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**Abstract:**

This article examines the Australian Football League’s diplomatic efforts to bring about recognition and reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous players and to make a broader contribution to inter-communal relations. The AFL’s primary diplomacy has focused on classical racism, dealing with instances of on-field abuse of player by player and spectator education about racism and Indigenous culture in Australia. Despite successes in these areas, the AFL has notably failed to acknowledge structural, institutionalised modes of discrimination and exclusion with the result that the sport remains deeply influenced by colonial thought and discourse concerning Indigenous Australians.

**Introduction:**

Towards the end of the first game of the 2013 Indigenous Round, the Australian Football League’s (AFL) annual celebration of the contribution of Indigenous peoples to Australian Rules football, the highly decorated Aboriginal player, Adam Goodes, drew the attention of a security guard to someone in the crowd that had just racially abused him. It was an inauspicious beginning to the weekend of football that puts Indigenous people at its centre and was all the more disturbing for the AFL as 2013 marked the 20th anniversary of the first time an Indigenous footballer had openly confronted spectators about their racial abuse of him. The 1993 incident finally prompted the AFL’s acknowledgement of on and off field abuse and brought about its first faltering steps to put in place educational campaigns and sanctions to deal with a deeply entrenched practice of abusing Indigenous players on the basis of their ethnicity.

The political context of the earlier confrontation is important. In December 1992, then Australian Prime Minister, Paul Keating, addressed a largely Indigenous audience at Redfern in Sydney to mark the beginning of the UN year of Indigenous people. Keating was blunt in his assessment that the problems of Australia’s Indigenous people arose from the beliefs, conduct and violence of what he called non-Aboriginal Australians. Keating’s position was simple and the choice he presented stark: incorporate Indigenous people, culture and history into an inclusive future or fail as a nation. It was a landmark speech that sought to put reconciliation with Indigenous peoples at the centre of Keating’s government.

One effect of Keating’s address to the nation was to place explicit racism outside of the realms of acceptability in early 1990s Australia. As Sankaran Krishna notes, despite Australia’s disturbing history and entrenched structural racism there is now ‘...a strong legal regime against the use of racial epithets against anyone.’ St Kilda player, Nicky Winmar’s raising of his jumper and pointing at his black torso while looking towards supporters of the Collingwood team was instantly recognised as a seminal challenge to public racist abuse. That Winmar’s protest occurred during the UN’s International Year of the World’s Indigenous People made it an even more telling commentary on race relations within Australia. The incident was captured by sports photographers John Feder and Wayne Ludbey with the image published in the Sunday press the following day. It has since become, arguably, the most important moment recorded in the history of the sport. The local impact of the photograph has been likened to that taken of Tommie Smith, John Carlos and Peter Norman at the Mexico Olympics in 1968. It has spawned street-art, songs, and featured in a range of celebrations of Indigenous culture. Indeed, David McNeill argues that the image ‘...best conjures the
complexities and antinomies of cultural life in this country during the closing years of the last century. Interviewed 20 years later along with Indigenous team-mate Gilbert McAdam, Winmar confirmed that he had reached ‘breaking point’ and had ‘had enough’ of abuse from football fans saying on the day he and McAdam had not only wanted people to see how good they were as footballers but to stand side by side to make a point about their pride in their identity.

At the time of Winmar’s protest there were no mechanisms through which players could take up their complaints about racist abuse and to the extent there was any interest in the welfare of Indigenous players on the part of their clubs or the League itself, they were advised to turn the other cheek. The adage of what happens on the field stays on the field afforded serial abusers anonymity and the certainty that they would not be publicly exposed as racist. Players of earlier eras confirm that racist abuse, often extremely menacing (‘nigger, nigger, pull the trigger’ is reported to have been said during the 1970s), was ‘relentless’. While the exact remarks that were made week in and week out by players and supporters are not widely known, players of the 1980s and 1990s have spoken of routinely receiving racially motivated hate mail, death threats and, in the case of Michael McLean in his first match (1983) being told by opposition supporters that he should go back to where he came from. Winmar and McAdam both received death threats after the 1993 incident.

It was not until 1995 when another Indigenous player, Michael Long reported at the conclusion of a match that he had been racially abused by a Collingwood player in the presence of an on-field umpire that things began to change. As a result of that episode, abused and abuser were brought together in a process to which the AFL sent no representative. The nature of exchange between accuser and accused was kept secret. Long, and his club, argued that this was wholly unsatisfactory. Nonetheless, early attempts at dealing with on-field vilification continued to rely upon behind closed doors mediation and a handshake agreement between the parties. Indigenous players (and others) complained this approach presented closure on and implied reconciliation between two contrasting views rather than applying penalties to perpetrators of abuse. On this view, the process of rapprochement between players disadvantages black athletes in that it erases the original offence. That is, the handshake gives the ‘all clear’ signal whereas the problems of race and racism reside deeper within the game and are not addressed by such examples of mediation.

