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**Abstract**

Between the second half of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century, Australia and the islands of the southwestern Pacific were the setting of a wide context of encounters between Europeans and Indigenous peoples, in regions that could be perceived as disconnected at a first glance. However, it was part of a wider project of colonization that overlapped on a not less wide set of Indigenous networks of interconnection. Such a colonial project had landscape modification as a main common goal, added to projects of ethnic and cultural separation and segregation. This article suggests an approach to cultural seascapes as an approach to power relations between European colonizers and Indigenous people in this region. I suggest that this level of analysis allows to connect realities that could be perceived as disparate, but which were coherent with global projects of imposition of colonial identities according to a dominant global matrix of power. I aim to highlight the value of local spaces of interconnection as expressions of wider realities, approachable throughout the analysis of cultural seascapes as mobile spaces of power relations.
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During the nineteenth century and the beginnings of the twentieth, in Northeastern Australia, landscape modifications, for sugar cane plantations, were accompanied by the introduction of workers from the Melanesian Islands. In this process, colonial agents inserted a set of ethnic groups with non-Western notions of place and identity into a social order that imposed division, control, and productivity in accordance with the globalized ideals of colonial systems.

This article aims to open the discussion about two different dynamics of intercultural relation between the European settlers of the Australian continent and the inhabitants of the southwestern Pacific islands. On one side, I will take into consideration the relations between the colonial configuration of places of struggle and mutual dependency; on the other side, the dynamics of identity and constructions of otherness. As a transversal axis of analysis, I will focus on how both European descendants and South Pacific Islanders have historically acted on their cultural seascapes and island landscapes to project their respective forms of regional connections in terms of political articulation.

As an embracing framework of discussion, I will refer to contemporary historiographic and anthropological discussions about the history of Melanesian descendants in Queensland’s sugar cane landscapes. Among these referents, I will pay special attention to dominant narratives about the environment as a way of construction of otherness, with a particular focus on places located on maritime landscapes and locations associated to areas of sugar cane processing. On a wider level, I will project my main focus to the configuration of colonial discourses about southwestern Pacific seascapes and their original inhabitants as a form of construction of otherness historically imposed as the hegemonic referent of identity. In the relations between the Australian colonial project and the southwestern Pacific frontier, it is necessary to go beyond disciplinary and epistemological divisions. Since they are a consequence of the intellectual justification of the division between a metropolitan identity and a colonial otherness (Wallerstein 1996), disciplinary boundaries belong to imperial projects, with no solid epistemological sustainance. On the other side, epistemological divisions are the consequences of political arbitrariness that have derived in institutional territories of power (Wallerstein 1999: 11); hence this article follows the world-systems theory’s claim for an “epistemologically unified framework” for the study of the mutually constitutive relations that configure the global order.

In this sense, this writing is based on approaches and statements derived from different intellectual traditions: structuralism, Marxism, poststructuralism, perspectivism, cultural anthropology, decolonial theory, and world-systems analysis. These traditions are not presented in sequential order, but rather in subordination to the statements about the southwestern Pacific frontier.

I suggest that the empirical ground of such research should integrate historical sources generated by the main political agents in the imposition of the colonial system on the southwestern Pacific Islanders. Among others, through testimonies from ships’ logbooks destined to Melanesian workers’ “recruitment,” allow us to identify whether and how these regional practices of connectedness, according to cultural patterns from the southwestern Pacific, were displaced by a logic of separation and islands’ separation. In this sense, it is possible to focus on those narratives
directed to configure a regional epistemological framework for the fragmentation, suppression, and dominant appropriation of these regional connections. These narratives open the analytical gaze to potential associations between the configuration of an idealized Pacific Islands’ maritime environment and the epistemic grounds of Queensland’s sugar cane plantation as itself a social project of ethnic division and work exploitation. As a transversal theoretical discussion, this article takes into consideration contrasts between spatial and ethnic apportionment, based on objectifying notions about nature, as a form to supress intersubjective notions of landscape and supra-local relations.

Colonial Temporality and Unilinear Sense of Time

The intellectual representations of the colonial projects in Australia and the southwestern Pacific are framed by the methodological requirement of focusing on local connections and struggles. Such requirement has marginalized regional approaches that take into account the unifying narratives that define the common ground and the mutually constitutive relations between different spaces of sociopolitical overlapping and contestation. This article suggests that such disconnection between local and regional representations is deeply related to the ideal of unilinear sense of time. In this sense, to approach the global system’s frontiers, it is necessary to contest such a principle as the hegemonic epistemic referent to explain cultural differences. This representation is grounded in Judeo-Christian mythology and is the main form of self-naturalization of colonialism (Fabian 1983; Whitrow 1990). In this narrative framework, dominant subjectivities have imposed a “monoculture of linear time” (Sousa Santos 2011: 30) according to which every historical trend around the globe has the same single objective and pre-determined trajectory, inside which colonized societies, as well as those that resist colonization, either do not have the status of being historical subjects or are empty spheres, without volition and sense. In this sense, there is a set of epistemologically legitimized mythologies of colonialism based on the imagine about the so-called non-Western societies as essentially unable to have their own historical dynamisms, due to the determinations that their bodies exercise on their intellectual processes (Chukwudi Eze 2001).

Inside this mythical and epistemic framework, dominant intellectual agents—under the service of colonial powers—have configured a set of great meta-narratives (see Lyotard 1980) that maintain that there is a linear historical path, from the simple to the complex, which leads every society to follow an irreversible and progressive trend of change (Wallerstein 1996). The contrary of progress is considered “stagnation,” which sets the intellectual referent to promote projects of colonization, from religious missions, through physical repression, to developmental and educational projects (Dussel 2000).

Since the configuration of world-systems’ frontiers is based on a set of intersubjective connections with contrasting and complementary historical directions, colonial histories cannot be considered as unidirectional determinations, but in terms of reciprocally complementary, heterogeneously divergent, discontinuously disjointed, inconsistently unpredictable, and conflictingly antagonistic and paradoxical relations (Quijano 2011). As a constitutive
epistemological configuration with the contestation to unilinear time, the de-naturalization of provincialist approaches to culture as parochial forms of thought of the political orders are perceived as universal (Restrepo 2007). Therefore, instead of stagnant in time and locally circumscribed realities, frontiers are integrated by contrasting yet mutually interrelated histories, with struggling logics of change (Quijano 2011). Global frontiers, such as the southwestern Pacific, show how challenging the unilinear sense of time means provincializing Eurocentric history thought the disclosing of its underlying narratives, which is complementary of the cosmopolitan trend of local contestations. These local dynamics are related to systemic approaches to place, landscape, and seascape, as the empirical referent of connectedness and self-determined logics of change.

