In Ceri Peach’s recent and final report on social geography for this journal, he returns to a theme that framed his first. That is the contrasting approaches of social geography and cultural geography, particularly with regard to work on race and ethnicity. The contrast he draws is between empirical work on migration and ethnic residential segregation in Britain, other European countries, Canada, the USA and Australia that makes use of census data, and a cultural geography ‘that teaches us that everything is nuanced, plastic and fluid, so that the analysis of census-given ethnic or racialized categories may be represented as static and empiricist’ (Peach, 2002: 252). He reads the critique of superorganic versions of culture to suggest that cultural geographers are uncomfortable with attributing socio-economic differences between ethnically defined groups to ‘cultural’ factors (Peach, 1999: 284). Cultural geographers are presented as both unhappy with essentialist categories and unwilling to use cultural explanations. In contrast, social geographers sensitive to the construction of racial and ethnic categories within and beyond the census, he suggests, do consider cultural differences in explaining the socio-economic position of different ethnic groups. His argument is that a critical and politically effective human geography must make pragmatic use of data based on racial and ethnic categories despite their problematic status. ‘Ethnicity’ and ‘race’, he writes, are dangerous topics to discuss in geography. Use them and you are in danger of denunciation by cultural geographers as an essentialist. Don’t use them and you abandon the debate to the Sun on the one hand or cultural geography’s fragmenting, reflexive self-obsession on the other’ (Peach, 2002: 260).

In this report I decline this challenge to defend cultural geography or to narrowly delimit subdisciplinary differences, especially since doing so can end in parody. Despite their purpose and their usefulness, writing these progress reports constantly throws up both the restrictions of disciplinary and subdisciplinary boundaries and the impossibility of summarizing a boundless body of work except thematically. This problem could be resolved practically by confining the review to work published by
those working in geography departments, or to work published in geography journals. Yet geography journals often feature non-geographers, geographers publish beyond the discipline – itself a positive indication of interdisciplinarity – and geography journals’ fields of interest overlap with so many others. Again, as with ‘race’, this is an issue of boundaries and names for entities, objects and classes of people and things, that both makes communication possible and powerfully naturalizes differences and divisions through those names and categories. It would be ill-conceived to push a parallel between the relatively trivial issue of academic (sub)disciplinarity and the political implications of ethnic and racial categories. Nevertheless, the politics of knowledge production in the university are central to critical versions of multiculturalism (Goldberg, 1994). Racialized (and gendered) power and privilege characterize the historical development of academic disciplinarity in which the authority to define truth and value was allocated and limited via whiteness and masculinity. Racial ideologies and racial privilege have been shaped by specific disciplinary contributions to the construction of racial divisions and racial hierarchies, and the role of specialist disciplinary knowledges in securing authority to classify and naturalize those categories, and are sustained by the continued whiteness of the academy. Laura Pulido (2002b: 42) argues that engagement with race and racism in geography is hampered by the limited number of people of colour within the discipline, limited connections with ethnic studies and by disciplinary fragmentation which has largely confined the study of the issue of race to social and urban studies.

Critically engaging with race and racism thus requires an inter- and multidisciplinary effort. This report therefore does not take up Ceri Peach’s challenge via a narrowly sub-disciplinary defence but responds to his provocation by considering recent work on race and ethnicity across the blurry boundaries between social and cultural geography. It is based on two recent theme issues, one in the Journal of Social and Cultural Geography (2000) and one in The Professional Geographer (2002)3 featuring recent work on race and geography, and other recently published work that reflects what has been described as a ‘renaissance’ of work on race and racism in geography (Peake and Schein, 2000: 133). What emerges in this reading is not the resolution of the problem, which is raised and largely dismissed by Peach as an unhelpfully restricting concern, that work on race can inadvertently give credence to race as natural category. Instead it points to new challenges to find adequate approaches and languages to understand and critically engage with the social, cultural and political construction and consequences of ideas of racial, cultural and embodied difference, when notions of respect for cultural difference can be recruited to reactionary projects and ideas of multiculturalism can be deployed in racist ways in the service of neoliberalism. If Ceri Peach’s critique reflects a wider sense of fatigue with the ‘cultural turn’ in human geography, this report on anti-racist geographies registers the liveliness of cultural (and social) geography.

