The Invasion Day 2018 rally saw the largest crowd of supporters for Aboriginal rights and justice in decades converge on the centre of Narrm (Melbourne). The protest was organised by a small group of proud and inspiring Indigenous women from the Warriors of the Aboriginal Resistance collective (WAR). Despite the real threats of interference or assault from racist, ultra-right-wing groups or Victoria’s militarised police force, which have marred recent pre-refugee actions, the direction of the women of WAR ensured that over 60,000 people could safely listen to a series of passionate and provocative speeches made predominantly by Aboriginal women. Respect must be paid to Tarneen Onus-Williams, Meriki Onus, Arika Waulu, Celeste Liddle, Gwenda Stanley, Jenny Munroe, Aretha Brown, Ruby Kulla Kulla, and all Aboriginal women who expressed their justified anger at the ongoing killing and imprisonment of their relatives and community, profound outrage at the ongoing removal of Indigenous children from their families, and grief for capitalist and colonial destruction of country.

Upturning the colonial symbolism that celebrates the landing of Cook, WAR marked the 80th anniversary of the first Day of Mourning protest by embodying the pain, grief and anger of a funeral parade. In 1938 William Cooper and the Sydney-based Aborigines Progressive Association led the first nationally coordinated Indigenous civil rights protests to decry their discriminatory treatment. The Aboriginal community continues Cooper’s legacy, calling on their supporters to honour their ancestors; whose lands were stolen, who were killed in frontier wars and massacres, on reserves, in custody, and who were taken from their parents. Prior to the first speeches, hundreds of bouquets of flowers were laid on the steps of Victorian Parliament House. Tony Birch pointed out that it was within this Parliament that colonial legislators debated and enacted the earliest genocidal policies, which sought to classify Aborigines out of existence. Colonial authorities, let alone the Melbourne public, could scarcely have imagined that the local Aboriginal people would not only survive genocide, but would be leading a powerful national movement 183 years after their initial dispossession. Woiwurrung and Boonwurrung sovereignty, culture, and leadership were at the forefront of Invasion Day. The march was cleansed by a smoking ceremony presided over by Wurundjeri Elder Uncle Bill Nicholson and led by a traditional dance group of young Koori women and girls. Aboriginal survival and the importance of family was clear as multiple generations walked together; children holding the hands of Elders and their great-great-grandparents, whose own parents and grandparents may have marched down the same streets in 1938. Men painted for ceremony and mourning marched in funeral procession, weighed down by chains around their necks, carrying a large cardboard coffin inscribed with ‘Colonisation’.
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Following the lead of WAR and the Aboriginal community was a sea of red, yellow, and black. Many different groups demonstrated in solidarity. African migrants, Refugee collectives, Muslim groups, queer and non-binary folk; all identities and ethnicities marked by colonial oppression, violence, and routine targeting by the media/state marched with banners supporting Aboriginal justice. Unionists lent substantial support equipment to the march, while certain Socialist groups were happy to disregard WAR’s annual requests to opportunistically (in true capitalist fashion) sell their newspapers and merchandise. Thousands of white-settler supporters from all backgrounds marched.

In Melbourne and in other cities standing on Aboriginal land, the steadily growing number of attendees to Invasion Day rallies — both Indigenous and settler — is clear evidence that more people are rethinking their relationship to Australia Day, and by extension their position within ongoing colonization. Can the movements by several local councils, a popular national radio station, and some white celebrities to not recognise the symbolism attached to the day of Cook’s invasion be taken as indication of a maturing Australian identity? Despite the growing popularity of the #ChangetheDate movement and corporate media misrepresentation, WAR called on the Aboriginal community and their non-Indigenous supporters to Abolish Australia Day entirely. The heavy organisational, emotional, and educational burden on WAR and the speakers must be acknowledged, before, during, and after Invasion Day. It was undeniably energising to be part of Invasion Day in Narrm, as speakers told us we were part of history and speaking truth to power. Invasion Day is a vitally important annual event where the public — devoted ‘allies’, first-time attendees, members of the Police, tourists and passers-by — are exposed to powerful and direct articulations of Aboriginal sovereignty, Black power, anger and pain. Invasion Day powerfully confronts settler history and ideals of decolonization. Significantly, the Invasion Day march absolutely dwarfed the official Australia Day parade.

