

Welcome to Country? Aboriginal Sovereignties and Asylum Seekers

EMMA COX

Drama and Theatre, Royal Holloway, University of London

Emma.cox@rhul.ac.uk

This essay considers what might derive from a structurally marginalised but affectively acknowledged Aboriginal Australian territorial authority (inhering in the right to welcome the newcomer to country) in the context of determinations of belonging and non-belonging, deserving refugee and audacious boat-person. It traces points of engagement between Aboriginal people and unauthorised arrivals (asylum seekers and refugees) and considers the imagining of such engagement in Michael James Rowland's feature film *Lucky Miles* (2007). In this, the essay is concerned less with material interventions into Australian sovereign biopower vis-à-vis asylum than with affective interventions, examined as three broad modalities: activism (protests, statements and critical discourse), intimacy (interpersonal contact and support) and art (cinematic representation).

Keywords: Australia, Aboriginal, asylum seeker, refugee, affect, activism, film

We can't separate ourselves from other human beings – it's a duty.

—Wadjularbinna Nulyarimma¹

At the opening of the Australian parliament on 12 February 2008, Prime Minister Kevin Rudd acknowledged the 'traditional' owners of the land after being Welcomed to Country in a ceremony performed by Aboriginal people from around Australia.² Similar welcomes and acknowledgements of country are common at many types of events and gatherings (with State and Territory guidelines devised on their implementation), but they had never been part of the opening of federal parliament prior to 2008. The landmark welcome ostensibly 'enacted' the idea that the Australian government's authority is somehow granted by – and not imposed upon – Aboriginal people. That this symbolism is conspicuously at odds with historico-political reality underpinned the latest incarnation of public debate in Australia over the efficacy of the Welcome to Country and acknowledgement of traditional owners. In March 2010 the opposition leader Tony Abbott's suggestion that the latter in particular is often 'out-of-place tokenism'³ prompted a brief flurry of discussion on the role of symbolic thought and action in organising human affairs generally, and specifically, on whether Australians should be explicitly reminded of the unceded, unresolved sovereignty of Aboriginal people.

Setting aside debates over intention and symbolism, it is undeniable that whatever form of Aboriginal sovereignty the Welcome to Country and acknowledgement of country signify or articulate, its structural difference from executive, legislative and judicial powers – the bulwarks of what Aileen Moreton-Robinson terms ‘patriarchal white sovereignty’⁴ – is profound in a nation that has only recently seen the first Aboriginal person elected to the federal House of Representatives. Moreton-Robinson pinpoints the ambivalence of ceremonial recognition, arguing that it is ‘simultaneously a reminder and a denial of the existence of Indigenous sovereignty. The reminder is evidenced by the presence of Indigenous bodies, but its denial is contained in the words “traditional lands”, which transports ownership back into the past not the continuing present’.⁵ What, then, might be the value of taking indigenous protocols as a provocation in the context of unauthorised asylum seekers, whose attempted arrivals in Australia have been vehemently *unwelcomed* by successive governments that, since the passing of the Migration Amendment Act 1992, have mandatorily incarcerated them and since 2001 gone to great lengths to prevent them from (b)reaching the maritime migration zone? What might derive from a structurally marginalised but ceremonially, performatively acknowledged Aboriginal territorial authority (inhering in the right to welcome, or presumably reject, the stranger) in the context of determinations of belonging and non-belonging, deserving refugee and audacious boat-person? To begin to answer these questions, I trace moments of engagement between Aboriginal Australians and unauthorised arrivals (asylum seekers and refugees), and consider the imagining of such engagement in Michael James Rowland’s film *Lucky Miles* (2007). In doing so, I am concerned less with material interventions into Australian sovereign biopower vis-à-vis asylum than with *affective* interventions, which I examine as three broad modalities: activism (protests, statements and critical discourse), intimacy (interpersonal contact and support) and art (representation in *Lucky Miles*).

It must be noted that academic arguments for comparison or alignment between indigenous Australians and asylum seekers run the risk of recapitulating well-traversed theorisations of postcolonial power relations, or worse, of corralling Aboriginality and asylum as twin paradigms of victimhood and marginalisation. Indeed, the links that that can be drawn between Aboriginality and asylum tend to underline representational problems associated with both: if, as Bain Attwood argued convincingly in the early 1990s, discourses of ‘Aboriginalism’ have produced a compendium of expert knowledges *about* rather than *with* their subjects,⁶ the political and politicised categories of

unauthorised asylum seeker or ‘illegal’ immigrant are similarly becoming the possession of scholars across a range of disciplines, having in the years since 11 September 2001 been positioned (in Australia and other western host/receiving nations) as the uninvited others *par excellence* against whom the affective tropes of sovereign integrity, security and national identity are pitted.

And yet, the points at which the interests of Aboriginal people and asylum seekers or refugees have converged in recent years demand attention as key components of alternative formulations of nation, belonging and community in Australia. In this context, an emphasis on affect – the sensorial, emotional aspects of cross-cultural contact – might look like an evasion of *realpolitik*. However, as cultural and social theorists Ghassan Hage and Amanda Wise have demonstrated, affect and *affective practice* intersect explicitly with politics in contexts of displacement or oppression. For asylum seekers and refugees, the affect of hope within the host nation is particularly vital; Hage has argued that hope is not a whimsical desire, but indispensable to social functioning: ‘once one has hope within one’s field of vision, one discovers the astounding degree to which the constellations of feelings, discourses and practices articulated to hope permeate social life’.⁷ Elaborating upon Hage’s concept of ‘affective intensification’, Wise makes an argument for the social and therapeutic significance of re-enactments and commemorations of trauma among East Timorese refugee communities in Sydney, considering that these are affective strategies by which trauma is ‘rendered meaningful in a very embodied way’.⁸ In his recent book on applied theatre in Africa in conflict and crisis contexts, performance scholar James Thompson seeks to extricate applied theatre from its assumed constitutive function, efficacy (political and social change) by privileging joyful and celebratory affects.⁹ I share Thompson’s interest in the affective ends of artistic and activist work, but do not mean to abandon an interest in efficacy – rather, I wish to map a *politics of affect*.

