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This paper provides a critical survey and analysis of (more recent) scholarly literature that deals explicitly with Australian locals, a theme of identity important to both regional lore and culture. It is somewhat surprising that while the idea of being a local is common in everyday Australian usage—whether in private discussions, in the media or in scholarly writing—there is no sustained focus in Australia on what the idea means. This is not the case elsewhere. In published research on tourism in the developing counties, and in social research in the United Kingdom and in the United States of America (especially Hawai‘i, but also from the USA on locals and cosmopolitans) the locals have been objects of study for up to sixty years.¹

The objective here is not so much to propose why there is relative silence from Australian scholars regarding the locals, but instead to draw together the disparate and generally disconnected literature from this country. The literature is disconnected, perhaps because the locals are never the primary, explicit focus of research. I hesitate to say ‘never’, but that is my experience. One could not, therefore, refer to this literature as a ‘body’ of research, but rather as organs performing a function for other bodies. A consequence of this is that finding writing on the idea of being an Australian local is often the result of serendipity rather than these documents’ intention and the following survey is, no doubt, incomplete. Any correspondence from readers on work I have missed is particularly welcome.

Throughout the paper, being a local signifies an identity formed in relation to an ‘other’. Indeed, the sense of that sentence should be inverted. The word ‘locals’ initially named and marked the marginalised labourers in the rural margins of late 18th century England, and from then on it is the locals that have typically constituted ‘the other’ for a privileged unmarked group.² That their typical form is plural, ‘the locals’

¹ For a critical survey see: Rob Garbutt, ‘‘Locals only’? Identity and Place in Australian Settler Society’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, Southern Cross University, 2006), Chapter 3. This paper is based on the section of that chapter dealing with Australian locals.
² On the emergence of the idea of ‘the locals’ in England see: Rob Garbutt, ‘‘Locals Only’?’; Chapter 2. Also see O.E.D. 2nd ed..
rather than ‘the local’, would seem to speak of the stereotyping that assigns traits indiscriminately to individuals because of their membership of an out-group. In typical modern twentieth and twenty-first century fashion, however, this marginalisation has often been claimed by the locals as a point of solidarity, sometimes to the point of inversion by constituting the hegemonic position in the social order. Thus, while being a local is often interpreted as the way place defines one’s identity, a more contingent and historicised reading considers how locals ‘make place relevant to their identities in situated interactions’. Being a local, then, can be thought of as a resource on which to draw in specific situations.

It is significant that, in my introduction of the concept of ‘locals’ in the paragraph above, I have not defined who is and who is not a local. I would make two points here. The first is that my approach to the idea of being a local is not to define the term—though I am always interested in definitions—but to understand how the idea works in Australian society, and to think about what the word does. Secondly, while definitions of who is and is not a local often dominate everyday discussions on the subject in local communities—expressed in questioning how long it takes to be a local or whether ‘real locals’ have to be born and bred—in scholarly literature the term is often undefined. There appears to be an assumption that the idea of being a local is so much a part of everyday Australian culture we all know and understand just to whom it is that this identity refers. On the surface this may explain why the idea receives so little academic attention, but conversely does not explain how a powerful idea that connects people intimately to place is able to function unnoticed.

The remainder of this paper is divided into six sections, each dealing with an approach to the idea of being a local. The first deals with the link between family history and the locals, particularly in the work of Katrina Schlunke. This is followed by a brief analysis of Schlunke’s use of ‘the carnivalesque’ and its implications for how being a local intersects with ideas of Indigeneity. The subsequent two sections provide a survey of the social history and sociology of being an Australian local. The works surveyed to this point are located in rural Australia; however, the second-last section concentrates on the performance of being a local in Sydney. Finally, before concluding, I discuss my own work which looks at the language of being local.

---

3 Greg Myers, ‘‘Where are You From?’ Identifying Place’, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 10 (2006), 320-343 (p. 325) [emphasis in original].
A Local Family History of Locals

In Australia, which was founded as a settler nation, claims of who settled a place first provide a critical context for the right to speak ‘for’ a place. It patterns an insider claim of place-based power, often with the legal backing of property rights, first of squatters and then the selectors who appeared with the passing of closer settlement acts of the 1860s. Consequently, one’s family history of arrival in a place becomes important in establishing oneself as a local. Coming from a place, which ironically and paradoxically requires a form of forgetting one’s arrival, expresses a process of naturalisation in a place and having always been ‘from here’.