Yet, in many ways the debate around symbolism does little to further the aims of decolonization. Rather than returning power and self-determination to Aboriginal people, First Nations ‘leaders’ and thinkers are forced to spend a month of their year arguing about a change that would not translate into enhanced rights. The debate over Invasion Day can also test the limits of potential or self-professed allies to the Aboriginal struggle. What proportion of Invasion Day attendees took to social media to stand in solidarity with the Aboriginal organisers who were abused by racist, misogynist and body-shaming trolls? How might young white people react if they had to sacrifice an entire public holiday, not just their morning? Would the same young people, or indeed progressive institutions, contribute some of their income to Pay the Rent? How can the left-leaning politics of voters and protesters in urban hubs of Melbourne, Sydney and Hobart reconcile with the racial inequalities and violence in remote and regional Australia? And how can Australia have any chance of being legitimised through a sovereign treaty when the premiers of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia refuse to consider changing the date?

Finally, what is the role of educational and academic institutions at this moment? Gary Foley challenged Invasion Day attendees to educate themselves on the history of the Aboriginal political movement and struggle, to learn what happened to First Nations peoples in the areas where they live. Intellectual institutions can and do have an impact in furthering debate and fostering maturity in relation to national identity. But this cannot occur without direct, dedicated, and respectful engagement with the marginalised groups whose identities and wellbeing are becoming increasingly precarious. If public sentiment in relation to the ‘fair go’, ‘mateship’, and colonization is undergoing a moment of rethinking, the challenge will be to ensure that it moves beyond symbolic politics of recognition.

Decolonization demands that states surrender substantive power to First Nations peoples. Initial treaty discussions are underway in Victoria and South Australia, offering a real possibility of new relationships between Aboriginal peoples and the state. If we are to see a treaty substantively address issues of injustice, power, and inequality, we need to listen to Aboriginal people, especially women, and have the courage to honestly confront the long-standing abuses that bear directly upon the lives of Aboriginal people. Once we do, the conflicts around January 26 will be shown for what they are, namely, narrowly framed debates that act as distractions from deep historical legacies and ongoing processes of dispossession and disempowerment that need to be collectively owned.

Massimo Amerena
Contributors to public debate about Australia’s asylum seeker policies regularly deploy representations of the past to justify or condemn present-day policies. Refugee advocates might talk about the Fraser government’s “exemplary” response to boat people or trace the origins of Operation Sovereign Borders to the Immigration Restriction Act 1901. The government, on the other hand, often tries to contextualise the detention of asylum seekers by invoking Australia’s “proud” humanitarian record. Historians are called upon to critically examine the use of history in public debate. They are also expected to provide contestants with useable histories (proving or disproving, for example, that Malcolm Fraser managed to convince the Australian public that Indochinese asylum seekers arriving by boat did not pose a threat). In my talk, I will sketch the outlines of a historical practice that is not reactive and does not take the present as its point of departure, and argue for histories that are relevant without being useful.

Klaus Neumann has written about cultures and pasts in the Pacific Islands, New Zealand, Australia and Europe. He is the author of six books, including three about Australian responses to asylum seekers, refugees and other non-citizens: Refuge Australia, winner of the 2004 Human Rights Award for non-fiction; In the Interest of National Security, winner of a 2007 NSW Premier’s History Award; and Across the Seas, winner of the 2016 CHASS Australia Prize. He is about to start a new project about local responses to refugees in Germany. He is professor of history at Deakin University.

