



## Affirming Fissures: Conceptualizing Intersectional 'Ethnic' Feminism in Aotearoa New Zealand

Rachel Simon-Kumar

**To cite this article:** Rachel Simon-Kumar (2023) Affirming Fissures: Conceptualizing Intersectional 'Ethnic' Feminism in Aotearoa New Zealand, *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, 44:4, 454-469, DOI: [10.1080/1554477X.2023.2247927](https://doi.org/10.1080/1554477X.2023.2247927)

**To link to this article:** <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554477X.2023.2247927>



© 2023 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.



Published online: 04 Sep 2023.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 748



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

# Affirming Fissures: Conceptualizing Intersectional ‘Ethnic’ Feminism in Aotearoa New Zealand

Rachel Simon-Kumar 

School of Population Health, Waipapa Taumata Rau/The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

## ABSTRACT

Intersectionality, as scholarship and praxis, has traversed boundaries far beyond its roots in Black American feminism into population groups whose histories of marginalization are vastly different to those envisioned by Kimberlé Crenshaw. In translation, intersectionality can articulate with new clarity the voices of the invisibilized but also reveal fundamental fissures. This article discusses these contradictions in the context of “ethnic” populations in Aotearoa New Zealand. Comprising 17% of the total population, ethnic groups are peoples who come from Asia, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. In this article, I set out to interrogate the viability of an Antipodean ethnic feminism given the distinct backdrop of white-settler colonialism, biculturalism, and multiculturalism extant in contemporary New Zealand. I point to five “fault lines” – around positioning, culture, minoritization, place and the subject – where conceptual clarity will deepen ethnic feminism’s theoretical roots and relevance for NZ’s fastest growing population group.

## KEYWORDS

Ethnic; migrant; Aotearoa New Zealand; feminism; intersectionality

## Introduction

Unlike any other contemporary feminist concept, intersectionality has had a momentous impact on an array of academic disciplines and, cascading out of academe, on art, film, political life, and, indeed, public imagination. Conceptualized in the late 1960s, intersectionality as theory articulated “home-truths” about African-American women’s oppressions (Nash 2011), but since then it has traversed boundaries far beyond its roots in Black feminism. En route, it has been translated, actively reconstituting its fundamental meanings and relationships as it moves across space and time into populations whose histories of marginalization are vastly different than those envisioned by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991), a process that is both empowering and challenging. In this essay, I discuss these contradictions in the context of ‘ethnic’ populations in Aotearoa New Zealand (henceforth, NZ) – formally referring to peoples who have migrated from Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East.<sup>1</sup> As NZ’s third-largest population group, they are constituted in incongruity: as visible minorities, they often share experiences of racialization, yet there are stark heterogeneities in their socio-economic realities. Politically, as relative newcomers, their claims to equal, as much as minority, status are tentative.

‘Ethnic feminism,’ as I pose it here, is an emergent assemblage of grassroots practice, policy interventions, and fledging critical thought that has no formal core of ideas other than its responsiveness to the needs of NZ’s ethnic and migrant women.<sup>2</sup> Set against the backdrop of NZ’s distinctive migration histories, white-settler colonialism, official policies of biculturalism<sup>3</sup> and rapid ethno-

**CONTACT** Rachel Simon-Kumar  [r.simon-kumar@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:r.simon-kumar@auckland.ac.nz)  School of Population Health, Waipapa Taumata Rau/The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

This article has been corrected with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

© 2023 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

cultural diversification and multiculturalism,<sup>4</sup> ethnic feminism offers a lens for novel reflections on intersectionality as it moves spatially and temporally. As a theoretical foundation, intersectionality validates minority and migrant women's complex identities and experiences of oppression, but it can also reinforce ideological fissures among them.

This essay seeks to sharpen the conceptual terrain of ethnic feminism while also revealing some inherent contradictions and gaps about intersectionality. It charts some of the conceptual fault lines that need attention if intersectionality is to be meaningfully employed, as Davis (2008) notes, for a “successful” ethnic feminist theory. I structure my argument into three main sections. I begin by briefly sketching NZ's migration histories and a profile of its ethnic groups. Following this, I summarize key arguments for the movement of intersectionality theory into non-Black intellectual spaces leading into the core of the article, which develops five conceptual critiques for an Antipodean ethnic feminism. Drawing on illustrative examples from my own research as well as topical issues in NZ's gender-ethnicity politics, this essay is fundamentally an attempt to encourage introspective reflection and wider discussion of the possibilities for intersectionality to enrich an ethnic and migrant feminist theory and vice versa.

### Migration histories of ethnic and migrant communities

Māori are acknowledged as the first people to have arrived in NZ circa 1300 CE on *waka* (canoes) possibly from Polynesia. Māori were agro-pastoral people, famed sea-farers and fighters who constructed social, cultural, and faith systems on worldviews that centered on the natural world and ancestral lineages. It would be 300 years before the first Europeans came to NZ shores; early Māori-European relations were marked by co-existence amidst tensions but through the 19th and 20th century, the land and its peoples were usurped as the island-nation was transformed into a colony of the British Empire. The signing of the Treaty of Waitangi (*Te Tiriti o Waitangi*) in 1840 raised expectations that issues of sovereignty, governance, and race relations between the two peoples would be clarified; yet in the decades that followed, Māori experienced significant dispossession of land, loss of culture and languages, increased exposure to disease and death, and forced economic, social, and political marginalization (O'Malley 2019; Radio n.d.; Salmond 1991).

Asian presence – particularly Indian and Chinese – in NZ has been recorded since the 18th century, although they are largely invisible in histories that predominantly recount Māori-European encounters. Records show Indian sailors among the first European ships that docked in NZ (Nachowitz 2015, 2018), while Chinese arrived in the South Island as gold miners a century later. Alongside hardship, overt racism, and isolation (Ip 2013; Leckie 2021), Asians and other racialized minorities were subject to socio-political exclusion by the colonial state. Stereotypical representations drummed up fears of the ‘Hindoo’ or ‘Asiatic/yellow’ peril as NZ embraced “White New Zealand” policy through much of the early 20th century (Elers 2018; Ferguson 2003). Indians were entrapped into visions of British colonization of NZ because they were “just in that state of civilization proper to be made useful” (Salmond 1997, 234–35, cited in Nachowitz 2015).

Immigration Reforms in 1987 radically reset the demographic profile of NZ. Until then, the “mother country,” Britain, was its traditional trading partner and together with Ireland, its source of immigrant labor. In the wake of the UK's membership of the European Economic Community in 1973, NZ recognized the need to realign its economic and geo-political relationships more globally. Diversifying from its traditional migration pathway, the Reforms introduced a merit-based immigration that soon attracted skilled labor, especially from Asia. Within the short span of three decades, there was a rapid increase in migrants, first from Asia followed by Latin America, the Middle East, and more recently from the African continent.

In 1991, the proportion of Asians/ethnic people in the country was recorded as 3.1%, and in 2006, it was 11.6%. Currently, nearly 27% of NZ's population is born overseas and the ethnic population, nearly half of who arrived less than 10 years ago, sits at 20% (Stats NZ 2019, 2020a, 2020b). By 2043, ethnic groups are projected to become the second largest, i.e., just over a quarter of the total

population. A highly skilled population group, they comprise 200 ethnicities and 170 spoken languages; in fact, Hinduism is the third most widely practiced religion in NZ after ‘No Religion’ and ‘Catholicism’ (Ministry of Ethnic Communities n.d.). This group’s median age of 31.3 reflects the typical working age of the majority of migrants. A third of the ethnic population (around 30%) is young, aged 15–29; this youth cohort includes those who arrived as children with their parents (the “1.5 generation”) or born in NZ (“2+ generation”) (Lewycka, Peiris-John and Simon-Kumar 2020). The ethnic population also constitutes a heterogeneous and stratified population group who hold a range of permanent, short-term, and temporary migration residential statuses in the country. This complex demographic diversity is vividly mirrored in the pluralistic configuration of identity politics among this group. Those who arrived prior to this period settled as citizens, whereas for many on temporary visas life have been more precarious (Simon-Kumar 2020). Although there are similarities in their structural experiences as migrants, the aspirations of this stratified group for personal development, collective advancement, and social cohesion could not be more different (Simon-Kumar 2020).

