EDITORIAL
Welcome to a modern forum for Australian Studies. This newsletter is a bilingual platform to inform members of the Association for Australian Studies about academic and professional activities in their fields of study and research. The newsletter will accept relevant information on conferences, publications, lectures, scholarships, awards, research projects, institutions, and web links to Australian resources. The editor welcomes contributions which will help build a vital network in the field of Australian Studies, including essays, news, critiques and constructive commentary on specific subjects of research. We encourage a liberal and creative approach to the topic. The editor urges every reader to help launch this professional news forum to reflect the spirit of Australian Studies in timely information, memorable dialogue, and innovative ideas. We need new ideas and colourful frames of presentation.

The newsletter presents an extraordinary survey of recent Australian Studies and public relations work. The Association has changed a lot since 1989; however, it remains the most important network for German-speaking Australianists in Europe; and meanwhile you can also find GAST on Facebook – thanks also to our board member and chair Dr. Amelie Bernzen and our webmaster, Dr. Guido Isekenmeier.

Again, this e-Newsletter reflects the interdisciplinary character of German-Australian studies and activities. Rob Hitchcock, Miriam Gertzen and Carolin Hoffmann will appreciate new contacts in order to build networks and partnerships in their fields of interest. And once more we are delighted to present another series of travel adventures, experienced and vividly described by Professor Gerhard Stilz. Thanks to all contributors!
And now: Enjoy our new issue!

Contributions (in German or in English) to:
Dr. Henriette von Holleuffer: adfonteshistory@aol.com
Deadline of submission for Newsletter Nr. 15: June 1, 2016
As the ballad goes:  
"They’ve builded wooden timber tracks,  
And a trolley with screaming breaks, (...)"

Remember it? No? It was the famous Australian poet Frank Leslie T. Wilmot (1881-1942) who certainly had the railway in mind when he wrote the poem "Progress". Could he ever imagine that in 2012 Australians would move a step back and build an old-fashioned vehicle? Yes, they did this for the Queen – to commemorate her Diamond Jubilee. The golden state coach was conceived and built in Australia by a team led by J. Frecklington. It is the newest coach in the Royal Mews (London). Australian-made it is a postillion driven, three metres high, almost five and a half metres long "trolley" without screaming brakes, and weighs over three tonnes.

Golden times to come: Happy New Year 2016!

Henriette von Holleuffer
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INSIGHT

The Federal Intervention

An Insider’s Perspective

Rob Hitchcock

The former Secretary of the North Australian Workers Union Branch of the ALHMWU (1996–2000) and Ministerial Advisor to the NT Deputy Chief Minister Sydney James Stirling (2001–2003) gives an insight view into the Northern Territory Statehood Referendum which may explain some aspects of the Referendum vote.

Big Place/Small Jurisdiction

The Northern Territory is not a small jurisdiction in terms of land mass. It takes more than 12 hours to drive at the legal speed limit from Darwin to Alice Springs. It takes at least another 2 hours to reach the South Australian border. It is not possible to drive anything but cattle from the West Australian border to Queensland unless you drop down to Three Ways and hang a leftie. That is meant to be rhetorical, not directional.

There are still a few good lefties hanging around in Darwin and the outer fringes. They would tell you that the Northern Territory is in fact a very small jurisdiction from a political point of view – that it is not that hard to make friends, form cliques, know your enemies and influence events both socially and politically (as if they were not the same thing). There are, at last count, around 240,000 people in the NT\(^1\). Around 25% of that population are local indigenous citizens – born and bred in their own country, with a history going back further than anyone can count and not likely to move anywhere else anytime soon.

This lack of mobility has always been a big problem for the white men who have come to run the show and boss things like they own the place. It is a particularly big problem since the NT Land Rights Act and the more recent High Court decisions in Mabo\(^2\) and Wik\(^3\) have made it legal for Indigenous Australians to stay on their own lands for as long as they want. But for the white man there are minerals to find and mines to dig and every white settler knows that historically and logically the best way to make a fortune in a country as old and dry as Australia is to either dig it up or provide the services to help dig it up. Everything that follows in this commentary rests on that proposition. The Intervention is all about access – to the land, to the minerals and to the minds of the Indigenous population – it is about how to change the terms of access by white men to these key elements of our Aboriginal heritage.

---

\(^1\) Northern Territory population = 243,800 as at end of March 2015 (ABS Aust. Demographic Stats 3101.0)

\(^2\) Mabo and Others v Queensland (No 2) (1992) 175 CLR 1, [1992] HCA 23

\(^3\) Wik Peoples v Queensland (1996) 187 CLR 1
and culture so that the Indigenous Australians themselves can no longer stop whites from living and working on their land; indeed, no longer want to live on their own land and no longer much care what happens to that land in the future.

That is the real agenda behind the Intervention and the story of how it came about can be traced to the efforts of just two men, neither of whom was born in the Territory, but both of whom were trained as suburban solicitors, shared the same basic conservative political beliefs and had similar personal ambitions and aspirations which would ultimately bring them very close together. They also had one other thing in common which would bind them tight and which was, I believe, a major driving force behind the Intervention: they had both been publicly humiliated by Aboriginal people and both had their hearts set on political payback - big time.

No Turning Back

I was present at the first of these humiliations, at the Reconciliation Conference in Melbourne in May 1997. The newly elected Prime Minister, Mr. John Howard, had been invited to give the opening speech to the Conference, a gathering of Aboriginal people from all over the nation, buoyed by the High Court decisions in Mabo and Wik and fast reaching a high point in Indigenous confidence in the progress of their political struggles for cultural recognition and social justice. Mr Howard had already made a number of statements about Indigenous affairs in the national media. He had been reported as saying that he would not be making a public apology to the Stolen Generations. He had also stated that he did not support what he called `a black armband view of history’ – by which he was taken to mean that there was nothing in the history of the colonization of the Australian continent by white settlers to be sorry about and certainly no need to try to repair that which had been done in the past. The audience waited to see if he would repeat these sentiments openly before the very people he claimed required no apology.

He was clearly nervous when he began. An apparently humorous aside fell flat and there were several pauses as he found his place in his lecture notes. And it quickly became apparent to the assembled audience that this was to be a lecture, that Mr. Howard, as Prime Minister, was giving them a lecture about what mattered and what did not:

“In facing the realities of the past...we must not join those who would portray Australia’s history since 1788 as little more than a disgraceful period of colonial imperialism...such an approach will be repudiated by the overwhelming majority of Australians who are proud of what this country has achieved although inevitably acknowledging the blemishes in its past history....”.

And so, as the PM moved from describing two centuries of repression, massacre and dispossession of grandparents and great grandparents as mere blemishes in a nation’s proud history, and began to reiterate his refusal to apologize to the Stolen Generation on behalf of the Australian people, some in the audience began to shift in their seats. Others began to growl under their breaths. And, as Mr. Howard began to hector rather than lecture and to raise his voice in a high-pitched way in response to interjections, some people started to stand up and turn their backs to the speaker. Others followed, until at least half the audience stood with their backs to the Prime Minister in the bravest expression of disgust and defiance I have ever seen against an elected leader of this country. It was perhaps the greatest shame job in the history of Australia. Mr. Howard eventually stuttered to a stop and left the stage. His face was a study in purple, his fists clenched and his shoulders hunched. He did not stop to say goodbye to the organizers. His entourage leapt into their Commonwealth cars and he was whisked away. He would not forget what happened to him that day. Revenge, as they say, is often best served cold. Mr Shane Stone, on the other hand, was not unfamiliar with Aboriginal people. He had started a legal practice in Alice Springs some ten years before and had quickly joined the Country Liberal Party – the dominant political party in the Northern Territory since the commencement of self-government in 1974. Mr Stone had risen quickly through the CLP ranks, had been elected to Parliament in the seat of Port Darwin in 1990, and was recognized by the NT News as the first politician to wear a 3 piece suit in the Parliament.