Central to this is the argument that an individual’s attachments to community and (crucially here) nation are produced and sustained by a constellation of affective responses (to places, people, ideas, discourses) and that the affective dimensions of activism, interpersonal contact and creative work can reproduce or reshape these responses, however modestly or intimately. My emphasis on affective response is, then, a way of thinking through the mechanics of feeling on asylum, and by extension, national belonging. Benedict Anderson recognised that the ideas of nation and nationhood (the *imagined community*) ‘command [...] profound emotional legitimacy’.¹⁰ For Hage, writing with reference to John Howard’s Australia, the affective dimension of nationhood

is epitomised by the xenophobic figure of the worried citizen or paranoid nationalist.¹¹ When the basis upon which most Australians ‘know’ asylum seekers, refugees and Aborigines is affective – emotional judgements derived from government discourse, media reports and the idea of national interest – it stands to reason that the affective work of the encounters and representations that I examine here is a basis for other (minoritarian) knowledges and understandings.

Activist affects

The remote Northern Territory Aboriginal community of Ampilatwatja, home to the Alyawarra people, is one of the ‘prescribed’ townships acquired by the federal government in 2007 for five-year lease under the terms of the controversial Northern Territory National Emergency Response, or ‘intervention’,¹² implemented via a ‘special measures’ exemption from the Racial Discrimination Act 1975 to address widespread child sexual abuse and neglect in Territory Aboriginal communities. In August 2009, Alyawarra members, represented by spokesperson Richard Downs, lodged a formal request with James Anaya, United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Indigenous Peoples, that they be classified as refugees. Downs’s letter to Anaya reads: ‘The current status of Aboriginal people is that we are refugees in a Country we have called our own since time immemorial’ and requests that the United Nations ‘Ensure[s] that the Australian government is aware of, and fulfils, its obligations under the International Refugee Convention, the UN Charter for Human Rights, the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and other international human rights covenants’.¹³ This followed a protest that began a month earlier, when thirty community elders walked off the dilapidated Ampilatwatja township and established a camp outside the government-controlled boundary.¹⁴ The activism is a response to the lack of improvement in living conditions despite promises made at the time of the intervention. The submission to the United Nations serves the potent political function of contextualising the Alyawarra’s position – forced relinquishment of leasehold and scant provision for basic housing and infrastructure – in terms of an internationally recognised political status. For Downs, the walk-off constitutes a simultaneous exile and return, with the camp situated on his mother’s country; in other words, even as it embodies the abjection of the townspeople, the protest is a rejection of government determination and an attempt to, as Downs explains, ‘create a sustainable community for ourselves’.¹⁵ The walk-off is continuing, and in Sydney in April 2010 a documentary charting the

construction of a protest house at the camp (with the support of trade unions and community organisations), *The Ampilatwatja Walk-off Protest vs the NT Intervention*, was presented by Actively Radical TV.

While the Alyawarra people's activism articulates a generalised connection with refugees based upon similar disenfranchisement and displacement, the responses of a number of other Aboriginal activists, elders and scholars specifically to mandatory immigration detention represent quite a cohesive statement of responsibility for, and hospitality toward, the stranger. But like the Alyawarra protest, these responses seem to be propelled by a sense of affinity with experiences of oppression, and in this capacity, they strategically underscore a politicised Aboriginal identity as much as they express support for asylum seekers and refugees. The Aboriginal Tent Embassy, which has stood on the lawn of Old Parliament House in Canberra intermittently since 1972 and continuously since 1992, is an important nexus of Aboriginal activism, especially regarding sovereignty and land rights. In recent years, current and former representatives of the Tent Embassy have publicly expressed support for asylum seekers and refugees. At an event organised by the Refugee Action Committee in 2000 to welcome refugees who had been resettled in Canberra, Gunilaroi / Kamilaroi (North-central New South Wales) member Robert Craigie invoked a connection between them and Aboriginal people who, he asserted, had become refugees within their own country. On behalf of Isabelle Coe, a Wiradjuri / Ngunnawal (Canberra region) elder and Tent Embassy founding activist, and other embassy members, Craigie offered Canberra as a 'safe haven'.¹⁶ Birri Gubba (central Queensland) activist Sam Watson, who was a founding member of the Tent Embassy in 1972, has been a vocal advocate for asylum seekers and refugees. In 2001, in response to the infamous MV *Tampa* affair, Watson expressed affective identification with the desperation of the asylum seekers: 'why [...] would they be risking their lives, and the lives of their children, on the open seas. They need medical treatment and deserve a safe haven'.¹⁷ Watson's support formulates a mutually-constitutive solidarity: 'The government is scapegoating refugees in the same way as they scapegoat indigenous people'.¹⁸ In 2002, in response to mass hunger strikes and self-harm taking place at the remote Woomera detention centre, activist Pat Eatock extended an offer of asylum to detainees on behalf of the Tent Embassy. Although a symbolic gesture, which was never going to directly influence policy decisions, the offer (which was reported by the national and international media) denounced the 'callous and inhumane'¹⁹ treatment of asylum seekers at the same time as it explicated the sovereign claim that is central to the Embassy's continuing activism. Emerging at a time when

asylum was one of the most inflammatory and emotive issues in Australia (propelled by tense situations such as the *Tampa* stand-off and hunger strikes), these statements essentially answered affective discourse with affective discourse; while they could not intervene materially in the politics they decried, they circulated ideas of welcome and hope – legitimised by Aboriginal territorial authority.

Noeleen Ryan-Lester, an Adnyamathana (Flinders Ranges of South Australia) woman and social justice campaigner, invokes a connection between indigenous people and asylum seekers in terms of biopolitical coercion under Australian sovereign power; in an interview, she states, ‘Baxter is not the first detention centre in Port Augusta. The first one was the Davenport mission, where they put Aboriginal people. It had a fence around it too, to stop the Aboriginal people from coming to Port Augusta. Port Augusta was just for the whites’.²⁰ Like Ryan-Lester, Linda Dare of the Bungala people (South Australia) identifies a continuity between successive histories of exclusion, coupled with what is effectively, in William E. Connolly’s terms, a ‘politics of forgetting’²¹; in the same interview, she asserts: ‘John Howard [...] and everyone in Parliament have got to realise that we are the first people of this country [...] what right have they got to lock up other people? They got off a bloody boat, or their ancestors did’.²² In 2003, Dare (along with Bungala, Kokatha and Adnyamathana community members) joined a gathering of several hundred refugee activists outside Baxter detention centre.²³ In 2005, Ryan-Lester and Dare were part of an anti-racism protest by the Port Augusta indigenous community, an act they linked to simultaneous protest activities at nearby Baxter, thereby drawing lines of embodied connection between two of the nation’s spaces of exception, or in Foucauldian terms, its heterotopias of deviation.²⁴