In their introduction to the Social and Cultural Geography theme issue, Linda Peake and Rich Schein (2000) argue that the ‘renaissance’ of work on race in geography does not mean an abrupt departure from the themes which characterized the work of North American geographers in the 1960s who coupled radical geography’s concern with civil rights and social justice and the new tools of spatial science. The tradition of mapping racialized migration flows, residential segregation, poverty and political participation persists, with scholars seeking to sensitively combine the use of empirical material derived from the a priori categorization of racial groups, with attention to poststruc-
turalist perspectives on the relational and situated construction of ethnic and racial identities (Holloway, 2000). Subdisciplinary isolation and antagonism is challenged by work which, despite the difficulties of doing so, draws on both critical race theory and empirical traditions. Important work on race and urbanism continues (Keith, 2002). At the same time, the confinement of race to urban studies is challenged by the analytical need to address the wider regional and multiscaled processes that shape the lives of racialized urban groups (Woods, 2002: 64).

Much of this work has been informed by anti-essentialist perspectives on race which deconstruct race as a naturalized hierarchy of biologically distinctive human groups while exploring processes of racialization which place individuals and groups within racial categories and have material effects in terms of the unequal distribution of power and wealth. The thematic research domains identified by Audrey Kobayashi and Linda Peake (2000) invite the bridging of perspectives across economic, cultural, urban, social and political geography. These interconnected research areas include the relations between race and law (Gilmore, 2002); racism and immigration policy (Liu, 2000); racism and poverty; and anti-racist policy and activism (Pulido, 2002c). Recent work on race in geography has addressed the relationships between the ideologies of race and historical geographies of imperialism and colonialism (Anderson and Domosh, 2002; Braun, 2002; Domosh, 2002); the racialization and racialized experiences of First Nations people (Morin, 2002; Olund, 2002; Peters, 1998); the psychic relations between race, heterosexuality and white family structures (Nast, 2000); histories of anti-racist thinking (Wilson, 2002); the close relations between race, culture and nationhood evident in contested attempts to commemorate racialized national histories (Leib, 2002); racism online (Keith et al., 1996; 1998); and the construction, negotiation, critique and experience of racialized and gendered identities as people rework racial categories and terms of identity in social practice (Kobayashi and Peake, 1994; Mahtani, 2001; 2002; Ruddick, 1997; Tyner, 2002; Watt, 1998) and in cultural forms (McKittrick, 2000a; 2000b).

As with other disciplines (Moses, 1997), problematic questions of semantics accompany the ‘return’ to race in geography: the meaning of the terms ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’; the implications of the language of ‘ethnic community’ (Alleyne, 2002) and ‘minority’; the collective names under which social groups can politically mobilize and which mask difference (Alexander, 2002); the subdivisions that mark finer distinctions of culture and class within those categories (Zavella, 2000); constraining categorical fixes (Christopher, 2002) and subversive possibilities of new ways of classifying and counting (Ellis, 2000). These are conceptual as well as semantic challenges that cross-cut recent avenues of inquiry and concern: the emergence of studies of whiteness as a racial category, the new racist shift from notions of race to ideas of conflictual cultural difference, and the problem of discourses of multiculturalism shorn of critical attention to inequality. Alastair Bonnett’s (1996; 1997; 2000) challenge to the erasure of whiteness within geographical work on race and the equation of race with ‘exotic’, marginal, minority non-white racialized groups has been enormously influential. The understanding of whiteness as an achieved racial identity has been influenced by labour history in the USA which has traced the ways in which the ascription and achievement of whiteness has been contingent on conflict over wages and possibilities of profit. James Tyner and Donna Houston (2000) take up this materialist perspective in their genealogy of the prohibition of multiracialized sexual relations in the USA, showing
how the punishment of those involved and definitions of the racial identity and legal status of progeny depended upon the material interests of the slave owners who could supplement their slave numbers with the offspring of eliciting relationships and the sexual coercion of female slaves by elite white men. Their use of the term ‘multiracialized’ rather than ‘mixed race’ reflects their understanding of white relationships and identities as also racialized.