In 1995, with the retirement of Marshall Bruce Perron, he was elected leader of the CLP and hence Chief Minister of the NT. Mr. Stone was an ambitious and at times arrogant man who, as Attorney General, had made himself a QC by his own order. He was liked by the younger conservative members in Parliament and in the general Darwin social scene, but he was distrusted by many older CLP supporters and often intensely disliked by his immediate political opponents in the ALP and by activists in the wider community. He did, however, consolidate his political position by leading the CLP to a resounding victory in the August 1997 general election and his hold on the reins of government seemed secure with a weak Opposition, a compliant populace and a steady flow of dollars from the Federal coffers.

Indeed, the Territory, or more particularly Darwin, had come a long way since the tragedy of cyclone Tracy in 1974. The city now had a string of modern hotels along the main Esplanade into town, a population of over 100,000 people living in the greater Darwin area, a permanent garrison of troops to protect the town, and a huge new white Parliament House overlooking the Harbour. Outside of Darwin, there were several thriving mining towns in the Top End and a smattering of smaller mine sites sprinkled over the western deserts and the gulf country to the east. The tourism sector had also developed in a number of key sites including Kakadu and Uluru and there were signs that live cattle exports to Indonesia and
beyond were becoming increasingly feasible. The Territory on a range of economic indicators (and excluding all Indigenous social data) was really starting to boom.

Statehood

So, from many white perspectives the obvious next legal step for the Northern Territory was to become a State, with a Premier (who might or might not be Mr. Stone), with all the rights of a Sovereign state of the Commonwealth of Australia, and perhaps even a few more Senators in the Federal Parliament like the other Australian States. It was so obviously the next big thing to aim for that Mr. Stone decided to dispense with the Constitutional development process and the ideas developed over the previous several years and instead hold a referendum to endorse the idea of Statehood for the Northern Territory as soon as possible. He called together a handpicked bunch of CLP supporters and community leaders to rubber stamp his own Constitutional framework and then set a date for the Referendum (5 October 1998). From the CLP perspective it was a no-brainer to lead the charge for Statehood, be identified as the Party responsible for Statehood and watch the electors vote their way for another 20 years. Mr. Howard held a joint Press Conference with Mr. Stone in Canberra to support the idea of the Territory becoming “a new State for a new Century” by January 2001. The Federal Minister for Territories and Local Government, Alex Somlyay, suggested that, once the NT referendum had been held and passed, the Australian people could be asked to vote on the question in a national referendum to be held in conjunction with the next Federal election (whenever that might be). The sudden (almost undue) haste of the announcements made many people begin to question the motives behind the whole process.

But Statehood, as one commentator said at the time, was like Motherhood – no-one could vote against it. Except that more than half of the Northern Territory population actually did just that. The Statehood referendum vote has not been well analyzed or properly explained even though it was clearly the watershed in modern NT politics for a generation of politicians, activists and voters.

Mr Stone’s arrogance and his poor handling of the Yes campaign, including the choice of words for the Referendum question itself, are often cited as the primary factors behind the outcome. The basic statistics of the majority NO vote are usually noted but little research or

---

1 J. Howard (Prime Minister) and S. Stone (Chief Minister), Joint Press Conference, Parliament House, Canberra 11 August 1998.
2 The NT Legislative Assembly Constitutional Committee’s Inquiry into the Statehood Referendum found a number of reasons for the NO vote: These included “a lack of information and understanding about Statehood, concern about the Statehood Convention process and the events surrounding it, a lack of trust in those responsible for last year’s process, inadequate consultation, the role and approach of the Chief Minister, and a protest against the then Chief Minister and ‘the arrogance of politicians’”. This view became the received wisdom regarding the Referendum vote and the character assassination of Mr. Stone was supported by both the CLP and the ALP for very different reasons. It should be noted that the Constitutional
explanation has been really provided as to why the NO vote was so uniformly high in all of the bush seats and in the marginal seats outside of the greater Darwin area.

Why did at least 75% of the Aboriginal population of the NT vote against Statehood and how did that vote mesh with a solid No vote in the white urban areas to achieve a majority of just over 51.9% of the total vote?

The NO Campaign

The public campaign against Statehood was led by a group of social activists in the Darwin area who were horrified at the prospect of the CLP government having the sovereign powers of a State to legislate and enforce laws over the Indigenous people of the Territory without Commonwealth oversight or right of veto.

This was a society which, it must be remembered, still had graffiti in red paint on the bridge into the town of Katherine demanding “Free Klaus Barbie”, a society which still had an active cadre of the KKK in Alice Springs and which, even in Darwin, had failed to prosecute the drive-by shooting of the Northern Land Council shop-front windows in the Stuart Highway as recently as 1990. These incidents were only the epiphenomena of a much deeper racial divide, one which Mr Stone relentlessly exploited in his references to the “whingeing, whining carping blacks” who stood in the way of economic progress and the development of the mining, pastoral and tourism industries on which the white people relied.

The NO campaign quickly established a loose coalition of groups opposed to the Statehood proposal, including the somewhat legalistic “Territorians for Democratic Statehood” who were not opposed to Statehood as such but more to the manner and form in which it had been proposed, and retired local businessman John Hoffmeyer, who paid for a TV advertisement which ran:

“Territory politicians want us to agree to a constitution that doesn’t guarantee freedom of speech and basic human rights and has no protection against government excess. Make the politicians listen - vote No. It’s a word they’d understand.”

Many parts of the ‘Aboriginal Industry’: the Community Legal Services, the Land Councils and the Aboriginal Community Organizations located in the larger towns down the Track from Katherine, to Tennant Creek and Alice Springs, all played low-key but important roles in getting the message out. The murmur in the vineyard was not loud. People were not used to

committee acknowledged that Aboriginal people had other reasons for voting NO related to the Reeves Report and a perceived threat to Land Rights (infra).

A comment made by Mr Stone as Chief Minister originally in reference to Galarrwuy Yunupingu

Spokesperson for Territorians for Democratic Statehood was another Darwin lawyer Peter McNab who was vocal on radio discussions and TV interviews and regularly questioned both the wording and the process of the Referendum debate.
real political protest out bush and they knew the CLP Government too well to make too much noise. But there was a fractious mood in the communities and some smart guys were sniffing the wind and smiling with intent.

The No campaign was also supported by the North Australian Workers Union Branch of the Miscellaneous Workers Union. Historically the largest Union in the Territory with the closest links to the Indigenous population, the NAWU had led the campaign for half-caste employment rights in the 1950’s, had run the equal wage case for Aboriginal stockmen in the 1960’s and supported the Wave Hill walk-off which led to the Land Rights legislation of the mid-70’s. The Union had members from many of the old Aboriginal families in Darwin and Alice Springs and a solid Indigenous membership across the NT Public Service, the health services sector and local council workforces.

The NAWU released a rather long-winded two page broadsheet condemning the proposal for Statehood on several grounds. The Union pointed out that the NT Government and the 20,000 people it employed directly through the NTPS were still totally dependent on Federal funding to survive. The Union argued that any weakening of the fiduciary controls exercised by the Commonwealth would be a huge risk for the Territory and especially for the Indigenous population reliant upon that Federal funding. Many people in the Territory believed that the Darwin ‘fat cats’ took more than their fair share of that funding anyway and that this would only get worse if the Federal government withdrew its oversight and ultimate control of NTG spending.

From a purely Industrial perspective the Union also observed that no firm guarantees to preserve the Federal Award system in the Territory had been offered in Mr Stone’s revised Constitutional framework. There were many workers covered by common-rule Awards in the pastoral, mining and hospitality industries who relied upon those Awards to protect their working conditions and entitlements. If the new State was given unfettered powers over industrial relations then many of those Award conditions (and particularly the common rule system of Award maintenance and enforceability) would be under real threat. A mere wink and a nod to protect existing conditions was in no way good enough when it came to the working future of so many Territorians.