Wading into the contentious waters of asylum politics in post-2001 Australia – essentially meeting, as I have noted, affective discourse with affective discourse – activists such as Ryan-Lester and Dare, and members of the Aboriginal Tent Embassy, might be seen to be addressing what Hage regards as the key affective inequality in contemporary Australia. Taking up Hage’s claim that ‘societies are mechanisms for the distribution of hope, and [...] the kind of affective attachment (worrying or caring) that a society creates among its citizens is intimately connected to its capacity to distribute hope’,²⁵ we can make the (somewhat schematic) argument that Aboriginal refugee activists offer ‘caring’ affects as opposed to Australia’s prevailing (according to Hage) ‘worrying’ affects, and thereby begin to redress an imbalance in an economy where there is ‘deep inequality’ in the ‘distribution of hope’.²⁶ Given that Aboriginal supporters of asylum seekers and

refugees frequently cite a sense of affinity with oppression, and that this reinforces a politicised self-identification, their activism is imbricated with Aboriginal affective interests as well those of newcomers. Of course, a redistribution of hope can seem a distant aspiration in the sobering light of the Australian Indigenous Doctors' Association 2010 Health Impact Assessment of the Northern Territory Emergency Response, which reported that Aboriginal Australians suffer 'a deep sense of alienation and a collective existential despair'²⁷ – in another word, hopelessness. Nevertheless, that the nature of engagement between Aboriginal people and refugees is inevitably small-scale, and its political impact undramatic, does not, I argue, diminish its significance for those it affects.

Gungalidda (Gulf of Carpentaria) elder and Aboriginal Tent Embassy member Wadjularbinna Nulyarimma elaborates in an essay the activist perspectives I have described with reference to spiritual and ecological values. She likens the Australian government's control of discourse on unauthorised asylum seekers to a similar control of discourse on Aborigines: 'we know that what the Government says about Aboriginal Peoples is wrong, so we are not going to believe' pejorative rhetoric on asylum seekers.²⁸ Central to Nulyarimma's argument is a humanist duty of responsibility: 'Before Europeans came here, (illegally), in the Aboriginal world, we were all different, speaking different languages, but we all had the same kinship system for all human beings [...] everyone is part of us and we should care about them. We can't separate ourselves from other human beings – it's a duty'.²⁹ In an essay that scathingly unravels the concept of the 'un-Australian', re-deploying it with reference to the Australian government's treatment of Aborigines and asylum seekers, Tony Birch articulates a similar view of duty to the stranger, asserting that Aboriginal people 'must [...] assert more moral authority and ownership of this country. Our legitimacy does not lie within the legal system and is not dependent on state recognition [...] we need to claim and legitimate our authority by speaking out for, and protecting the rights of others, who live in, or visit *our* country'.³⁰ The notion of ethical inseparability between asylum seekers and Australians challenges the dichotomies of citizen and alien, legitimate and illegitimate, that rationalise mandatory detention. Nulyarimma's and Birch's perspectives are founded upon concepts of indigenous sovereignty defined in part by a right and responsibility to offer hospitality to newcomers. These are expressed as community perspectives: Nulyarimma writes on behalf of Gungalidda elders who, she asserts, were distressed by the MV *Tampa* incident and subsequent legislative amendments, while Birch writes in part as a call to activism, concluding his essay with an affective demand to Aboriginal people 'to speak, to write, to

march, to protest, to be angry and put that anger into expression and action'.³¹

Seeking to elucidate the question, 'What can Indigenous people offer to thinking about refugee issues?', Mark Minchinton invokes (after Dinesh Wadiwel) Achille Mbembe's concept of *necropower* (the ultimate, defining power of the sovereign to kill) to align the oppression of Aboriginal Australians and asylum seekers. He considers carceral spaces that construct 'death worlds' and confer bodies the (non-)status of 'living dead', concepts taken from Mbembe that engage Giorgio Agamben's theorisation of *homo sacer* or bare life, meaning life divested of citizen and civic rights and instrumentalised by the sovereign (crucially, however, Agamben argues that modern biopower inheres in the production of infinitely *surviving* bare life, rather than death³²). Minchinton describes Palm Island's carceral history to illustrate his point: 'Palm Island was a site of beatings, humiliations, and arbitrary imprisonment; a place where Indigenous people's right to movement, food, health care, and freedom of association was denied'.³³ He continues: 'Like refugees, Indigenous people are exiles. But exiled in their own country. Both groups have much to offer each other: much to learn in terms of resistance, of perseverance, of working together to make Australia a place that welcomes difference and diversity'.³⁴ If Minchinton's identification of certain carceral histories occludes other (for example, convict) histories, this serves the strategic, affective purpose of formulating cross-cultural solidarity in the present.

The trope of affinity as a result of comparable experiences under sovereign power is, as I have shown, a recurring one in activist and academic contexts. In spite of this coherence of perspective, it is important to resist homogenising Aboriginal responses to asylum seekers and refugees. Former ATSIC family policy and health commissioner Marion Hansen has identified unauthorised asylum seekers as competing figures of oppression and marginalisation that detract from social, political and economic focus on Aborigines. At a National Press Club of Australia seminar on 21 September 2001, Hansen (in opposition to whom Nulyarimma positions her article) expressed support for the Howard government's policies and voiced concerns that the economic cost of detaining asylum seekers and subsequently assisting their resettlement in Australia threatens the employment prospects of Aboriginal people and comes at the expense of funds for Aboriginal support and benefit programs.³⁵ Professing to speak on behalf of indigenous people around Australia with whom she had spoken on the issue of 'illegal immigrants', Hansen called into question the hardship of people who seek to arrive by boat: 'We have to protect our shores. Questions have been put to me that if they are really refugees, how

come they can afford to pay literally thousands of dollars to these smugglers or people who are actually getting these boats to come across here?’³⁶

Indigenous law specialist and Tangane-kald and Meintangk (south-east South Australia) member Irene Watson argues that the opposition expressed by a number of Australians to the prolonged, indefinite detention of asylum seekers redirects public attention away from human rights issues concerning indigenous Australians. While she does not support the mandatory detention of asylum seekers, she notes, ‘it is the detention of Aboriginal peoples in this country that we have turned our gaze away from; a much more deserving victim has emerged, along with another human rights struggle, the refugee’.³⁷ Watson is referring specifically to the high rates of juvenile detention of Aborigines in the Northern Territory, a comparison that identifies a similar instrumentalisation of vulnerable lives, even if it risks obscuring the differences between two forms of incarceration, particularly in terms of judicial process. While Watson is more sympathetic towards asylum seekers, her view is, like Hansen’s, underpinned by a sense that asylum seekers represent a competing oppressed minority in Australia and as such threaten the fragile social, political and economic standing of indigenous Australians. In Watson’s formulation, affective human rights responses (to the ‘deserving victim’) that might prompt social change are in limited supply; or to put it another way, affective attention stands in an all-too-protean relation with immediate politicisation.