This recognition of whiteness as a racial category rather than unmarked norm against which the racial difference of others is judged critically expands the geographies of race. David Delaney has argued for the need to address the subtly but profoundly racialized geographies beyond the ‘central places of what might be called the conventional geographies of race’ – ‘the inner city’, ‘the reservation’ and ‘the border’ (Delaney, 2002: 6). Mark McGuinness (2000) similarly argues for the need to address the racialized geographies of postcolonial Britain beyond the paradigmatic sites of ‘exotic’ urban ethnic diversity. Limiting attention to race to ‘non-white’ spaces is a feature of an unreflective whiteness, that only sees race through the visual markers of ‘non-white’ bodies, thus normalizing both the bodies and spaces of whiteness. Kobayashi and Peake (2000), for example, argue that in the media reaction to teenage school shootings in the ‘normal’ white suburb of Littleton, Colorado, violence and racism were figured as the cultural characteristics of black inner cities, but incomprehensible in ‘normal’ white suburbs (see also Aitken, 2001). Similarly, the public condemnation of incidents of overt racism, in which racism is attributed to a specific group or locality and denied more widely (Pred, 1997; 1998; 2000), especially in dismissive responses to anti-racist activism, suggests that critiques of the racism of specific groups can occur in racist ways by denying the reach and routine nature of racialization and racism. Laura Pulido’s (2000a) work on environmental racism explores the historical processes of suburbanisation and decentralization as means of securing white privilege and as a less conscious but hegemonic form of racism.

This expanded field of inquiry has diverse strands – sometimes contradictory, sometimes compatible – with different political implications. These stands include delineating the unnamed features of hegemonic whiteness, and tracing the different geographies and histories of how whiteness is lived as a social identity. Owen Dwyer and John Paul Jones III (2000) reject a division between whiteness as a conceptual framework and whiteness-in-practice but argue that white epistemology ‘as a particular way of knowing and valuing social life’ is based on an essentialist and non-relational understanding of identity and space as fixed and bounded. Historically and geographically distinctive forms of whiteness, they argue, share this approach to knowing the world (2000: 219). Dwyer and Jones trace the epistemology of whiteness in the USA, yet the danger here is that, in identifying the features of a dominant white epistemology, whiteness is endowed again with the transhistorical, essential, asocial and universal character of unmarked whiteness. When people identified as white are assumed to occupy a kind of undifferentiated white positionality, whiteness become reified as real and natural rather than a cultural category based on the meanings ascribed to skin colour. This is the slippage Bonnett noted in ‘White Studies’ from whiteness being understood as discourse and socially achieved identity to whiteness as ‘a discrete, commonsensically assumed, set of people’ (1996: 151). Robert Wilton’s (2001) account of the progressive as well as reactionary ways in which white European ethnicities were deployed in a NIMBY conflict over the location of ‘special needs’
services, works against an image of monolithic whiteness. Bonnett also warns against the globalization of the historically specific American racial dualism of black and white (1996: 152). Indeed, recent work on race in the USA has challenged the model of black and white racial difference and the conflation of the experiences of diverse people of colour. This work attends to the ways in which different groups are differently racialized in relation to that binary, while interrogating the effects of its historical and cultural centrality in US history. The tension in work on whiteness as a racial category is that it may buttress rather than undermine this binary.

While studies of whiteness insist on the necessity of understanding whiteness as a racialized subjectivity and collective identity, within public culture the charge of racism has led to a shift away from explicit discourses of race to those of cultural difference. Arguments about the cultural making rather than natural status of race has been central to anti-racism. Nevertheless, anti-racist arguments for considering human diversity in terms of anti-essentialist cultural difference can easily be recouped to support ideas of national cultural purity, cultural exclusiveness and natural antagonism between ‘cultures’. The concept of culture has a central place in new racism whose discourses have shifted from the overt claims of racial superiority and biological difference to the idea that ‘fear of strangers’ and tensions between groups are an innate and universal feature of human societies. Anti-immigration attitudes and racist ‘fair but firm’ asylum policy are increasingly entangled with ‘common sense’ notions of citizenship, nationhood, the idea of natural ‘thresholds of tolerance’ and an instinctive fear of ‘others’, and supposedly supported by the findings of evolutionary psychology. Verena Stolcke argues that these discourses are better described as cultural fundamentalism than new racism since they postulate not hierarchical difference based on race but the natural hostility between different cultures that are best kept apart. Rather than overt discourses of racial superiority, racially marked bodies are read as signs of immigrant origin and their unnatural, anomalous place in the nation (1995: 8).

The persistence of racist discourses of national belonging that shape the lives of national subjects and would-be citizens is evident in alarmist responses to immigration and asylum-seekers, in Britain and other places, that eschew overt discussions of race in favour of ideas of cultural heritage and cultural difference (Fincher, 2001; Mains, 2000; Wren, 2001). The difficulty of addressing racism and sexism in undergraduate teaching in contexts of institutional competition for students whose consumer satisfaction is directly tied to staff promotion (Nast, 1999; Nast and Pulido, 2000) is compounded by the ways in which critical material on the relational construction of cultural difference – processes of ‘othering’ for example – can be neutralized by cultural fundamentalist ideas of the inherent enmity between cultural groups as simply ‘human nature’. Even critical attention to the cultural construction of racialized, gendered and national identities can furnish support for culturalist approaches that silence questions of structural inequality and political economy.