The NAWU statement concluded that the NT and the NTG in particular showed no signs of having reached the necessary maturity to operate as a State. The appalling health, education and living standards of Aboriginal people on the fringes of the major towns and in many remote communities had not improved in the 24 years of Self-Government by the CLP and provided no evidence that a further increase in NTG powers would bring any improvement in the near future.\(^9\)

\(^9\) Private papers of the author as former Secretary of the NAWU.
The Union broadsheet was widely distributed across Union workplaces and through active delegate structures in a number of key occupational groups including the organized mine sites at Gove and Groote Eylandt, the Aboriginal Health Workers Association and the Territory Hospital network. The Union’s position attracted criticism from the ALP and from several prominent ALP politicians, including the leader of the Opposition, Maggie Hickey, who had decided (for misplaced populist reasons) to officially support the push for Statehood. It is interesting to note that Wikipedia incorrectly reports that the ALP opposed Statehood and supported the NO vote. This seems a curious (and perhaps willful) misconstruction of the nature of the debate at the time and perhaps reflects more about the history of the Statehood debate since that time.

In truth, however, the impact and influence of these campaign efforts was probably quite minimal and largely restricted to the white urban centres – there were other issues percolating in the bush which would have a far more profound effect on the vote amongst the Indigenous population.

The Black Perspective

Many Aboriginal people were deeply cynical about the Government’s real motives for wanting to become a State. There was in fact a real fear that the NT as a State would one day resurrect its overturned Euthanasia legislation in ways which might not be quite in the best interests of Aboriginal people. This fear existed in a context of the Stolen Generations, massively disproportionate imprisonment rates and a not totally humorous suggestion that the Royal Darwin Hospital was the place where black people were strapped up to machines and left to die in the freezing air-conditioning of a ‘non-smoking concrete dungeon’. It was, perhaps, an irrational fear, in the scheme of things, that the Government might start lawfully killing Indigenous people if euthanasia was allowed, but it was generally understood that it had been the Federal Government which had overruled the Perron legislation and that if the NT had its way the so-called ‘Right to Die laws’ would be back on the books quick time. But there was another issue in the Bush which was burning far more fiercely than any other and which, ironically, had been set alight by the CLP and Howard Government together – the Reeves review of the NT Land Rights Act\textsuperscript{10}. In October 1997, the Howard Government appointed Mr. John Reeves QC to head an inquiry into the functions and operations of the NT Lands Rights Act. Mr. Reeves was a prominent Darwin lawyer who had formerly and very briefly (in 1983) been the Labor MHR for the Northern Territory, before falling victim to the interminable internecine power struggles between the Left and the Right which characterized internal Labor politics throughout the 1980’s and 1990’s. Mr. Reeves maintained close links with Bob Collins and the Right of the ALP but over time had also developed a friendship with Shane Stone, who appointed him a Queens Counsel in 1997.

\textsuperscript{10} “Building on Land Rights for the next Generation” by John Reeves QC, AGPS 1998 ISBN 0642588031
The Reeves Review of the NT Land Rights Act was tabled out of session in Federal Parliament on 21 August 1998 (two months before the NT Statehood referendum). The Review recommended the abolition of the existing Land Councils and their replacement with an NT Aboriginal Council with members to be hand-picked by the Federal Minister and the NT Chief Minister. The NTAC would be given effective control of much of the surviving ATSIC funding and all mining Royalty payments to Traditional Owners. The Review also recommended the abolition of the Permit system and the granting of powers to the NTG to override customary laws, to control access to sacred sites and to acquire Aboriginal land for ‘public purposes’ by compulsory acquisition.

Not surprisingly, the Review recommendations caused a furore in the Aboriginal media and in the Land Councils, where it was seen as a direct attack upon the very concept of Land Rights. Many Aboriginal leaders came out strongly against the recommendations and there was a sudden edge to Indigenous workplace meetings and discussions which had not been present before. At the national level, prominent former Liberal parliamentarians, including Malcolm Fraser, also publicly condemned the proposals.

It was the reaction in the Bush to the Reeves review which more than any other issue determined the outcome of the Referendum on Statehood. Any complacency amongst the younger generation of black voters over the need to protect their Land Rights and any inclination to trust the Northern Territory Government with more powers or greater authority over their welfare, was blown away. The Land Rights Act, more than any other gesture by the white governments, had validated the continued existence of Aboriginal people on their own lands and anyone who wanted to water down that legislation was not to be trusted or supported. The Aboriginal people of the Northern Territory voted in favour of their own identity and voted No to Statehood accordingly.

The Numbers

Nevertheless, and despite the poorly run YES campaign and the clear rumblings in the Bush, the result of the Referendum came as a shock to almost everyone. Shane Stone and his cronies could not believe it and insisted that the pundits hold fire until the counting was finalized. It was a close vote and there was always the possibility that the postal and absentee votes might make a difference. But they didn’t – certainly not enough to change the outcome.

Of the 92,943 formal votes cast in the Referendum of 5 October 1998, 44,702 people (48.1%) voted Yes to Statehood and 48,241 (51.9%) voted No.\(^{11}\) In the mobile booths (a

feature of Territory elections where the NT Electoral Office visits remote communities across the entire jurisdiction in the weeks prior to the voting date and assists mostly Indigenous voters to register their vote) only one Team out of 21 Mobile Teams recorded a majority vote in favour of Statehood. The total bush vote showed a massive resistance to Statehood – 3257 (25.2%) voting Yes and 9655 (74.8%) voting No – a ratio of nearly 3:1 against. The turnout in the remote communities was the highest of any vote before or since and the vote was also seriously consistent across all of the regions – from Arnhem Land and the Tiwi Islands in the North, through the Roper river regions and the Barkly tablelands to the Western desert country and all points south of the Alice. Even in some static polling booths in parts of Katherine, Alice Springs and the older northern suburbs of Darwin the No vote prevailed.

It is worth noting the change in the Bush vote from the previous Territory election held only one year earlier in August 1997. The seat of McDonnell covering the region south of Alice Springs voted 52% to 48% on a two-party preferred basis in favour of the CLP in the 1997 election. On the referendum question the voters opted for the NO vote by a ratio of nearly 3:1. In the seat of Stuart (to the north and west of Alice Springs) the two party preferred vote was 48%/52% in favour of the ALP candidate in 1997. Just over one year later the NO vote was attracting over 88% of the total vote in some major centres such as Yuendumu and Docker River. Similar increases in the anti-establishment vote occurred in the seat of Barkly and in the Top End bush seats of Arafura and Arnhem, from two party preferred ratios of roughly 40/60 to yes/no ratios of nearly 20/80 in some areas.

It was clear to analysts on the night, if not to subsequent commentators and pundits, that the solidarity of the black vote had been sufficient to outnumber the fragmentary white vote in the urban centres and that, on crudely democratic or proportional representational terms, politics in the NT had been turned completely on its head.

The ALP tried to say that the people had spoken and that the Party were happy with the result, but they didn’t sound convinced and it didn’t matter anyway because no-one was listening. The main effect was the shock. There were no other obvious consequences of the vote. There was no change of Government, no change in Government policy on any key issues. There was just a sense, a very deep sense, that something very basic had changed in the politics of the Territory. Everyone now knew that the CLP could be beaten in a fair vote, that there were enough blacks and whites somehow on the same side of some poorly defined fence in this new Territory to vote together and beat the bastards. There was now real hope in the bush, and a real fear in the suspicious minds of the white supremacists in their Wedding Cake on the edge of the Darwin cliffs, that the vote in the bush had been

---

13 ”The Wedding Cake” was the somewhat descriptive term used by many people to refer to the new Parliament House – built with Federal funding at very great expense to the Australian taxpayer.
somehow actually organized. In fact, the bush vote was not so much an organized opinion as a shared consciousness of self-interest and an expression of nascent political power. The bush had always voted more for Labor but now it was voting as a block, and as a black block in their own interests and in support of their own agenda.