As a consequence of ongoing dissatisfaction, the AFL consulted with a number of Indigenous players who insisted they would settle for nothing less than the imposition of meaningful penalties in instances of racist abuse and the establishment of educational and cultural awareness programmes. Recognising that racial vilification was inconsistent with the emergent vision of a nation reconciled with its Indigenous peoples and its desire to promote the code as an inclusive, family-friendly, sporting entertainment, the AFL introduced a racial and religious vilification prohibition in 1995, Rule 30. This was the first such rule in any Australian sports code. Indigenous players themselves led the way by reporting abuse to on-field umpires. By the end of 1997, ten complaints had been heard under Rule 30 but no player was found guilty.

**Sports Diplomacy: Reconciling Difference and Reforming Institutions:**

My aim in this article is to critically evaluate the AFL’s efforts at reconciliation of Indigenous and non-Indigenous players and supporters as a form of sports diplomacy. Unlike most examples of such diplomacy, the AFL addresses distinctive communities that reside within Australian national boundaries. As such, there are not two separate states or rival sports institutions engaged in
negotiations. Despite having global broadcast partners that provide live coverage of its matches, the AFL is not primarily engaged in promoting Australia’s image in the international arena (unlike, for example, nations that host Olympic Games). The AFL is not under siege in the way South African sporting institutions were during the Apartheid era. Accordingly, the AFL has far more capacity for imaginative diplomacy in its engagement with Indigenous peoples given it is not subject to the strictures imposed by negotiations between states or state-based sporting institutions. However, the absence of external challenges to established discourses of identity and discrimination seemingly limits the AFL’s vision. With no institutionalised interlocutor in its diplomatic efforts the AFL has little incentive to interrogate its identity norms and corporate architecture. Instead the AFL has focused on what could be termed classical racism, insisting individuals take responsibility for their racist abuse, rather than examining ingrained discursive and institutional modes of exclusion. That is, racism is not simply a matter of individual misconduct or overt social exclusion but lodges in the structures and unspoken assumptions that preclude Indigenous players from holding coaching positions at clubs or senior administrative positions in the AFL itself. It is critical to a deeper understanding of the way that racism functions in Australian football to distinguish between individual racist abuse and the consequences of ‘concealed and subtle’ forms of institutionalised racism. Arguably, it is entrenched, mute racism that more definitively frames and marginalises Indigenous players and stifles their ability to accomplish career ambitions. While the AFL has positioned itself as a progressive organisation tackling racism head on it has proven itself unwilling or unable to scrutinise the intransigent racial logics that underpin the sport. Indeed, narratives of inclusion and lauding of Indigenous contributions to Australian football which lie at the heart of the AFL’s project are manifestations of the soft underbelly of liberal racism. In this sense, the AFL’s struggles with its culture reflect wider difficulties in Australia’s reconciliation efforts with its Indigenous peoples.

The intensive use of sport as a tool of diplomacy is comparatively recent and falls under the broader ambit of public diplomacy. However, as Stuart Murray argues, sports diplomacy lacks rigorous theoretical development and remains a contested concept. He defines it as involving:

...representative and diplomatic activities undertaken by sports people on behalf of and in conjunction with their governments. Facilitated by traditional diplomacy, this practice uses sports people and sporting events to engage, inform, and create a favourable image amongst foreign publics and organisations to shape their perceptions in a way that is more conducive to achieving a government’s foreign policy goals.

Concerns about the lack of precision in the conceptual underpinning of public diplomacy are echoed by Eytan Gilboa who notes a range of ‘...confusing, incomplete, or problematic definitions of public diplomacy’. However, he also notes that its elaboration over the last few decades includes recognition of non-state actors as important contributors to the shaping of opinion among foreign publics and the blurring of the distinction between diplomacy (carried out by states) and public relations (conducted by corporate entities). As a means of achieving foreign policy goals sports diplomacy has a range of attractions for governments including the growing international profile, power and mass appeal of sport and the belief that sport has a unique soft-power capacity for bringing together estranged communities. However, even in Gilboa’s careful attempt to systematise approaches to public diplomacy it is noteworthy that the idea of a foreign public remains in common to the different models he defines. This suggests that the AFL’s efforts at
facilitating recognition and reconciliation between non-Indigenous and Indigenous Australians is distinctive in that its diplomacy is primarily focused on the Australian public, albeit a public that is comprised of quite separate communities. That is, while there are no formal Apartheid-like structures in Australia, levels of integration between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians are low.