Recent research has addressed the different political geographies of apparently progressive approaches to culture, nationhood and ethnicity, as when multiculturalism means the consumerist commodification of ‘exotic’ ethnic cultures while the geographies of segregation and racial privilege remain unchanged (de Oliver, 2001), or when culturalist discourses of identity obscure class-based inequities. The adoption of discourses of cultural difference to naturalize antagonism between racially marked groups and the effects of neoliberal multiculturalism in both delegitimizing the politics
of class and redistributive justice and providing opportunities for more overtly reactionary versions of nationhood to emerge pose considerable challenges for cultural geographers exploring the progressive potential of ideas of hybridity, plurality and multiculturalism. This is a challenge to continue to critique notions of cultural purity and essentialist difference while attending to the political implications and material effects of alternative discourses of multiculturalism and ethnic diversity. It is, as Claire Dwyer and Phil Crang (2002) argue in their work on the entanglement of commerce and culture in the production of ethnicized commodities, to conceptualize the political economy of cultural production in ways which neither simply critique the commodification of ethnic exoticism nor celebrate the multicultural hybridities of commerce. Recent work on discourses of anti-racism, multiculturalism and neoliberalism in Peru and in Britain illustrates the importance of attending to the complex and contradictory connections between class, capital and multiculturalism.

In their research with Peruvian anti-racist educators, Nina Laurie and Alastair Bonnett (2002) address the relationships between international racial equality initiatives, globalization and economic restructuring. The ‘multicultural’, ‘intercultural’ and ‘anti-racist’ education initiatives sponsored by the USA that seek to foster social harmony and mobility in multiracial populations reflect the recent recognition that social equality and social mobility in the ‘South’ facilitate sustainable capitalist development. Yet they argue that the simple conflation of multiculturalism and neoliberalism fails to acknowledge the ambiguous potential that neoliberalism has for creating possibilities for resistance and critique. This ambiguous potential is evident in the ways in which the dominance of North American discourses of racial equality and multiculturalism are eliding indigenous anti-racist traditions, helping to recentre skin colour as the locus of racial discrimination, construct an idea of a homogenous majority despite the complex traditional demarcations of race and ethnicity in Peru, reaffirming the white European as symbol of social progress and delegitimizing ‘state interventions capable of supporting marginalized communities’ (Laurie and Bonnett, 2002: 48). This ambiguity is negotiated by those working within race-equity initiatives, acutely aware of the links between equity education, international capitalism and cultural colonialism. This issue of the ambiguous neoliberal deployment of discourses of multiculturalism and anti-racism resonates with other recent considerations of the cultural and political economies of race, class and nation.

In Britain, liberal multiculturalism that constructs and then condemns a reactionary and racist white English working class performs a complex form of cultural racism. Chris Haylett’s (2001) research on the ways in which welfare reform reconstructs white working-class poor identities in Britain dispels any view that work on identity is limited to a celebration of playful hybridity. She traces the shifting characterization of the white working-class poor in Britain in government policy and British postcolonial multicultural modernity. This shift is from the Conservative strategy in the early 1990s of differentiating the working class into the respectable aspirational working class and an ‘underclass’ racialized by association with the image of the black ghetto ‘underclass’, to the redefinition of the poor white working class as the ‘socially excluded’ and, more pejoratively, as a cultural ‘underclass’ ill fitting the image of new Labour’s Britain but capable of reform and recuperation through welfare packages that seek not to create jobs but to challenge a ‘welfare culture’ in which the attitudes of the poor rather than inequitable economic and social structures create deprivation. The white working class
can be modernized, and must be in order to resolve the tensions of class, race and culture that make them awkward subjects in a modern multicultural Britain. The lack of fit stems from the anomalous position of poor whites in a society structured around racialized forms of privilege and wealth that are justified as the ‘natural order of things’ (see also Lambert, 2001; Winders 2003). It also results from the construction of the poor white working class as a recalcitrant, reactionary social group, symbolized in particular by the image of white working-class masculine criminality, violence, sexism, racism and homophobia, that challenges the image of inclusive, progressive, post-imperial Britain. Yet at the same time, middle-class modernity and multiculturalism are constructed in contrast to the white working class.