Intimate affects

If activist affects such as those I have discussed engage with and within the public sphere, they articulate to, and are often sustained by, personal contact and intimate engagement. Emmanuel Levinas emphasises recognition and response that is epitomised in the human(e), naked encounter ‘face-to-face with the Other’,³⁸ maintaining that this relation embodies a fundamental ethical demand and a condition of being in the world that precedes politico-legal concepts of sovereignty and citizenship. Anecdotal evidence derived from my interviews with refugees underscores the ethical – and I would argue, affective – importance of face-to-face contact. Iranian artist and refugee Ardeshir Gholipour proudly recalls being welcomed to Australia by occupants of the Canberra Aboriginal Tent Embassy; this welcome was deeply significant for Gholipour, whose detention for five years and prolonged battle to avoid deportation took a psychological toll, communicating to him that he was not welcome under the terms of sovereign Australia.³⁹ The alternative authority of Aboriginal sovereignty offered similar affects of

belonging in Australia for Iranian theatre practitioner Shahin Shafaei when following his release after almost two years in detention he was, in his words, ‘adopted’ by an indigenous community in North Queensland. Shafaei continues to wear a carved pendant given to him by this community.⁴⁰ In these instances, an intimate experience of Aboriginal welcome was a crucial aspect of the affective work of belonging in a new country.

The power of face-to-face welcome and support is understood by Yankunytjatjara (north-west South Australia) elder and former public administrator Lowitja O’Donoghue, whose association with refugee issues encompasses involvement with the United Nations and local humanitarian and refugee support organisations, including the Refugee Advocacy Service, A Just Australia and the National Council of Churches in Australia. In public statements, the former chairwoman of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) has articulated a politicised link between Aboriginal people and unauthorised asylum seekers; in an address to the National Council of Churches on 11 July 2004, she commented, ‘when asylum seekers – boat people – are dismissed as queue jumpers or ‘illegals’, I want to remind Prime Minister Howard and Ministers Ruddock and Vanstone, that my people had to deal with boat people over 200 years ago!’⁴¹ O’Donoghue expresses a particular sense of affinity with Afghan asylum seekers, citing the Afghan heritage of many of the indigenous people of her Oodnadatta (South Australia) region as a result of colonial-era contact with cameleers.⁴² This articulation of kinship intervenes in unitary discourses of Australian nationhood by (re)claiming a national history that is sidelined in celebratory narratives of British settlement and convict heritage.⁴³ Aboriginal links with Afghans in O’Donoghue’s state capital of Adelaide are relatively robust; the city’s Aboriginal Catholic Ministry has forged particularly close ties with the Afghan refugee community and in 2003 its Aboriginal Otherway Centre (a drop-in community centre) was partially converted into a makeshift mosque.⁴⁴

In recent years, O’Donoghue’s key ‘affective work’ has been as an advocate, teacher and mother figure to young Afghan refugees living in Adelaide on Temporary Protection Visas.⁴⁵ She became involved in the lives of the young people when she gave English classes at an Adelaide Baptist church, and subsequently became a support figure to them and a regular presence at the so-called ‘Afghan room’ established in the home of her friend, broadcaster Stephen Watkins. The young refugees, who had spent various periods in immigration detention centres, appear to have responded to the support with a sense of belonging; as one declares of the ‘Afghan room’, ‘This is our territory’.⁴⁶ For O’Donoghue, the act of welcoming refugees must be performed in a personal (as intimate,

affective practice) as well as political capacity; in a speech she comments that she has ‘welcomed them. They are here. They are part of us. They are grafted into my ancestry and my country’.⁴⁷ The ‘us’ that O’Donoghue invokes is not the imagined community for whom the Australian government claims to act, but an alternative community founded upon kinship connections and continuing indigenous sovereignty. O’Donoghue’s public explanation of intergenerational, communal and territorially located ‘grafting’ combines with her private role as ‘a mother figure’⁴⁸ to young individuals; such close, affective ties can be seen as an active cultivation of the ‘intercontamination of identity’ that Prem Kumar Rajaram argues is an inevitable consequence of Australia’s relationship (of disavowal) with undocumented asylum seekers.⁴⁹ For O’Donoghue, intercontamination or grafting has historical, political and personal dimensions, all of which are intimately imbricated with her Aboriginality.

Of course, the affective consequences of face-to-face encounter between Aboriginal people and asylum seekers should not be characterised simplistically in terms of solidarity, hospitality and support. The ambivalence that can underpin interpersonal contact is illustrated well by the indigenous Tiwi Islanders’ relationship with uninvited boat arrivals to their territory in recent years. The Tiwi Islands (comprising Melville Island and Bathurst Island) are situated eighty kilometres from the Northern Territory’s capital city, Darwin, and within the regulated zone of the Australian Defence Force Border Protection activities in the Arafura and Timor Seas. On 4 November 2003 a group of fourteen Turkish Kurds and four Indonesian crew landed at Melville Island. Suvendrini Perera describes the encounter between the Tiwi people and the boat arrivals:

The Islanders [...] were surprised to come across obviously foreign men on the beach who asked them, ‘Is this Australia?’ Perhaps the arrivals were confused by the large number of black faces and the general third world look of the place. The Islanders’ answer marked a subtle distinction: You are on Melville Island. Yes, it is Australia. *In but not of*. Did the arrivals register any qualification? [...] They requested water, indicated they were from Turkey, and asked for asylum. Only a few weeks earlier, the Islanders had been instructed by visiting officials what to do in such an eventuality. The men were provisioned, quickly dispatched back to their boat, and the authorities notified.⁵⁰

That same day, the government applied a retrospective excision of the island (and thousands of other islands proximate to the continent) from the migration zone, promptly towed the boat into international waters and directed it back to Indonesia. The Tiwi people's submission to Australian authority resulted in the politically cynical exclusion of their island from the national community and from Australian legal obligations pertaining to migration. While the excision was later rejected in the senate (but re-implemented in 2005), and although some outraged Melville Islanders reportedly resolved to disobey future government directives,⁵¹ the government's extraordinary action nonetheless reveals its capacity to control spaces in which it holds scant influence in terms of local social and cultural organisation – places that retain, in local terms, indigenous sovereignty.