NZ rates highly on the MIPEX (Migrant Integration Policy Index<sup>5</sup>), suggesting relatively good pathways for migrant integration economically, socially, and politically. There is a robust network of community-based associations fostering music, art, theater, religion, food, and culture advancing NZ as an ethno-culturally diverse society. A dedicated minister and Ministry for Ethnic Communities serve the needs of this group while also promoting diversity and social cohesion more generally. In recent years, there has been a prominent shift in the framing of multiculturalism as aligning with responsibilities to indigenous Māori.<sup>6</sup> Official narratives of “diversity as strength” and “the ethnic advantage” are tempered by everyday realities of socio-political exclusion, barriers to advancement, and systemic racism (Malatest International 2021). The killing of 51 Muslims at NZ mosques in 2019 by a white supremacist and anti-Asian violence in the wake of COVID-19 are reminders of their ongoing vulnerabilities.

### Intersectionality and emergent ethnic feminism

Since intersectionality was coined in 1989 in response to the erasure of African-American women’s subjectivity in single-axis anti-discrimination law, there has been considerable debate about its movement across disciplines, groups, and borders. In a suite of articles written a decade ago, Crenshaw and colleagues point out that intersectionality as a theoretical framework is intended to be generative, transcending the specific context of Black women. In that light, they refer to intersectionality as a theory that is “provisional,” a “work-in-progress,” and “incomplete”; the gender-race multiple-axis discrimination is merely “one way” to understand specific structures of power and there is “possibility for agents to move intersectionality to other social contexts and group formations” (Carbado et al. 2013, 304; also, Carbado 2013; Cho, Williams Crenshaw, and McCall 2013; Collins 2015). To mobilize its spatio-temporal movements to explain new forms of power structures, they argue that intersectionality must be conceived as more than a rigid and “contained entity” (Carbado et al. 2013, 304) – rather, it is an “analytical sensibility,” “disposition,” and a “way of thinking,” thus shifting its emphasis to “what intersectionality *does* rather than what it *is*” (Cho, Williams Crenshaw, and McCall 2013, 795; emphasis added). As they note:

What makes an analysis intersectional is not its use of the term “intersectionality,” nor its being situated in a familiar genealogy, nor its drawing on lists of standard citations . . . what makes an analysis intersectional—whatever terms it deploys, whatever its iteration, whatever its field or discipline—is its adoption of an intersectional way of thinking about the problem of sameness and difference and its relation to power. (Cho, Crenshaw, and McCall 2013, 795)

With this malleability, however, comes responsibility. While endorsing these efforts of transdisciplinary knowledge production – and the attendant displacement of its original subject – Crenshaw and colleagues also appeal against its distortion. This would involve, at the least, keeping intersectionality’s

aim of uncovering multiple and complex dimensions of power front and center of any social analysis using rigorous methodological tools. Further, they hope that scholars will work toward mainstreaming and integrating intersectionality so as to transform their own disciplines as well as to continue to build bridges and coalitions into the core theory (or what they call “centrifugal forces”), rather than remain as isolated and radicalized positions within their own fields thereby limiting intersectionality’s potential and also risking the possibilities of enabling disruptive identity politics (or “centripetal forces”) (Cho, Crenshaw, and McCall 2013).

These provisos are pivotal to thinking about NZ ethnic feminism. Historically, ethnic women migrated as partners of male migrants, when permitted entry at all. In the late 20th and early 21st century, occupational shortages in childcare, aged care, nursing and allied health fields meant that ethnic women have migrated in their own right as skilled workers. Like the wider ethnic population, ethnic women are a heterogeneous group stratified across the social, economic, and political spectrum. There are, however, shared exposures to multiple layers of oppression: these include *sexism* from dominant Eurocentric NZ society as well as from their own conservative traditional cultures; *racism* from wider society; systemic *invisibility* in mainstream economic and political systems; *exploitation* from capitalist structures that historically have diminished the labor of women of color; and *selective hypervisibility*, for example, in the context of some religious practices or discussions of sexuality (Simon-Kumar 2009).

The idea of ‘ethnic feminism’ has been constituted against this backdrop. Within some current public and political discourse, ethnic and migrant women are recognized as a marginalized group. In the strongest showing of race/ethnicity-gender advocacy, a suite of legislation and government prohibitions have been actioned as an outcome of grassroots women’s organizing and advocacy. These relate to Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (1996); Minors (Court Consent to Relationships) Legislation Act (2018) against underage marriage; dowry abuse (noted in the Family Violence Act, 2018); and visas for migrant victims of family violence, among others. Women-specific ethnic organizations have existed since post-World War Two to ensure the continuity of language and culture, but by the 1990s, ethnic organizations “led by ethnic women for ethnic women” were addressing concerns of settlement and integration, women’s rights and autonomy, safety, and freedom from violence (Leckie 1993; Simon-Kumar 2019b). Family violence within ethnic communities, particularly, has become a focal galvanizing issue that has led to the establishment of feminism-led community organizing toward reflection and action; *Te Aworerekura*, NZ’s first National Strategy to eliminate Family Violence and Sexual Violence, recognizes the unique contexts of violence in ethnic communities (Ministry of Justice 2021). In 2003, CEDAW’s *Fifth Period Concluding Statement on NZ* makes no more than a passing mention of the discrimination and xenophobia faced by migrant and ethnic women. In its subsequent periodic reports (see CEDAW 2012, 2018, 2022) ethnic minority and migrant women garner special attention as disadvantaged groups facing multiple discriminations: “women with disabilities, *women of ethnic and minority communities*, rural women and *migrant women*, who may be more vulnerable to *multiple forms of discrimination* with respect to education, health, social and political participation and employment” (CEDAW 2012, Clause 35, emphasis added). Forums such as Ethnic Minority Women’s Rights Alliance Aotearoa (EMWRAA), a community-government alliance since 2012, attract political attendance and response at the highest ministerial levels.

Even as grassroots activism, politics, and policy work with and among ethnic women have thrived and gained visibility, feminist theorizing within the particular context of biculturalism-multiculturalism has lagged. In the early decades of Asian migration post-1987, it was common to see feminist scholars adapt and improvise post-colonial feminism to migrant issues in NZ (e.g., Mohanram 1999; Pio 2007; Simon-Kumar 2009). However, as the ethnic “migrant” assumes the subjectivity of a NZ “citizen,” the post-colonial feminist frame has become less tenable. It is not without basis that Gunew (2004, 15) argues the relationship between postcolonialism and multiculturalism to be an “uneasy one.” While the former is a retrospective study of “specific historic legacies,” multiculturalism “deals with the often compromised management of *contemporary*

geopolitical diversity in former imperial centers as well as in their ex-colonies” (Gunew 2004, 15, emphasis added). Multiculturalism, concerned with migrant and refugee transnational flows, is centered on goals such as social cohesion, inclusion and diversity, distinct from those of postcolonialism. such as social cohesion, inclusion, and diversity. Although, arguably, histories of colonization frame the current relationships between migrants and the white settler state, their struggles for identity and belonging go beyond the immediate postcolonial objectives of de-centering Eurocentrism – although both, as Gunew (2004, 29) reminds us, have a “shifting and shifty role to play.” In NZ, these transitions in identity are unsurprisingly reflected in feminist intellectual and literary scholarship. The longer ethnic minorities spend as citizens, the greater the likelihood of distancing from their identities as migrants – and academics are no different in this regard. Further, there is greater imperative to develop a theory that recognizes migrants’ roles as *Tangata Tiriti* or *tauwiwi* (translated as “people of the Treaty”) to refer to all non-indigenous settlers to the land, distinct from the positionalities of post-colonial Third World subjects (see, for example, Terruhn and Cassim 2023). There is also a new generation of young ethnic feminists who no longer identify as being Third World and for whom postcolonial critical frameworks, while a useful heuristic, hold little immediate relevance (e.g., Ng 2017; Golbakhsh 2020).