And the conservatives were right to be worried. Because if an election had been held on that same day, and if the electors who had voted No had also voted Labor, then the result of that election would have been very close indeed. It would have meant the almost certain loss by the CLP of at least 3 seats (McDonnell, Millner, and Jingili) and the possible loss of another 3 seats (Casuarina, Nightcliff, and Karama). Indeed, 3 years later, at the next actual NT election in August 2001 this was pretty much what did happen [and everyone was shocked again!!]¹⁴

Consequences of the Referendum

The first head to roll had to be Mr. Stone. His own Party made sure that by February of the next year he was gone.¹⁵ Maggie Hickey followed the next day. The new leaders of the CLP and the ALP faced off across a new divide (the colonel [Mr. Burke] and the media star [Clare Martin]). Everyone could see how the game had now changed and who was what and how and by what margin.

And so Mr Stone left the politics of the Northern Territory, ousted and humiliated by those same carping, whingeing Indigenous voters he had ridiculed and persecuted for so many years. But it wasn’t long before his soul mates in Canberra had found him a job. In 1999 he was appointed President of the Federal Liberal Party, a position he was to hold for 6 years. It was a position from which he could watch (probably with some Schadenfreude in respect of his former CLP colleagues) the election of the first Labor government in the NT in 2001 and their subsequent re-election with an increased majority in 2005.

Mr Stone assumed the role of the Liberal Party Sibyl, issuing warnings of dire electoral defeat if the Liberal Party did not lift its game in Canberra and make war on profligates and idleness. Mr. Stone was no longer on the fringes of political power and could now work even more closely with the Prime Minister, Mr. Howard, with whom he would continue to share not only a mutual horror of Land Rights, but also the need to develop a new strategy which would crush the articulation of self-determination in Aboriginal communities across the country. The economic backbone of the nation had to come first and the mining industry, in particular, had to be given every opportunity to explore and expand. And if the number of

¹⁴ NTEC: 2001 Legislative Assembly General Election – 18 August 2001
¹⁵ Mr Stone has always disputed that he was sacked as Chief Minister by his own party. He maintains that he had a long-standing agreement with Mr. Howard to vacate the Chief Ministers job and become Federal President of the Liberal Party when the existing President retired. Perhaps, if he had told the Territory electorate of his intentions to depart, they might have believed him and perhaps the Referendum vote might have swung the other way. Alternatively, the secret deal with Mr. Howard was perhaps just another example of why many people did not trust the man or his policies.
mines grew so would the number of jobs available to local Indigenous people. The whole thing was an obvious win-win situation, and if this new prosperity also happened to split the black vote well that would be good too, and if everyone in white Australia felt good about it all then who could possibly complain? These were all ideological objectives which fitted neatly into the xenophobic, sabre-rattling, self-made nationalism of the Howard era – market driven with a hint of steel - a strong nation must have strong borders and there is no room for any other nation(s) inside those borders.

Ultimately, in the dying days of the Howard era, when all the rest of the Liberal dream was beginning to fade, the opportunity for political payback finally came – dressed up as a response to a humanitarian plea for help and in reply to an open invitation to address the levels of family violence and child abuse occurring in Indigenous communities across the NT. The legal capacity to intervene was never really questioned or effectively challenged by the ALP NT Government. Indeed, some elements of both the Right and Left factions of the ALP were cautiously supportive of the program. The Chief Minister, Clare Martin, took a swing at the lack of prior consultation with her government and questioned the need to abolish the Permit system but was otherwise completely wrong-footed by the announcement. The fact that the NTG was slow to act on the recommendations of the Anderson Report did not help matters. But the fact that there were apparently no formal discussions with the NTG prior to the announcement of the Intervention was merely consistent with the contempt in which the Howard Government hardliners held the soft pedal Indigenous policies of the Martin government.

The NT Intervention therefore had been brewing for some time and was essentially the ultimate neo-conservative response to the development of an Indigenous political consciousness. It would contain all of the elements of the attack on Land Rights that the Indigenous population of the NT had voted against in the 1998 Referendum, but the new Intervention process would not give Aboriginal people the opportunity to vote against that agenda again. The conservatives had learnt from their mistakes. They would not give notice of their intentions. They would certainly not give the Aboriginal people or their supporters the chance to mobilize against them.

The Federal Government would intervene comprehensively and with energy and new ideas. It would stop family violence. It would ban alcohol for Aboriginal people. It would disband community development programs in remote communities. It would cut family benefits for non-compliance with new truancy rules and introduce a new benefits card tied to certain

types of groceries and the stores that provided them. It would even bring in the Army to bring back law and order.

Although it was never put in these terms, the NT bush was to become the crucible for a new experiment in social engineering. The people of those communities were to become the guinea pigs. The outcome would become clear only as the years progressed: the destruction of self-determination for Aboriginal people, the re-introduction of social control mechanisms into all aspects of the Indigenous social fabric and, ultimately for the lucky few, the achievement of accelerated assimilation as the reward for total and uncritical obedience.

Many commentators have remarked upon both the lack of detail in the early Intervention announcements and the virtually complete disregard shown to the recommendations of the *Little Children are Sacred Report*. But the Intervention was not premised on those recommendations. The interests of little children were never the focus of the Intervention. The real focus was the interests of the mining companies and how best to open up access to Aboriginal land for exploration and mining. That was and remains the most important element of the Intervention agenda and it appears to have been guided by a simple but effective three point plan:

**Three Point Plan**

1. Destroy the Permit System
2. Install white officers to control all important decision-making in remote communities
3. Implement policies and processes which will lead to the accelerated assimilation of the Indigenous youth into white Australian programs and value systems.

The impact of this three point plan would be felt quickly, as the NTG walked away from its primary responsibilities in the bush and effectively ceded the management of health, education and welfare services to the Federal Government. The upshot was a gradual decline in Land Council influence, the fragmentation of the ALP support base in many remote communities and the emergence of coconut candidates with overt CLP backing in many previously staunch Labor seats. This fragmentation would lead eventually to the

---

17 It should be noted that, in 2007, and in obvious recognition of the role he had played in the formulation of the policies and objectives of the conservative Indigenous agenda, Mr. Reeves was rewarded by the Howard Government with appointment as an inaugural member of the Intervention Taskforce. Later that year, in one of the very last acts of the Howard regime, Mr. Reeves was appointed to the Federal Court with special responsibility for the Northern Territory. The Right of the NT Labor Party, however, was not to be outdone and, in 2008, having effectively encouraged his Federal colleagues to make only minor changes to the Intervention process, Chief Minister Henderson appointed Mr. Reeves to the reserve bench of the Supreme Court of the Northern Territory.

18 A “coconut candidate” is a reference to a candidate who is “black on the outside but white on the inside”.

---
election of several black CLP candidates in bush seats at the 2012 Territory election and the resulting loss of government by the ALP.

Destroying the Permit System, which had been operated by the Land Councils since the introduction of the NT Land Rights Act in 1976, was the first and primary objective of the Intervention. The permit system made Land Rights real by requiring people to give reasons for entering the land of Traditional Owners – prior to entry. By removing the permit system, the Federal Government took away the capacity of Aboriginal people to control the influx of white strangers into their communities and to regulate the activities of those persons. Border protection was thereby cynically abolished. It would be replaced by an open invitation to treat for outsiders, with internal controls run by white administrators and enforcement officers.

The recruitment and introduction of white administrators and enforcement officers to the remote communities was necessary in order to seize control of the most important decision-making processes at the local level. In classic foreign occupation format, a new form of social order and control would be introduced in which all key decisions were made directly or indirectly by white men in accordance with an agenda set by white men and enforced by white men. Collaborators would be rewarded with positions of status if not power and with the regular supply of welfare payments. Non-compliance would be punished by pecuniary penalties, incarceration or by turning off the welfare tap.

