exemplar. The *History Projects* are driven by the search for a temporally and spatially specific ethic, one that eschews the vagaries associated with the collapse into a universal moral code and relies instead on a didactic communicative principle in order to reground art’s function, while retaining its autonomy as an aesthetic domain. The didacticism of the works (historical quotations on chalkboard strictly connoting the classroom, and for which the artist is indebted to the pedagogical chalkboard drawings of both Joseph Beuys and Rudolph Steiner) is primarily for Young, the residue of an effort to locate himself within the frame of an ethical encounter with the Other, that refuses a representational distance that would allow for mastery over his subject. Layering and erasure here prevent the foreclosure of meaning in narrative construction. In creating the drawings, Young situates himself as a subject reacting to history, literally writing out the voices of the past with chalk on a blackboard, erasing and reworking fragmented quotations until they achieve the right weight—there are evocations of the artist’s training in Chinese calligraphy as a child, the student forced to repeatedly write a character in water until the contour of its expression is fully held within its configuration.

Centring both the condition of ‘the refugee’ and the act of hospitality at the heart of his exploration, suggests Young is not simply proposing that Australia has always been ethnically plural, although this is true, but that he is in fact demanding a more radical reorientation of the bounds and schema of our political communities. In a 2019 interview between Homi Bhabha and Klaus Stierstorfer for the publisher De Gruyter, Bhabha suggests that it is the condition of the refugee (temporally delimited, at least theoretically) that demands the most from our structures of civility, that the refugee’s appeal for hospitality throws into sharp relief the deficiencies of citizenship as the mode of certification offered by nation-states to formally accept one into a community, and thus render legible their political agency. He further proposes that the short-term necessity for refuge, which comes in excess of the provisions and permanent nature of citizenship, most clearly reveals the need to reframe the ethical basis of modern governance and the boundaries of socio-political community around more radical principles of hospitality, as a framework which allows for structures of impermanence within a politics of recognition, further framed by Jacques Derrida, that the cosmopolitan ethic of hospitality, being not a complete dissolution of territoriality through unconditional welcome, is a mode of address to strangers that is without any demand for reciprocity. The risk in seeking to grasp the ethical enunciation that emerges at the point of transcultural crossing, specifically via the act of hospitality, distinguished from its expression in conflict or violence, is that hospitality presents
a positive historical reading, tending to emphasise the hero. According to Schamberger, the shift in narrative focus of the riots onto the figure of James Roberts, as opposed to previous glorification by some accounts of perpetrators-as-heroes (around the time of Federation), resolves the story of the riots as a multicultural triumph.\textsuperscript{24} Even while Young’s artworks resist being read conclusively, his attention to hospitality (we observe in a scene in \textit{The Field}, from the perspective of a prone, apparently injured Chinese person, being covered by a felt blanket by a woman, in an anonymous act of care) can nevertheless function to offer audiences positive points of re-identification.

Young’s insistence on the resonance and relevance of historical events, his conviction that they continue to ripple through cultural memory, is in reaction to the speed and flatness of contemporary life and the mediated nature of our relationship to images, which he understands as contributing to an ethical indifference.\textsuperscript{25} Viewed in relation to his earlier \textit{Double Ground Paintings} (1995–), which are characterised by the layering of carefully rendered kitsch stock images over digitally printed backgrounds, in a pastiche of traditional art historical genres (landscape, still life, nude), \textit{The History Projects} constitute an effort to rediscover and reinvest into images a depth of meaning, after decades of postmodernist deconstructivist practice, into absolute relativism or aesthetic play—syntactical strategies that dominated during the artist’s developmental years. Connecting these bodies of work, it is possible to see a poststructuralist belief that existing codes of practice are just one possible order amongst many. Hence Young’s interest in transcultural humanitarianism (on an individual rather than a national level): certainly, ethical codes are relative and relational to socio-historical milieu, but what are the specificities of their cultural inflection? What are the precise historical circumstances that cause them to be expressed as such? And, significantly, how might their reconsideration inform or reground contemporary subjectivity?