**The making, unmaking and remaking of difference: Shifting ideas of difference in theories of settler-Indigenous relations**

**WEDNESDAY 11 APRIL, 7.30 PM**

‘Difference’ conjures diverse meanings in contemporary discourses, and no less so in discourses on relations between settlers and Indigenous peoples. Whether our differences can be breached, and the ethics of such an attempt, has been the subject of colonial, postcolonial and anti-colonial discourses, each shaped by varying notions of difference: difference as essential; difference as culturally constructed through the binary of whiteness and its others; difference as a radical alterity, beyond the binary; and, then again, differences so small that we can, apparently, dismiss their significance and say ‘we are all…’
human together’. But new materialism now throws the debate again. How to speak of human differences, including differences between culture, language, and embodiment, in the context of new materialism’s arguments concerning our entanglements, one with each other, nature with culture, body with mind, and so on? This paper engages with some of the questions of difference and entanglement for how ‘we’—now newly problematized—can live in this country now.

Alison Ravenscroft is Associate Professor in English at La Trobe University. Her research is focussed on white settler and Indigenous encounters and collaborations. She is the author of The Postcolonial Eye: White Australian Desire and the Visual Fields of Race (Ashgate 2012; Routledge 2016).

Decolonisation and the Struggle over the Global Corporation

WEDNESDAY 2 MAY, 7.30 PM

The end of formal empires in Africa and Asia in the twentieth century, and the onset of the Cold War, inaugurated three worlds. These worlds were not so much places, as rival projects of world-making, with distinct political, economic and juridical dimensions. Not often remembered is the fact that the question of the transnational corporation, how it should be conceptualized, and its proper relation to law and state, was a key element of those rival stories. Colonialism is the long backstory to foreign investment. In this talk, I trace the attempt in the 1970’s by the ‘Group of 77’ states to assert international legal control over global corporations through the establishment of a United Nations Commission on Transnational Corporations. Led by Salvador Allende, that effort was at once a response to the large corporations destabilising Chile, the anti-colonial imperialism of US foreign policy, and an attempt to deal more broadly with the economic legacies of formal empire. And yet the battle lines were drawn in ways which upset a comfortable rehearsal of a North-South divide. Anti-colonial struggles, the ‘Cold War’, the invention of Development, and the implementation of a (Marshall) Plan to (re)construct Europe, all played into the generation of rival imaginaries and competing anxieties, producing unexpected commonalities that include coalitions across North and South, and instructive alliances of interest between ‘public’ and ‘private’ actors. Ultimately the project did not so much fail, as undergo a tragic inversion, culminating - for now - in the voluntarism of the ‘business and human rights’ paradigm on one hand, and the internationalised protection of foreign investment on the other. But slowing down our study of this moment reveals that much of what was at stake then remains so today, and that other worlds are still possible.

Sundhya Pahuja is Professor of International Law at the Melbourne Law School and Director of the Institute for International law and the Humanities at the University of Melbourne. Her work centres on the history, theory and...
political economy of international law. Her most recent projects are International Law and the Cold War, and International Law and Global Corporations.

The dilemmas on ontological security in a postcolonising Northern Ireland

WEDNESDAY 6 JUNE, 7.30 PM

Since the signing of the Belfast Good Friday Agreement of 1998, Northern Ireland has made significant progress towards a postcolonising transformation of its political culture and its major political and social institutions, as it has shifted away from violence and the dominance of political ideologies structured by the friend–enemy distinction. These ideological formations and the practices of social and political antagonism that they prescribed have been challenged by adversary–neighbor ideological formations that construct identities and relations through more inclusive norms of recognition and that support a more complex emotional constellation. However, as this cultural transformation has been neither thoroughgoing nor universal, Northern Ireland finds itself in the somewhat counter-intuitive situation in which the shift away from the violence of the past has increased, rather than reduced, the ontological insecurity of its citizens. Moreover, as ontological security may be supported by either friend–enemy or adversary–neighbor ideological formations, two distinct ways in which ontological security may collapse or re-configure have emerged in Northern Ireland.