The Accelerated Assimilation policies to be introduced by the white administrators would go by other names and other procedures, but would be characterized by a more aggressive enforcement of rules and more punitive responses for non-compliance with white rules of behaviour (particularly in relation to infringements of rules relating to time-keeping, benefit compliance activities and school attendance rates). Beyond the new rules, however, lurked the compliance methodologies of benefit withdrawal and welfare card expenditure restrictions. The most outstanding outcome of these accelerated assimilation policies, however, has not been in the marginal improvement of school attendance rates, or any notable reduction in rates of domestic violence, but in the continued increase in the rate of incarceration at which young and ever younger Indigenous males are being locked up in Territory jails. This outcome, perhaps more than any other, should ensure that the adult Aboriginal population of tomorrow is more fragmented, less focussed and much less settled than any previous generation.

19 Social historians would recognize the similarities of the new welfare card system with the system of ‘trucking’ practiced by the large Textile companies of 19th Century England, where weavers were paid in credits which could only be redeemed at company-owned stores selling a limited range of goods at company set prices.
Prohibition

The impact of the alcohol prohibition for Aboriginal people has differed across communities and regions. The blanket strategy of banning grog everywhere was not adopted by the previous Labor NT Government on the grounds that it would be a racist and discriminatory action, and that moreover, there was sufficient variation in community attitudes and abuse levels to warrant a case by case community response to the problem. In effect this had amounted to a status quo formula, with no lasting changes in alcohol consumption or its consequences in terms of health and social well-being.

The Intervention strategy of a complete ban has, like all previous attempts at prohibition, run into severe compliance issues. These have been exacerbated by the inevitable emergence of sly grog runners and by the extraordinary effrontery of tourist operators and white campers drinking openly on black land. The combination of the reduction in the availability of welfare cash and the increase in availability of alternative drugs such as ice and other amphetamines has had the nett effect of reintroducing a widespread drug problem together with a significant increase in prostitution and pimping in many townships, as young men and women seek alternative ways to get the money to buy the drugs that they want and can also sell to equally desperate friends and associates.

Jobs

Indigenous employment has not received much critical attention in the media in the last ten years, despite the fact that it was a keynote item on the list of intended achievements under the Intervention. Indeed, even given the almost blanket ban placed on information relating to the Intervention by the Federal Governments of both political persuasions, it is very disturbing to note how much the rhetoric of job creation and meaningful employment has died away from the politicians mouths and how many of the quickly-abolished employment programs (like CDEP) appear to be coming back as mere shadows of their former selves.

This is a matter of some personal concern for me. As a former Union official and labour market analyst, I have always believed that jobs, the nature of jobs, the level of job security and the terms and conditions of a person’s employment, are always the best indicator of social cohesion and social progress in a community. This is especially the case, I believe, in Indigenous communities, where the number of paid jobs is so few and the prospects for employment are so dismal. Any job or task that can be developed and grown into useful and gainful employment should be encouraged and wherever possible, funded. It is a basic operating principle of Australian society that the predominant mechanism for wealth distribution is through earned income derived from useful employment. Fair and decent wages are the best way to share our nation’s wealth and the only way for most people to secure their long term futures.
There was and still is only one large employer in the Northern Territory: the NT Public Service with over 20,000 public servants. It is the obvious place in the NT to look for jobs and the obvious first stop for policy-makers looking for job creation and the development of work options in the bush.

In 2003, the newly appointed Commissioner for Public Employment in the NTG introduced a new Indigenous Employment Strategy for the entire Northern Territory Public Service. The Strategy recognized that the number of Aboriginal employees in the NTPS had been a long way shy of a representative proportion of the Indigenous population of the NT (put roughly at 25%). Clearly the previous CLP regime had not seen the employment of Indigenous men, women and young people as a major objective and indeed many Aboriginal people were understandably reluctant to apply for NT Government jobs or even to identify as Aboriginal people when they did. It was clearly time for the NTPS to make a serious effort to recruit and train Indigenous employees in all occupational areas and across all Departments. The Commissioner made it clear to all Agency Heads that their Indigenous employment numbers would be scrutinized every year and that all Agencies were expected to introduce a range of Mentoring and training programs to encourage not only the recruitment but also the retention and promotion of Indigenous staff over time. A figure of 10% for Indigenous employees was set as the target across the NTPS by 2010.

In the first three years of the Strategy, the number of Indigenous employees in the NTPS increased from the initially identified 2.5% to over 7% of the total NTPS workforce. In real terms this represented an increase from around 500 Indigenous employees to around 1400 employees by the end of 2005. This was an impressive achievement and a credit to the hard work of the OCPE and Agency officers involved in the various recruitment initiatives and promotions directly and indirectly responsible for much of the increase.

There were signs, however, that job ready applicants for positions were becoming harder to find. This was a reflection of the poor education outcomes in most bush schools where literacy and numeracy learning was still not much better than dismal. The apparent shortage of job ready recruits became ammunition for an Agency push to decentralize control of the Strategy back to the Agency level and to leave the OCPE with a purely information and research role within the Policy framework. Predictably, within two years the numbers had begun to seriously decline and, by the time of the Intervention, the Strategy itself had begun to be questioned and a new ideological thrust towards private sector employment had taken hold. This was the period when the mining boom was in full surge in Australia and leading entrepreneurs such as Twiggy Forest were proposing to find jobs for 50,000 Aborigines in the private sector alone.
In response to these new initiatives, endorsed by the Federal Government and promoted by a number of Job networks across the country, the NTPS effectively went quiet on their own Indigenous recruitment initiatives. Their new brief, as they saw it, was to actively support the private sector to create sustainable jobs across industries which had not really embraced the notion of Indigenous employees before.

The initiative was as noble as it was ill-conceived. Since that time, the number of Indigenous employees within the NTPS has continued to fall, while most of the jobs for Indigenous people in the private sector have been poorly paid, short-term and nowhere near as many as have actually been lost in the public sector. This is not to say that many jobs have not been created as a result of the Intervention itself, but most of those jobs have been filled by whites and most of those whites are, by contrast, being very well paid. There has, more than likely, been a nett decrease in Indigenous employment in the Territory since 2007.

The issue of Indigenous employment must be, I believe, at the centre of any serious discussion about the future of Aboriginal communities in the Northern Territory. If there is nothing to do except drink and smoke then that is exactly what people will do. If there is no sense of satisfaction from the doing of tasks well done and of ideas well thought out, then there is not much scope for self-respect and self-reliance.

There is no reason why Aboriginal people cannot learn to perform all of the tasks required to be performed in their communities. This was proven by Indigenous people in a range of occupations during WWII and again in the Australian Survey Office after the war. It has been proven since in the cattle industry, with Indigenous women in the textile and craft industries, and with Aboriginal Health Workers to the level of formal nursing competencies in the NT Community Controlled Health Sector. It has always been covertly resisted by racists and troglodytes in Government departments and will always meet opposition in areas where profit is put before people. But, unless gainful employment is encouraged and developed in our remote communities, there will be no resolution of the social problems facing those communities.

A Way Ahead

Given that the Intervention has now been nearly 10 years in operation, it may be too disruptive to remote communities for the whole farrago to be suddenly scrapped, for the whites to be withdrawn all at once and for the bans on alcohol and laughter to be suddenly lifted. Instead, and more in keeping with cultural practices and the UN principles of self-determination, it might be better to engage in a process whereby, as a first step, the Indigenous people themselves are asked to determine what they want done on their behalf and what they want to do themselves both at the Territory level and at the local or regional level. A clear statement by both the Northern Territory and Commonwealth governments
concerning the paramount nature of the Land Rights Act 1976 over other laws, and a statement concerning the on-going importance of Indigenous self-determination in all matters relating to the Territory and Federal funding of Aboriginal programs and initiatives, might be a good way to kick that process off.

Then again, if it is all too hard, and the politicians in Darwin and Canberra just can’t bring themselves to withdraw their foot soldiers from the communities, remove the occupation signs and pay a fair wage to black people for the work that has to be done, then it might just be a good idea to ask the Indigenous people of the NT if they want to remain a part of this failed State, called the Northern Territory in any sense, or in any way into the future.