**Interethnic Systems, Place, and Regimes of Seascapes**

In approaching the Southwestern Pacific’s historical processes, it is possible to suggest four interweaving theoretical discussions. First, identity constructions can be approached from the category of “interethnic systems” (Cardoso de Oliveira 1968, 1992) according to which identities’ constructions are defined by relations of mutual dependence and opposed interests. This category highlights colonized spaces as places where people with contrasting and changing ethnic adscriptions are connected to one another in the middle of a constant and ubiquitous environment of multi-sited terror and fear. In this social climate, shores are places where people encounter “not only...growth in self-consciousness but also fragmentation, then loss of self-conforming to authority” (Taussig 1986: 7), resulting in ideals about spatial practices based on relationships characterized by a constant threat of violence. In this framework of ethnic divergence, perception and practices in relation to seascapes and coastal landscapes can be approached as a way of constructing identity as a constitutive dimension of otherness (Hall 2000).

Second, the contrast between the colonial and the Indigenous sense of social spaces will be analyzed from the idea of these places as material referents with contrasting notions of the ideal way of life (Bender 1993). Thinking about nature means approaching the ways in which different societies conceptualise the non-human world through inter-subjective constructions (Viveiros de Castro 1992; Descola 1994; Rose 1996; Rival 2002). In this sense, the embeddedness of the landscape to narratives about time, status, and belonging relate to the category of “second nature” (Coronil 1997; Testa 2009), which considers the multidirectional levels of seascapes and coastal landscapes’ representation as different ways of projection of collective selves. This theoretical orientation asks how seascapes and coastal landscapes representation were the embracing geocultural imaginary that defined the colonial construct about southwestern Pacific Islands’ populations. Moreover, the representation of such colonial otherness became hegemonic, widespread between different islands and the continent, at the point that could be an opaque framework (Geertz 1973; Ginzburg 1983) for the construction of subaltern identities in the places of encounter, interaction, and competition in both the southwestern Pacific Islands and Australia. Third, discourses and practices about social spaces connect to different ways of environmental
knowledge as historical constructions connected to places, between social and cultural groups with contrasting and opposed positions of power (Escobar 2000). Relations between environmental knowledge and power can be examined through the analytical category of nature regimes (Escobar 1999), as a discursive formation (Foucault 1968) about landscape (Stewart and Strathern 2003). In these contexts, seascapes are liminal places of perceptive fluidity and otherness construction (McNiven and Brady 2012). Fourth, this a multicultural scenario regarding the world-systems configuration from its “periphery” or frontiers, and through the imbrications of Indigenous and global networks of connection (Wallerstein 1974; Mintz 1986; Hornborg 2005). As a transversal axis of enquiry between the points where these theoretical areas connect and diverge, a sense of place, historical configurations of landscape perception, and the dynamics of identity constructions intersect. Therefore, South Sea Islanders’ connections to place had a contradictory relation to a dominant way of knowledge, coherent with colonial notions of social space and race, universalized through global colonization (Castro-Gómez 2000, 2007; Dussel 2000), and based on a sense of nature as an objective resource according to capitalist principles of commodities (Escobar 1999). In this sense, imposed colonial rules about material expressions of idealized social spaces are grounds for the epistemological status of a particular notion about a civilized way of life, urbanity, and a “civilized” model of personhood (Pagden 1982). Moreover, widespread colonial construction of knowledge sustained hegemony as a “permanently organised consent” (Gramsci 1971: 247), whose theoretical and practical principle “has also epistemological significance” (689). In this framework, narratives of otherness and identity gave legitimacy (Weber 1947) to colonial agencies to impose their senses about humans and non-humans in divergent regions with mutually constitutive discursive practices. In these dynamics, power relations are expressed and at the same time sustained by processes of knowledge construction (Said 1979). In terms of infrastructural grounds, such as seascapes and landscapes, senses about nature are built over a constant existence and as an embodied and changing epistemology (Ingold 1988), inside contradictions between a naturalized dominance and an identity for resistance (Bender 1990).

Inside a colonial creation of nature and its materialization through the configuration of a particular model of a productive landscape, as well as a civilized and controlled social space, ways of knowledge and living created by powerless agencies are able to permeate and create a multiplicity of voices beyond the willingness of dominant groups. Therefore, the imbrication and friction (Cardoso de Oliveira 1968) between powerful and powerless senses of knowledge, body, place, and nature create liminal transitions both in time and in space (Turner 1974). In contrast to landscapes, seascapes are singularly fluid (McNiven and Brady 2012), and places for construction of identity represent windows for approaching marine cosmologies and their ontological and epistemological dimensions (Ingersoll 2016; Plaan 2018; Aramoana Waiti and Awatere 2019). As places of superposition between ideals of humanity and non-humanity, shores are areas of construction of otherness and connectedness between contrasting ontologies (Gosden and Pavlides 1994; McNiven and Feldman 2003; Testa 2009; Kuijt et al. 2010; Walker 2010; Westerdahl 2010; Hill 2011; Reid et al. 2014; Mianowski 2015; Thornton 2017; Doyle 2018). In addition, as horizons of difference they are zones for configuration of narratives, tales, metaphors, and memories that
nourish collective identities (Lowenthal 1975; Radstone 2000; Taussig 2000; McWilliam 2002; Breen and Lane 2004; Mack 2007; Westerdahl 2010; Kearney 2012; Hicks 2016; Thornton 2017), in particular memories related to ancestral places (Clarke and Johnston 2003; Westerdahl 2010; Leger 2016; Thornton 2017), and technologies of navigation (Harris 2014; Asbjørn Jøn 2016). In regions of cultural contrasts, as locations of ontological overlapping, narratives of identity related to the sea represent struggles between global powers and local resistances (Jackson 1995; Radstone 2000; Huang 2016; Manyanga and Chirikure 2017).