John Cash is an Honorary Fellow in the School of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Melbourne, and an editor of *Postcolonial Studies* and a co-editor of *Political Psychology*. His research interests are in the area of psychoanalytic social theory and psychoanalytic political theory. One focus of that research is an analysis of the conflict in Northern Ireland and the more recent attempts at reconciliation. His publications with that focus include *Identity, Ideology and Conflict* (Cambridge 1996,) and “Squaring some vicious circles: transforming the political in Northern Ireland” in *Consociational Theory*, (Routledge, 2009).

Special Institute Symposium
Refiguring the postcolonial for precarious times
13-14 September 2018

A two-day symposium co-hosted by the Institute for Postcolonial Studies and the Alfred Deakin Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation, Deakin University

This two-day symposium responds to a provocation emerging from recent scholarship on the turn to precarity. Cultural Studies scholar Simon During, for example, observes that precarity globalizes and thus displaces the category of the subaltern, an argument echoed in recent work by scholars of settler colonialism, and in the shift of “refugee” from noun to verb to describe a pervasive experience of disenfranchisement and placelessness. The rise of historical precarity marks the loss of earlier specific instances and kinds of inequality. The unemployed and working poor are increasingly recognized as sharing basic affinities with indigenous people. “You are all Aboriginal now,” announced an Australian Aboriginal academic at a 2016 public meeting to discuss the perilous conditions facing humanities scholars in the contemporary university. The symposium invites vigorous responses to this provocation. Participants are invited to consider: what are the distinctive perils and possibilities—political, artistic, scholarly—of the current moment? In what ways might earlier ideas of a postcolonial project be enlarged or rethought for the destabilised times of the present?

For more information about this event contact Melinda Hinkson, melinda.hinkson@deakin.edu.au
Launch of the Martin Harrison Archive

In late 2015 the IPCS generously agreed to house the literary archive and poetry library of one of Australia’s foremost poets, cultural essayists and teachers, Martin Harrison (1949-2014). Since Martin’s passing, we had been examining the many unindexed and scattered papers he left behind in order to make them available to researchers. The launch of the archive and library, which occurred at the IPCS on 15 November 2017, was the culmination of this process. With the assistance of French champagne, a nod in the direction of Martin’s deep identification with French culture and literature, poets Barry Hill and Michel Farrell, sound artist and writer Nick Keys and Anne Elvey (editor, Plumwood Mountain) read from Martin’s poems. University of Melbourne student, and now budding archivist, Oliver Armstrong, took us on a guided tour of the on-line catalogue; Paul Carter spoke about the process of creating it.

The archive straddles the pre-digital and digital periods of cultural production: by the beginning of the 2000s, the scribbled draft – once upon a time a palimpsest of the poet’s working technique – is largely replaced by a multiplicity of versions (each of which may look ‘finished’). It also straddles a division in the cultural history of memory: the long time of pre-digital production, circulation and recollection yields to a period where the new is scarcely announced before it is discarded. The comparative fragility of memory committed to hard drive, together with the capacity for an almost infinite multiplication of intertextual encounters and hybrids, is also a challenge to archiving method. The archive is also situated across a period of institutional change, as the decision to lodge it outside the familiar repositories of literary materials illustrates. Our thought here was to keep Martin’s work as close as possible to a living community of writers that knows his work, published and unpublished, is an essential part of this country’s eventual cultural awakening to its own unique environmental and human responsibility.

It was a convivial evening whose undoubted centre was the performance of Martin’s work: the readings and multiplication of intertextual encounters and hybrids, is also a challenge to archiving method. The archive is also situated across a period of institutional change, as the decision to lodge it outside the familiar repositories of literary materials illustrates. Our thought here was to keep Martin’s work as close as possible to a living community of writers that knows his work, published and unpublished, is an essential part of this country’s eventual cultural awakening to its own unique environmental and human responsibility.