One aspect of the use of sport as diplomacy that requires further consideration is the prevalence of race and racism in sport. As Kevin Hylton argues, the commonplace of a level playing field denies the reality that sport is another ‘racially contested arena’. As with other areas of social life, power is mediated through sport and so maintenance of the argument that sport is colour blind entrenches and extends the authority and privilege of the dominant group and leads to distortions in policy making concerning inclusion. In the Australian context, it may be that the valuing of individual (Indigenous) athletes is a function of the successful containment of collective demands for justice, a recognition that Indigenous peoples ‘…no longer constituted a communal counter-will in themselves…’. On this view, spectators and supporters may have at least some ability to distinguish between individual Indigenous players (who they like and respect) and the culture of Indigenous people (that they dislike and reject). If so, the containment of Indigenous demands for recognition, reconciliation and social and economic justice may in part arise from the ways the AFL limits its vision of reconciliation to confronting classical racism and celebrating Indigenous contributions to the uniquely Australian game. In these endeavours at least the AFL has been quite successful and is regarded as setting the standard for other sporting codes in Australia.

**Sledging and Abuse on the Field of Play**

Sledging is the term Australians use to describe the practice of a player verbally intimidating or taunting an opponent to distract the opponent from his/her game. In Australian team sports (particularly those played by men) sledging is commonplace. It is occasionally referred to as ‘mental disintegration.’ Sledging can be callous, vulgar and harsh or comic, ironic and humorous. Players are taunted about their ability, physical attributes, sexual preferences, mental toughness or with references to family members or their relationships with others. Sledging is a persistent part of international sports often seen as pushing the limits of acceptable conduct but generally acknowledged by players to be part and parcel of elite competition. Sledging as a practice is also knowledgeable. To sledge an opponent in sport is generally not unthinking but rather understands the anxieties and concerns of those to whom it is directed.

But sledging should not be confused with racial, ethnic, sexual or religious vilification. Such forms of abuse, like their distant and far more troubling relative torture, recognise the vulnerabilities, doubts, and fears of their other. The torture of Abu Ghraib detainees was not carried out in ignorance but drew upon an Orientalist anthropology that held Arab men to be fearful of sexual humiliation hence the resort to parading them naked in front of taunting and goading female US service personnel. Thus to racially abuse an Indigenous footballer is not just a random insult but one calculated and understood to harm and to denigrate. It is a knowing engagement with a history of racism and exclusion and an active enabling of such practices to torment in the present. Thus to call an Indigenous footballer ‘a black cunt’ is, as Lawrence McNamara observes...
the person in their physical appearance and embodiment – as being a person of less value for what they are of themselves. It carries in the Aboriginal context a history of institutionalised white superiority in Australian society and...sport. 41

As Indigenous former-footballer and continuing activist, Michael Long, observes: ‘Racism isn’t something you’re born with, it’s something you’re taught’. 42 However, for decades, racial vilification of Indigenous players was regarded as part of the game, one element of the tactical toolkit available to undermine their on-field performance. 43 The fact that non-Indigenous players continued to do this despite the unhappiness of their opponents (and Indigenous team-mates) only confirms the deeply embedded racism that informs Australian social discourse. It also draws attention to the particularly strong focus on the body that is characteristic of Australian racism, a mode of discrimination that is alert to skin colour and racial appearance. 44 On this account, racist taunting based on appearance draws upon anxieties particular to white Australia the genealogy of which lies in colonial concerns about racial decay and miscegenation arising from the menace of races that threaten to undermine the supposed purity of white Australian identity. While the danger of ‘Asian invasion’ was one pole of this danger (being numerically overrun) the other was contact with Indigenous peoples whose cultures social Darwinism held to be degraded and unfit for survival into the future. 45

**Australian Discourses of Indigenous Bodies:**

The establishment of Australia as a penal settlement as far flung from Britain as was imaginable in the latter years of the 18th century was to have devastating consequences for the Indigenous population. The extraordinary brutality of the penal settlement was never likely to be contained to relations between gaoler and gaolied. Indigenous Australians coming to terms with the sudden presence of people of hitherto unknown customs and conduct quickly came to understand that ‘white man, white law, white gun’ would destroy the tenure they had long held over the continent despite their resistance to dispossession and the physical violence they experienced at the hands of occupying forces. 46 Frontier conflict and violence became the norm in early colonial Australia, a violence that found discursive as well as physical expression. 47

The body of the Indigenous Australian was a strange artefact in the eyes of the invaders. In all likelihood their nutritional levels were superior to the Georgian British and their teeth, because of the particularities of their diet, were strong and healthy. While the culture of the Indigenous body, unclothed and unwashed, was offensive to the new arrivals there was admiration for the physical prowess of the hunter-gatherer men. 48 That is, despite the completeness of their otherness in the eyes of officer and convict beholder alike, early reckonings of Australia’s Indigenous peoples invoked the noble savage. 49 Henry Reynolds notes first encounters with whites provoked profound fear among Indigenous people and yet the historical record confirms that they were steadfast in managing such encounters earning the esteem of explorers such as Charles Sturt and Thomas Mitchell. 50