In these spatial liminalities featured by tensions and contradictions, frontier epistemologies (Grosfugel 2006; Mignolo 2009) emerge as dynamic and constantly innovative strategies for dealing with the surrounding environment. In this framework, beyond the colonial opposition between body and mind, both dominant and subaltern agencies construct their senses of space, constitutively connected to knowledge’s configurations, inside a dynamic where different subjectivities establish contradictory relations of power according to the position that they occupy. Therefore, legitimacy of knowledge is determined by its place of enunciation (Mignolo 2001) built by a geopolitical consciousness (Said 1990), which in local scales are microcosms (Geertz 1996) of colonial orders with a macro-regional scope. In this sense, inside a interethnic dynamic of power relations, connections between place and knowledge are, at the same time, cultural patrimonies (Bonfil Batalla 1989), or symbolic elements perceived by different groups as exclusive possessions that mark the difference and singularity in relation to others.

**Global Coloniality and Landscape Modification**

In a wider scope, global expansion of colonialism has historically been accompanied by a set of ideals about the ecological modification of regions around America, Africa, Asia, and Oceania as a means to embrace the control and objectification of their inhabitants (Crosby 1993; Pollini 2010). Based on a worldwide matrix of power, European colonizers treated non-European landscapes subject to conquest as “wilderness,” uncultivated and opposed to European conceptions of civilized spaces. Processes of colonialism thus included modifications to landscapes in order to accommodate colonized lands to European ideals of domestication (Heffernan and Sutton 1991; Langton 1998; Sluyter, 2001, 2002; Hauser and Hicks 2007; Wernke 2007; Wagner 2008; Morrison, Della-Sale, and McNaughton 2018). As part of a European colonial conception of landscape, these environments are also resources for subjugation, consumption, and places in which colonized peoples have been objects of extraction and labor exploitation. Within these frameworks, colonial ideals regarding landscape domestication accompanied attempts to create controlled spaces guided by rhetoric about ethnic division (Wilsem 1996). On a global level, such discursive practices of ethnic division and stratification were defined by the notion of “race” as an ideological construction used by settler and metropolitan colonizers to legitimise orders of control and extermination (Chukwudi Eze 2001).

In Australia, colonial projects directed the reproduction of European notions of civilized nature in regions perceived as a pristine and untouched reality (Crosby 1993), with populations
also seen as part of an uncivilized environment without any capacity for modifying their surrounding landscape according to their own notions of nature. This ideal supported the notion of *terra nullius* (Buchan and Heath 2006), which justified the alienation of indigenous territories under the conception of native lands as empty places where colonial agencies could achieve their models of social and functional spaces.

By contrast, some indigenous perceptions of the non-human environment have historically tended to consider cultural landscapes as complex sets of non-human being, and even to be other subjects, with their own volition and consciousness (Ingold 2000; Nadasdy 2007; McNiven 2010). Furthermore, among Indigenous Australians, landscape is referred to as “Country” and, what is perceived as an object from the western point of view, is seen as a set of entities with history and subjectivity (Rose 1996; Suchet 2002; Mark and Turk 2003; McNiven and Feldman 2003; Moreton-Robinson 2003; McNiven 2004; Franklin 2006; Vaarzon-Morel 2010; Lavau 2011; Coombes 2012; Huggan and Tiffin 2015). Moreover, sea and ocean environments have been represented and understood as part of Country, and therefore as places where human behaviour is guided by a sense of rights and responsibilities to Country and beings within it (Rose 1989).

In contrast to indigenous perceptions of landscape, sugarcane environments have been one of the main forms of objectivizing nature and people according to colonial notions of human and nonhuman extraction and capital gain. Sugar was a specific kind of crop because it required huge landscape modifications, supported by a proto-industrial processing system, and connected to global capitalist trading networks (Mintz 1986). Sugarcane landscapes have been associated with colonialism since the beginnings of American colonization (Mintz 1986; Hicks and Kelly 2008) and spread through late colonial experiences, in places such as the South Pacific and the north of Australia (Griggs 2007, 2011).

With such global and regional relevance, sugar cane plantations were more than a mode of production, but an epistemic configuration which founded and fuelled the senses of industrial exploitation and even colonial nationhood. Even more, narratives of power that sustained these orders of human and environmental objectification were sustained by fields of knowledge as an apparatus of authority sustained by a set of emblems and signs (Bourdieu 1979). In each different historical experience and colonial frontier, sugarcane processing required great amounts of human labor. Australia’s sugarcane industry was maintained by European, Aboriginal, and Melanesian labor (Irvine 2004). In the last case, workers were moved to Australia through “blackbirding,” a labor recruitment process that included imposed movements through coercion, kidnapping, and enslavement; and after years of exploitation, some of these people were returned to the Pacific islands (Wawn 1973; Moore 1985, 2001; Cheer and Reeves 2013).

In representations of the sugar cane planters and Queensland’s institutions, colonial agents moved people from the Melanesian Islands. These people became known as “South Sea Islanders,” and their movement to Australia was by both voluntary and non-voluntary means (Connell 2010). In their dealings with Islands’ populations, Europeans exploited their political advantages using
unequal, dishonest, and coercive methods to impose work exploitation and cultural suppression (Docker 1970; Munro 1993; Moore 1997) for both men and women (Jolly 1987). During recruitments, interethnic struggles between different Islanders influenced patterns of both migration and the abduction of people (Corris 1970). Added to relations of potential conflict between colonizers and natives—as well as inside these sets of contrasting cultural groups recruitments coincided with dynamics of movements, intermarriages, and trade between Islanders (Dick 2015). In these frameworks of encounter between Europeans and Islanders, what globalized colonial ideals about otherness and identity circled between the Islands and the mainland? Even more, at what point did these narratives became a hegemonic notion about the relations between place and civility in both the Islands and the Australian sugar cane plantations?