Perera's narrative of Tiwi obedience to and subsequent instrumentalisation by the government is complicated by recent developments in the Islanders' response to arrivals from the north. In April 2009 Tiwi Land Council executive and ranger, Andrew Tipungwuti, made a request to the government for greater powers to patrol the coastline, stating, 'Our marine rangers don't have adequate powers to help and secure these people until the right authorities arrive',⁵² and in November 2009, Tiwi Land Council Chairman Robert Tipungwuti made an offer to the government for Bathurst Island to become a site for a new immigration detention centre.⁵³ The Tiwi community's position at the maritime vanguard of unauthorised arrivals offers an alternative perspective on indigenous and asylum seeker engagement, reminding us that indigenous sovereignty can articulate as easily to defence of country as to solidarity and welcome.

Artistic affects

The final part of this essay deals with the imagining of contact between Aboriginal Australians and asylum seekers in a work by white Australian filmmakers, and as such, it opens up a series of representational questions connected with agency and cultural appropriation. While I will begin to unravel some of these here, my main purpose is to consider the affective potentialities of the film's vision of cross-cultural encounter. A feature-length work, *Lucky Miles* (2007) was written by Michael James Rowland and Helen Barnes and directed by Rowland. A departure from typical representational practices in Australian cinema, it incorporates Asian, Middle Eastern and Aboriginal characters and several languages (English, Bahasa Indonesian, Khmer, Arabic, Gumatj and French). The film is, as an opening subtitle states, 'inspired by true stories' from the period of 1989-90, the most well-known of which is an incident in which a group of forty

people from southern China became lost in the West Australian desert for two weeks after being dropped off on the coast by people smugglers. *Lucky Miles* is set in 1990⁵⁴ and follows the story of a boatload of Cambodian and Iraqi asylum seekers who are abandoned on the remote Pilbara coast in north-western Australia by Indonesian smugglers, who instruct them to walk over the sand dunes to a (nonexistent) bus stop in order to be taken to Perth. Rowland reconfigures Australia's persistent paranoia over a threat of non-white invasion from the north, fundamental to what Ien Ang terms the 'psycho-geography' of nationalist white Australia,⁵⁵ in terms of *arrival* anxiety in a film that relegates white Australian perspectives to the periphery.

The asylum seekers organise themselves into two groups along ethnic lines and set off in different directions into the desert, under the drastically erroneous assumption that the populated centres of the country lie in its interior. After most of the men are picked up by Australian police, *Lucky Miles* follows the trials of an unlikely remaining trio that stumble into one another's company: Iraqi man Youssif (Rodney Afif), Cambodian man Arun (Kenneth Moraleda), and one of the people smugglers, Ramelan (Srisacd Sacdpraseuth) who has come ashore after accidentally setting his uncle Muluk's (Sawung Jabo) vessel on fire. The men are pursued through the outback by a good-natured trio of army reservists, two of whom are Aboriginal, Tom (Sean Mununggurr) and Sgt. O'Shane (Glenn Shea), the third a white Australian, Plank (Don Hany).

While *Lucky Miles* connects broadly with tried and true models of Australian cinematic representation in its humour and characterisation, it reterritorialises the dominant image of the white comic figure (especially the larrikin male), recasting it in the figures of Asian, Middle Eastern and Aboriginal men. While recent Australian films such as Khoa Do's *The Finished People* (2003), Tony Ayres's *The Home Song Stories* (2007) and Rolf de Heer and Peter Djigirr's *Ten Canoes* (2006) centre around Asian (in the case of the first two films) and Aboriginal (in the case of *Ten Canoes*) characters, representational practices in Australian film remain overwhelmingly Eurocentric; the actors that Rowland employed in the main roles had not previously been given the opportunity to lead an Australian film. In addition to the professional actors cast in the main roles, Rowland employed refugees who had arrived in Australia as boat-people to be cultural consultants on the project and to play minor roles in the Cambodian and Iraqi groups. In this way, he utilised the collaborative possibilities of film-making to democratise the work of representation, engaging with individuals for whom the narrative had intimate, personal significance.

Rowland's imagining of Australia as a broad, featureless expanse of hot, arid and apparently uninhabited land is one that is notionally (and mythologically) familiar yet experientially unknown for the majority of Australians who dwell in or near the nation's coastal metropolises. In placing a group of asylum seekers within the remote desert landscape, the film coheres well-established (white) images of the Australian outback as a space of alienation and isolation with the affective psycho-geography of Asian and (more latterly) Middle Eastern invasion. But the affects Rowland is most interested in are those sensed by the invaders: when Youssif asks, 'Where are the people, these Australians?' – a question Helen Grace describes as a 'kind of ironic terra nullius moment'⁵⁶ – he offers his own answer in the next breath: 'Maybe this is not Australia'. Youssif's suggestion that the territory is 'not Australia', not the western democracy that he seeks, is both unfounded and (humorously) well-founded. Anxiety and humour are the film's key moods, and both of these relate to questions of knowing and belonging to the Australian landscape. The opening credits are interspersed with topographical images – maps of the land, sketches, diagrams and descriptions of places written in the cursive script of colonial-era explorer diaries and (in one case) in Arabic. The asylum seekers place their faith in maps and pre-conceived (inaccurate) knowledges of Australia; Arun carries a hand-drawn map and debates with Youssif how to interpret it and find the way to civilisation. Both men struggle to reconcile their respective psychic mappings with the brutal embodied reality of the land in which they have been abandoned. For Arun, Perth is a point of focus and an image of hope; along with his map, he carries as a sort of talisman a tattered business card that will help him find the Perth-based Australian father he has never known.