The history of first and ongoing contact is complex and ranges between mutual respect and cooperation to conflict, resistance and killing. The cultures of 18th century Britain and of Indigenous Australia were utterly incommensurate and it took a great deal of patient learning on the part of representatives from both sides of the frontier (as Reynolds calls it) for understanding to be cultivated. Even so, the ambition of the invaders for control of the land led to significant tension and the large-scale dispossession of Indigenous Australians. Aboriginal Australians maintained no title over land that the British recognised and their dispossession brought a hitherto unknown form of
conflict to Indigenous communities provoking ever stronger responses as the pain of forcible detachment from tribal lands became ever more real.\textsuperscript{51} Despite significant difficulties for Indigenous peoples, the politics of contact did not necessarily lead to intractable conflict and many Aboriginal people sought to adapt and find a place in the society that unfolded around and over them.\textsuperscript{52}

Nonetheless, as the 18\textsuperscript{th} century gave way to the 19\textsuperscript{th}, widespread beliefs about competitive social change in which the struggle for increasingly scarce resources would see some societies adapt and prosper and others fail, led to an intensification of focus on the body as the measure of social worth. Race was the marker by which purity and degeneration were measured by emergent ethnographers and social theorists influenced by the works of Linnaeus, Malthus, and others. Physiological and anatomical characteristics were highlighted to distinguish between superior and inferior races and these were then read into comparative psychological accounts of the other to hypothesise degrees of cultural advance and prospects for survival.\textsuperscript{53} A range of observers of Indigenous Australians from the middle decades of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century began to ponder their fate and often noted that it was contact with European civilisation that seemed to promote physical, spiritual, and mental decline. As such, legitimate observations concerning the material effects of dispossession and discrimination were wedded to the norms of 19\textsuperscript{th} century racial science which argued the reasons for the decline of Indigenous peoples was found in their racial backwardness. Here a corrupted social-Darwinian ‘science’ trumped politics and forecast the demise of Australia’s first inhabitants.\textsuperscript{54} Increasingly, Aborigines were discursively framed in fairly conventional post-Enlightenment terms such as stone-aged, primitive, over-sexed, monkey-like, the missing link, physical, unintelligent, incapable, lazy, parasitic, violent, dishonest, drunkard, irresponsible.\textsuperscript{55} As Mills and Sen (2004) note, the body was at the centre of colonial relations, a key justification for colonial rule and was ‘…a surface onto which a whole world of messages was encoded and presented’.\textsuperscript{56} Specifically, the Indigenous body was constructed by colonial power as a site for the exercise of authority, legitimacy, and control requiring extensive administrative and ideological mechanisms to achieve that goal. The Indigenous body was only acceptable to the extent that it performed according to the conditions of control and assimilation.\textsuperscript{57}

What is important for the argument I am making is that these acutely negative, deeply embedded understandings of Aboriginal peoples and cultures remain the ‘truths’ which inform political debate in Australia. That is, while the legal standing (including recognition of land rights) and struggles for equality among Indigenous Australians have changed for the better over recent decades, the key indicators of health, longevity, rates of imprisonment, educational achievement among others remain profoundly depressing.\textsuperscript{58} Even more dispiriting is the ingrained nature of discourse about Indigenous Australians in which references to their supposed backwardness, hopelessness and violence animate debate about contentious issues as well as everyday matters.\textsuperscript{59} Aboriginal affairs and the financing of Aboriginal representative, legal, health and other sorts of institutions have been imperilled in Australia over the last thirty years and no more so than under the conservative Howard government of 1996-2007 which undermined organisations that represented Indigenous interests, railed against two historic High Court judgements that recognised land rights, and refused all entreaties to make an apology to Indigenous peoples on behalf of the Australian state.\textsuperscript{60}

Of course, there are distinctions between the ways in which male and female Indigenous people are framed in various discourses. Citing Konishi, Lui-Chivize and Slater, Kearney argues that contemporary understandings of Indigenous gender identities owe a debt to ‘racist hierarchies of
identity’ that underpinned the colonisation of Australia and which remain entrenched in popular and political Australian myths about Indigenous Australians. Ideas of normative and deviant masculinity are pervasive in early colonial writings and ethnographic accounts of Australia. White Australian masculinity is particularly corporeal with the country’s mythology littered with references to and images of resolute diggers (soldiers), bronzed life-savers, and vigorous sportsmen all bound in a culture of mateship. These images of idealised Australian men are not sophisticated in their framing but they are tenacious and exclusive of Indigenous men.