During their stays in Australia, some Islanders maintained connections with their original regions through the sending of money to their families, which conferred a material benefit to their relatives. Even so, in their insertion to colonial and neo-colonial society, they endured the imposition of the categorization of “colored people” or “Kanaka,” as specific names inside the imposed category of “Black,” as a social classification that included Aboriginal people. Some researchers have considered the way in which Islanders have found belonging among a wider category of Nesian peoples, those from the Pacific islands (MacGavin 2014). In one way or another, the Australian colonial system was based on the idea of ethnic and cultural isolation in contrast to societies that, in epistemic terms, were grounded on the notion of networks and connections between different ethnic and cultural groups. On an axiomatic level, such a trend to classify and divide with another level of imposition of a constructed narrative, which became naturalized inside the already established colonial and neo-colonial systems.

In the first half of the twentieth century, the Commonwealth Government of Australia deported most of the Melanesian and other South Pacific workers. Those able to stay created communities where they avoided policies of deportation (Gistitin 1995). In a context of binary divisions between “whites” and “non-whites,” some of them created a new identity through mixing with Aboriginal Australian people and others who migrated to work in the sugarcane industry (Quanchi 1998; Dick 2015; Moore and Gounder 2015). In a socio-political environment of divisions and spatial control, these Islander and mixed communities shaped a sense of cohesion around places associated with working or regular movement (Hayes 2002). Around these areas, religious agents of power established places for religious encounters, such as churches and missions, as a continuation of proselytist activities exercised by protestant missionaries in the Solomon Islands (Moore 2007, 2013). Despite policies of deportation and relocation both outside and inside Australian territory (Shnukal 1992, 2010), by the late twentieth century, South Sea Islanders achieved institutional recognition by the Australian state as a distinct ethnic group with

---

1 The term has been used as a way to describe intercultural encounters according to work exploitation inside capitalist logic of people’s alienation: “We also used the term ‘cultural kidnapping,’ meaning that Europeans were decidedly taking cultural advantage of the Islanders’ desires to obtain new technology, and loosening the bonds and demands of small-scale societies. They became more speedily upwardly mobile in their descent groups when, and if, they returned” (Moore 1997: 199).
their own history and culture (Dick 2015). This Australian South Sea Islanders’ sense of recognition was framed by the same historical period of processes of political decolonization in the Pacific and worldwide. In these new ideals about self-determination, newly decolonized nation-states framed their identities inside the notion of closed ethnic boundaries as a way to gain acknowledgement by global dominant agencies (Nederveen Pieterse 1996; Wimmer 1997; Mukadam 2005; Goldsmith 2012). In sum, ideals of ethnic partitioning were already an accepted self-conceptualization that, although imposed by colonial agencies, became a resource that subaltern groups used to attain recognition within a global context of the concept of localized identities, coherent with the concept of nation-statehood.

In Australia, subaltern ethnic groups constructed these identities inside the institutional framework of the “White Australia” ideology, which was an imagined sense of a pure Europeanness (Price 1966; Bernal 1987; Megarrity 2006), or as one early writer asserted, “the preservation on the Australian Continent of a nationality possessing and maintaining all the institutions, characteristics and attributes of the British race” (Pike 1938: 720, emphasis mine). In this context, non-European populations were generically categorised as “colored” people, which included not only the Islanders, but also Chinese (Tan 2003), Indians (Maclean 2015), and even Italians (Andreoni 2003) as part of those identities not connected to the dominant model of “whiteness.” As a contrast to the colonial ontology, being “colored,” as the condition of being “not European,” induced a “constant source of anxiety for the white settlers” (Wisker 1879: 82). In sum, a category of social distinction based on senses of isolation and closeness was fabricated by the colonial system and imposed over people considered as the opposite of what racist institutions perceived as the ideal person. For these agencies of power, whiteness was the only human state of “normality.”

In a wider global context, between the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, before the Australian experience, former neo-colonial projects of ethnic division and control were based on a specific notion of social space (Haynes 2014) which were accompanied by policies of work exploitation (Shlomowitz 1981; Irvine 2004), body control (Saunders 1976), and a definition of “race through space as a political, historical and social product” (Haynes 2014: 3). These global processes of otherness construction framed a dominant common sense about the notions of what a state is, and how ruling powers recognise the status of humanity inside their boundaries. Throughout the twentieth century to the present, facing these hegemonic narratives, contemporary South Sea Islander communities have sought legal recognition from the state, including their reconnection with their historical places of origin, as well as places of translocation (Dick 2015).

These historical processes reflect an empirical ground to project towards a wider epistemological level. In this sense, beyond a realistic approach to facts immediately approachable, it is necessary to take historical events as ideas to be inserted in a disguised system of representation (Bachelard [1938] 2002). Therefore, inside a colonial representation of race materialised in landscape and social space, questions about how this sense of space and ontological self-contention was naturalized emerge. In particular, in contrast to identities based on the sense of networks between non-European populations, it is necessary to disclose how colonial agencies
imposed the ideal of closed boundaries over a set of populations located in areas related to the sea. Dominant agents built these paradigms about circumscribed selves and otherness inside contexts defined by the objectification of seascapes and island landscapes, the imposition of work exploitation, configuration of categories of racial classification, and naturalization of narratives of whiteness as foundations of Australian nationhood. As a counter-history of resistance, and as the possible opposite of such a naturalized coloniality, spatial intersubjectivity, social connectedness, and openness to mixture seem to be disguised on the other side of these prevailing logics of hierarchization. In this sense, it is necessary to formulate the question: How did colonial ideals about ethnic self-contention became a hegemonic common sense, at a point that has historically become a veiled epistemic ground for subaltern groups to claim recognition by global powers?

In this sense, it is necessary to formulate the question: How did colonial ideals about ethnic self-contention became a hegemonic common sense, at a point that has historically become a veiled epistemic ground for subaltern groups to claim recognition by global powers?

In addition, it is possible to investigate the role of colonial subjectivities in the construction of ideals about these spatial referents in contrast to Islanders, whose counter-discourses suffered the impact of colonial models of a landscape which was ethnically and geometrically homogenous. If social space and landscape was relevant for identity construction, what was the relevance of the colonial discourses of power to attempt to control Islanders’ dynamics of regional connections? Inside these relations to the senses of place, in the overlapping between colonizers and Islanders, what connections to the sea did these colonial agencies create?

For example, narratives about marine environments had a special role in Islanders’ and Aboriginal senses of movement, since this knowledge was used as a resource in exchange with populations from regions as far as Melanesia (McNiven 2010). Contrastingly, as part of a wider project of landscape objectification, what narratives of identity and otherness did colonial agents impose in contexts of encounter with Islanders and their respective senses about seascapes, as a form of non-humanity?