With the launch of the archive the rich subject matter of that continuing conversation is not only greatly amplified: it is returned as far as possible to the conversation between the living and the conscience of the future.

Postcolonial Studies

The last few months of 2017 saw a great deal of editorial activity as the journal came back into the normal schedule of four issues a year, with all of the issues for 2017 published by the end of December. These include the third issue for 2017—a special issue edited by John Cash and Catarina Kinnall on ‘postcolonial borderings’, with the theme of ontological insecurity running through its various articles—and a miscellany issue. The miscellany issue publishes pieces submitted sometime back while others were received only recently. The articles cover a wide range of topics including the racialisation of slavery, Indian high-rise condominiums and the ethics of representation as related to the Rwandan genocide.

The beginning of 2018 has seen much development of a variety of manuscripts, largely through the work of our invisible reviewers—some of these articles going into the pool of for a miscellany issue later this year, others for the first, special, issue of 2018, entitled ‘German-Australian Colonial Entanglements’. A special issue arising from the 2017 IPCS conference is also in production, entitled ‘The Multiple Forms of the Postcolonial’, edited by Phillip Darby.

A major recent development for PCS is the formation of a new Global Editorial Group at the University of California, Irvine, which adds to the new groups in Melbourne, London and Delhi. We welcome three new editors: Tamara Beauchamp, Sharareh Frouzesh and Liron Mor. Tamara comes to us with research interests in comparative literature, modern Hebrew and political philosophy and ethics. Liron has research interests in comparative literature, modern Hebrew and Arabic literature and film, terror and political conflict, decolonization, and critiques of law and rights. We very much look forward to working with them.

Finally, the more automated system for the registering and tracking of articles through the editorial process—Editorial Manager—is up and running, albeit with some early hiccups. This system will streamline relationships between the editorial groups, between editors and reviewers, between editors and authors, and finally, between the managing editor and Taylor and Francis.

Alison Caddick
Book Series: Writing Past Colonialism

Writing Past Colonialism - subset of Postcolonial Politics published by Routledge, part of Taylor and Francis group based in Abingdon, outside of Oxford.

We were sad to hear that Nicola Parkin, editor of postcolonial and international relations books at Routledge, is moving to a new appointment in the organization. Nicola was a great supporter of Postcolonial Politics and its subset. We wish her well in her new position on the utilization of data and metrics. We look forward to working with Rob Scorsby and his editorial assistant who will now be responsible for the series and its subset.

We are delighted to announce the publication of a new monograph with another coming up later in the year.

Japanese Poetry and Its Publics
From Colonial Taiwan to Fukushima
Dean Anthony Brink (National Chiao Tung University)

This book aims to explore precisely how modern Japanese poetry has remained central to public life in both Japan and its former colony of Taiwan. Though classical Japanese poetry has captivated the imagination of Asian studies scholars, little research has been conducted to explore its role in public life as a discourse influential in defining both the modern Japanese empire and contemporary postcolonial negotiations of identity. This book shows how highly visible poetry in regular newspaper columns and blogs have in various historical situations in Japan and Taiwan contested as well as promoted diverse colonial imaginaries. This poetry reflects both contemporary life and traditional poetics with few counterpoints in Western media. Methodologically, this book offers a defense of the public influence of poetry, each chapter enlisting a wide range of social and media theorists from Japan, Europe, and North America to explore specific historical moments in an original recasting of intertextuality as a vital feature of active inter-evental material engagements. In this book, rather than recite a standard survey of literary movements and key poets, the approach taken is to examine uses of poetry shown not only to support colonialism and imperialism, emerging objectionable forms of exploitation as well as the destruction of ecologies (including old-growth forests in Taiwan and the Fukushima Disaster), but also to present a medium of resistance, a minor literature for registering protest, forming transnational affiliations, and promoting grass-roots democracy. The book is based on years of research and fieldwork partially in conjunction with the production of a documentary film, Horizons of the Rising Sun: Postcolonial Nostalgia and Politics in the Taiwan Tanka Association Today.