It is into this theoretical void that intersectionality has breathed new life. There is a rise in feminist writing in NZ that draws on intersectionality as a frame to express ethnic communities’ collective experiences of disadvantage (e.g., Kohli 2015; Nakhid et al. 2015; Soltani 2018; Sumihira 2020). However, the turn to intersectionality has been rapid and there has been insufficient engagement with the deeper conceptual issues that accompany the movement of ideas across contexts. Despite its notable gains in policy, there is, for instance, no overarching narrative of what ethnic and migrant feminism is about or “what it does”; aside from a focus on ethnic women as an identity, it is unclear as to what novel insights and structural analyses ethnic feminism offers. Is ethnic feminism, as Nash (2011) noted, a general theory of identity or specifically of marginalization? What relationship does it hold to “place” – places of origin and place in NZ? In other words, if intersectionality is to be more than another theoretical “buzzword” (Davis 2008) wrapped into an ethnic feminism, its blind spots and creases need scrutiny.

### **Fault lines for a theory**

The growing popularity of intersectionality for explaining the lives of NZ’s ethnic women and as the basis for advocacy on their behalf calls for the critical examination of some of its underlying assertions. In this section, I identify five domains for theoretical critique – related to positioning, culture, minoritization, place, and the subject – drawing on illustrative examples to explore unresolved tensions in ethnic feminist thought, politics, and practice.

### **Positioning and intersectionality theory**

Crenshaw’s definition of intersectionality is inspired by Black feminist ideas of “multiple jeopardy” (King 1988), or the idea that women of color experience amplified discrimination different from that experienced by their male minority or female majority counterparts. Her assertions center fundamentally on the oppression and omissions of multiple identities. She argues that minority women are endowed with multiple, simultaneous – and importantly – historically marginalized identities that compound oppression exponentially, not additively (Crenshaw 1991). To be a black (or ethnic) woman is an entirely new identity independent of being a woman or a black alone, multiplying the impact of simultaneous interlocking systems of discrimination (Collins 1990; King 1988). To invoke multiple jeopardy draws on histories of colonization, patriarchy, and capitalism, and their contemporary manifestations as structural and institutional racism and sexism. Additionally, Crenshaw highlights the omissions in current anti-discriminatory perspectives and practices in recognizing the significance of multiple axes of difference.



NZ ethnic women's claims to historical marginalization are complicated given the recency of their presence in the country and the broad contradictions of their lived realities. There are three prevailing representations of contemporary ethnic populations: first, as a group whose lives are precarious and vulnerable; second, as peoples who enrich NZ's cultural diversity; and third, as outsiders competing with local NZers for its resources, including welfare (Simon-Kumar 2020). These contradictory representations are mirrored in the lives of women as well. In many facets of life, ethnic women are disproportionately impacted and vulnerable to a range of societal structures. At the same time, given particular immigration incentives on which they entered the country, they also contribute skilled labor and are either employed or employable. Although there are variations among them, ethnic and migrant groups tend to be working or middle-class, have the potential to be generally socially mobile and access reasonable standards of living compared to Māori or Pacific communities where substantive, generational inequity is persistent (Friesen 2020). Take ethnic-gender wage comparisons. Although Asian women earn less than European/Pākehā women and men in all ethnic categories, they are by no means the worst paid among women of color; Pacific women consistently are in the lower rungs of earnings (Public Service Commission 2022; Stats NZ 2022). In health development indicators, ethnic populations, regardless of gender, generally benefit from "the healthy migrant effect" in many measures of wellbeing (Mehta 2012) in comparison with Māori or Pacific health outcomes. Ethnic women also experience a doubled-edge effect of having marginal identities. Representations of migrants as hardworking 'model' minorities are both salutary and a caricature. In NZ's mixed member proportional electoral system, ethnic women are sometimes preferred to ethnic men because they 'tick' multiple-diversity boxes (Barker and Coffé 2018).

The contradictions and instability of 'privilege-marginal' positioning constrain an unqualified adoption of multiple jeopardy perspectives, calling for alternative framings of intersectionality. Among the more prominent is Nira Yuval-Davis, who advances a 'situated analysis' approach highlighting complex and contingent societal grids of power that can impact anyone not only racialized women. A situated analysis framing framing, as she argues, "could ultimately avoid the risk of exceptionalism and of reifying and essentializing social boundaries" but also better encompasses complex real-life distributions of social privilege and disadvantage (Yuval-Davis 2015, 93). Similarly, Hancock (2007) suggests that in lieu of an *a priori* determination of race, class, and gender, intersectionality would be better served by "fuzzy logic," allowing for empirical investigation to reveal interactive, mutually constitutive and unpredictable relationalities. McCall (2005), likewise, proposes *intracategorical* (that assumes a fixed, unified intersectional race, gender, class core), *intercategorical* (that uses these categories in a provisional way to explain inequities), and *anticategorical* intersectionality (that deconstructs and eschews fixed categories altogether as "social fictions" focusing instead on the conditions that produce complex groupings and inequalities). Of these three, the latter two offer more promise to better portray ethnic women's realities.

The first theoretical challenge I would like to signal for the development of robust ethnic feminist analyses is the clarification of the specific intersectionality theory applied to a structural analyses of ethnic women's lives. Typically – and dominantly reflected in advocacy claims – ethnic women are positioned as subjects of multiple jeopardy even though it defies their lived experiences (Nash 2011). Situated analyses, intercategorical, or anticategorical perspectives, could more productively re-focus away from the marginalized subject (the who) to that of which aspects of social identity are pertinent to specific moments of marginalization. Multiple jeopardy risks too singular a perspective, while situated analyses open theoretical possibilities for historical and lived complexities. Context-specific analyses of marginalization in this sense could also better reflect contemporary institutional and policy effects, where they have or have not been effective. Further, contingent intersectionality could both stave off competition among minority groups as well as eschew false alliances based on thinly shared experiences of othering. It also calls for a feminist theory that is not deterred by, but instead is productively grounded in, contradiction and nuanced understandings of marginalization. The risk here is that political gains for minority groups typically demand a framing of need, injury, and injustice.

### ***The conceptual clarity around culture and essentialism***

The place of culture and multiculturalism is another unwieldy and contested factor in intersectionality theorizing among NZ's ethnic feminists. Scholarship since the 1990s (e.g., Gutmann 2004; Kymlicka 1995) advocates liberal democracy for multi-ethnic societies as necessarily based on the recognition of ethno-cultural group differences. For ethnic minorities in white-settler societies, cultural distinctiveness is a significant pillar of multicultural claims, where the entitlement to culturally differentiated practices frays in relation to women's rights. Scholars (Okin 1999; Shachar 2000) point out that cultural rights potentially disenfranchise women from access to liberal rights and legitimize the dictates of patriarchy wrapped up as tradition in exercising control over ethnic minority women's decisions around marriage and family, clothing, sexuality, and career. NZ's ethnic feminists both embrace and shun the idea of 'culture'; it is used to lobby for specialized claims to programs and services, but culture is also posed as a primary source of their oppression. The focus on culture highlights the internal practices of the group specifically its gendered ideologies and relations, often overlooking the materiality of ethnic women's lives in relation to broader systems of white-settler societies. Ethnic feminist theory needs a deeper engagement with culture as a political dynamic.