This historical sense of being an Australian local has its roots in England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland as the main origins for our colonial migration. Kent Ryden, for example, writes of a rural Northern Irish sense of place-based identity that is based on ‘one’s connection with history, both factual and mythic, that is so central a component of the sense of place’. He goes on to explain that

the locals understood themselves as historically and genealogically linked with the past as it transpired in that place—as the living end results of a historical process—and that they could not be fully understood or known without a knowledge of local history . . . . In recounting stories of local history, people recount and affirm who they are. This also holds true for the more personal, intimate kind of history . . . .

Furthermore, in the (former) colonies it is through personal and local history that one’s place as a local to the nation is established, and this is a key process in the colonists’ differentiation of themselves from the English imperial centre.5

Katrina Schlunke’s insightful analytical narrative of her troubling relationship with the New England area of northern New South Wales reaffirms the importance of a ‘personal, intimate kind of history’ to being an Australian local.6 For Schlunke, local history is the contested arena in which it is decided ‘[w]ho is indisputably from the [local] area’.7 Family histories, then,

---

6 Ryden, p. 65.
invent a particularly located person who becomes the ‘local’, who, in turn, immediately brings to life the immediate location. While ‘local’ is a term that can carry the simple sense of being familiar with a place—‘knowing’ a place enough to direct a visitor, for example—it is also a term that denotes a living relationship to place. A real ‘local’ must be ‘born and bred’, and more tellingly, must have connections back to the colonial history of the location.8

In this account, local status is determined by using a number of ‘proofs’: knowing a place geographically, being born and bred there, and by/from colonial family roots. Satisfying the criteria differentiates locals along a scale, in Schlunke’s words, from the ‘simple sense’ local to the ‘real ‘local’ ’ who is ‘indisputably from’.9

It is through local and family histories, Schlunke argues, that the local is told and invented and the location is brought to life. By bringing this new creation to life, and by setting that bringing-to-life in a narrative of ‘here’, an ‘historical right’ is established through which ‘real title’ is both claimed and granted.10 This is a specifically pioneering form of the local narrative against which all other claims of local settler belonging are organised. And as with English forms of belonging based on born and bred kinship, being local, especially a real local, implies a moral right to possession.11


* The ‘Carnival of the Locals’

Significant in Schlunke’s narrative of the locals are her problematisations of local belonging. The locals, she says, ‘can be both sorry for those from beyond who haven’t known of some of their pleasures’ of being in ‘a rich order of culture’, while also longing for ‘something more than themselves’.12 Further, through local histories, the locals are always looking to the past which is often a ‘place’ of better times and relative abundance.13 There is, then, an ‘unrequited relationship with history’, because there is an ongoing ‘process of ‘localising’ ,
'always caught and working at place and history which will drag [the locals] inside and outside [of themselves]'\(^\text{14}\).

However, the most significant problematisation of local belonging for Schlunke derives from the locals’ relationships with Aborigines. The ‘proofs’ which determine one’s local status, she says, ‘exclude Aboriginal people of the area who, in a bizarre, carnivalesque manoeuvre, are too local to be ‘local’’. Aboriginal peoples’ ‘land tenure becomes an unmeasurable imagining that bobs uneasily around the edges of all these claims to ‘localness’’.\(^\text{15}\)

What, then, is this carnivalesque manoeuvre that transforms ‘too local to be local’ into ‘not local’? The ‘carnivalesque’ may be understood as the overturning of the ‘proper’ order of things to establish (for the duration of a carnival) an alternative order. Following Kristeva’s conception of the carnivalesque, the alternative social code of the carnival only ‘exists and succeeds . . . because it accepts another law’.\(^\text{16}\) In the inversion that results in settlers being local and Aborigines not-local, the established law which is overturned is that which pre-exists settler arrival, that is, Indigenous sovereignty. The carnival begins with the establishment of British sovereignty over Australia and reaches its climax with the installation of the pioneering locals.