Such a reading of Young’s practice is supported by the video work \textit{The Field} (2018), commissioned by 4A Centre for Contemporary Asian Art for \textit{The Burrangong Affray}. Within the work an anonymous hand, the full figure cut off by the edge of the camera frame, tugs at the braid of a hyperbolically Anglo-Saxon woman (the artist had freckles painted onto the model for effect), pulling her backwards. In a later scene her braid is cut off entirely, an action that mirrors the scalping of Chinese miners of their queues during the Lambing Flat riots. This deliberate slippage of identity confirms that the specific historical role occupied by Chinese and pan-European miners during the riots is less relevant to the artist than the juncture of their interaction or negotiation. For Young, as a member of the Chinese diaspora, existing and moving between cultures proffers a unique motivation to action that is not bound only to the principles or practices of a singular milieu. The diasporic figure as informed by a dialectic of ‘here and there’ and possessing the ability to draw on asymmetrical cultural codes or registers, highlights the generative capacity of dwelling across a multiplicity of cultural realities. It is relevant here to briefly explicate a perspective that lies at the heart of the critical anthropology project, as articulated by Ghassan Hage in his 2011 text ‘Dwelling in the Reality of Utopian Thought,’ that anthropology, in researching and revealing radically different modes of living in and relating to the world, at its heart implies the maxim: “we can be radically other than what we are.”\textsuperscript{26} Hage suggests that the more challenging and profound implication contained within this proposed latent capacity to difference, is that if we \textit{can} be, then we must also already have it in us to \textit{be} other than what we are, or as he states: “Our otherness is always dwelling within us, and we are always dwelling in it: there is always more to us than we think.”\textsuperscript{27} This can be read in both positive and negative terms. As the woman in \textit{The Field} is pulled by her braid, her expression shifts ambivalently between a grimace and a grin, failing to land conclusively.
It is impossible to deduce entirely from the actions of the figures in this scene if we are witnessing a moment of cruelty or playfulness. Young has suggested that this slippage is in order to maintain an actionable proximity between violence and play, highlighting the contingent line along which they fold into each other, most plainly in the acts of children. The inference of a universal capacity (of violence, trauma, benevolence) is in order to make it more difficult for an audience to maintain Self/Other subject positions in relation to these histories and so remove themselves from association. In seeking moments of rupture, re-inscription or displacement, of the repetitive performance of prevailing cultural values manifest in individual acts of reaching for, across or beyond Otherness, Young’s *History Projects* make visible this inherent potential of the various minor realities that we inhabit.

At the time of writing, Australia is, like much of the world, in the midst of collective self-isolation in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Fear has a tendency to reveal the prejudices of a society, contracting in a moment of threat around a presumed essential core. The language of racial exclusion is often closely linked to that of medical contagion, framed in terms of contamination of an ethno-culturally homogenous body politic in a manner that emphasises permeability. In newspaper reports documenting the riots and public debates around the ‘Chinese Question’ of that pre-Federation period, research presents such a vocabulary (and it is inscribed within Young’s artwork): “pestiferous,” “locust,” “caterpillars,” “curse,” “plague,” “degenerating,” etc. The term “*Le Peril Jaune*” (The Yellow Peril) was coined by Russian sociologist Jacques Novikow in an 1897 essay, three years after the discovery by Franco-Swiss scientist Alexandre Yersin of the bacillus that caused the bubonic plague in Hong Kong. This particular outbreak of the plague started in Yunan Province, China in the 1850s, gradually making its way to Canton and Hong Kong, before spreading across the world in a global pandemic. The introduction of the White Australia Policy in 1901 did not only affect the migration of non-Europeans to Australia (although this impact was immediate and considerable) but also had significant ramifications for the lives of Chinese-Australians, whose presence became marked for surveillance. After 1903 naturalisation was denied to Chinese people, irrespective of how long they had lived in Australia. The White Australia Policy remained in force until 1957 when reforms introduced by the Menzies government began a slow dismantling – it was formally abolished in 1973. In Australia, as elsewhere in the world, COVID-19 has precipitated racist attacks directed against Asian members of the national community, mirrored by a xenophobic backlash against foreigners in China, stoked by nationalist rhetoric of the Chinese Communist Party. Also at the time of writing, in the context of increasingly tense political and trade relations between China and Australia, the Chinese Ministry of Culture and Tourism escalated the gravity of the overall situation, issuing an alert advising Chinese citizens not to travel to Australia and citing this increase as justification. Enrolments of Chinese students are down in both Australia and the USA (a trend pre-dating the outbreak of COVID-19) and there has also been a decrease in the number of Chinese-born residents being granted citizenship in Australia. In May 2020 the National Library of Australia, long underfunded by government, announced that it will cease collecting material on Japan, Korea and all of mainland Southeast Asia, and maintain a “reduced acquisition” of content on China, Indonesia and Timor-Leste. All of which points to a likelihood that beyond the current period of closed borders we may see an exacerbation of the rejection of globalisation in favour of the introspection of nationalist interests. That being said, as John Young demonstrates, the actions and lives of individuals are not always or not necessarily circumscribed by the nation and its dominant imaginaries of culture, epistemology, or ethics.
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