Archipelagic Thinking: decolonising governance
Paul Carter (RMIT University)

Archipelagic Thinking: decolonising governance proposes a new approach to region governance. It argues that even well-intentioned plans for culture-led regional development, or Indigenous-led inter-regional cooperation or even ‘hotspot’ biodiversity conservation perpetuate neo-colonialist assumptions about authority, vesting them in the language of administrative prose and the cartography of territory. Posing three archipelagic regional governance scenarios – an Indigenous ocean management strategy for the Arafura and Timor Seas, a regional cultural development vision for the Western District of Victoria and an alternative environmental biodiversity plan for Wallacea (Indonesia) – Archipelagic Thinking notes that Indigenous peoples are regularly acknowledged, but integration of their knowledge systems into regional and global governance policy is one-way. It links this failure of translation to poetic illiteracy, arguing that the decolonization of environmental governance is inseparable from renewed metaphorical competence, the capacity to understand story-telling. The book reflects on the retreat of the hermeneutical sciences from their primary cultural function, the understanding of the knowledge invested in stories: when anthropology becomes a narrowly social science, the challenge of polysemous meaning (essential to setting the exchange rates of poetic exchange) is subordinated to the pragmatics of reducibility.

In Archipelagic Thinking, the archipelago is a geographical concept. In this context, the book is a contribution to the evolving field of island studies, ocean studies and, in general, the turn away from nation-state territorialisations of the Earth’s surface. Unlike these, though, it argues that archipelagos have a significant ontological property: grounding the relationship between being and becoming in relationality, they are distinctively open, ordered systems. The primacy of relating in the life world of the archipelago gives metaphor, or the carrying over of unlike concepts to form new crossings of sense, a primary role.
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in conceptualising and operationalising cross-cultural relations. Narrativising exchange defines the business of decolonised governance wherever regional and global communities seek to act locally in the human interest. Deterritorialising the traditional association of decolonisation with the securing of Indigenous rights, Archipelagic Thinking extracts indigeneity from its colonial definition, and presents it in the context of creative region cultural production or plural self-relating. Paul expects to submit the manuscript at the end of March.

**Senses of the Postcolonial**

Over the past several years we have received manuscripts that we have been unable to place with major global publishers as they do not fit with their international marketing strategies. This is particularly the case with manuscripts that do not have an evident disciplinary readership or attempt to bring together different forms of documentation that might shape alternative imaginaries. Working in collaboration with the independent publisher Palaver, founded by Paul Komesaroff in connection to his Global Reconciliation project, we now see a way forward. Our plan is to set up committees to work with authors on the accessibility of their projects and to implement publication arrangements, distribution networks and associated issues. We are pleased to say we now have two manuscripts submitted for consideration. We welcome proposals for both the Writing Past Colonialism series with Routledge and the Senses of the Postcoloniaal series with Palaver/IPCS.

**Subscriptions**

You can now take out - or renew - a membership subscription online by pointing your browser to http://www.ipcs.org.au/join.html. You will need to sign up to the PayPal system the first time you use the system. After that, payments can be made by credit card or transfer from a bank account. Please note that subscriptions taken out online will automatically renew each year - you can cancel your subscription at any time by visiting http://www.ipcs.org.au/join.html. Members can also pay their subscriptions in person at IPCS or by cheque mailed to the Institute.

**Annual subscription rates are as follows:**

- Student Membership: $20 per annum
- Ordinary Membership: $40 per annum
- Corporate Membership: $500 per annum

The first 200 members of the Institute now receive a free subscription to our journal Postcolonial Studies.

**Donations**

Donations to the Institute can now also be made online. Donations over $2 are tax-deductible for Australian taxpayers. To donate online, please visit our homepage at http://www.ipcs.org.au/