The ‘Carnival of the Locals’ is unusual, however, because it is a carnival which endures. It is not a carnival in Bakhtin’s sense of the term—a ‘temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order’.\(^\text{17}\) For settlers to install themselves as local, to be ‘indisputably from’, requires not one bizarre and temporary manoeuvre but an ongoing daily overturning of Aboriginal sovereignty. As a continuing event, this ‘carnival’ becomes normalised. Thus, when Schlunke recalls that ‘[t]o be ‘local’ in the 1960s and 1970s was to be neither black nor white’, we read a statement of identity that can only be white.\(^\text{18}\) The possibility of being a local and an Aborigine is beyond the bounds of settler comprehension.\(^\text{19}\)

\(^{14}\) First quote is from Schlunke, *Bluff Rock*, p. 44; the second and third from Schlunke, pers. comm.

\(^{15}\) Schlunke, *Bluff Rock*, pp. 43-44.


Because the ‘carnival of the locals’ establishes a dominant power structure rather than the overturning of dominance, the metaphor of the carnival is a questionable one. Nevertheless, when it is applied to the installation of the locals, the carnival provides a useful strategy for analysis. In thinking through the ‘overturning’ of the Indigenous order, we find no simple inversion, and in this there are resonances with Bakhtin’s carnival. As Stuart Hall notes,

what is... original about Bakhtin’s ‘carnivalesque’ as a metaphor of cultural and symbolic transformation is that it is not simply a metaphor of inversion... it is precisely the purity of this binary distinction which is transgressed. The low invades the high... creating impure and hybrid forms.\(^\text{20}\)

If the ‘Carnival of the Locals’ was a simple inversion we might expect the Aborigines to take the position of non-locals (‘nomads’, perhaps?) while the most local of the locals would be tourists. Yet this is not the case. Tourists’ excess mobility mitigates against them becoming local.

The inversion is impure, though not disorderly. Instead, the inversion operates around two axes: one overturns and one preserves. The first is a racialised axis that overturns the ‘natural’ order of Aborigine and settler and installs the settler as native. The second axis preserves the order of indigeneity or autochthony—of being authentically of a place because of being the first from a place. These axes organise the temporary laws according to which the ‘Carnival of Locals’ is established and still operates.

This ‘Carnival of the Locals’ operates through, as Ken Gelder says, ‘taking out the ‘non’ from ‘non-Aboriginal’,”\(^\text{21}\) or as Deborah Bird Rose proposes, by settlers unilaterally imagining that the mantle of autochthony has been passed by Aborigines to settler Australians.\(^\text{22}\) In Hunters and Collectors, for example, Tom Griffiths asserts that the ‘white locals’ are singing ‘new songlines’ with an ‘historical consciousness that is Aboriginal in emphasis’.\(^\text{23}\) This historical consciousness and these new songlines, Griffiths argues, are expressed in


settlers’ renewed interest in local and family history. And this expression is motivated firstly by ‘the search for geographical identity—for ’deep-rootedness’ that ’unravel[s] all the fine detail of their [‘Anglo-Celtic Australian’s’] attachment to the soil’. Beneath this ‘search for . . . deep-rootedness’ Griffiths contends, may be an Anglo-Celtic settler ‘defence against modern inroads of multiculturalism and Aboriginal land rights’.

There are two main concerns I have with this discourse regarding the ‘white locals’. The first is the somewhat paradoxical situation that family history leads settlers into ‘deep-rootedness’ and the ‘fine detail of their attachment to the soil’. The idea of this detail being ‘unravel[led]’ indicates the naturalised expectation that roots will be uncovered, discovered, un concealed, whereas the practices of local and family history also operates to construct deep-rootedness. This is not passive but active work. The paradox is that one might reasonably expect that settler Australians’ genealogical explorations might uncover a geographical identity that always leads away from intricate rootedness confined to Australian soil towards a succession of places across oceans, and towards a complex multi-sited identity based on migration.