The relationship the foreigners have with the land is diametrically opposite to that of Aboriginal reservist troop and tracker Tom, to whom the Pilbara country is intimately known and intricately readable. The reservist group is a Regional Force Surveillance Unit (RFSU) modelled on the West Australian / Pilbara version of NORFORCE (North West Mobile Force). Aboriginal people comprise approximately sixty percent of these remote surveillance troops and according to Torres Strait Island actor and director Rachael Maza, they are a source of pride in their communities, representing indigenous territorial authority: 'These soldiers are seen in their communities as protectors of Aboriginal land'.⁵⁷ Australian Army Lt. Colonel Clay Sutton observes of the RFSUs, 'the Aboriginal soldiers have a sixth sense and they pick up if something's unusual or not right out there in the environment. They can then pass on this information back through us and we can pass it on to our higher headquarters'.⁵⁸ As Sutton's comment hints, the role played by

Aboriginal people in RFSUs is complicated in terms of sovereignty. In one respect, they can be seen as being appropriated for their indigenous knowledges, employed under Australian authority in order to serve the surveillance and security interests of the nation in locations that otherwise would not fall easily under a white territorial influence. In another respect they may be seen as embodying an indigenous authority over the territories in which they operate, performing the type of defensive sovereignty that Tiwi ranger Andrew Tipungwuti seeks.

In *Lucky Miles*, Tom is a quietly authoritative presence and his expertise as a tracker is indispensable to the hunt for the boat arrivals. If the film's characterisation of this observant, unflappable character risks reinforcing a stereotype of 'authentic', traditional Aboriginality (as, arguably, Sutton does in extolling the indigenous troops' 'sixth sense'), the other indigenous reservist Sgt. O'Shane balances the question of representation. Physically, O'Shane is lighter-skinned than Tom, and furthermore, not familiar with the landscape and as ineffective as Plank, the white Australian reservist, when it comes to tracking human activity and understanding the land. O'Shane's lack of territorial knowledge is a subject of humour in the film; at one point he attempts to match Tom's tracking skills by studying a patch of obvious campsite detritus left by Youssif and Arun – an extinguished campfire and a discarded biscuit packet – and sagely noting that people have camped in the space. At the same time, the film occasionally satirises the perception of Tom as omniscient: one morning when he announces what the day's high temperature will be, O'Shane nods respectfully at the presumed indigenous knowledge; Plank asks Tom how he knows this, and Tom replies nonchalantly that he heard it on the morning radio broadcast. Such exchanges serve to portray Tom as a character possessed of common sense that complements his territorial knowledge, rather than as an exotic or mystical figure. The differences between Tom and O'Shane undercut the notion of unitary Aboriginality; in the film's terms it is a complex and diverse ethnic, cultural and geo-political identification.

The film's climax comes when the reservists catch up with the asylum seekers and people smugglers. Youssif, the most serious and anxious – but also the most resourceful⁵⁹ – of the group, has rehearsed his performance of identity: his request for protection under the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees. He comes face-to-face with Tom and delivers the request, in clear and careful English. Tom's laconic response is both comic and poignant: he looks Youssif in the eye (a Levinasian recognition) and after a pause, replies, 'Yeah, okay'. Rowland constructs, in this

deceptively simple moment of encounter, a profoundly affective image of Aboriginal authority to welcome newcomers. Part of the significance of the moment of contact derives from the audience's awareness of the ambivalence underlying it. As a reservist, Tom is under the authority of the Australian government, and his affirmative response will not, we know, be the end of the matter in terms of Youssif's refugee status; but at the same time, Rowland challenges the audience to consider the authority upon which Tom can offer the response that he does – an authority that is removed from and in many ways independent of metropolitan sites of power.

Rowland perceived *Lucky Miles* as a means by which to reflect upon contemporary global pressures under which forced migration occurs, explaining that the film functions in many ways as a metaphor for those people who 'fall through the cracks' of globalisation.⁶⁰ This observation coheres with Hage's comment that 'each nation is developing its own third world inhabited by the rejects of global capitalism'.⁶¹ Although his film is set in the commodity-rich Pilbara, Rowland's interests are more affective than economic; he is interested in conditions of human encounter amid difference: 'what happens when [...] people from cultures that have hitherto had nothing to do with each other come in contact with each other and [...] the conflict that precedes the harmony'.⁶² It has been argued that globalisation has given rise to 'post-sovereign' forms of governance,⁶³ and *Lucky Miles* bears this out to a certain extent in its portrayal of governance on the micro-level of complex interpersonal relations: we see that the authority of sovereign Australia over the movements of non-citizens within its territory is contingent upon an Aboriginal man whose affective affiliations must be said to be split between his federal employer and his homeland. In Rowland's imagining, Aboriginal Australians have an active stake in the new lines of conflict and connection that are a condition of globalisation. There is, it has to be said, an element of utopianism in this vision: the film gives little sense that the Aboriginal characters might themselves 'fall through the cracks' in a globalising world. While it would be unreasonable to denounce the film on this basis, it is worth pointing to the similar vulnerability of asylum seekers and indigenous peoples under economic globalisation.⁶⁴

Irene Watson observes that 'In the struggle for Aboriginal sovereignty [...] the prevailing "reality" is that the sovereignty of Aboriginal laws is an impossibility'.⁶⁵ State sovereignty is, in terms of this prevailing reality, exclusive and inviolable. And undoubtedly, in the context of unauthorised asylum seekers, the Australian government's biopolitical power does not permit structural challenge from Aboriginal laws or

authorities. Yet, Watson articulates the paradoxical ‘reality’ that in spite of their impossibility, ‘Aboriginal laws live’; they stand ‘elsewhere’ to Australian sovereignty and law.⁶⁶ This concept – which recalls Birch’s assertion that Aboriginal ‘legitimacy does not lie within the legal system and is not dependent on state recognition’⁶⁷ – expresses something of the *aliveness* that I have sought to trace by foregrounding affective engagements and representations. Thompson’s identification of ‘a certain power of affect that is *more than* the moment’⁶⁸ seems to explicate Watson’s and Birch’s convictions regarding the ‘reality’ of lives and laws ‘elsewhere’, and indeed, underlines my argument that the affective dimensions of the relations and representations examined here offer more than momentary feeling; they are the continuing, cumulative basis of cross-cultural understandings and knowledges, producing, in however minor and incomplete a capacity, new landscapes of identity, belonging and community across Australia.