The developments around ethnic domestic and family violence are a case in point. Violence against women was one of – indeed, the singular – issue that NZ ethnic/migrant women first mobilized around in the 1990s. Grassroots anti-violence activism and scholarly analyses of the drivers of migrant women's vulnerability to violence highlighted a complex plethora of structural, post-migration, and cultural factors (see Simon-Kumar 2019a; Simon-Kumar et al. 2017) although the role of culture is differentially highlighted by key actors in these narratives. In official documents, there is a tendency to underplay the role of culture. A 2011 Ministry for Women report on ethnic violence, for instance, presents culture as benign but open to abuse by "some" men: "[t]he most salient [issue] was the way that *some men* used their culture and religion, and their standing in the community, to rationalize their coercive behavior" (Levine and Benkert 2011, 5, emphasis added). There are also attempts to distance the generalized/macro culture from the particular/micro societal values as seen in the 2019 government report which noted that study-participants "were adamant that *culture in itself was not a cause of family violence*, [but] when victims are recent migrants it is *relevant to consider the 'norms and values' of their homeland*" (Immigration New Zealand 2019, 11, emphasis added). Begum and Rahman (2016), similarly, focusing on Muslim communities, distinguish (patriarchal) local traditions and culture from religion, and point to the active distortions by the former leading to misinterpretations of the latter. Somasekhar (2016) harnesses a version of tradition and culture that is static and restrictive among diasporic populations although becoming progressively liberal in countries of origin. Rather than culture per se, it is the anachronistic version adopted by migrants that is the problem. Feminist grassroots activists are more explicit in positioning culture as patriarchal, instrumental to gender biases, and implicated in the socialization of men (and some women) to commit violence (Nair 2017). They also point to structural organization of cultures, particularly collectivism, that normalizes violence by erasing the interests of individual women in favor of the family or community (Shakti International 2019). On the other hand, some feminists favor a more genial and transformative view of culture, focusing on its potential in addressing violence against women (Simon-Kumar et al. 2017).

While a shared understanding in and of itself is not a feminist expectation, the lack of depth of theorization of a core concept impacting women's lives is. Is culture an ally, or is it ethnic minority women's strongest source of oppression? Is culture to be understood as a group definition, a set of practices, and norms/values? Each has different implications for women's lives and rights. There are also contradictions in the way that culture is reflected in feminist praxis and scholarship; at one level, culture is blameworthy for ethnic women's oppressions, yet community activists also advocate for 'culturally sensitive, competent, and appropriate' services. There is a particular representation of culture that rationalizes gender oppression; in most narratives, its more abhorrent practices (e.g., dowry, honor-based violence or forced marriages) are highlighted as rationale for ethnic women's claims of marginalization. These claims are legitimized through the construction of an "essentialized"



ethnic female subject, typically, a recent migrant who is English-language- and social network-deprived as well as financially- and visa-dependent. Also in this frame, culture is constructed as an imported problem in need of re-purposing in NZ. A deep analytical account of culture – as group, boundaries, practices, values – would more clearly address systemic power. It would also recognize that culture is not standalone but profoundly reconstituted in relation to class, religion, and region. A fuller theoretical engagement with culture would feed directly into the relationship of ethnic feminists to the state, on which there is an over-reliance for resources and policy settings. As it stands, there is ambivalence as to the role of the multicultural state, whether it is to arbitrate *against* regressive culture or in stark opposition, if its responsibility is to deliver culture-based services for women. In the context of the UK, multiculturalism in recent decades has seen shifts from secular feminist services to multi-faith feminist provision (Anitha and Dhaliwal 2019; Dhaliwal and Pragna 2012), a move that could be either beneficial or a cause for worry. Given these complexities, an intersectional theory would do well to clarify the connections between culture, feminism and multiculturalism.

### **Clarifying minority among minorities**

A third conceptual clarity for NZ ethnic feminism relates to the understanding and representation as an ethno-cultural minority among other minorities – particularly Māori and Pasifika women – and also prospects for shared struggle against systems of oppression that impact all women of color.

Current scholarship on relationships among minority groups takes one of two routes. The first folds inter-ethnic relations into broader discourses and practices of white/majority racism, in effect, categorizing different minority groups as distinct and unconnected, positioning their political identities solely in relation to their particular experiences of subordination; as Omi and Winant (as quoted in Kim 1999, 105–106) stated, “. . . [n]ative Americans faced genocide, blacks were subjected to racial slavery, Mexicans were invaded and colonized, and Asians faced exclusions.” This framing envisions all ethnicities in relation to a “black-white” binary and inadvertently locates racial groups in a hierarchy in a *competitive model* with minority groups jostling with each other to become the preferred “model minority” (Chou and Feagin 2015; Wong and Halgin 2006). Alternatively, there are efforts to explore relationships among minorities using relational perspectives noting that “colonialism and white supremacy have been relational projects” (Molina, HoSang, and Gutiérrez 2019, 3; see also, Nguyen and Velayutham 2018). At one level, relationality, informed by intersectionality, focuses on developing co-operation and a sense of commonality through complex understandings of shared disadvantage; studies show that greater contact between the two communities, perceived similarities in skin tone, and heightened ethno-political consciousness encourage solidarity and coalition-building among minorities (Kaufmann 2003; Wallsten and Nteta 2017). Other, scholars eschew the idea of “independent, already formed groups” (Rodriguez-Muniz, as cited in Molina, HoSang, and Gutiérrez 2019, 7) and instead explore racialization as constituted through the process of relationships. As Molina, HoSang, and Gutiérrez (2019, 7) note, race is not a defining characteristic of a person; instead, “it is better understood as the space and connections between people” so much so that “ethnoracial boundaries, identities, and political affiliations do not precede, but rather are *the effects* of these relations.”

Feminist scholarship in NZ is still nascent to the possibilities of developing theory on minority-minority relationships and an air of “suspicion and controversy” (Lowe 2015, 496) still hangs over discussions of multiculturalism and biculturalism. Certainly, in the 1990s wave of Asian migration, feminist solidarity among women of color seemed far from practical or feasible. The late arrival of Asian migrants into the country, the latent privilege ascribed to their skilled economic status, and their political ambivalence as outsiders generally led to wariness. Writing in 1996, Mohanram highlights states of skepticism – not sisterhood – between migrants and other feminists of color:

If Mohanty’s concept of a common context of struggle held sway, then we would see the forging of alliances between the various “blacks”- Māori, Asian, Pacific Islander women in Aotearoa/New Zealand. But no such alliances exist. Rather, Asians in particular are perceived as usurpers of that which rightfully belongs to the Māori rather than as kindred victims of the global economy. (Mohanram 1996, 52)

In the new millennium, a new generation of scholars seek to re-frame the Māori-migrant relationships using indigenous principles and values. *Manaakitanga* or the Māori custom of care and respect (Kukutai and Rata 2017) and *whakawhanaungatanga* or relationship-building (Rata and Al-Asaad 2019) underpin meaningful and decolonized ways in which minorities may forge connections. On the face of it, the divergent histories, political claims, systems and structures of tradition and culture, and gender ideologies among minority groups caution against simplistic gestures of shared struggles. However, relational perspectives might offer ethnic feminism possible analytical tools to reassess the effect of contingent histories in the emergence of identities and oppression, its relation to the Treaty (as *Wāhine Tiriti* or Women of the Treaty, perhaps), the contours of feminist alliance building, and the work of decolonization and nationhood more broadly.

### **The issue of moral politics and place**

A fourth issue for consideration in the development of intersectional perspectives in ethnic feminism relates to the effect of place and the attendant shifting of politics and morality that accompanies geographical transitions. What might be a socially just position, claim, or entitlement in one country becomes morally ambiguous and even untenable simply through the act of migration.

An illustrative example here relates to abortion rights and sex selection. Sex selective abortion, arising from son-preference in Asian, particularly Indian and Chinese societies, has been discussed since the 1980s when population-level sex-ratio discrepancies raised concerns about “missing women” (Bongaarts and Guilimoto 2015; Sen 1990). More recently, sex selection practices have been noted among migrants, including second-generation Asian migrants (e.g., Dubuc and Coleman 2007; Wanigaratne et al. 2018) in Canada, the US, UK, Europe and Australia, among others, pointing to ongoing effects of culturally driven gender bias. In recent research on sex selection in NZ, my colleague and I (Simon-Kumar and Paynter et al., 2021) found no signs of population-based sex ratio discrepancies at birth for babies born among ethnic communities in NZ and concluded that sex-selective abortion practices, even if prevalent, are rare.