This naturalised expectation of deep-rootedness leads me to my second concern: that the anxiety over rootedness that ‘white locals’ are expressing appears in exclusive terms. Rights to land are bolstered ‘by appeals to claims of primordial bonds and autochthonous status’. Constructing deep-rooted ramparts as a defence against Aboriginal land rights and multiculturalism, expressing one’s settler autochthony to the exclusion of others, approaches the idea of belonging as if it was a finite and ‘scarce symbolic resource’ to be claimed and defended. Belonging in an increasingly interconnected world, one might imagine, might be better approached with a generous spirit, not as a zero sum game, but this is not to be. Instead the ‘white locals’ approach belonging with that inheritance of born and bred kinship, ‘a proprietorial identity . . . claimed over a large range of animate, inanimate, and quasi-animate entities, such as one’s own past [ and] the place where one lives . . . ’.

25 Griffiths, p. 224.
Bangalow Real Estate and local language—‘A real local . . . born and bred . . . here to stay . . . roots deeply planted . . . local knowledge’.
Historicising being a Local

In her recent insightful thesis, Johanna Kijas examines the history of internal migration to the north coast of New South Wales from a postcolonial perspective. This analysis situates the idea of being a local within a context of ongoing social change. By doing so, Kijas is able to chart shifts in meaning across four periods of colonial settlement and of internal migration on the mid-north coast. The first, from the mid-nineteenth century to around 1920, she designates as the period of ‘colonial settlement . . . and marginalisation of indigenous owners’. The second period was a period of relative stability between the end of World War One and the start of World War Two. The third period Kijas names the ‘intermediate period’ from 1945 to the late 1960s, and the fourth is an accelerated period of internal migration from the 1970s to the present.

For many older people it is the colonial period and that between the World Wars from which the ‘real’ locals emerge. Echoing Schlunke’s definition that ‘[a] real ‘local’ must be ‘born and bred’, and . . . must have connections back to the colonial history of the location’, Kijas writes:

For these [older] people it is not good enough to claim genuine local status merely on the basis of birth or length of residence, because this no longer guarantees a rural background. An elderly Coffs Harbour resident vehemently denied to me any local status as he had only come to the town from Sydney as an adult in 1958. Another local explained to me that to be a ‘real local’ one’s family has to be of pioneering stock from the nineteenth or early twentieth century.

He also conceded ‘real local’ status to similar generations of local business people and the few professionals in town. Within this definition of ‘real local’ Kijas notes a ‘rural hegemony’ and an identity as ‘country people’ who together—farmer, shopkeeper and professional alike—faced isolation from major centres and poor transport and communications infrastructure.

During the intermediate period following the World Wars, the relative stability experienced by the ‘real locals’ came to an end. Changes in domestic and international markets, in particular, had a marked affect on one of the mid-north coast’s major rural industries, dairy farming. Between 1942 and 1972 the number of dairy farms in the Bellinger

---

31 Schlunke, *Bluff Rock*, p. 43 [emphasis in original].
32 Kijas, p. 79.
Valley, for example, declined by sixty-nine percent from 304 to 93.\textsuperscript{33} The changes in the dairy industry are just one marker of a general economic decline of the region. Despite the decline and a net migration to the city in this period, there was a flow of newcomers, primarily from Melbourne and Sydney, some of whom brought with them new industries, personal wealth and an interest in real estate development. While some newcomers ruffled the feathers of the locals, many new settlers ‘generally fitted into the patterns of country living and identification as country people’. Some claimed local status ‘in their own right, or on the basis of marriage or friendship with ‘real locals’’, though old timers may challenge such claims.\textsuperscript{34}

It is in this intermediate period that new ideas of being a local emerged, though still as a strategic claim in the face of in-migration. With many locals of pioneering families moving off the land and into town, the direct connection between farming and being a local was disrupted. Newcomers who felt the desire and/or understood the benefits of being a local also sought alternate routes to becoming local. Being ‘born and bred’, length of residence, fitting in through displays of ‘countrymindedness’,\textsuperscript{35} and marriage all presented possibilities for forging a claim to local status. As a


\textsuperscript{34} Kijas, pp. 101-104, with quotations from p. 80.

result, newer designations such as ‘real local’ emerged to ensure that an aristocratic ranking was maintained and acknowledged.