Article© Rob Hitchcock 2015
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The Intervention and its Consequences – 9-10 October 2015 (Bonn)

Miriam Gertzen and Carolin Hoffmann
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An international and interdisciplinary conference on “The Intervention and its Consequences” was held at Bonn University from 9 to 10 October 2015. It was organized by two members of the Association of Australian Studies (Gesellschaft für Australienstudien – GAST), Barbara Schmidt-Haberkamp of Bonn University’s English Department, and Elisabeth Bähr, curator of Australian Indigenous art from Speyer.

The term “Intervention” is commonly used to refer to the “Northern Territory National Emergency Response” (NTER), which was issued just before the Australian election in 2007 by the Federal Government led by John Howard. Officially in reaction to a report by the local Northern Territory Government about the supposed sexual abuse and neglect of Indigenous children, these emergency laws authorised the Australian government to drastically intervene in the self-determination of Indigenous communities. Among the measures taken were a massive influx of police and military in the respective communities, a suspension of the Racial Discrimination Act of 1975, a cancellation of the right to prohibit access by non-community members to areas given to Indigenous communities via the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act of 1976, the abolition of the consideration of Indigenous customary law, the mandatory allocation of social security contributions, the prohibition of alcohol and pornographic material and a compulsory medical examination of all children in the areas concerned.
Even though the Intervention and the political measures subsequently taken have led to heated controversies and continue to divide the Australian nation until the present day, so far this issue has not been the focus of an academic conference, neither in Australia nor abroad. Therefore, this conference sought to provide a starting point both for the interdisciplinary and the international discussion of this controversial piece of legislation. It triggered much interest in advance, for example by Australian media and human rights organizations, and among the attendants and speakers were participants from several countries, institutions and organizations. This wide range of participants underlined the necessity of providing a platform for such an exchange on a topic that for years has put a strain on the relationship between the Indigenous and non-Indigenous population as well as on the relationship between some urban Aborigines and remote Indigenous communities, and that has revived the trauma of the past and substantially damaged the process of reconciliation.

Barbara Schmidt-Haberkamp, Elisabeth Bähr and Amelie Bernzen, chair of GASt, welcomed the speakers and participants on Friday morning in the Universitätsforum, setting the aim for this conference to examine the Intervention from the perspectives of a diverse range of academic disciplines.

The first session, chaired by Inge Erhardt (Bonn) was dedicated to the bureaucratic framework of the legislation. It was opened by Lindsay Frost (Speyer) with his paper on “The Intervention: The Truth, the Whole Truth and Nothing but the Truth?”, a title that already points out the controversial nature of apparently objective certainties. His presentation provided a timeline of the events as well as information about key individuals, statements and statistics. Katrin Althans (Cologne) followed with her paper on “Stories of the NT Intervention: The Narrative Power of the Law”, examining how legal documents shaped the narrative of the Intervention and how other narratives might challenge that story. Her analysis looked into questions of voice and voicelessness before the law and the interpretation of human rights.

The second session of the conference, chaired by Katrin Althans, consisted of three talks by speakers from both Australia and Germany. Stefanie Affeldt (Lüneburg) followed the question of “‘Who are the Aborigines?’ The Western Image of Indigenous Australians” and pointed out that European notions of Aborigines underwent decisive changes in the course of history, but that discriminating images still determine various answers to this question. Victoria Grieves (Sydney) focused on “Aboriginal Australians and the State of Exception: Camps, Refugees, Biopolitics and the Northern Territory Emergency Response”. In her paper, she analysed the disenfranchise ment of Aboriginal Australians by employing analytical concepts by Agamben and Mbembe, arguing that they exist in a state of exception to the modern Australian settler-colonial democracy. Regina Ganter (Brisbane) closed this session
with “A Brief Transnational History of Northern Australia, 1421-1976”, shedding light on non-European cultural contacts with Northern Australia, for example through long-standing traditional trading routes between Australia and the Asian continent.

The first day of the conference closed with a session discussing how the Intervention echoes colonial discourses and power dynamics, chaired by Carolin Hoffmann (Bonn). Alexander Bräuer’s (Rostock) paper titled “The Protector of Aborigines: Origins of the Intervention in pre-convict Western Australia” showed how the Intervention could rely on established discourses of intervening dating back to the mid-nineteenth century, in particular the implementation of the “Protector of Natives” in the Swan River colony. Sabrina Vetter (Frankfurt) talked about “Sexualities in Aboriginal Australian Cultures and the Ban on Pornography”, comparing the Intervention laws to the invasion of Aboriginal Australian cultures regarding sexuality, violence and land abuse upon First Contact. The first day of the conference ended with an informal conference dinner.

On Saturday morning the participants reconvened for two further sessions. The first of these was chaired by Miriam Gertzen (Bonn) and examined examples of literary engagement with the Intervention. In her paper on “Negotiating the Intervention: First Australian Stories of Reconciliation”, Hanne Birk (Bonn) attempted to answer the question of how far culture-specific narrative strategies can potentially contribute to the negotiation of cultural identities or transcultural reconciliation processes. She focused on pre-Intervention texts by Bruce Pascoe and examples taken from The Intervention: An Anthology, edited by Rosie Scott and Anita Heiss. In the second paper in this session, “The Intervention in Indigenous Literature – Alexis Wright’s The Swan Book”, Dorothee Klein (Freiburg) analysed how literary representation can question dominant discourses of normalcy and the pathologisation of individuals as well as entire communities.

The final session of the conference, dedicated to visual culture, was chaired by Hanne Birk (Bonn). Victoria Herche (Cologne) talked about “Reassessing Aboriginal Self-determination in Rolf de Heer’s Charlie’s Country”. By mean of short excerpts from the film she demonstrated how the circular structure of the film challenges both the negative consequences of the Intervention in remote communities and the failure to return to a traditional way of life and thereby addresses the universal human right of self-autonomy in its ambivalence and complexity. Last but not least, Elisabeth Bähr spoke about “‘An Australian Government Initiative: Criminal’ – The Intervention in Australian Art” and showed several works of art by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous artists as examples. These can be read as political commentary on the Intervention but, from a curatorial point of view, also show similarities to works made in another context and thus emphasise the Intervention as a continuation of previous government repression.
The conference was concluded by a lively closing discussion in which several overarching topics raised in the two days were brought together, such as human rights and Aboriginal self-determination, treaty vs. sovereignty and the power of narratives. Discussing the Intervention in Germany might contribute to raising international awareness of a national story somehow stuck. Such international and interdisciplinary exchange proved particularly fruitful, not only in this closing discussion but also in the more informal conversations. For these, the conference provided much opportunity during the coffee and lunch breaks as well as at the conference dinner where participants were able to share experiences and to network. Further reading material and other relevant information was provided in the foyer of the Universitätsforum, for example a book table by the organisation Concerned Australians. The publication of selected conference papers and further articles is in preparation, due to be published in 2016.

**Article © Miriam Gertzen and Carolin Hoffmann 2015**

**Miriam Gertzen** studied English literature, German literature and communication at the University of Münster. From 2006 to 2012 she worked in publishing in both the UK (five years) and Germany (one year), before she took up her current position as research assistant/lecturer at the University of Bonn in 2013, where she has been teaching in the field of postcolonial studies. She is currently working on her PhD on the interrelation of generic, spatial and memory-aspects in young adult dystopian novels.

**Contact:** mgertzen@uni-bonn.de

**Carolin Hoffmann** studied English Literature, German Literature and Art History at the University of Bonn, where she currently works as a research assistant and completes her PhD thesis on the Post-Apartheid South African farm novel. Her research interests include African culture and postcolonial studies.