- ¹ Wadjularbinna Nulyarimma, 'A Gungalidda Grassroots Perspective on Refugees and the Recent Events in the US', *Borderlands e-journal*, Vol. 1. No. 1 (2002), http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol1no1_2002/wadjularbinna.html, accessed 8 July 2009, para. 6.
- ² The following day, as the first item of business at the opening of parliament for the year, Rudd apologised on behalf of the parliament to Aboriginal peoples forcibly removed from their families (the Stolen Generations) and their descendents. See Gay McAuley in this issue.
- ³ Tony Abbott, qtd in Samantha Maiden, 'Abbott reopens culture wars over nods to Aborigines', *The Australian*, 15 Mar 2010, p. 1.
- ⁴ Aileen Moreton-Robinson, 'Writing off Indigenous Sovereignty: The Discourse of Security and Patriarchal White Sovereignty', in Aileen Moreton-Robinson (ed.), *Sovereign Subjects: Indigenous Sovereignty Matters*, (Crow's Nest, New South Wales, 2007), p. 87.
- ⁵ Aileen Moreton-Robinson, 'Writing off Indigenous Sovereignty', p. 98.
- ⁶ See Bain Attwood, 'Introduction', *Power, Knowledge and Aborigines: Journal of Australian Studies*, Vol. 35 (1992), pp. i-xvi.
- ⁷ Ghassan Hage, *Against Paranoid Nationalism: Searching for Hope in a Shrinking Society* (Sydney, 2003), p. 9.
- ⁸ Amanda Wise, *Exile and Return Among the East Timorese* (Philadelphia, 2006), p. 117.
- ⁹ James Thompson, *Performance Affects: Applied Theatre and the End of Effect* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 5-6.
- ¹⁰ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, revised edition (London and New York, 1991), p. 4.
- ¹¹ Ghassan Hage, *Against Paranoid Nationalism*, p. 3.
- ¹² The intervention was introduced by the Howard government and is continuing under the Rudd government, with some adjustments to its administration.
- ¹³ Richard Downs, Letter to Professor James Anaya, 20 Aug 2009, *Intervention Walkoff's Blog*, <http://interventionwalkoff.wordpress.com/statements/>, accessed 23 Apr 2010.
- ¹⁴ The protest echoes earlier actions, most famously the Gurindji / Wave Hill cattle station walk-off of 1966-75, led by Vincent Lingiari, which mobilised the land rights movement and led to the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976.
- ¹⁵ Richard Downs, qtd in 'Aboriginal Community Returns to Country: Ampilatwatja Walkoff vs NT Intervention', The Juice Media (video), *Intervention Walkoff's Blog*, <http://interventionwalkoff.wordpress.com/video/>, accessed 23 Apr 2010.
- ¹⁶ Robert Craigie, qtd in Phil Griffiths, 'LL: Art: Canberra Welcomes Refugees', 30 Aug 2000: <http://www.mail-archive.com/leftlink@vicnet.net.au/msg03494.html>, accessed 6 Feb 2009.
- ¹⁷ Sam Watson, qtd in Bill Mason, 'Treatment of Refugees "Heartless"', *Green Left Online*, No. 463, 5 Sep 2001, <http://www.greenleft.org.au/2001/463/25312>, accessed 6 Feb 2009.
- ¹⁸ Sam Watson, qtd in Bill Mason, 'Treatment of Refugees "Heartless"'.
¹⁹ Pat Eatock, qtd in Patrick Barkham, 'PM Calls Asylum Protest Blackmail – Aborigines Throw Their Weight behind Afghan Hunger Strikers', *The Guardian*, 26 Jan 2002, p. 18.
- ²⁰ Noeleen Ryan-Lester, qtd in 'Interview: Refugee Activists Support Aboriginal Rights', Interview with Noeleen Ryan-Lester and Linda Dare, *Socialist Alternative*, No. 90 (Apr-May 2005), <http://ur.lc/iui>, accessed 20 Apr 2010.
- ²¹ William E. Connolly, *The Ethos of Pluralization* (Minneapolis and London, 1995), p. 138.
- ²² Linda Dare, qtd in 'Interview: Refugee Activists Support Aboriginal Rights'.
- ²³ Emma Murphy, 'Solidarity and Defiance in the Desert', *Green Left Online*, No. 535, 23 Apr 2003, <http://www.greenleft.org.au/2003/535/30437>, accessed 9 July 2009.
- ²⁴ See Michel Foucault, 'Of Other Spaces', Trans Jay Miskowiec, *Diacritics*, Vol. 16, No.1 (1986), pp. 22-27.
- ²⁵ Ghassan Hage, *Against Paranoid Nationalism*, p. 3.
- ²⁶ Ghassan Hage, *Against Paranoid Nationalism*, p. 17.
- ²⁷ *Health Impact Assessment of the Northern Territory Emergency Response* (Canberra: 2010), p. 8.
- ²⁸ Wadjularbinna Nulyarimma, 'A Gungalidda Grassroots Perspective', para. 2.
- ²⁹ Wadjularbinna Nulyarimma, 'A Gungalidda Grassroots Perspective', para. 6.
- ³⁰ Tony Birch, 'The Last Refuge of the "Un-Australian"', *Subaltern, Multicultural and Indigenous Histories: Transforming Cultures Winter School*, 2000, http://www.transforming.cultures.uts.edu.au/pdfs/last_refuge_birch.pdf, accessed 20 May 2009, p. 5.
- ³¹ Tony Birch, 'The Last Refuge of the "Un-Australian"', p. 7.