Since 1970—a period of unprecedented growth on the North Coast—the internal migration of large numbers of new settlers from Sydney, inland New South Wales and Victoria has provided the ‘intermediate’ locals and ‘real’ locals an additional common interest. Kijas argues that affirming a country identity in the mould of countrymindedness allowed some of the intermediate group, in their alliance with some of the older locals, to contrast a solidarity of their combined interests in opposition to a particular typecast of an over-educated, selfish newcomer population of post-1970 city dwellers.

... The eruption of such contestations within the countryside reflected the threat to the hegemony of previously dominant groups by new groupings, just as the intermediate postwar group had threatened the ‘real locals’. ... [Claims over the right to speak and act on behalf of the countryside became central to the contestation over the meaning of the countryside in the changing rural contexts ...  

Claims to speak for and act on behalf of the countryside were especially complicated by the arrival of ‘alternative lifestyle’ newcomers. Powys et al., for example, position locals in opposition to the ‘alternates’ in a range of ways. They contend that ‘the new settlers appear to operate at a heightened ... level of awareness from that of the local traditionalists’ and desire ‘an alternate way of living to the current mainstream lifestyle’. But perhaps most significantly, it was the alternates’ claim to speak and act on behalf of ‘the environment’ and therefore the countryside and against the locals’ ‘exploitation’ of the land in the name of the ‘market economy’ that was most threatening to local hegemony.37

While an ‘alternative lifestyle’ initially separated newcomers from country-minded locals, care for the land was a claim made by both groups which generated new alliances between some locals and alternative newcomers. For example, campaigning for and promoting environmentally sustainable development is one form of ‘countryminded’ community concern that could bring together ‘locals’ of all types and recent newcomers. In this sense, for Doug, one of Kijas’s research participants and a ‘real local’ from a pioneering family,

... to be a local is not a matter of length of residence or place of birth or socialisation, but a matter of contribution to the community. A shared sense of responsibility for the land and the community found

36 Kijas, pp. 116-117.
37 Powys and others, quotations respectively from pp. 18, 2, 3.
Doug and [post-1970 newcomer] Gloria learning new environmental lessons together as they watched the Valley’s population soar from the late 1970s.  

Kijas unsettles the idea of being ‘local’ by showing it to be an historical construct, continually being formed in relation to a continuing history of internal settler migration. In this historical analysis we begin to see a succession of strategies for claiming insider status as a local and, therefore, claims on the right to speak and act for a place. Beneath the homogeneity of the mask of being a local is a dynamic heterogenous accretion. Local history viewed as a process of migrations rather than as settlement highlights how a place and its community are always constituted by flows and relations with the larger-than-local national and global scales, and with other local places and communities.

But most importantly, it is the continuing presence of Aborigines that unsettles the locals’ claim to speak and act for the countryside. That the locals are able to unproblematically represent themselves as always having been here without reference to Aborigines, demonstrates for Kijas that ‘[w]hiteness is an assumed characteristic of this kind of local status’.  

For all the anxiety regarding who is and is not a local, for all the claims to speak and act for the countryside, this is what remains unspeakable.

*Sociologies of the Local*

A number of sociological studies highlight the role of locals in Australian rural communities. In Ian Burnley and Peter Murphy’s study of recent internal migration, defining the locals comes second to the availability of demographic data and so for their purposes locals are those who have been in an area for more than ten years, or where that data is missing, for more than five years. This constraint makes their analysis of the attitudes of locals and newcomers to growth and change problematic from the outset. For Ken Dempsey, in his close study of a small rural community undertaken between 1973 and 1987, the locals are significant community members, but he does not give them any focus, nor attempt a definition. Being a local, for Dempsey, is a self-evident and commonsense identity. Ian Gray, in his study of power in rural local
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39 Kijas, p. 79.  
40 Ian Burnley and Peter Murphy, *Sea Change: Movement from Metropolitan to Arcadian Australia* (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2004), pp. 175-176.  
politics in Cowra, New South Wales makes similar assumptions.\(^{42}\) Gray’s focus on power and politics, however, directs him towards framing localism as a particular ideology which produces particular subject positions, amongst them, non-locals and locals.