**Indigenous Masculinities:**

The place of the Indigenous footballer is therefore doubly complicated as the kinds of masculinities that can be performed by Indigenous men are deeply inscribed and circumscribed by congealed understandings and imaginings of Indigenous identity. Mills and Sen (2004) also note that the body as a site of social scientific research is contentious and, in postcolonial settings, profoundly unsettling as:

...resorting to the concept [of the body] aligns the investigator with the colonial anthropologist or biologist as, by choosing the bodies of the ‘natives’ as the correct means of understanding ‘them’, the investigator is simply replicating the power relations and tools of analysis at that time.

Nonetheless, I am interested in the ways that available masculinities are performed by Indigenous men, how they relate to the possibilities that are accessible to non-Indigenous men and the relationship between these masculinities and the ways that the AFL confronts racism in the code making use of such masculinities to promote a message of reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians.

An important element in understanding Indigenous masculinity is appreciating how its white counterpart functions in Australian football. As Kearney notes, ‘...the ability of certain forms of masculinity to render themselves general and invisible is central to the retention of power’. Citing Stephens and Lorentzen (2007), Kearney goes on to observe that white male bodies are subjected to an:

....act of double erasure: first its norms are projected onto a generalized category of ‘the body’ which is assumed to be a stable construct; then this corporeality is displaced onto the bodies of cultural ‘others’, leaving [certain forms of] masculinity to occupy the place of reason, rationality, and the disembodied mind.

This normalisation of certain forms of masculinity obscures the fact of gender’s contingency and stabilises performed identities as though they were complete, perfected and unchanging. Particular attributes are valued above others and in the context of AFL football are racialized, yet the athletic bodies of Indigenous and non-Indigenous athletes seemingly confer equality on all who fulfil the expectations of elite performance. In the Australian context, the sports-field is routinely construed as a haven from the messy and rugged world of politics and the one place where genuine fairness and equality exist.

Arguably, the famed level playing field is a less inclusive place than it might first appear. While football and other male-dominated, homosocial sports draw upon myths of a pure and battle-
hardened masculinity and in a fashion that often references supposed national values and character traits, such depictions necessarily limit the ways that the masculine can be performed to the satisfaction of club, administrators and supporters. Indeed, as Stella Coram argues, it is precisely the body ‘...the physical sign of the natural slave...’ that has been the symbol of inclusion or exclusion from the moral community. ‘It is the athletic body which draws acceptance into mainstream culture; a privilege bestowed’. It is inclusion into the moral sporting community of club, code and country that precipitates a process of self-formation for Indigenous players and that self being made available to a wider audience for scrutiny and critique. But as Coram observes the idea that race is inclusive in AFL football ‘...masks the presence of deeper ambivalent discourse in which race as a negative is erased...To claim that race is inclusive is an interesting development since historically the notion of race referred to inferior colonised peoples not the superior European’. Race becomes immaterial in criticisms of Indigenous athletes because their non-Indigenous counterparts are framed in the same ways (childish, immature, reckless or un-coachable). On this view, rather than biological difference being a marker of contempt and derision it becomes a means of inclusion and equality, a cause for celebration. But race is never a marker of inclusion. For example, journalists and coaches alike refer to the ‘special’ skills of Indigenous peoples that defy coaching manuals and practice or to attributes such as ‘fast twitch’ muscles which make the skills of Aboriginal players unique. These remarks and observations are framed with affirmative intent but are, nonetheless, examples of the racialization of sporting performance.

Aboriginal corporeal attributes are also often explicitly linked to spirituality. ‘Indigenous players have been described as being mesmeric and scintillating, and as having breath-taking flair, inventiveness, exquisite touch and wizardry, magical football ability, instinct, natural talent and a different sense of time and space’. Indigenous AFL administrator and commentator Jason Mifsud wrote of Nicky Winmar as playing in another dimension and as dancing and dazzling his way past opposition players. The brothers Jim and Phil Krakouer who simultaneously played for North Melbourne during the 1980s were often cited as magical and as having a mystical understanding of each other’s whereabouts on the field of play. Recently retired Sydney star Michael O’Loughlin was nicknamed Magic. Another Indigenous footballer, Jeff Farmer, who played up until 2008, was nicknamed ‘the wizard’ for his extraordinary skills and the lesser known Liam Jurrah ‘the Walpiri wizard.’ These discourses of ‘magic’ invert an earlier racism in which Aborigines were deemed incapable of certain things because of their race whereas it is their racial attributes that now render them exceptionally capable. Moreover, such commentary not only implies ability is innate but ignores the commitment and discipline required to succeed at the highest level of the game. As Coram has noted, non-Indigenous players are idealised as achieving excellence through hard work, training, perseverance and dedication. Their ‘magic’ is never seen to arise from racial attributes. Understating the effort and determination required to succeed has the effect of disempowering Indigenous athletes.