What happens in terms of spatial relations when agencies whose world view has been configured inside a model of spatial statism move between different sets of collectives descended from ideals of islands’ interconnections? Transversally, since the colonial and neo-colonial ruling system are based on a sense of framed divisions, both in spatial and racial terms, contrasts and contestation to this system of divisions is a matter of debate. What happens to identity constructions in relation to places of connectedness when these connections are subjected to human extraction for the imposition of working regimes?

In the Australian colonial projects on the Southwestern Pacific, otherness constructions and seascapes were intimate connected, as the “signifier” (Saussure [1916] 1971), between the empirical reference of patterns of mobility and identity constructions by colonial agencies and islander populations in the southwestern Pacific. These connections between representations of human and non-human subjectivity are approachable through the interpretation of historical material that reflects how colonizers constructed their subjectivities and allows us to identify how they imposed their representations about Islanders and their cultural seascapes. Such constructions are approachable throughout narratives about the contexts of forced mobilisation and racialisation of islands’ peoples, under the conditions of work exploitation.
Logbooks of recruiters’ ships are a potential main documentary source of information for disclosing the mobility of symbols of power between colonial agents and islanders, as well as the construction of otherness by the former. This kind of study should focus on the set of islands historically related to the central-eastern coast of Queensland. This region has been an area of connections between Australia’s colonial systems and to South Sea Islanders’ networks of connection. Indirectly, these kinds of sources open the window to the epistemic grounds of the White Australia policy, which included the imposition of forced institutionalisation in the early and mid-part of the twentieth century, when removals and relocation of Aboriginal children and families created historic discontinuities in terms of self-determined supra-local social and group connections (Rowse 2012). These official controls were constitutive to the social diagramming of the system of separations based on the ideal of “race,” the category of “half caste,” as an ontological condition that had to be monitored (Rowse 2012). These ideologies were discursively rooted on wider geographic scopes as means of imposition of colonial common sense on the connections between different South Sea Islanders’ networks of mobility.

Between continental and island networks there were direct and indirect ties, of which the main axis of meaning was based on colonial narratives about seascapes. In these networks of meaning, different colonizers struggled and competed through time and through varied ways. Such competitions around places of encounter were related to the ways in which Europeans and Islanders’ notions about routes of movement overlapped. This overlap had a particular emphasis in the historical connections between different dynamics of colonizers’ otherness construction, in relation to indigenous environmental knowledges about their coastal social spaces. In these situations, dominant agents alienated Islanders’ coastal settlements by colonial agencies, and consequently the impact on both European and Indigenous dynamics of construction of identities.

In terms of the historical and ethnographic background, previous research on Australian South Sea Islanders, Vanuatu’s dynamics of supralocal connections, and northeastern Australia’s archaeological research about interethnic dynamics around colonial spaces must be taken in consideration. In addition, from pre-colonial to colonial times, research about regional connections between islanders in the southwestern Pacific (Thompson 1971; Luders 1996), provides insights about the regional dynamics beyond the colonial control on relations between different islands.

**Regional Connections and Colonial Enclosure**

Historical, ethnographic, and archaeological material demonstrates that, before and during the arrival of European and Melanesian populations to Australia, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples traded with other diverse groups, including colonists and other groups outside the colony. Therefore, it is possible to ask: is trade an activity in which we might find expressions of identity related to land, seascape, and other spatial practices of encounter? Furthermore, might this trade (and thus identity and its spatial practices) have extended to South Sea Islander peoples newly displaced to Queensland in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century?
In Australia, colonial agents built their narratives about southwestern Pacific Islanders and their surrounding seascape environments from the place of enunciation (Mignolo 2019) of being official subjects inside the imperial hegemony. In this continent, these officers faced and acted in relation to a set of dynamics, of interconnections between different Aboriginal peoples and between them and European descendants. In this sense, to contextualise the socio-political referent of these dominant subjectivities, I will refer to previous research about different ways of interethnic relations in Australia.

**Regional Connections in Mainland and Colonial Agency in Australia**

Along different regions of Australia, colonial experiences of landscape modification and interethnic struggle created the referent of narratives about the southwestern Pacific Islands. In northeastern Australia, historical research has shown that, during colonial times, this region was the framework for a set of colonial projects of environmental modification including cattle ranching (May 1994), sugar cane plantations (Moore 2013), mining (Mate 2014), pearl harvesting (Bolton 1970), whaling (Orams and Forrestell 1995), and dugong and turtle fishing (Daley, Griggs, and Marsh 2008). In addition, ethnographic, archaeological, and historical research suggests that Indigenous connections to regional trade systems existed. In the first instance, ethnographic accounts from the early twentieth century have recorded the celebration of the rituals of regional exchange amongst Moreton Bay’s Indigenous population (McCarthy 1939). Secondly, archaeological research has suggested these connections between different Aboriginal populations have a long temporal background since the Holocene environmental changes, and according to records from settlements on offshore islands, it continued until the post-contact period (Campbell 1979). The continuity of these networks and the role of Indigenous people as providers of knowledge has also been suggested (McNiven 2017). Added to kinship connections, in contexts of imposition of colonial culture, Indigenous people from places other than Australia found their senses of cohesion inside both Christian beliefs and Aboriginal knowledge systems. Thirdly, historical accounts regarding Indigenous regional exchange during colonial times have been illustrated in the north of New South Wales (Bennett 2007) and in the Moreton Bay region (Kerkhove 2013), which were the main locations of political construction of colonial identity due to their relevance for navigations between Australia and the Pacific Islands.

Colonial agents did not experience an absolute success of their policies of special control, but a constant resistance by Indigenous populations. During periods of colonial conflict, these supra-local integrations played a main role in Indigenous peoples’ tactics to contest colonial repression and extermination policies (Trigger 1992). For example, Fraser Island was one location where Indigenous people resisted the colonial rule. However, historical evidence shows that in this region conflict was not the only type of relation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations. Peaceful trading was another form of interethnic contact. Moreover, during peaceful trade, dwellers from Moreton Island provided seafood and forest products to Brisbane inhabitants. In this area, the continuity of a set of Indigenous camps around Brisbane has been illustrated (Kerkhove 2014, 2015, 2016). Furthermore, research has highlighted colonial connections between mainland
populations and Melanesians as well as Kanak people (Mercer 1974). As a demonstration of the political efficiency of Aboriginal social connectedness, relations between their family systems and the Estate have also been analyzed (Babidge 2010). In this way, colonial agents configured their logics about ethnic isolation in correspondence to the imposition of divided and internally pure social spaces. Such logical configuration happened in the middle of a struggling dynamic where subaltern populations constantly tended to connect between each other, as well as to European populations and their institutions.