For Gray, localism is expressed in Cowra by portraying local residents as belonging to a social whole with common interests. Local politics are, therefore, represented as neutral, while the reality is that only certain interests, those of farmers and business people, are presented in the local political arena. Through localism in Cowra there is an ‘obfuscation of interests’.\(^{43}\) Similarly, Dempsey found that the representation of Smalltown as ‘one big happy family’ is at variance with the reality of conflict among locals and between locals and ‘blow-ins’ (newcomers).\(^{44}\)

Ian Gray builds on the work of Hall and colleagues to describe localism via a four-element framework based on property, propinquity, kinship and countrymindedness.\(^{45}\) For Gray, each of the elements contributes to one’s local status. The first, ownership of private property, is seen as the primary means through which cultural ideas of countryside ‘develop into a rural ideology’. Within this ideology ‘property symbolises that which is good and can be achieved by hard work and perseverance’.\(^{46}\)

The second element of localism is propinquity or nearness. Social and geographic propinquity develops a sense of local social unity that distinguishes one place and its community against other towns, villages, rural areas or areas within towns. Thus, a sense of local attachment arises and boundaries between places develop.\(^{47}\) Propinquity is closely connected to duration of residence, as it is through a long-term connection to a place that propinquity has its effect.

Kinship, being a ‘local local’, is a third aspect of localism.\(^{48}\) The criterion of being ‘born and bred’, he finds, is the most commonly used for defining who is and isn’t a local. As one of Dempsey’s informants says, ‘No matter how long you stay unless you’re born here you’ll always be a “blow-in”’.\(^{49}\) Relationships in the town are such that one’s family history and status is always known by someone else and ‘acceptance for non-locals is conditional and problematic, while for locals


\(^{43}\) Gray, p. 161.

\(^{44}\) Dempsey, p. 84.


\(^{46}\) Gray, p. 163.

\(^{47}\) Gray, pp. 163-166.

\(^{48}\) Gray, p. 167.

\(^{49}\) Dempsey, p. 61.
it is a birthright'.\(^5\) One of Gray’s research participants says of Cowra, ‘First, people live here slowly. Second, [to be fully accepted] you have to be a ‘local local’ ’.\(^5\)

Gray’s fourth element of localism is ‘countrymindedness;.. an ideology that places the ‘country way of life’ at the centre of Australian identity. Unlike the ‘competitive and nasty’ values of the city, a countryminded mindset sees country life as ‘virtuous, ennobling and co-operative’.\(^5\)

For Gray, localism, expressed in terms of ideas of identity and place, is based upon each of the four elements of property, propinquity, kinship and countrymindedness. Within Cowra he found divisions in the status of locals based upon these elements. He writes that

> [the] division between ‘local locals’ and others . . . served to show that there were people who really belonged, and that concomitantly, the district was more than a geographical expression; it was an identity that people could belong to. The old families may have been looked upon as different, but they bestowed continuity on the locality, and to that extent personified local identity.\(^5\)

*Local Performances*

So far, this review of literature on Australian locals has highlighted connections to rural places that are structured by autochthony, by one’s being-local, having sprung ‘indisputably from’ within the confines of a place.\(^5\) Being a local is, in its simplest autochthonic mode, organised as a social hierarchy that places ‘real locals’, or ‘local locals’—those descendants of pioneering settlers, for example—at the top and the most recent arrivals in a place at the bottom.

Richard Woolley and Clifton Evers, on the other hand, explore a quite different mode of being local that is constructed through performance, narrative and story, and perhaps more significantly, in the city. Woolley’s research takes place in the inner Sydney suburbs of Redfern and Chippendale between 1998 and 2002.\(^5\) This period was marked by accelerated gentrification of a once working-class area. Woolley, like Kijas, tells a story of internal migration and transience. Within this transient population, many of the more permanent inhabitants—from

\(^{50}\) Dempsey, pp. 94 and 117.  
\(^{51}\) Gray, p. 167.  
\(^{52}\) Aitken, p. 35.  
\(^{53}\) Gray, p. 170.  
\(^{54}\) Schlunke, *Bluff Rock*, p. 52 [emphasis in original].  
amongst whom Woolley draws his research participants—identify as locals. Even in the cosmopolitan city, being a local has significance as a marker of belonging.