The refusal to acknowledge discourses of multiculturalism and modernization as neoliberal and class-positioned depends on the unmarked and normalized privilege of middle-class whiteness, at the same time as ‘a culturally shameful and burdensome whiteness’ (Haylett, 2001: 366) tainted by an imperial history is offloaded by attributing an inappropriate white ethnicity to the poor white working class. Haylett’s work challenges undifferentiated notions of whiteness and the neglect of questions of class in both poststructural attention to forms of collective identity and subjectivity and in government policy in which the rhetoric of inclusion is limited to equality of opportunity, cultural integration and cultural diversity. Yet this does not mean discounting questions of culture. Instead, as she argues, multiculturalism must be accompanied by forms of redistributive justice that address the material and cultural violence of discourses of the cultural poverty of the white working class. This depends ‘on a redistribution or regeneration of ideas about white working-class identities as much as a redistribution of material resources between unequally classed groups’ (2001: 366). Though the neglect of class results from dominance of cultural arguments in political discourse, Haylett’s work points to the continued importance rather than insignificance of issues of cultural representation in arguments about material differences between social groups, and the need for more overtly critical, socialist and anti-racist versions of multiculture.

The developments that I have been reporting on here include the attention to processes of racialization as well as empirical work on more expanded senses of racialized geographies, the delineation of the features of white epistemology, and the differentiation of whiteness across time and space and through class. Other work responds to the challenges posed by the shift from overt discourses of racial hierarchies to a racist cultural fundamentalism that naturalizes anti-immigration attitudes and exclusive, essentialist, bounded and ideally tightly guarded, versions of the nation, and the ways in which culturalist discourses of the causes of poverty and celebrations of cosmopolitan multiculturalism deflect attention from and deny the presence of racism and class-based inequalities. Finally, if one challenge for geography is to deal with the racist use of ideas of culture and cultural rather than the older ideas of biological difference, another is to develop theoretically adequate and politically effective ways of engaging with the body as more than a culturally constructed product of discourse, that is, to challenge cultural racism and reconsider biological embodiment.

The imperative to do so comes from various directions. Recent efforts to consider questions of embodiment and the materiality of the body challenge approaches which only engage with the body in terms of text and representation. Medical geographers, for example, have begun to develop ways of re-engaging with the physicality as well as
cultural coding of the body (Parr, 2002), even if one term suggested for this approach – sociobiological – evokes the difficulties of doing so. Challenging biological essentialism has been central to anti-racism and (at least most versions of) feminism, yet better ways of addressing the biological are needed in order to counter persistent biological determinism. Despite their often maverick status within science, the profoundly racist and sexist arguments made by evolutionary psychologists (sociobiologists newly packaged) and behavioural geneticists that the attributes and social roles of women, men and different ‘races’ are biologically determined are depressingly commonplace in the media. Yet notions of the absolute social construction and fluidity of identity are not sufficiently powerful counter-arguments in the face of ‘commonsense’ understandings of what shapes identity, including biological inheritance. How it is possible to address material embodiment in ways which undermine rather than give credence to biological determinism? There are semantic difficulties here too, since figuring this challenge in this way may seem to presuppose the meaning of the ‘natural’ or ‘biological’ and relocate the body in non-social nature. As Peter Wade (2002) has argued, rather than assume that biology and nature simply imply fixity and stability in either science or everyday practice, effective engagements with these new developments needs to address the ambiguous and contradictory ways in which people understand ideas of nature, nurture, blood, genes, biology and heredity in relation to ideas of race, ethnicity and personal identities. To a large extent, critiques of biological essentialism have not been matched by ethnographies of the ways in which people imagine ancestry and biological inheritance, in terms of the family, ethnicity, race and nation (Nash, 2002b). Research in this area could explore the complexities and implications of these understandings of selfhood and relatedness.

