

© Pamela Trotman

Definition of internalised dominance: The unchallenged assumption of privilege as a right by dominant social/racial/religious groups with behaviours and attitudes which serve to perpetuate and validate that dominance. Applies to all forms of oppressive behaviours most recent example in Australia being opposition to gay marriage.

Dynamics of internalised dominance: active and passive. **Active** is behaviour and attitudes which serve to maintain privilege/power/status. It can range in intensity from maintenance of blockages to people gaining access to similar privileges, recent example in Saudi Arabia: last country in the world where women can gain licence to drive; to extreme political and actual violence: Rohingya in Myanmar. In Australia: 1967 Referendum.

Passive forms can be identified as the unchallenged acceptance of privilege whilst ignoring the reality of forces which serve to restrict, restrain, or negate other people's access to those same social/political benefits and/or status (formal and informal). Australian colonisation which did not recognise in law, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people as humans with same status as white people – hence all the policies which served to keep Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people outside the perimeters of white settlement. Eg Stolen Generations and Terra Nullius. Quote re Rwanda Genocide: *Peter Uvin says that, in trying to understand or explain the Rwandan genocide, it really isn't important to know exactly what the history was between Hutu and Tutsi. The things that actually affect societies are the perceptions which people share. If people have a shared belief that one group is different - not like them - then that group WILL be set apart, regardless of "the facts."*
rwandanstories.org/origins/hutu_and_tutsi.html

Some examples common/community attitudes and behaviours which reflected internalised dominance I have gleaned from my professional and private life.

Attitudes:

1. Only one world view is valid. Common in child protection and the environmental protection verses mining
2. Attributing negative descriptors to other groups, especially when threatened or challenged. Mostly those descriptions diminish directly or indirectly the other's humanity
3. Dismissive of evidence of negative impact of dominance – Black Armband Brigade
4. Reluctance to challenge myths eg Aboriginal people are lazy, dirty, can't hold their liquor – genetically different.
5. Unchallenged assumptions around own socio/economic/political standing especially when that status is not universal.

Behaviours:

1. Active exclusion from decision making/power sharing, enjoying social/political/economic benefits. In extreme forms: slavery, genocide/expulsion/ethnic cleansing.
2. Creating and sustaining barriers to achieving equality – laws, rituals.
3. Actively dismissing or undervaluing skills/knowledge. Aboriginal community workers not afforded same status in child protection as non-Indigenous workers – lower pay and reduced capacity to influence/shape policy/practice. Use of derogatory terms to describe traditional medicines/practices – i.e. witch doctor

4. Limited or no attempt to build and sustain effective relationships with Indigenous colleagues/contemporaries. Focusing on 'otherness' rather than on shared humanity. Otherness is used to justify non-engagement:
5. Attend cultural awareness training programs then assume one has a knowledge of culture and practices. Gives no consideration to cultural differences within the other group eg 'all the same' one size fits all approach.
6. No evidence of willingness or capacity to explore how one's own cultural constructs/socialisation has shaped and continues to shape one's practice or to critique their potential to impede the achievement of anti-oppressive practice despite being philosophically committed to the principles of social justice.

The five fatal flaws to practice: all have references within the AASW Code of Ethics

1. Attempts to 'rescue/save' people rather than applying social work principles such as self-determination, and critical social work theory of 'walking with' clients/ Corollary: blaming people for circumstances.
2. Expressions of resentment/frustration when policies serve to favour Aboriginal people – CF. May miss-out on opportunities for personal advancement because of a particular affirmative action policy.
3. Emotional and social 'trespass' – entering Indigenous spaces without consideration that may be seen as a threat/intrusion.
4. Failure to challenge social/organisational policies/practices which serve to marginalise/discriminate.
5. Dismissive of challenges to practices/attitudes as just 'angry blacks'.

References/examples:

Background to Rwanda Genocide: The Belgians always had considered the Tutsi's more favorable because they thought they were more "white" and were more capable of being rulers than the Hutus. And for the next forty-six years of their rule they provided the Tutsis with more opportunities than the Hutus. Giving them better jobs, education and places in the government. This of course angered the Hutus, and hatred towards the Tutsis began to bubble up. Even when the Rwandans got independents from the Belgians in 1962, the Tutsis remained at the head of government in both Rwanda and Burundi¹.

<https://isabellesgsglobalblog.blogspot.com/2011/05/tutsi>

¹ The Hutus were the larger social/racial group, who mostly were farmers while the Tutsi were landholders/ranchers. Only Tutsi could own cattle, Hutu could lease from them. Cattle were the symbols of wealth and status.