**Regional Connections in the Southwestern Pacific**

As a geopolitical constitutive dimension of colonial narratives about southwestern Pacific seascapes, research focused on Vanuatu and its surrounds is also relevant in identifying Australian South Sea Islanders’ continuities, ruptures, and innovations inside neo-colonial contexts. In this sense, there have been relevant contributions in the archaeological and ethnographic fields. In a similar way to Aboriginal dynamics of interconnecting, dominant representations about seascapes were framed by a set of resistances and contestations reflected by this body of research.

In archaeology, processes of contact, the development of missions, and their place in the dynamics of regional connections, and the use of museum collections in historical reconstructions have found that the Indigenous agency on the spatial management of missions was a demonstration of how “Christianity in the New Hebrides was adapted according to local habits and preferences” (Flexner and Spring 2015: 202). Furthermore, contemporary connections between Aboriginals and white settlers in Cape York and to places of cultural heritage have been recorded and analyzed, as well as the configuration of new spatial referents for Indigenous and European identity construction in Australian landscapes (Strang 2003). In ethnographic research there have been contributions to the knowledge of socio-political reflection on South Sea Islanders’ ethnic identity processes in Australia, in relation to their de-colonization histories. In this sense, several influences have contributed to ethnographic knowledge about Islanders’ construction of identity. These include the imposition of the privatisation of lands (McDonnell 2016); the building of decolonization consciousness among the Ni-Vanuatu through the historical shaping of ideals about *kastom* in a context where imperial agencies imposed the sense of isolation (Rawlings 1999); and attitudes of new generations of Ni-Vanuatu, towards the sense of nationhood (Clarke, Leach, and Scambary 2013). Other research has contributed to understanding the configuration of memories associated with colonial spaces in Vanuatu, perceived as referents for identity constructions (Rodman 1998); including how a sense of heritage might play a role in the projection of local perspectives towards global representations (Trau 2010).

In matters of contemporary supra-local connections, internal migrations between Tanna and Port Vila, Vanuatu (Lindstrom 2012), and the continuity of migrations to work in Australia (Petrou and Conell 2018) have shown that kinship networks have operated as grounds for the configuration

---

2 This term refers to the historical reconfiguration of the sense of tradition as a referent of construction of identity in Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, and New Guinea (Keesing 1982).
of networks of movement from Vanuatu (Petrou and Conell 2018). Additionally, comparisons between Vanuatu, Maori, and Fijian constructions of identity (Norton 1993) can also be another ground of comparison with the shaping of new identities associated with a sense of place in Australia.

These references do not seek to build an essentialist point of view based on the ideal of a mechanic and static movement of Melanesian culture to Australia. Instead, the various studies provide a background for comparison between parallel responses to colonial, neocolonial, and post-colonial dynamics of connection between identity, place, and landscape at both the local and the regional level. In the same way, the histories of the reconfigurations of Aboriginal regional connections inside Queensland’s landscapes represent another background to compare with Australian South Sea Islanders’ ethnic processes. This is a way to identify points of intersection between two great geo-cultures (Wallerstein 1991) in the South Pacific sub-sector of the world-system. Furthermore, in contrast to these trends to the configuration of subaltern networks and dynamics of resignification of colonial spatial control, colonial agents imposed a sense of ethnic division. This veiled yet divisive narrative was possible because colonizers imposed it from a ubiquitous referent of spatial control, grounded on the political control cultural seascapes.

**Historical Archaeology of Colonial Spaces in Queensland**

Throughout the Australian continent, archaeological research concerned with the imposition of colonial social spaces and the continuity of Indigenous cultural autonomy during colonial times has shown that beyond policies of ethnic closure, subaltern populations maintained their trend to connect with other groups—including Europeans—and to move between different locations. Continuity of colonial and Indigenous cultural universes through their overlapping in missionary settlements has been demonstrated through archaeological research at the Ooldea Soak Mission in the Great Victoria Desert, a location that the current Yalata’s inhabitants still perceive as possessing spiritual centrality (Brockwell et al. 1989). In addition, in Tasmania, at the Wybalenna settlement on Flinders Island, and at the Lutheran mission at Lake Killalpaninna, the influence of Indigenous people on the dynamics of cultural interactions has shown the variability of two different missionary experiences. Firstly, in Wybalenna the interaction between Europeans and Indigenous peoples was characterized by interdependence and cultural hybridisation; secondly, Lake Killalpaninna indigenous resistance was the main characteristic (Birmingham and Wilson 2010). Moreover, in Queensland’s gold mining camps, ethnic differences throughout the landscape outline interethnic hierarchies in material culture, such as the size and locations of buildings and residences as well as the mining land lots (Mate 2014). Furthermore, at Strangways Springs Station in northern South Australia, research has highlighted the involvement of Indigenous populations in the development of a pastoral station (Paterson 2005). Excavations at Cheyne Beach, a whaling station in western Australia, demonstrate how mixed inhabitants followed specific dietary practices, evidencing a preference for sheep rather than accessible native fauna (Gibbs 2005). No less important, at Peel Island’s Lazaret, colonial policies of ethnic and racial segregation have been demonstrated through the contrasts between the different types of
access to infrastructure and resources by Indigenous and European peoples (Prangnell 2002, 2013; Youngberry and Prangnell 2013).