Resources for this conceptual challenge may be found in science too. While the critique of ideas of biologically distinct human groups is a key weapon of anti-racism, biology, at least in the hands of left-wing, anti-racist biologists like Steven Rose (1997), may provide models of understanding that effectively challenge both scientific racism and cultural fundamentalist ideas of natural animosity between cultural groups. The alternative he offers to biological determinism renounces the ineffective distinction between ‘nature’ and ‘nurture’ by understanding all organisms as actively shaping themselves in dynamic relationships with their environments. This move beyond the nature/nurture debate resonates with deconstructive engagements with the dualisms of culture/nature and human/animal in ‘post-humanist’ human geography. In Kay Anderson’s work exploring the racist dimensions of the construction of categories of humanity and animality, culture and nature in colonial biology, and in western epistemologies more broadly (1998; 2000; 2001), she significantly extends the argument about the ways in which the construction of the division between nature and culture, savagery and civilization, located women, children and non-white people as less than human, by arguing that dismantling the division between humans and other animals may offer ways of reformulating whiteness. Dispensing with notions of nature as an external realm of the non-human, she argues, may unsettled white identities dependent on notions of white civility and savage ‘others’ (2002: 29). Though this is a move to unsettle the human/animal divide, the implications of this recognition of an ‘animality within’ in relation to reconceptualizing subjectivity in terms of the dynamism of bodily inheritance, social constraint and agency are not clear. Does ‘animality’ stand for instinct, inheritance and the irreducible and unruly nature of physicality, all that is con-
ventionally deemed non-human and uncivilized? If so, how can ideas of instinct and inheritance be rescued from the grip of racist and sexist biodeterminism? But this is a provocative suggestion.

I end with another provided by juxtaposing Steven Rose’s and Paul Gilroy’s paraphrasing of Marx. In Rose’s case, he does so to conceptualize living organisms, including humans, and in Gilroy’s to conceptualize human identities: ‘Far from being determined, or needing to evoke some non-material concept of free will to help us escape the determinist trap, it is in the nature of living systems to be radically indeterminate, to continually construct their – our – own futures, albeit in circumstances not of our own choosing’ (Rose, 1997: 7); ‘people do make their own identities but not in circumstances of their own choosing and from resources they inherit that will always be incomplete’ (Gilroy, 1997: 341). How can the body be thought of as an inherited resource? What might be the outcome of thinking of human subjectivity post-human/animal, post-culture/nature, post-nature/nurture? How are these outcomes constrained by the racist and sexist fixing of identity through particular readings of bodily difference and hereditarian fundamentalism? What new ways of talking about human diversity and bodily inheritance can foster more effective critiques of ideas of race and biological determinism? How might the naturalization of ideas of inequality through ‘natural’ attributes of race and gender and the naturalization of racism be challenged more incisively by critical anti-essentialist approaches that theorize embodiment in material and materialist ways?

Notes

1. This seems to be a misreading of the debate in that it takes an argument about culture being most usefully conceptualized as symbolic practice rather than as a pre-existing entity to mean that cultural geographers are now unwilling to attend to the questions of culture in relation to the geographies of race and ethnicity. Peach points to statistical errors in population predictions to belittle the efforts of the Runnymede Trust in the Parekh Report on the Future of Multiethnic Britain (2000) to problematize the language of ‘ethnics’, ‘ethnic minorities’ and ‘ethnic groups’ because of their implications of fixity and marginality from a homogeneous ‘majority’ (Peach, 2002: 253). Yet this argument against over-sensitivity to issues of language and representation seems odd considering the way his own work has been used to support the New Right argument that the fortunes of different ethnic groups are a matter of their different ‘cultural dispositions’ (Kundnani, 2000: 3 and footnote 7). Though subdisciplinary claims and counter-claims may be prompted by the nature of these progress reports – Peach’s first was written in reaction to a previous report on social geography – I open with his comments as a welcome stimulus in writing this report and not in the spirit of counter-attack.

2. Though, as I have noted elsewhere, it is still irksome to find cultural geographers presented as wholly uncritical of each other’s work and wholly united in pointless cultural playfulness (Nash, 2002a).

3. These two theme issues come out of a workshop on race and geography at the University of Kentucky in 1998 funded by the National Science Foundation.

4. This desire to escape whiteness, that Bonnett notes within some versions of White Studies, is paralleled by attitudes to Englishness tainted by histories of domination within Britain and in the overseas empire. Yet dumping Englishness in favour of cosmopolitan modernity provides no adequate progressive alternative to the right-wing refiguring of Englishness as an embattled white ethnicity under siege from asylum-seekers, European political encroachment and a liberal elite (Kundnani, 2000).
5. Linda McDowell’s (2002) work on young white working-class men and their investment in respectable domestic masculinity provides a counter-image to that of violent male working-class whiteness in discourses of the ‘underclass’.

6. Similarly, attention to the activism of racialized groups challenging injustice (Pulido 2002c) highlights the ‘active racist practices by local states and local capital’ and undermines the image of impoverished ethnic communities [as] passive and disorganized (Woods, 2002: 66).
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