In 2020, as the NZ government started to debate a change in abortion legislation, sex selection became the foremost concern that framed the pro v. anti-choice debates. Since 1978, New Zealand has had legislation strictly regulating abortion; it was located in the Crimes Act, and termination was allowed only under the strictest conditions and oversight. The move to decriminalize abortion removed it from the Crimes Act into the domain of health where termination, like any other medical condition, would be part of practitioner-client decision-making (see Abortion Legislation Act, 2020).<sup>7</sup> Given the charged debate centered around sex selection, the Act specifically notes that it “opposes the performance of abortions being sought solely because of a preference for the fetus to be of a particular sex” (Abortion Reform Act 2020, S21). Interestingly, Asian practices of sex selection became the fulcrum of the Parliamentary debates on both sides of the argument, for and against, any law change.

Among ethnic women Parliamentarians, there was a fractured view on the reform. Although all ethnic women politicians supported access to abortion generally, some chose to reject the Bill because the issue of sex selection, in their view, was poorly clarified. Positions fell along party lines with left-of-center Labour and Green Party’s ethnic women MPs in Parliament all voting for the Bill and right-of-center National’s ethnic woman MPs against. Those who voted for the Bill did so because it removed “the need to lie to get an abortion that many women have felt over the years,” the “delays that many women have faced in trying to access an abortion,” and because it was “good legislation” (Priyanca Radhakrishanan, Labour Party, voted “for”; Hansards 2020a). Ethnic women politicians who voted against did so because the Bill had not considered that sex selection is a “reality in the world. Yes, sex-selective abortions happen, and in some communities, they happen more than in others” and because the wording of clauses on sex selection in the new Act might create ethnic profiling when ethnic women seek abortion (Parmjeet Parmar, National Party, voted “against”; Hansards 2020b).

The sex selection v. abortion rights debate aptly illustrates the complexity and fissures of intersectional perspectives and the role of geography in constructing a moral feminist politics. In the

geographical location of the global south, feminist politics of empowerment coalesces into a singular politics that privileges the rights of the unborn girl child. In the Asian diaspora, it is more complex. For ethnic feminists, to take a pro-abortion stance resting solely on a woman's liberal right to abortion risks being supportive of anti-girl child practices. Ethnic feminists who lobby for a regulated abortion environment in the interest of the girl-child risk becoming aligned with anti-choice conservatives. As a *via media*, to institute enhanced monitoring of ethnic couples requesting in-vitro diagnostic testing would be acceding to ethnic/racial profiling. The very same issue moved into the geopolitical place of western multi-ethnic nations, reconstitutes meanings and politics in entirely different ways.

The lesson here is that ethnic feminism is not an extension or continuation of global south feminism. To conceptualize the two as similar, albeit enacted in different geographical contexts underestimates the constitutive impact of migration and place. The political allegiances and coalitions in the global south do not readily roll over into a post-migration context; rather, ethnic feminism is new wine and should be encased in new bottles. Yet, the threads of continuity with the "home country" cannot be ignored either. What goes on back home very much impacts gender relations in migrant enclaves. Ethnic feminism must be balanced between these two very different obligations.

### ***The concern with the subject***

Nancy Fraser (2005), feminist philosopher, argues the case for different sets of rules in a "post-Westphalian, post-Keynesian" globalizing world. She posits that the principles of justice within the sovereign boundaries of a liberal democratic state cannot be applied directly into a transnational context. As Fraser (2005, 100) notes, "the idea that state-territoriality can serve as a proxy for social effectivity is no longer plausible." Citizens in a liberal state must be cognizant of wider cross-border inequities and the impacts that their claims for justice have on those who are less able to voice them. Fraser (2005, 97) points out that "the Keynesian-Westphalian frame is a powerful instrument of *injustice*, which gerrymanders political space at the expense of the poor and despised." In re-thinking justice in a post-Westphalian/global world, she points out the need to rework the "underlying grammar" of injustice, specifically, the subject or the 'who' of injustice.

In this regard, she points to two justice frames that are typically applied to questions of global injustice. In the first, the affirmative frame, the liberal state is seen as the legitimate boundary for determining claims for equality and justice. The underlying assumption is "that what makes a given collection of individuals into fellow subjects of justice is their shared residence on the territory of a modern state and/or their shared membership in the political community that corresponds to such a state" (Fraser 2005, 98). The second, transformative frame, recognizes the limitations of the stand-alone state and the inadequacy of its principles of justice as the basis of equity ("the state-territorial principle no longer affords an adequate basis for determining the 'who' of justice in every case"). Fraser notes that typically justice frames are grounded in those who are directly subject (the "all subjected") to or impacted by injustice; instead, in a transnational world, she advocates for a principle of "all affected." The all-affected principle holds that individuals and groups have moral standing as subjects of justice when they are impacted by institutional frameworks that shape their respective life possibilities even when they are not bound by geographical proximity.

Fraser's all-affected principle has particular salience for the development of an ethnic feminism. What responsibilities, if any, do ethnic minority migrant women's claims for justice have in relation to disadvantaged women in their countries of origin, in the global south? In demanding equality and equity, do ethnic women place as comparators other citizens within New Zealand (men and women of all ethnicities) or do they balance their claims in response to potential impacts on minority women globally? What should be the "underlying grammar" of ethnic feminism?

An example where questions of this nature come to the fore relates to recent petitions by the New Zealand Prostitutes Collective (NZPC)<sup>8</sup> to remove Section 19 of the Prostitution Decriminalization Act or PDA (2003). New Zealand became the first country in the world to decriminalize prostitution with the passage of the PDA. The Act, the outcome of considerable organized grassroots activism led

by the NZPC, specifically states that its purpose is to decriminalize prostitution (while not endorsing or morally sanctioning prostitution or its use) and to create a framework that is human rights and public health focused, rather than punitive and criminal in intent. The PDA has sought to give sex workers the same rights and access to welfare, health, and safety conditions as other workers and to regulate businesses that operate in the sector under the same laws and controls as other businesses (Section 3). Section 19 of the Act focuses on immigration implications of the decriminalization of the sex industry. It specifically forbids the granting of an immigration visa in a case where anyone has: (a) provided, or intends to provide, commercial sexual services; or (b) acted, or intends to act, as an operator of a business of prostitution; or (c) invested, or intends to invest, in a business of prostitution (Section 19, Clause 1).

In recent years, the NZPC has been lobbying to have the legislative restriction of Section 19 lifted on the grounds that it enhances vulnerability and the abuse of migrant sex workers. Their case argues that despite the legal constraints, the reality of migrant women's lives are such that there is the practice of sex work among them. The restrictions of Section 19 prohibit them from accessing much-needed healthcare and welfare and, if anything, make them vulnerable to human trafficking (SEXHUM 2021). Furthermore, if they are apprehended while undertaking sex work, migrant women face criminalization and deportation. As the NZPC (2021, 6) petition notes: "There is no good reason to single out sex workers; it is discriminatory and stigmatizing, particularly for people of color who have English as a second language." The NZPC also seeks amendments to the legislation so that there is freer movement across New Zealand borders for the purpose of providing sex work services and without the need for declaring this intent on their visa. The organization, however, does continue to support the provision of the legislation that forbids anyone interested in operating or investing in sex work business in the country (NZPC 2021). NZPC's recommendations echo the CEDAW, which upholds amending Section 19 "with a view to reducing its negative impact on migrant women" (CEDAW 2018, Section 28 (a)). Several NGOs and grassroots organizations approached by NZPC have signed on to these changes, although there is a lack of clarity as to whether they are supporting the welfare of migrant sex workers currently residing within the country or making a case for de-regulating immigration policy to permit sex work.

This issue is grounded in Fraser's definition of rights and claims within and outside the state-territory and is illustrative of how an ethnic feminist perspective contends with 'who' is the main subject of its theorizing. Are the rights extended to migrant women practicing as sex workers in the country justifiable within an ethnic feminist perspective? Should claims of justice extend to the opening of immigration policy to enable the free entry of migrant workers from the global south given conditions of extant inequalities already present there? While the changes to Section 19 provide an example, it is not an isolated one. Similar questions may also be raised around practices of overseas arranged marriage or state coverage of injury that occurred prior to migrant women's arrival in New Zealand. Should the underlying grammar of justice for ethnic feminism be contained within the borders of New Zealand? Should it cover those who are its citizens or residents only? Should it be restricted to concerns here and now, or should ethnic feminism apply a broader spatio-temporal breadth in determining the scope of their struggles? In other words, ethnic feminism necessarily must clarify the subject of its liberatory doctrine.