The historical continuity of Indigenous settlements in places beyond colonial control has also been highlighted. These bodies of research also suggest the question of how supra-local narratives of spatial self-contention and ethnic separation reacted against subaltern contestations. Additionally, these contributions give empirical referents about how colonial subjectivities constructed their senses about the ideal society in the middle of a context of contradictions, where their idealized versions about an objectified humanity and non-humanity had to struggle with agencies of resistances. The role of mainland Indigenous people as providers of knowledge in the regional trade systems that have connected them with Torres Strait Islanders was sustained through the analysis of the concentration of ritual places in Pabaju, on Albany Island, and Muri, on Mount Adolphus Island (Greer, McIntyre-Tamwoy, and Henry 2011). Also in the Torres Strait, Manas and Bosun (2010) connect local cosmological systems to the spatial imposition of missions as a way to approach to the history of colonialism in that region. In northern Australia, the analysis of ritual places has suggested that the Indigenous peoples’ connection to seascapes and spiritscapes has been achieved through knowledge about the procuring and maintenance of subsistence species, the control of the main elements of the sea, and the mediation with the non-human world, in particular through mortuary places (McNiven 2004). Along the Noosa River, trading and selling of fish and oysters by Indigenous inhabitants to non-Indigenous settlers was documented during the 1870’s (Thurstan 2015). On the southern Curtis coast, the presence of glass fragments inside shell middens and quarried stone deposits have suggested the continuity of Indigenous settlements in places not recorded by documentary sources but present in oral testimonies during colonial times (Ulm, Eals, and L’Estrange 1999). The prevalence of Aboriginal trading routes following the “Dreaming Paths,” and their uses by explorers during colonial times have been presented (Dale 2010). Interactions between Torres Strait Islanders with Europeans, Japanese, and Pacific Islanders have also been illustrated through excavations at Mabuyang mission (Wright and Ricardi 2015). On Moreton Island, investigations into stone outcrops have shown how these places are perceived by Ngugi people as protected areas with a special role in exchange systems (Ross and Campbell 2003). Among Cape York’s Aboriginal populations (Morrison et al. 2018), Aboriginal networks used the territorial gaps between spaces controlled by Europeans as refuges for those that looked to escape from their control. The configuration of colonial narratives about such relations had dialectical relations between places of encounter in the southwestern Pacific and global narratives about landscape and seascapes.

**Australian South Sea Islanders Identity and History**

Australian South Sea Islanders’ history and contemporary presence have been approached from archaeological, historical, and ethnographic research. In archaeology, evidence about the continuity of Solomon Islands’ ritual practices carried out in mainland Australia have been documented (Barker and Lamb 2011). The ceramic exchange between Islanders and Europeans in
relation to missionary contexts, including its possible impact on the economic and social life of the Solomon Islands have been illustrated (Beck 1999).

In the ethnographic field, contemporary connections, through artistic expression, between Australia and Vanuatu have been highlighted (Dick 2015). And further research has shown how, inside primary schools, South Sea Islander children produce their own sense of ecological knowledge (Cox 2001). Comparative research about the similarities between the nineteenth and twentieth century recruitments, followed by migration of Vanuatu’s workers to Australia and New Zealand, illustrates the structural continuities of labor migration between these historical periods in terms of reproduction of inequalities between the original islands of the workers and host regions like Australia and New Zealand (Connel 2010). In matters of cultural heritage, literary production by students has been promoted and registered (Cox and Webb 1999; Davias 2013). In archaeological heritage, the registration of sites of historical significance as well as their connections to a contemporary sense of the past have been systematised (Hayes 2002). Furthermore, the building of a Pacific common identity, as “Pasifika” or “Nesian” in Australia has been identified (MacGavin 2014).

Historical research has been the main resource utilised to investigate South Sea Islanders’ relations to sugar cane plantations in Australia, through research about the emergence and development of blackbirding in Vanuatu (Cheer and Reeves 2013). Together with this, the initial rise of recruitment, enslavement, and insertion into Australian colonial and neocolonial society have also been documented. This research has documented the impact of Anglican missions between the second half of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century (Moore 2008); the role of missions as places of encounter in Mackay and Bundaberg (Stoetzel 2014); and working conditions inside plantations (Corris 1970; Mercer 1974). Other research has outlined connections between labor policies and theories about environmental determinism (Irvine 2004); how these policies were connected to neo-colonial imaginaries of territorial whitening (Megarrity 2006), and their relations with previous impositions of racial segregations (Haynes 2014). Inside these plans of racial division and subjugation, evidence of misappropriation of wages documents how people were subject to colonial power (Moore 2013), which was likely to have influenced Australian Islanders’ accesses to lands in Australia. Moreover, the historical continuity of their constructions of identity inside White Australia’s policies throughout the twentieth century has been displayed (Mercer and Moore 1978; Fantnowna 1989; Edmund 1992; Gistitin 1995; Mercer 1995). In addition, based on both documentary and oral testimonies in Vanuatu, the history of recruited women for working in Australia and Fiji has been included in the wider discussion about the impacts of colonialism on South Sea societies (Jolly 1987). Beyond this localized set of research, questions about the wider common sense that sustained and were influenced by these dynamics of interethnic relations and struggles emerge. Since these dynamics of interaction and struggle occurred in different places and in a wider historical structure, the question about their grounding common sense emerges. As they were expressed in different locations and different times, was there a pattern of multi-sited and long duration structural reproduction of hierarchical relations between different colonial agencies and different historical expressions of the South Sea
Islanders social groups? Even more, since such spatial-temporal variability was so contextually divergent, what was the wider narrative of subjectivities’ constructions that contextualised these relations? Also, because they had contrasting dynamics, how did local events impact the configuration of such supra-local common sense?

Between the Australian and the Southwestern Pacific colonial projects, there was a common “matrix of power” (Quijano 1996; Mignolo 2007) that sustained such dynamics of interethnic and colonial hierarchization, which is approachable through narratives built by agents of power with common presence in the different places involved in the sugar industry in particular, and in the Australian colonial project in general.

Because the empirical referents of these relations were placed both in the southwestern Pacific Islands and in Australia, seascapes are the historically hidden and neglected referent of configuration and spread of a geocultural imaginary (Wallerstein 1996). In the tense relation between the sugar cane plantations and the islands’ frontier, colonial agencies built such imaginaries as resources of symbolic power (Bourdieu 1979) that sustained a dormant structure in multi-scalar levels (Duin 2009). Such shifting between levels allowed these narratives of power to move from the local spaces to regional interactions between Australia and the northwestern Pacific Islands. In diachronic terms, such narratives had different moments of external actualization (Gaboriau 1969) that disclosed underlying symbolic structures of ethnic and racial hierarchizations, related to ideals about landscapes and seascapes. No less important, to maintain their legitimacy in different localities and in discontinuous historical conjunctures, colonial agencies of power grounded such systems of symbolic and practical orders of verticalization on mythologies of naturalization (Barthes 1957). In these dynamics, ships for workers’ recruitment were the medium for such myths to have historical continuity and geographical spreading along the networks of human extraction for labor exploitation in Queensland.