A good example of the manifestation of prejudicial assumptions concerning Aboriginal players is found in the case of the contemporary AFL’s most highly salaried and, arguably, best player, Lance ‘Buddy’ Franklin. Franklin entered the draft in 2004 as a highly promising seventeen year old footballer. Given his ability and promise, Franklin was an obvious first pick but concerns about his maturity and self-centredness meant that Richmond, the club with early draft selections, ignored Franklin and Hawthorn, his eventual home, also overlooked him with its first pick. Hindsight demonstrates the folly of Richmond’s thinking. However, it was some years later that Stella Coram...
took issue with an article by former AFL footballer and coach, Robert Walls, that compared the attributes of Franklin with a similarly big-bodied key position forward player, Travis Cloke. Walls wrote:

...To a certain extent he [Franklin] is uncoachable because he acts on amazing impulse and instinct. But Buddy will never captain the Hawks because it’s all about me not we. Travis, with a level head and a year of experience will be a future captain. He will take and give more hits and wear more bruises than Buddy. Cloke will be very conscious of creating for his team mates whereas Buddy’s team mates will be very conscious of creating for Buddy.82

Coram’s intervention into debates about depictions of Franklin in the sports press provoked strong responses from journalists who resented implications that their commentary was racist. Nevertheless, Coram observed that behind the inability or unwillingness to understand the anxieties a young Indigenous man may have felt in dealing with non-Indigenous authority figures lies a culture of poor journalism: ‘...the rhetoric of neutrality, captured in the notion that criticism has nothing to do with race, means that blacks are no longer able name their reality’.83 After what she claimed was an exhaustive search through AFL reporting, Coram found no reference to a non-Indigenous player being described as uncoachable. On this basis Coram describes ‘un’ as a racial marker.84 Indeed, the belief Indigenous players are un-coachable (implying innate ability and indiscipline) and unwilling to train as hard as fairer skinned counterparts is commonplace among recruiters and coaches.85

Coaches and other football department staff that admire the freakish, exotic, unexpected exploits of Indigenous players equally lament their supposed lack of discipline.86 Thus, the flipside of celebrating innate ability is the conceit that the physical magic of Indigenous players is offset by their presumed mental fragility.87

Given the disproportionate rates of police harassment and incarceration of Aboriginal peoples and notwithstanding the catalogue of crimes and misdemeanours involving non-Indigenous players, Indigenous players are also often considered as posing excessive risks to the reputations of clubs they represent.88 No better illustration of this attitude is available than the remarks of the Collingwood president, Allan McAlister, defending his club in the wake of the Winmar protest: ‘As long as they conduct themselves as white people, well, off the field, everyone will admire and respect...As long as they conduct themselves like human beings, they will be alright’.89 Low expectations of the conduct of Indigenous athletes forms part of a wider view of Indigenous people as unsuitable for leadership positions and unable to responsibly deal with success whether in sport or other areas of public life.90

**On the Field of Play:**

Much concerning assumptions about Indigenous players is revealed through a close analysis of their deployment on the field of play. Australian football is played on a relatively large playing surface of oval shape (though not on a standard sized pitch. Ground sizes vary from place to place), typically 135m-185m long and 110m-155m wide. The game itself is highly physical with tackling and bumping a feature of it. Unlike soccer and rugby there is not a formal structure to the game (no off-side rule, no requirement that the ball be moved in a set direction) the play is fast and possession of the ball highly contested.91 The key areas on the field of play run down the so-called spine of the ground: full forward, centre-half forward, centre, centre-half back and full back. These positions are generally occupied by a team’s elite players and place particular demands on them with respect to skills,
physical attributes and leadership. A team well beaten down its spine rarely emerges victorious from a match although strong performances from running and flanking players may overcome this significant handicap. Typically, Indigenous players have been ‘…clustered in positions that selectors identify as requiring physical skills and are largely absent from positions that selectors identify as requiring judgement, leadership and which are seen as strategically vital to the outcome of a match’. Hallinan et al analysed some 1400 games spanning eight years of the AFL competition at its highest level and clearly demonstrated that Aboriginal players are very much under-represented in the spine positions (resilience, leadership, sound judgement, calm temperament) but over represented in positions where flair, pace and opportunism are required. Very few had played at full back (0.2%) but were over represented in the forward pocket (15.4%), a scoring part of the ground that often requires nimble and unpredictable movement to make the most of opportunities. Overall 2.6% of Indigenous players could be found in central positions and 10.4% in non-central positions. This is a clear demonstration of the ways coaches and selectors regard Indigenous players as being ill-suited to taking responsibility for winning matches. Such attitudes ignore the past examples of Indigenous players not only exercising on-field leadership but being among the best spine players in the history of the game.