## Conclusion

Intersectionality has been a *tour de force* since its appearance on the critical theory landscape 30 years ago. It has given voice and visibility to women in the intersections of marginalized multiple social identities, and produced cutting edge analytical and methodological tools to understand deeply masked structures of power. Its rapid translation across disciplines, groups and space has, as yet, been its most triumphant and challenging movement.

This article, conceptualized against the backdrop of Antipodean ethnic minority and migrant women's experiences, is an attempt to challenge the boundaries of ethnic feminism,

and in its wake, to formalize the normative foundations of intersectionality theory as it settles on new ground. The five areas of concerns outlined here, by no means exhaustive, challenge NZ's ethnic feminism to reflect on its foundations as it articulates the conditions of a vastly heterogeneous population. The concerns about positioning of identity, culture, minoritization, place, and subjects of identity point to broader engagement with intersectionality as theory itself and its responsibilities to centrifugal movement, building bridges and coalitions as envisioned by Crenshaw. Is ethnic feminism an expression of what intersectionality 'does' or 'can do'? What analytical sensibilities and dispositions is it generating – and what short, medium and long-term emancipatory goals are in its sights? These questions for introspection, I hope, will deepen its theoretical roots.

Theoretically, ethnic feminism is still very much a work-in-progress beset with self-contradiction. Anchored as it is to public funding, the theory has developed from a praxis that posits ethnicity as a fixed marker of identity. It currently presents as a theory of marginalization, while its putative subjects strain to reconstruct themselves as citizens in more complex ways, not merely as migrants (Ahluwalia 2001). There are possibilities ahead for NZ ethnic feminism – to reconstitute as a generalized theory of identity for a rapidly changing population and in relation to evolving histories and peoples (Molina, HoSang, and Gutiérrez 2019). In this form, it has the potential to offer pluralistic perspectives that would neither spiral into essentialized obsolescence nor be held captive by narrowly defined identity politics (Davis 2008; Nash 2011). It is to this task, then, that NZ ethnic minority feminists must now turn.

## Notes

1. The definition of 'ethnic' used here broadly reflects that used by New Zealand's Ministry of Ethnic Communities (<https://www.ethniccommunities.govt.nz/community-directory/>), although there are some important differences. Unless specifically noted, I do not count Continental Europeans as ethnic for the specific purpose of this article. Further, given its particular evolution, there will be overlaps with the term "migrant" (although all ethnic people are not migrants and vice versa) and the term "Asian" (encompassing East, South, and South-East Asians) which for a long time was NZ's main ethnic group.
2. For the purposes of this article, the focus is on cis-women and heteronormativity, as much of mainstream ethnic and migrant women's needs are expressed within this implied context. The contours of queer/rainbow ethnic feminism equally deserve attention.
3. The term "biculturalism" has historically been used variously in NZ (Hayward 2012). In the 18th century, biculturalism was commonly understood as the relations between two cultures, i.e., Māori and Pākehā/European settlers. By the early 20th century – despite the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi that protected an equal partnership between Māori and Pākehā/Europeans – bicultural relations were progressively erased under assimilationist policies. In the 1970s and 80s, against a backdrop of Māori language renaissance and protests for sovereignty, an official policy of biculturalism was adopted with the aim of reforming the state sector through the institutionalization of *te reo* and Māori cultural traditions and recognition and practical implementation of the Treaty partnership. Many Māori intellectuals found bicultural policies to be restrictive in scope and called instead for broader constitutional reform in a landmark report *Matike Mai* (Hearn et al. 2016) that centers the Treaty as a framework for NZ's multicultural transitions.
4. Multiculturalism has been used in the scholarship variously: (a) descriptively, as the demographic diversity of a society; (b) as a set of aspirational goals of social cohesion and racial equity for such societies and (c) as a state-sponsored intervention aimed at achieving these goals. In this article, my references to multiculturalism are aimed at the latter two descriptions.
5. See <https://www.mipex.eu/new-zealand>.
6. See Multicultural NZ, <https://multiculturalnz.org.nz/>.
7. See <https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2020/0006/latest/LMS237550.html>.
8. See <https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/research-papers/document/00PLSocRP12051/prostitution-law-reform-in-new-zealand>.



## Acknowledgements

This essay was completed during my NZ Fulbright Fellowship (2022-2023) at Georgetown University, Washington DC. I am deeply indebted to Nadia Brown, Priya Kurian, Naomi Simon-Kumar and two anonymous reviewers for constructive feedback on earlier versions of this essay. The views expressed in this article are mine alone.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

## Notes on contributor

*Rachel Simon-Kumar* is Associate Professor, School of Population Health, Waipapa Taumata Rau/The University of Auckland, New Zealand. Her research covers areas in gender, ethnic minority and migrant populations, racism, health and politics.

## ORCID

Rachel Simon-Kumar  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4866-5226>

## References

- Ahluwalia, Pal. 2001. "When Does a Settler Become a Native? Citizenship and Identity in a Settler Society." *Pretexts: Literary & Cultural Studies* 10 (1):63–73. doi:10.1080/713692599.
- Anitha, Sundari, and Sukhwant Dhaliwal. 2019. "South Asian Feminisms in Britain: Traversing Gender, Race, Class and Religion." *Economic and Political Weekly* 54 (17): 37–44.
- Barker, Fiona, and Hilde Coffé. 2018. "Representing Diversity in Mixed Electoral Systems: The Case of New Zealand." *Parliamentary Affairs* 71 (3):603–32. doi:10.1093/pa/gsx073.
- Begum, Fariya, and Anjum Rahman. 2016. Crisis Intervention for Muslim Women Experiencing Sexual Violence or Assault/Good Practice Responding to Sexual Violence - Guidelines for Mainstream Crisis Support Services for Survivors. *TOAH-NNEST*. <http://toahnnestgoodpractice.squarespace.com/crisis-support-services>
- Bongaarts, John, and Christophe Z. Guilmoto. 2015. "How Many More Missing Women? Excess Female Mortality and Prenatal Sex Selection, 1970–2050." *Population and Development Review* 41 (2):241–69. doi:10.1111/j.1728-4457.2015.00046.x.
- Carbado, Devon W. 2013. "Colorblind Intersectionality." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* 38 (4):811–45. doi:10.1086/669666.
- Carbado, Devon W., Kimberlé W. Crenshaw, Vickie M. Mays, and Barbara Tomlinson. 2013. "Intersectionality: Mapping the Movements of a Theory." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 10 (2):303–12. doi:10.1017/S1742058X13000349.
- CEDAW. 2003. Draft Report, Consideration of Reports of States Parties, Twenty-Ninth Session 30 June-18 July 2003, CEDAW/C/2003/II/CRP.3/Add.6/Rev.1
- CEDAW. 2012. *Concluding Observations on the Seventh Country Report (2012)*, Fifty-Second Session, CEDAW/C/NZL/CO/7.
- CEDAW. 2018. *Concluding Observations on the Eighth Periodic Report of New Zealand (2018)*, CEDAW/C/NZL/CO/8.
- CEDAW. 2022. *List of Issues and Questions Prior to the Submission of the Ninth Periodic Report of New Zealand*. CEDAW/C/NZL/QPR/9
- Chou, Rosalind, and Joe Feagin. 2015. *The Myth of the Model Minority Asian Americans Facing Racism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, and Leslie McCall. 2013. "Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Applications, and Praxis." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* 38 (4):785–810. doi:10.1086/669608.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2015. "Intersectionality's Definitional Dilemmas." *Annual Review of Sociology* 41:1–20. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6):1241–99. doi:10.2307/1229039.
- Davis, Kathy. 2008. "Intersectionality as Buzzword: A Sociology of Science Perspective on What Makes a Feminist Theory Successful." *Feminist Theory* 9 (1):67–85. doi:10.1177/1464700108086364.