**Contact:** carolin-hoffmann@uni-bonn.de
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Queensland 1988 und 1991
Schlaglichter auf einen australischen Bundesstaat

Gerhard Stilz

Cairns 1988


Freitag, 8. April. Ich habe heute das unternommen, womit dieser aufstrebende Touristenort vor allem lockt: nämlich eine Entdeckungsfahrt zu unternehmen hinaus zu einer der Inseln auf dem Barrier Reef. Im Grunde skeptisch bezüglich des Touristenrummels auf einer Koralleninsel, bin ich angenehm überrascht worden. Die Tour war gebucht bei Hayles, einer Gesellschaft, die seit vielen Jahrzehnten die Koralleninsel Green Island zur


Great Barrier Reef
Beim Abschied am Steg sagt der eine oder die andere von der Crew noch "good-bye", und wieder befindet man sich auf dem Schnellboot, der "Beach Cat", und erreicht in vierzig Minuten das Festland, auf dem es wieder Autos, Lärm und, man hat es fast schon vergessen, Ureinwohner gibt. Sie strömen heute am Freitag in die Bars, wo ihnen ihr Traum näher erscheint als auf Koralleninseln. High Life ist im Teer- und Touristenest Cairns an diesem Freitagabend angesagt. Auf der Mall – Cairns hat davon 50 Meter, sie zieht sich über eine Straßenkreuzung, geschützt von einem Baldachin, geschmückt mit dem Logo des australischen Bicentennial – spielt eine Rock- und Hillbilly-Gruppe zur öffentlichen Unterhaltung. Das Publikum würgt sich mit, klatscht im Rhythmus, jodelt dazwischen, einer tanzt frenetisch hüpfend und buckelnd vor der Musikerbühne auf und ab.


Am Samstagvormittag schaue ich mir in Cairns noch das Museum an. Dort befinden sich allerlei Überreste aus der Frühzeit des Pioniernestchens: Hämmer und Hobel, Druck- und

Cairns - Downtown


Diese beiden Storys erscheinen denkwürdig, und ihre Kultivierung hilft vielleicht mit zu erklären, warum hier in Queensland das Misstrauen zwischen Weiß und Schwarz noch so tief verwurzelt ist. Dabei spielt es offenbar keine besondere Rolle, dass die zu schurkischen Ungeheuern erklärten Protagonisten der ersten Story Torres-Strait-Islanders waren, das heißt ethnisch und kulturell mit der kontinentalen australischen Urbevölkerung wenig zu tun haben. Schwarz ist schwarz.

**We show the world: EXPO Brisbane 1988**

Um 16 Uhr werden wir als kleine, feine deutsche Delegation der University of Queensland abgeholt. Ein Regentag wendet sich zum besseren. Mit Regenschirm und schmutzunempfindlicher Kleidung bewaffnet, sind wir erstaunt, dass der Ingenieur mit Anzug und noblen Schuhen daherkommt. Über die Schlammpériode seien wir weg, meint er triumphierend. Zehn Tage vor Ausstellungsbeginn könne man das wohl auch erwarten. Das

klärt uns unser Führer auf, ist eine sogenannte B-Ausstellung. Das bedeutet, dass im Unterschied zu A-Ausstellungen nicht einzelne Industriefirmen ihre Erfindungen und neuen Entwicklungen ausstellen und sie auch verkaufen wollen, sondern dass Regierungen und Staaten von allen Ländern der Welt mit ihrer nationalen oder provinziellen Selbstdarstellung eine Art von Imagepflege betreiben.


Olsen Caves, North Queensland 1991

Marlborough, der seit 150 Kilometern angezeigte Hauptort dieser einsamen Gegend, ist eine kleine Bahnsiedlung und lässt sich am Bruce Highway durch eine Tankstelle und ein Roadhouse mit Verpflegungs- und Übernachtungsangebot vertreten. Ein paar abseits der


führt schnell hindurch. Die australische Rinderstadt will ja auch von Rinderlastzügen durchquert sein. Weiter südlich ist man unversehens wieder im Outback.

Article/Photos © Gerhard Stilz 1988/1991/2015

Im Anschluss an eine Einladung des Neuseeländischen Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade zum Besuch der Universitäten in Aotearoa unternahm Prof. Gerhard Stilz im April 1988, sozusagen am Vorabend zu den Feiern des Bicentennial, mit Unterstützung der DFG und der Universität Tübingen eine Forschungs- und Vortragsreise durch Australien. Dabei hielt er Vorträge an Universitäten in Westaustralien, Queensland und New South Wales und betreute vor Ort die neu eingerichteten Austauschbeziehungen der Universität Tübingen mit der University of Queensland und der University of New South Wales. Zwischendurch verfasste er mit einigem Vergnügen ein paar hintergründige Notizen wie die voranstehenden. Weitere Reisen folgten.

Gerhard Stilz is Professor of English, University of Tübingen (Germany), b. 1940, Chair of the German Association for Australian Studies (1993-1996). Stilz is co-editor of the German-Australian Studies (since 1990) and executive editor of KOALAS (since 1996). Recent books: Territorial Terrors (ed. 2007); South Asian Literatures (co-ed. 2010). He has been visiting Australia for some thirty years.

Contact: gerhard.stilz@uni-tuebingen.de
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POLAND

Europe and Down Under: Bridging Gaps and Fostering Connections

An interdisciplinary international conference July 1-2 2016
Faculty of English, Adam Mickiewicz University Poznań, Poland

Call for Papers

The aim of the conference is to bring together European, Australian, and New Zealand scholars and to provide a venue for exchanging views, ideas and research findings on Australian and New Zealand cultures and societies. We invite scholars representing multiple disciplines (history, sociology, anthropology, cultural studies, literary studies, law, political science, linguistics and other) to share their research and pedagogies; and Australian and New Zealand writers and artists to share their work. Inspired by the enthusiasm and scholarship of the students of our Faculty’s “Australia and New Zealand” MA Program, we would also like to encourage BA and MA students to submit their proposals as student sessions are planned during the conference.

Confirmed Keynote Speaker:
Prof. Ryszard Wolny, Head of the Institute of English, Opole University, Poland (http://www.ryszardwolny.pl).

The language of the conference is English. We invite proposals for 20-minute papers, 60-minute interactive workshops, round-table discussions, posters, and poetry and prose readings.

Please email your c. 250-word-long proposal and a brief CV to the conference secretary Patrycja Tomkowiak at anz.conference.poznan.2016@gmail.com or via the conference website: http://anzconferencepoznan.wix.com/2016

The deadline for proposals is January 15th 2016. Submissions will be acknowledged by email. Acceptance information will be emailed to participants on February 15th.

Conference fees:
- early bird (by March 15th): 350 PLN /90 Euro/130 AUD/140 NZD
- BA and MA students: 100 PLN/25 Euro/40 AUD/45 NZD
- after March 15th: 600 PLN /150 Euro/230 AUD/240 NZD
- BA and MA students: 150 PLN/40 Euro/60 AUD/65 NZD

The full fee includes the cost of all tea/coffee breaks and lunches during the conference, and conference materials. The fee does not include accommodation costs nor the cost of the conference dinner (70 PLN/20 Euro/30 AUD/30 NZD), which will be held on the first day of the conference.

Conference organisers: Dr Zuzana Buchowska/ Dr Tomasz Skirecki/ Prof. Jacek Fabiszak
IRELAND

The Neo-Victorian Antipodes

ESSE 2016

Galway, Ireland, from Monday 22nd to Friday 26th August 2016

Call for Papers

From arguably the earliest example of Neo-Victorian fiction (Patrick White’s Voss, 1957) to recent Man-Booker winner The Luminaries (2013) by way of Peter Carey and Kate Grenville, the antipodes are a favoured setting for Neo-Victorian novels. This seminar explores how Neo-Victorian fiction constructs Australia, New Zealand and the Southern Pacific as, variously, the site of uncanny domesticity, an Other to Britain, a landscape to be colonised or scientifically appropriated, a frontier for the testing of masculinity, an occasion for re-writing of canonical texts. The seminar aims to investigate the intersection of Neo-Victorian preoccupations with nineteenth-century discourses with post-colonial theorising of settler colonialism.