If under-representation in positions of responsibility on the field of play is indicative of a lack of regard for the strategic and leadership skills of Aboriginal peoples, then it comes as no surprise that they are even less visible in coaching and senior administrative roles in AFL clubs. Confining the skills of Indigenous players to the field of play perpetuates institutionalised racism that excludes Aboriginal peoples from decision making and the creation of club cultures. Such understandings of Indigenous people go largely unchallenged in the popular media and nor does the AFL itself seem willing or able to recognise the structural racism that still underpins the code’s culture. Despite important advances in the improvement of the working and playing lives of Aboriginal players and significant efforts targeted at encouraging reconciliation between black and white Australians, structural racism provides the limit of the AFL’s diplomacy.

_Celebrating Injustice: The Limits of Sporting Reconciliation in AFL Football_

There can be no doubting the AFL’s commitment to reducing, with the aim of eliminating, racial abuse of Indigenous players by opponents and spectators. Great strides have been taken in this respect, something widely acknowledged by Indigenous players. Beginning in the year in which Nicky Winmar stood up to racists among spectators, the AFL began to consciously showcase Indigenous culture as integral to the development and success of the code. In the pre-match entertainment at the 1993 Grand Final the culture of Australia’s Indigenous peoples was highlighted in recognition of the UN’s International Year of the World’s Indigenous People. Subsequently, an Indigenous All Stars team (first constituted in 1983, then again in 1994 and biennially since 2003) has played an established AFL team in northern Australia. An Indigenous team of the century was recognised in 2005 (marking the centenary of the first Indigenous footballer to play at the highest level). Since 2005 an annual Indigenous round forms part of the AFL calendar with the Essendon and Richmond clash the highlight of the round and vigorously promoted as ‘Dreamtime at the ‘G’ (the G refers to the Melbourne Cricket Ground, Australia’s largest sporting stadium and where the game is played every year). In addition, Essendon and Sydney have since 2002 played off for the Marn Grook Trophy. The incorporation of Indigenous themed events and celebrations is indicative of the AFL’s
determination to position itself as the sports body most visibly committed to the politics of reconciliation.\textsuperscript{99}

The public face of reconciliation AFL style is to be found in its celebration of Indigenous culture during the Indigenous round. Prior to the beginning of play ceremonies are carried out on-field that often include recognition of significant contemporary gains, a welcome to Aboriginal land sometimes offered by an elder of the traditional owners, and contemporary entertainment. For example, the traditional owners of the land upon which the MCG is built are the Wurundjeri and the formalities for the 2013 ‘Dreamtime at the ‘G’ is introduced by Essendon player Alwyn Davey (of the Kokatha people). Davey begins by reminding viewers that the year marks the 50\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the granting of the right vote to Indigenous and Torres Strait islander peoples ‘in their own country’ and the 20\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the landmark Mabo decision. He goes on to comment that ‘Dreamtime at the ‘G’ celebrates the importance of the land and country to Indigenous Australians’. Davey then stresses that Aborigines come from over 320 different nations before welcoming television viewers (and spectators at the ground itself) to the ‘modern day’ Wurundjeri ceremony that ‘tells the story of the land we have gathered upon.’ The performance concerns Wooroomul (Wurumul) (no amount of searching reveals this name although the emu features in Wurundjeri dreaming) the emu and Guruk the brolga (which does seem part of Wurundjeri dreaming) and serves as a welcome ‘to this ancient land for a game we call Marngrook, Australia’s game.’ After this introduction, attention turns to on-field activities with the first camera shot of one young woman, attractive and very fair-skinned, one of five who begins a chant like recitation presumably in the language of the Wurundjeri. They are clad in long robes of no obvious specific relevance to the Wurundjeri (or any other) people. After this brief interlude, the listener hears the sound of the iconic Indigenous instrument, the digeridoo and the opening bars to \textit{Solid Rock}, an early 1980s rock song that first raised Aboriginal disadvantage to a white, young, primarily urban audience. A range of artists, Indigenous and non-Indigenous contribute to a longer and more melodic version of the song as the camera pans across the field revealing dancers some of who carry large puppets of the two birds. One dancer carries the Aboriginal flag, a symbol of sovereignty and defiance.