- Dhaliwal, Sukhwant, and Pragma Patel. 2012. "Feminism in the Shadow of Multi-Faithism: Implications for South Asian Women in the UK." In *New South Asian Feminisms: Paradoxes and Possibilities*, eds. Srila Roy. New York: Zed Books 169–88. [10.5040/9781350221505.ch-008](https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350221505.ch-008)
- Dubuc, Sylvie, and David Coleman. 2007. "An Increase in the Sex Ratio of Births to India-Born Mothers in England and Wales: Evidence for Sex-Selective Abortion." *Population and Development Review* 33 (2):383–400. doi:[10.1111/j.1728-4457.2007.00173.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2007.00173.x).
- Elers, Steve. 2018. "A 'White New Zealand': Anti-Chinese Racist Political Discourse from 1880 to 1920." *China Media Research* 14 (3): 88–98.
- Ferguson, Philip. 2003. *The making of the White New Zealand policy: Nationalism, citizenship and the exclusion of the Chinese, 1880-1920*. Diss. University of Canterbury.
- Fraser, Nancy. 2005. "Re-Framing Justice in a Globalizing World." *Anales de la Cátedra Francisco Suárez* 39: 89–105.
- Friesen, Wardlow. 2020. "Quantifying and Qualifying Inequality Among Migrants." In *Intersections of Inequality, Migration and Diversification*, eds. Rachel Simon-Kumar, Francis Collins, and Wardlow Friesen. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 17–42. doi:[10.1007/978-3-030-19099-6\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-19099-6_2).
- Golbakhsh, Ghazaleh. 2020. *The Girl from Revolution Road*. New Zealand: Allen & Unwin.
- Gunew, Sneja. 2004. *Haunted Nations: The Colonial Dimensions of Multiculturalisms*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Gutmann, Amy. 2004. *Identity in Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2007. "When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm." *Perspectives on Politics* 5 (1):63–79. doi:[10.1017/S1537592707070065](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065).
- Hansards. 2020a. "Abortion Legislation Bill - in Committee - Part 1." NZ Parliament Transcript. [https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansard-debates/rhr/combined/HansDeb\\_20200310\\_20200310\\_20](https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansard-debates/rhr/combined/HansDeb_20200310_20200310_20)
- Hansards. 2020b. "Abortion Legislation Bill — Third Reading." NZ Parliament Transcript. [https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansard-debates/rhr/combined/HansDeb\\_20200318\\_20200318\\_24](https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansard-debates/rhr/combined/HansDeb_20200318_20200318_24)
- Hayward, Janine. 2012. "Biculturalism." *Te Ara – the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, June 20. <https://teara.govt.nz/en/biculturalism>
- Hearn, Jeff, Sofia Strid, Liisa Husu, and Mieke Verloo. 2016. "Interrogating Violence Against Women and State Violence Policy: Gendered Intersectionalities and the Quality of Policy in the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK." *Current Sociology* 64 (4):551–67. doi:[10.1177/0011392116639220](https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392116639220).
- Immigration New Zealand. 2019. "Recent Migrant Victims of Family Violence Project 2019: Final Report." Wellington, New Zealand. <https://www.mbie.govt.nz/dmsdocument/12138-recent-migrant-victims-of-family-violence-project-2019-final-report>
- Kaufmann, Karen M. 2003. "Cracks in the Rainbow: Group Commonality as a Basis for Latino and African-American Political Coalitions." *Political Research Quarterly* 56 (2):199–210. doi:[10.1177/106591290305600208](https://doi.org/10.1177/106591290305600208).
- Kim, Claire Jean. 1999. "The Racial Triangulation of Asian-Americans." *Politics and Society* 27 (1):105–38. doi:[10.1177/0032329299027001005](https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329299027001005).
- King, Deborah K. 1988. "Multiple Jeopardy, Multiple Consciousness: The Context of a Black Feminist Ideology." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* 14 (1):42–72. doi:[10.1086/494491](https://doi.org/10.1086/494491).
- Kohli, Ambika. 2015. "Forced and Underage Marriages in New Zealand: Some Reflections on Public and Private Patriarchy and Intersectionality." *International Journal for Intersectional Feminist Studies* 1: 58–70.
- Kukutai, Tahu, Arama Rata. 2017. From Mainstream to Manaaki: Indigenising Our Approach to Immigration. In *Fair Borders? Migration Policy in the Twenty-First Century*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 26–44. doi:[10.7810/9780947518851\\_2](https://doi.org/10.7810/9780947518851_2).
- Kymlicka, 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship: a Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford:Clarendon Press.
- Leckie, Jacqueline. 1993. "Immigration, Ethnicity and Women's Organisations." *Women Together-A History of Women's Organisations in New Zealand. Ngā Rōpū Wāhine O Te Motu*, ed. Anne Else. Wellington: Daphne Brasell Assoc. Press, 499–512.
- Leckie, Jacqueline. 2021. *Invisible: New Zealand's History of Excluding Kiwi-Indians*. Massey University Press.
- Levine, Marlene, and Nicole Benkert. 2011. "Case Studies of Community Initiatives Addressing Family Violence in Refugee and Migrant Communities: Final Report." In *Ministry of Social Development and Ministry of Women's Affairs*, Wellington, New Zealand. <https://women.govt.nz/library/case-studies-community-initiatives-addressing-family-violence-refugee-and-migrant>
- Lewycka, Sonia, Roshini and Peiris-John, and Rachel and Simon-Kumar. 2020. "Inequality and Adolescent Migrants: Results from Youth 2000 Survey." In *Intersections of Inequality, Migration and Diversification*, eds. Rachel Simon-Kumar, Francis Collins, and Wardlow Friesen. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 109–29. doi:[10.1007/978-3-030-19099-6\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-19099-6_6).
- Lowe, John. 2015. "Multiculturalism and Its Exclusions in New Zealand: The Case for Cosmopolitanism and Indigenous Rights." *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 16 (4):496–512. doi:[10.1080/14649373.2015.1103010](https://doi.org/10.1080/14649373.2015.1103010).
- Malatest International. 2021. *Drivers of Migrant New Zealanders' Experience of Racism*. New Zealand Human Rights Commission. <https://apo.org.au/node/311552>
- Manying, Ip. 2013. "Chinese immigration to Australia and New Zealand: Government policies and race relations." In *Routledge handbook of the Chinese diaspora*, ed. Chee-Beng Tan. Routledge, 156–75.