- ³² Giorgio Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (New York, 1999), p. 155.
- ³³ Mark Minchinton, 'The Living Dead: Asylum Seekers and Indigenous Australians', Context paper for launch of report: *Relocation of Refugees from Melbourne to Regional Victoria: A Comparative Evaluation in Swan Hill and Waarnambool*, Institute for Community, Ethnicity and Policy Alternatives and Sudanese Australian Integrate Learning Program, 20 June 2007, p. 2.
- ³⁴ Mark Minchinton, 'The Living Dead: Asylum Seekers and Indigenous Australians', p. 3.
- ³⁵ Lincoln Wright, 'Asylum-seekers "Affect Aborigines" Prospects"', *The Canberra Times*, 22 Sep 2001, p. 3.
- ³⁶ Marion Hansen, qtd in Lincoln Wright, 'Asylum-seekers "Affect Aborigines" Prospects"', p. 3.
- ³⁷ Irene Watson, 'Aboriginal Sovereignities: Past, Present and Future (Im)Possibilities', in Suvendrini Perera (ed.), *Our Patch: Enacting Australian Sovereignty Post-2001* (Perth, 2007), p. 42.
- ³⁸ Emmanuel Levinas, 'Time and the Other', in Seán Hand (ed.), trans. Richard A. Cohen, *The Levinas Reader* (Oxford, 1989), p. 45.
- ³⁹ Emma Cox, Interview with Ardeshir Gholipour, Canberra, 24 July 2008, unpublished.
- ⁴⁰ Emma Cox, Interview with Shahin Shafaei, Melbourne, 19 July 2008, unpublished.
- ⁴¹ Lowitja O'Donoghue, Address to the National Council of Churches in Australia (NCCA) Triennial Forum: 'At the Cross Roads: Living is a World of Change', 11 July 2004, http://www.ncca.org.au/special_projects/decade_to_overcome_violence/resources/theological_reflections/lowitja_odonoghue_ncca_forum_address, accessed 10 Feb 2009.
- ⁴² Lowitja O'Donoghue, Speech delivered at a fundraising event for the Refugee Advocacy Service of South Australia, 17 Apr 2003.
- ⁴³ For discussion of the history of Aboriginal and Muslim relations, see Peta Stephenson, 'Islam in Indigenous Australia: Historic Relic or Contemporary Reality?', *Politics and Culture*, Vol. 4 (2004), <http://aspen.conncoll.edu/politicsandculture/arts.cfm?id=55>, accessed 14 Apr 2010.
- ⁴⁴ Australian Catholic Social Justice Council (ACSJC) Briefing, No. 34, Apr 2003, p. 4.
- ⁴⁵ The Temporary Protection Visas was introduced in 1999 by the Howard government for unauthorised asylum seekers found to be refugees and was abolished by the Rudd government in 2007. The three-year visa denied family reunion, the right of return to Australia after overseas travel, as well as access to a number of social, settlement and educational services. See Fethi Mansouri and Melek Bagdas, *Politics of Social Exclusion: Refugees on Temporary Protection Visa in Victoria* (Burwood, Victoria, 2002), p. 23.
- ⁴⁶ Qtd in Debra Jopson, 'The Barefoot Regent in her Afghan Court', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 Mar 2003, p. 33.
- ⁴⁷ Lowitja O'Donoghue, 'Return to Afghanistan: Resettlement or Refoulment?', speech, Adelaide, 27 Feb 2003, <http://www.safecom.org.au/lowitja.htm>, accessed 10 Feb 2009.
- ⁴⁸ Lowitja O'Donoghue, qtd in Debra Jopson, 'The Barefoot Regent in her Afghan Court', p. 33
- ⁴⁹ Prem Kumar Rajaram, 'Disruptive Writing and a Critique of Territoriality', *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 30 (2004), p. 220.
- ⁵⁰ Suvendrini Perera, 'A Pacific Zone? (In)Security, Sovereignty, and Stories of the Pacific Borderscape', in Prem Kumar Rajaram and Carl Grundy-Warr (eds.), *Borderscapes: Hidden Geographies and Politics at Territory's Edge* (Minneapolis, 2008), pp. 201-02.
- ⁵¹ Michael Hodson, 'Tiwi Islanders: "We're all Non-Australians"', *Green Left Online*, No. 562, 19 Nov 2003: <<http://www.greenleft.org.au/2003/562/29197>>, accessed 20 May 2009.
- ⁵² Andrew Tipungwuti, qtd in Paul Toohey, 'Tiwi Islanders want more Power to Stop Boatpeople', *The Australian*, 1 May 2009, p. 2.
- ⁵³ 'Seeking Asylum in Tiwis', *Northern Territory News / Sunday Territorian*, 17 Jan 2010, p. 16.
- ⁵⁴ For a discussion of the implications of setting the film in 1990, pre- mandatory immigration detention and pre- the political polemics of 2001, see Jon Stratton, "'Welcome to Paradise": Asylum Seekers, Neoliberalism, Nostalgia and *Lucky Miles*', *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 5 (2009), pp. 629-45.
- ⁵⁵ Ien Ang, *On Not Speaking Chinese: Living Between Asia and the West* (London and New York, 2001), pp. 129-30.
- ⁵⁶ Helen Grace, "'Small-fry": Suburban Decline and the Global Outback in Recent Asian Australian Cinema', *Studies in Australasian Cinema*, Vol. 2, No. 3 (2008), p. 208.
- ⁵⁷ Rachael Maza, qtd in 'Norforce', *Message Stick*, Australian Broadcasting Corporation television, 22 Oct 2004, 6:00pm, transcript, <http://www.abc.net.au/tv/messagestick/stories/s1222121.htm>, accessed 20 Jan 2009.
- ⁵⁸ Clay Sutton, qtd in 'Norforce'.

⁵⁹ Youssif plays a pivotal role in the film by repairing, against all odds, a rusty, long-abandoned utility vehicle; his skill and persistence are observed by Arun and Ramelan, who at this part of the movie begin to conform to racist stereotypes of the Asian comic character – silly but of little narrative consequence.

⁶⁰ Michael James Rowland, qtd in Margaret Pomeranz, Interview with Michael James Rowland, *At the Movies*, Australian Broadcasting Corporation television, 11 July 2007, <http://www.abc.net.au/atthemovies/txt/s1963641.htm>, accessed 13 Feb 2009.

⁶¹ Ghassan Hage, *Against Paranoid Nationalism*, p. 18.

⁶² Michael James Rowland, qtd in Margaret Pomeranz, Interview with Michael James Rowland.

⁶³ Lindsey Te Ata O Tu MacDonald and Paul Muldoon, ‘Globalisation, Neo-liberalism and the Struggle for Indigenous Citizenship’, *Australian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (2006), p. 210.

⁶⁴ Lindsey Te Ata O Tu MacDonald and Paul Muldoon offer a detailed discussion of this issue in ‘Globalisation, Neo-liberalism and the Struggle for Indigenous Citizenship’. See citation above.

⁶⁵ Irene Watson, ‘Aboriginal Sovereignties: Past, Present and Future (Im)Possibilities’, p. 24.

⁶⁶ Irene Watson, ‘Aboriginal Sovereignties: Past, Present and Future (Im)Possibilities’, p. 24.

⁶⁷ Tony Birch, ‘The Last Refuge of the “Un-Australian”’, p. 5.

⁶⁸ James Thompson, *Performance Affects: Applied Theatre and the End of Effect*, p. 120.