These inner city locals construct their being-local, Woolley finds, through narrative and performance. Through these performative actions the locals ‘establish themselves as ‘insiders’, but without making legitimating claims that this is where they are ‘from’ . Instead, particular stories are told as a performance that discerns ‘who was ‘of’ the area and who was not’. Following the lead of Michel de Certeau, Woolley contends that these inner city locals create their being-local through emplaced, often repeated practices such as walking to a particular pub for the weekly pool competition, and also in sharing stories that simultaneously ‘found’ the hereness of place and their being-local.

The performative analysis of being-local provides a ‘processual’ approach to the construction of local identity through paths and biographies which invests place with dynamism. Narrative, story and performance continually make and remake place as well as one’s embodied belonging in that dynamic spatial order. Loss of aspects of the narrative may also be experienced simultaneously as a sense of displacement and solidarity as places change.

Woolley’s analysis focuses on two ways in which place and belonging are narrated. The first is a public founding of place that involves the wide circulation of stories in the media. These stories of Redfern and Chippendale include the area’s working class history, its decline as industries moved from the inner city, media reports of the area as a place of crime and danger, its proximity to an Aboriginal housing area centring on The Block, and recent redevelopment and gentrification. Through the circulation of these stories Redfern and Chippendale have been constructed and ordered in the imagination of the people of Sydney and for many throughout the nation.

Secondly, place and belonging are ‘storied’ by individual and group experience of a place. Narratives of these experiences cut across the stories in wider circulation in complex ways: shared stories of living in a place of danger; of friendships with others in an unpretentious, once

60 Woolley, ‘Ronnie’s Story’, pp. 3-4; Woolley, ‘Inhabiting Place’, throughout.
working-class area; and of the newcomers such as the ‘yuppies’ and overseas students who disrupt the routines of locals’ lives.\textsuperscript{61} An insider’s sense of belonging is created through these stories. As they circulate through performances, thereby an identity as ‘someone who feels qualified to speak as a local’ is constructed.\textsuperscript{62}

For Woolley’s research participants, all relatively immobile inhabitants of a rapidly changing inner city area, there is no need to establish that one is ‘from’ but ‘of’; ‘one of us’ rather than ‘from here’. A place of belonging is created through this narrative. This contrasts with ‘being from’ in which relatively bound and fixed concepts of community and place pre-exist the emergence of one’s local identity. Despite the relative fluid identity of ‘of locals’ compared with ‘from locals’, both identities authorise a form of speaking—‘as a local’ (to use Woolley’s words)—and both (again using Woolley’s words) ‘produce a kind of “ontological security”, which “makes-certain” the world of “insiders”’.\textsuperscript{63}

In his analysis of the masculine surfing culture around the beaches of Sydney, Clifton Evers describes an hybrid sense of being a local that is ontological as well as performative. For Evers localism is ‘the know-how [of a space], and the policing of its rules and the territory’.\textsuperscript{64} Being a local entails performance of this know-how that over time becomes embodied to the point that one’s body is familiar with the possibilities of a place.\textsuperscript{65} The territorial aspect of being a local and the performance of being a local also mark the performances of others within a space as fitting in or otherwise. This framework provides Evers with a powerful tool for analysing territorial clashes such as that which occurred between the locals and Lebanese-Australians at Cronulla in December 2005.

\* 

\textit{Local Language}

My thinking about the idea of being a local has drawn on these accounts as part of my research on the language and performance of being a local. My questioning began with my return, after 20 years to live in the place I was born and bred. I \textit{was} a local, but was now not quite local. After taking part in a Reconciliation event in 2000, further consideration

\textsuperscript{61} Woolley, ‘Inhabiting Place’, throughout, but see especially pp. 66-70.
\textsuperscript{62} Woolley, ‘Ronnie’s Story’, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{63} Woolley, ‘Ronnie’s Story’, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{64} Clifton Evers, ‘Locals Only!’, paper presented at the \textit{Everyday Multiculturalism} conference, (North Ryde, NSW: Macquarie University, 2006), p. 1. Thanks to Clif Evers for giving me permission to quote from this paper.
\textsuperscript{65} Clifton Evers, ‘Becoming-man, Becoming-wave’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Sydney, 2005), p. 139.
was required: How was it that we settlers had installed ourselves as locals thereby displacing Aborigines?  