Historical Records and Multivocality
Among different historical sources, testimonies about navigations of workers’ recruiters between South Pacific Islands and Queensland are a privileged kind of record enabling access to the foundational level of colonial seascapes in these regions. The timeframe from the second half of the nineteenth century to the first two decades of the twentieth century was a particular “structure of conjuncture [as the]…practical realization of the cultural categories in a specific historical context, as expressed in the interested action of the historic agents” (Sahlins 1985: xiv). In this sense, this is a singular period for approaching the historical process of colonial configuration narratives about seascapes, otherness, and ethnic closeness in contrast to South Sea Islanders’ regional connections.

Even when colonial and neocolonial documents are built on a dominant point of view, published and unpublished sources can be windows for approaching underlying Indigenous resistances. Agents of colonial power can spread their signs on subaltern groups at the same time that marginal actions and voices of resistance and contestation permeate dominant discourses, even when authors of documents do not realise it (Turner 1974). Following Ginzburg (1983: 96), critical
viewpoints can access connections between superficial phenomena through the “indiciary paradigm” method, focused on discards, marginal details, and fragmentary strokes to be reunified, in an opaque reality with privileged zones composed of clues that allow its decoding. These connections can be identified in “minor stories” inside which contrasting epistemic habits coexist and struggle beyond the impositions of dominant institutions, in a way that would not be perceptible in “major” history (Stoler 2009). Documentary sources are part of a common macro-regional framework as the spatial referent of analysis. Therefore, focussing on the common narrative patterns about human and non-human otherness, that colonial agencies depicted in these sources, allows to identify the regional expression of a global matrix power.

Geographical delimitation can be established in a multi-scalar level seeking to approach “how identified phenomena relate to each other on different, hierarchical, scales” (Duin 2009: 27). In these hierarchies of representations, narratives and descriptions based on local levels in the places of encounter between blackbirders and Islanders in the southwestern Pacific are the local representation of the wider geographical narrative scale. Such an approach would allow to identify the structural reproduction of these narrative patterns in places like the Queensland’s coastal landscapes and in regions of hierarchical relations in the sugar cane plantations. As a form of delimitation, those places where the workers’ recruiters also acted as agents of vigilance, control, and repression against the South Sea Islanders can be the focus of analytical attention. Statements that colonial agents projected to a wide geographical spectrum lead to approaching the regional level of exteriorisation of the spatial-temporal dormant ideals about southwestern Pacific seascapes and their inhabitants, during the last two decades of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth century.

These narratives are connected to colonial narratives about functionality, aesthetics, and civility of nature in contrast to non-European’s Pacific Islands practices of spatial creation, as counter-discursive strategies both for subverting the colonial order and for guaranteeing their ethnic continuity inside places where their condition of existence was intrinsically neglected. In sum, these narratives were part of the matrix of power that determined the mobile representations about otherness in the geopolitical system of the southwestern Pacific Islands and Queensland, aiming to identify the subjacent mythologies that grounded the inception of the White Australia Policy.

**Conclusion**

In research on interethnic contact in the southwestern Pacific and Australia, it is necessary to identify the role of spaces of encounter between colonial agents and Indigenous populations as sources of narratives of identification for social reproduction, inside the frameworks of images about nation states founded on ideals of ethnic separation. In general terms, such an investigation should be guided by the contrast between the ideals of ethnic and spatial separation on one side, and practices of mixture and movement on the other side. Its epistemological level, the dichotomy of subject/object imposed by colonial systems must be contrasted by different ways of inter-
subjectivity that societies subdued to colonialism have created as a response to processes of globalization and creation of the boundaries of nationhood. In the imposition of identities on South Sea Islanders, social spaces, coastal landscapes, seascapes, and the logics of suppression of non-European regional networks of regional connection, must be addressed from a place of enunciation configured “from the borders of the modern/colonial world system” (Mignolo 2000: 52). This frontier positioning contains the epistemic potential to highlight resistance dynamics as the primary exploratory principle. These counter-hegemonic loci of enunciation, reveal how colonial representations about island seascapes—and their overlap on South Sea Islanders’ processes of identity construction inside the framework of colonial processes of human extraction over these regions—are mutually constitutive to political relations in both the Australian continent and the southwestern Pacific islands. In terms of their connections to spatial representations, such relations had different vectors of subjectivity’s configuration. Talking about a subjectivity does not mean one single construction of the self, but an embracing epistemology about the sense of the subject transversal to different situations of encounter, exchange, competition, negotiation, struggle, conflict, violence, and attempts of reconciliation. Methodologically, such contexts of interaction can be approached according to the different scopes where colonial agencies exercised their power. Primarily, the British colonization of Australia allowed the imposition of coloniality over the southwestern Pacific. The power relations with Aboriginal Australians were the first situation of configuration of the opposition between opened networks and closed spheres, as axiomatic logics of connections between ontology and place.

In a second stage, sugar cane plantations were the places of stabilisation and naturalization of colonial ideals about hierarchization of ethnicities, and the invention of ethnicity itself. Therefore, their contrasts to Pacific regional networks represent the globalized version of what the colonial imaginary represents as the faraway frontier, the empirical referent of a never-ending episteme of frontiers of civilising and objectifying expansionism.

In a third scope, as the kind of places for alternate configuration, places of capitalist exploitation in Australia represented the contexts for hegemonizing ideals about mind, body, and social status, where race was naturalized and its mythologies became basic underlying principles (Gouldner 1971), that passed to the present as grounds of global imaginaries about the selves. Finally, histories of Australian South Sea Islanders are spirals of encounter between these other sets of contradictory configurations of the selves. Their history illustrates the way in which Eurocentric invention of race creates categories of exclusions and how these labels become semiotic places for ontological configuration beyond the suppressive discourses and actions of global coloniality.
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