- McCall, Leslie. 2005. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* 30 (3):1771–800. doi:10.1086/426800.
- Mehta, Suneela. 2012. "Health Needs Assessment of Asian People Living in the Auckland Region." *Northern District Health Board Support Agency*. Auckland, New Zealand.
- Ministry of Ethnic Communities. n.d. Community Directory. <https://www.ethniccommunities.govt.nz/community-directory/>
- Ministry of Justice. 2021. *Te Aworerekura: Strategy and Action Plan*. <https://www.tepunaonui.govt.nz/national-strategy/#download>
- Mohanram, Radhika. 1996. "The Construction of Place: Māori Feminism and Nationalism in Aotearoa/New Zealand." *NWSA Journal* 8 (1): 50–69.
- Mohanram, Radhika. 1999. *Black Body: Women, Colonialism, and Space*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Molina, Natalia, Daniel Martinez HoSang, and Ramón A. Gutiérrez eds. 2019. *Relational Formations of Race: Theory, Method, and Practice*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctvcwp0dz.
- Nachowitz, Todd. 2015. "Earliest Indian Presence in Aotearoa (1769–1809) and Settlement according to the New Zealand Census (1861–2013)." In *Workshop on Indian Migration to the Pacific & Indian Ocean States*. Christchurch, New Zealand: University of Canterbury, April 15. <https://www.wgtn.ac.nz/nziri/documents/nachowitz.pdf>
- Nachowitz, Todd. 2018. "Identity and Invisibility: Early Indian Presence in Aotearoa New Zealand, 1769–1850." In *Indians and the Antipodes: Networks, Boundaries, and Circulation*, eds. Sekhar Bandyopadhyay and Jane Buckingham. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 26–61. doi:10.1093/oso/9780199483624.003.0002.
- Nair, Shila. 2017. "Elephant in The Therapy Room: Counselling experiences of ethnic immigrant women survivors of family violence in Aotearoa, New Zealand." Master's Thesis. University of Auckland.
- Nakhid, Camille, Anna Majavu, Lisa Bowleg, Shelagh Mooney, Irene Ryan, David Mayeda, Menghzu, Fu, Huhana Hickey, Karanina Sumeo, Shakeisha Wilson, et al. 2015. "Intersectionality Revisited: Moving Beyond the Contours of Race, Class, gender' - Notes on an Intersectionality Symposium." *New Zealand Sociology* 30 (4):190–98.
- Nash, Jennifer C. 2011. "'Home truths' on Intersectionality." *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism* 23 (2): 445–70.
- Ng, Emma. 2017. *Old Asian, New Asian*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books. doi:10.7810/9780947518509.
- Nguyen, Tran, and Selvaraj Velayutham. 2018. "Everyday Inter-Ethnic Tensions and Discomfort in a Culturally Diverse Australian Workplace." *Social Identities* 24 (6):779–94. doi:10.1080/13504630.2017.1329655.
- NZPC. 2021. We are Seeking Your Support to Amend Section 19 of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003. *Petition Document*
- Okin, Susan M. 1999. *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. doi:10.1515/9781400840991-002.
- O'Malley, Vincent. 2019. *The New Zealand Wars | Ngā Pakanga O Aotearoa*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
- Pio, Edwina. 2007. "Ethnic Minority Migrant Women Entrepreneurs and the Imperial Imprimatur." *Women in Management Review* 22 (8):631–49. doi:10.1108/09649420710836317.
- Public Service Commission. 2022. Raraunga Ohumahi — Taiutu Workforce Data - Remuneration/Pay. <https://www.publicservice.govt.nz/research-and-data/workforce-data-remunerationpay/>
- Radio NZ. n.d. *The New Zealand Wars Collection*. <https://www.rnz.co.nz/nzwars>
- Rata, Arama, and Faisal Al-Asaad. 2019. "Settlers of Colour: Whakawhanaungatanga as a Māori Approach to Indigenous–Settler of Colour Relationship Building." *New Zealand Population Review* 45: 211–33.
- Salmond, Anne. 1991. *Two Worlds: First Meetings Between Maori and Europeans, 1642-1772*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Salmond, Anne. 1997. *Between worlds: early exchanges between Māori and Europeans 1773-1815*. Auckland: Viking.
- Sen, Amartya. 1990. "More Than 100 Million Women are Missing." *New York Review of Books*, December 20. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1990/12/20/more-than-100-million-women-are-missing/>
- SexHum. 2021. "Sexual Humanitarianism: Understanding Agency and Exploitation in the Global Sex Industry." Policy Report, European Research Council ERC-COG-2015-682451.
- Shachar, Ayelet. 2000. "On Citizenship and Multicultural Vulnerability." *Political Theory* 28 (1):64–89. doi:10.1177/0090591700028001004.
- Shakti International. 2019. "Ethnic Domestic Violence Response Framework and Best Practice Guidelines." Auckland, New Zealand. <https://shaktiinternational.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Shakti-Report-2019-part-3.pdf>
- Simon-Kumar, Rachel. 2009. "The 'Problem' of Asian Women's Sexuality: Public Discourses in Aotearoa/New Zealand." *Culture, Health & Sexuality* 11 (1):1–16. doi:10.1080/13691050802272304.
- Simon-Kumar, Rachel, Priya A. Kurian, Faith Young-Silcock, and Nirmala Narasimhan. 2017. "Mobilising Culture Against Domestic Violence in Migrant and Ethnic Communities: Practitioner Perspectives from Aotearoa/New Zealand." *Health & Social Care in the Community* 25 (4):1387–95. doi:10.1111/hsc.12439.
- Simon-Kumar, Rachel. 2019a. Ethnic Perspectives in Family Violence in Aotearoa New Zealand, ed. Anne Else. Issues paper 15. New Zealand: Family Violence Clearinghouse. <https://nzfvc.org.nz/issues-paper-14-ethnic-perspectives-family-violence-aotearoa-new-zealand>.

- Simon-Kumar, Rachel. 2019b. "Immigration, Ethnicity and Women's Organisations." In *Women Together: A History of Women's Organisations in New Zealand/Ngā Rōpū Wāhine o te Motu*. Ministry for Culture and Heritage.
- Simon-Kumar, Rachel. 2020. "Justifying Inequalities." In *Intersections of Inequality, Migration and Diversification*, eds. Rachel Simon-Kumar, Francis Collins and Wardlow Friesen. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 43–64. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-19099-6\_3.
- Simon-Kumar, Rachel, Francis Collins, and Wardlow Friesen, eds. 2020. *Intersections of Inequality, Migration and Diversification*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Simon-Kumar, Rachel, Janine Paynter, Annie Chiang, and Nimisha Chabba. 2021. "Sex Ratios and 'Missing women' Among Asian Minority and Migrant Populations in Aotearoa/New Zealand: A Retrospective Cohort Analysis." *BMJ Open* 11 (11):e052343. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-052343.
- Soltani, Anoosh. 2018. "Muslim women's embodied geographies in Hamilton, Aotearoa New Zealand: An intersectional approach." Diss. University of Waikato.
- Somasekhar, Sripriya. 2016. "'What will people think?' Indian Women and Domestic Violence in Aotearoa/New Zealand." Diss. University of Waikato.
- Stats NZ. 2019. "New Zealand's Population Reflects Growing Diversity." <https://www.stats.govt.nz/news/new-zealands-population-reflects-growing-diversity>
- Stats NZ. 2020a. "2018 Census Totals by Topic – National Highlights (Updated)." <https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/2018-census-totals-by-topic-national-highlights-updated/>
- Stats NZ. 2020b. "Ethnic Group Summaries Reveal New Zealand's Multicultural Make-Up." <https://www.stats.govt.nz/news/ethnic-group-summaries-reveal-new-zealands-multicultural-make-up/>
- Stats NZ. 2022. "Gender and Ethnic Pay Gaps: Stats NZ's Action Plan 2022/23." Accessed 25 January 2023. <https://www.stats.govt.nz/corporate/gender-and-ethnic-pay-gaps-stats-nzs-action-plan-2022/>.
- Sumihira, Ai. 2020. "Intersectionality and Sisterhood in the Time of Covid-19." *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work* 32 (2):49–54. doi:10.11157/anzswj-vol32iss2id743.
- Terruhn, Jessica, and Shemana Cassim, eds. 2023. *Transforming the Politics of Mobility and Migration in Aotearoa New Zealand*. New York: Anthem Press.
- Wallsten, Kevin, and Tatishe M. Nteta. 2017. "Race, Partisanship, and Perceptions of Inter-Minority Commonality." *Politics, Groups & Identities* 5 (2):298–320. doi:10.1080/21565503.2016.1164065.
- Wanigaratne, Susitha, Pamela Uppal, Manvir Bhangoo, Alia Januwalla, Deepa Singal, and Marcelo L. Urquia. 2018. "Sex Ratios at Birth Among Second-Generation Mothers of South Asian Ethnicity in Ontario, Canada: A Retrospective Population- Based Cohort Study." *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 72 (11):1044–51. doi:10.1136/jech-2018-210622.
- Wong, Frieda, and Richard Halgin. 2006. "The 'Model Minority': Bane or Blessing for Asian Americans?" *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development* 34 (1):38–49. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.2006.tb00025.x.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2015. "Situated Intersectionality and Social Inequality." *Raisons politiques* 58 (2):91–100. doi:10.3917/rai.058.0091.