The possibility of being a local, I propose, is the clearing of an epistemological space for settler-being. By beginning local history with first settlement and through the policing of local places I had been raised as a local who unquestioningly believed in my autochthony, of being born from the soil of this place in which I was born. In this imaginary scene Aborigines were of another time and place, and when I began to analyse how the word ‘local’ was used in the local newspaper, I found this idea reproduced in language. Aborigines were never represented as locals and the locals were never Aborigines. Furthermore, those who came to Australia from non-British nations, and especially from non-European nations, were all regarded as migrants. Unlike us locals, who had ‘always’ been here these new arrivals seemed somehow ‘out of place’.

Underlying the idea of being a local, and I propose, the idea of being a born and bred native-born Australian is an autochthonic imaginary I call white ‘autochthony’. This imaginary is expressed in a ‘language of Australian settlement’ which includes in its lexicon the idea of being a local. It is an imaginary whose assumptions deserve questioning, so that the idea of being a local does not remain exclusive of others while retaining its sense of caring for the places we live in.

Conclusion

The idea of being a local intimately links people to place. In a neologism of Derrida’s, the term expresses an ontology—a social

---


67 Garbutt, ‘Locals Only’?, Chapter 1.

68 Garbutt, ‘White on White’.


72 Richard Davis, ‘Introduction: transforming the frontier in contemporary Australia’ in Dislocating the Frontier: Essaying the Mystique of the Outback, ed. by Deborah Bird Rose and Richard Davis (Canberra: ANU e-Press, 2005), pp. 7-22 (p. 8).


system in which the value of being (on) is indissociably linked to stability in a locality (topos), particularly on one’s ‘native soil’. This system of values privileges the locals’ moral right to speak and act for a place over that of newcomers. This is the commonplace understanding of being a local in Australia that is expressed in Schlunke’s account which links being local through family history to colonial settlement. It is echoed in Kijas’ historical survey in which the ‘real’ locals are distinguished from ‘intermediate’ locals, who arrived after the Second World War, or the ‘wave’ of new settlers that began breaking against the local shore from the 1970s onwards. And this ontological sense of being local that orders the value of one’s presence in a place is that which underpins the local politics of power in rural and urban communities that Gray, Dempsey, Woolley, Evers and I describe.

In its most optimistic formation, being ‘one of the locals’ expresses a caring connection to others in a community and to the place in which one finds oneself. However, being one of the locals can also lead to social exclusion according to, as Adorno so forcefully puts it, the ‘barbaric law whereby he who was there first has the greatest rights’. It is on this count that the uses to which the idea of being a local is put deserve critical attention. How does one value community and place without that valuing becoming exclusionary?

In this regard, two pertinent issues arise from Australian scholarship on being a local. In the first instance the process by which settler Australians have installed themselves as the locals, physically and in language, creates an imaginative space that displaces Indigenous Australians from the settled landscape. Secondly, this sense of being local, of always having been from here, erases from settler memory the understanding that the process of colonisation was the beginning of an ongoing and continuing process of migration. It denies the locals the possibility of thinking of themselves as products of migration as much as products of the local soil. This has implications for the way that inclusive coexistence of settlers, Indigenous Australians and migrant minorities is imagined within localities and the nation.

While the idea of being one of the locals in its everyday sense is a fixed identity, scholarship on Australian locals also shows that this is far from the case. Kijas shows that the idea evolves with each phase of internal migration. Woolley and Evers demonstrate that being a local is constantly in process as a routine performance, and in the repetition of routine is open to variation and change. In my own research I demonstrate how


being a local functions within such performances as a resource to exclude and include others or to value or devalue their opinions. In this scholarship, being a local is revealed as being far from a fixed identity but is instead contingent upon circumstances. There is also the hope that the idea of being a local can emerge as a position from which newcomers, from an increasingly mobile world, can be welcomed home.
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