On the one hand, there is no necessary reason why the AFL should be responsible for presenting an account of Indigenous culture and struggle that is in some sense ‘authentic’. On the other hand, having positioned itself as a champion of Indigenous peoples and their battle for recognition and rights, the ceremony described above is a curiously ambivalent affair. Achievements such as winning the right to vote and gaining recognition of the concept of native title are ‘celebrated’ in the same entertainment breath as what appears to be a hybrid and confected welcome to the land of the Wurundjeri. The Indigenous round and this particular game within it, the ‘Dreamtime at the ‘G,’ proclaims the importance of the land and country to Indigenous Australians but makes no comment on the ongoing endeavours for access to land and other forms of social justice to address profound Indigenous disadvantage in Australia. There have been advances for Indigenous peoples in Australia in recent decades but whether achieving the basic thresholds of citizenship is a cause for festivity AFL style is highly doubtful.\textsuperscript{100}

As such, the AFL fails to address the racism more deeply structured into the code and Australian society more generally. As Coram noted after her heated clash with football journalists ‘...in the context of sports discourse...the processes of production and transfer of ideologies are largely unconscious rather than through conscious intent’.\textsuperscript{101} On this view lauding Indigenous culture and...
masculinity can further transmit and embed racialized discourses of the Aboriginal other. Coram notes that even in its anti-racist discourses the AFL practices essentialism in representing Indigenous footballers as blood brothers, revolutionaries, legends, and symbolic figures who transcend race. Moreover, despite large populations of Indigenous peoples residing in mundane country towns like Echuca, Shepparton and around the Dandenong Ranges (all in rural Victoria), the AFL has made a fetish of the ‘exotic north’ and footballers that hail from remote communities in the Northern Territory and the islands off its coast making the cultures and concerns of Indigenous people seem far removed from the day to day lives of urbanised non-Indigenous Australians.

The AFL’s senior administration remains largely comprised of middle-aged white males with a strongly vested interest in the maintenance of the status quo and as such colonial attitudes and structures of Indigenous exclusion are reinforced. To date there has not been an Indigenous commissioner on the AFL and former footballer and now Indigenous activist Michael Long explicitly cited this shortcoming in standing for recent election. However, Long’s bid was overlooked in circumstances that attracted some negative comment on the part of the media. Robinson notes hostile responses in the comments section of the story that broke news of the candidacy with allegations of racism levelled at Long for his wanting to represent the interests of Indigenous peoples. As noted above with respect to the attitudes of coaching staff and the discourses of journalists, the habits and attitudes of AFL and club administrators are not necessarily framed with racist intent but are informed by unconscious dispositions and values. Nonetheless, easy assumptions about biological determinism and the supposed limits of Indigenous ambition and leadership capacity, along with the view that it is the AFL which is the enlightened bearer of sound practices of reconciliation too readily become common sense. As such, ‘...everyday taken-for-granted understandings of race and racial difference permeate the working environment of Australian Rules football’. One direct consequence of the confluence of history, attitudes, discourses and governance is that the aspirations of young, non-Indigenous footballers are never placed into the hands of Indigenous management or coaches informed by distinctive sets of values and approaches to the game, success and overall well-being.

Conclusion:

Adam Goodes was widely recognised for the dignified way in which he confronted the abuse of a spectator in 2013. The abuser, a thirteen year old girl, was removed from the stadium by ground staff and briefly became the subject of media interest. The following day, Goodes held a press conference at which he expressed his hurt at being called an ape but also his determination that his abuser be supported through an ordeal of her own and helped to understand how offensive her remarks were to Goodes. Praised for his leadership and advocacy in the fight against racism, Goodes was selected as Australian of the Year for 2014. That his on-field presence subsequently provoked widespread booing from spectators (usually supporters of opposing teams) whenever he handled the ball is a distressing measure of the continuing blight of casual racism in Australia. So persistent and intense was the booing, Goodes prior to what may have been a slightly premature retirement, took a brief leave of absence from his club and playing while the nation’s media and politicians embarked upon a round of soul-searching and public speculation as to whether or not the booing was motivated by racism. With few exceptions, commentary focused on the conduct of individual spectators at the cost of any systematic analysis of issues Indigenous players have highlighted for years: racism is not unthinking but taught, learned and reproduced in attitudes and
structures of exclusion. That is, while tackling classical racism is commendable, necessary, it also has the effect of putting individuals at the centre of the struggle for justice. It is the racialized, gendered, Indigenous subject that must register protest about racist remarks but whose efforts to reform racist discourse and institutions are resisted. It is the individual Indigenous subject whose silence on the deeper currents of racism in Australia earns him acceptance and adulation but, as Adam Goodes discovered to his considerable cost, derision and contempt when player becomes advocate and attempts to hold players, supporters and nation to account for a history of exclusion. It is in this moment that the inadequacy of the AFL’s diplomacy is exposed. That is, rather than examine the shortcomings of a diplomacy that has failed to deliver the kind of discursive and institutional reform that would make the interventions of Adam Goodes not just acceptable, but ordinary it merely turns to supporters and pleads for respectful silence towards Goodes (and by implication others). Instead it is racism that remains ordinary, everyday, unremarkable and found in denial and disregard as well as outright prejudice. In this sense, the AFL’s diplomacy has done little to challenge colonial modes of thinking about Indigenous peoples or to establish pathways to genuine reconciliation. Indigenous players may have largely won the battle for on-field respect but the wider victory of genuine recognition and equality remains elusive.
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