We invite 200-word proposals for individual papers of 15 minutes on the topic of the Neo-Victorian antipodes. Relevant topics might include, though are not limited to:

- National narratives and antipodean geography
- Travel and exploration in the Neo-Victorian antipodes
- Aboriginal and Maori traces in Neo-Victorian writing
- Trauma and the Neo-Victorian antipodes
- Re-writings and reversals of the Victorian canon
- The Neo-Victorian antipodes and the Man-Booker Prize

Please send proposals to both convenors: (see below) by 28 February 2016.

Convenors:
Dr Mariadele Boccardi  Dr Therese-M. Meyer
Senior Lecturer in English  Martin-Luther University Halle/
Department of Arts and Cultural Industries  Wittenberg
University of the West of England  Institut fur Anglistik und Amerikanistik
Frenchay, Bristol BS16 1QY  Adam-Kuckhoff-Str. 35
Mariadele.Boccardi@uwe.ac.uk  06099 Halle (Saale)
therese.meyer@anglistik.uni-halle.de
Zweijahrestagung der GASSt 2016: Natur und Umwelt in Australien


Call for Papers

Die 1989 gegründete Gesellschaft für Australien-Studien (GASSt) ist eine interdisziplinäre wissenschaftliche Vereinigung, die sich zur Aufgabe gestellt hat, die Australien-Studien auf breiter Basis zu fördern sowie deren Entwicklung in Forschung und Lehre in den deutschsprachigen Ländern zu unterstützen. Im Sinne ihrer interdisziplinären Ausrichtung lädt die GASSt zur Einreichung von wissenschaftlichen Beiträgen (Vorträge, Poster) und Panel-Diskussionen ein, die sich mit Natur und Umwelt in Australien befassen.


- Die natürliche Umwelt des Kontinents im Wandel
- Entstehung und Verbreitung natürlicher, ökonomischer und sozialer Ressourcen
- Unterschiedliche kulturelle Verständnisse von „Natur“, „Umwelt“ und „Wildnis“
- Herausforderungen und Möglichkeiten für eine nachhaltige Entwicklung im heutigen Australien
- Literarische und künstlerische Repräsentationen von Umweltthemen
- Indigenes Umweltwissen und neue Perspektiven auf Rituale und Bräuche
- Die Rolle der Medien in Umweltdebatten
- Diskurse zu Australiens kulturellem und wissenschaftlichem Erbe
- Umwelt- und Geschlechterforschung
- Umweltethik
- Umweltgeschichte
- Umweltrecht, einschließlich von Landrechtsansprüchen und Bergbaukonflikten
- Politische und planungsbezogene Ansätze zur Bewältigung von ökologischen Herausforderungen

Bitte senden Sie Ihre Vortragsvorschläge auf Englisch oder Deutsch (250–300 Wörter) bis zum 31. Januar 2016 an Professor Beate Neumeier (Englisches Seminar, neumeier@uni-koeln.de) oder Professor Boris Braun (Geographisches Institut, boris.braun@uni-koeln.de).
Re-imagining Australia: Encounter, Recognition, Responsibility

International Association of Australian Studies (InASA) Conference

Centre for Human Rights Education, Australia-Asia-Pacific Institute, the School of Media, Culture and Creative Arts, Curtin University

Under the theme of ‘Re-imagining Australia: Encounter, Recognition, Responsibility,’ the conference will offer the opportunity of addressing the intensification of overlapping, interpenetrating and mixing of cultures and peoples in everyday life in Australia – and how its public culture has become increasingly re-imagined through intense conversations and inter-epistemic dialogue. The conference will showcase contemporary research and creativity in understanding Australia through interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches.

BOOK PROJECT

Proposed Edited Volume Title:
The Real and the Imaginary:
Transnational Perspectives on German/Australian Exchange

Editors:
Irina Herrschner (University of Melbourne), Benjamin Nickl (University of Melbourne)

Short Summary:
The focus of this edited volume is on the transnational or intertwined processes, which have marked cultural production in both Germany and Australia in a unique way for decades. This specific volume seeks to explore how transnationalism has been at work in the circulation of German and Australian culture, knowledge, and events. It presents specific contributions on music, literature, film, cultural diplomacy, food, events, visual art, performance and television in the context of intercultural contact zones shifting attention from nationally contained to transcultural self-imagery and the reception of Australianness in German culture and of Germanness in Australian culture as contact zones (Mary-Louise Pratt). In addition to asking what elements circulate and how, the contributors also are interested in how Germanness and Australianness are positioned in the receiving culture. The volume fills a research gap in response to the phenomenon called the “transnational turn” (Paul Jay), as the pace of socio-cultural globalisation accelerates while disciplinary projects are yet to keep up with the dramatic transformations and increased ease with which people, ideas, and culturally loaded discourses about national identities move across time and space.

Rationale for this Edited Volume:
The Real and the Imaginary: Transnational Perspectives on German/Australian Exchange surveys with its expert contributions intersections between Australia and Germany. They have arisen from colonialism, migration, communication, tourism, histories, and socio-cultural representation in the context of key debates within literary and cultural studies as well as other closely related critical theory issues. The contributors argue that the translation of national cultures, knowledge, and goods is part of a wider program of intercultural practices which have positioned nation states in certain orders over time. The knowledge structures which govern these practices however are often outdated or no longer reflect the realities of large-scale migration in the 21st century and digital and actual travel of ideas and people. This uneven development opens up the opportunity for discursive investigations through practices of translation, which have the potential to raise further questions pertinent to today’s German/Australian exchange.

The space each country occupies in the other’s national context is situated within an even larger discussion of antipodean cultural communication and translation. Australia bears the legacy of the country’s contemporary history as a European settler nation, while Germans are fascinated by Australia as the great unknown and the cultural opposite. In media, literature and other contexts, such discourse reciprocities play out in the adaptations and translations of language and culture. They illustrate the other as an imagined reflection of
the self. Drawing on examples of literary translations, the representations of each country in contemporary media reporting, popular customs, and nationally themed events this volume illustrates the various linkages between Germany and Australia as well as the country’s intertwined identity discourses.

**Key Questions for this Edited Volume according to thematic groups**

- What are the current and past intersections of German and Australian culture and how are they translated in different media types, such as literature, film, television, music and art?
- How have social changes in national populations due to colonisation and globalisation affected the mutual perception of two countries in such vast geographical distance?
- Can translation serve as an imaginary connector?
- Is the driving force of socio-cultural translation a version of Anglophone/Western cultural imperialism?
- What para-texts are at play in the process of cultural translation? Are there German and Australian discourses, which cannot be translated? What elements remain untranslated?
- How do we as scholars approach issues such as the culturally sensitive topic of Aboriginality?

The tension between Australia and Germany in the cultural imaginary and in factual reality is the guiding principle for the contributions to this volume. Questions related to the disconnect between reality and myth can be grouped, but are not limited to the following categories:

- literature
- visual arts (television, film, theatre, fine arts)
- performance/events (film festivals, music)
- historiography/translation (travel writing)
- spatiality (cityscapes, environmental issues)

**Information for Contributors:**

Please send a short abstract of your paper (250 words plus key terms) to the volume editors:

transnationalperspectivesdeaus@gmail.com

Deadline for proposals: Jan 31 2016
NEW PUBLICATIONS

BY GAST Members

Alexandra Ludewig.

SFR 68.00 €** 61.60 € 56.00 £ 45.00 ** inkl. MWSt. – gültig für Österreich


Alexandra Ludewig ist Professorin und Institutsleiterin an der University of Western Australia.
EXTERNA

A WORKSHOP IN MEMORY OF VERONICA BRADY

THE WESTERLY CENTRE
VERONICA BRADY
A LIVING LEGACY
5 FEBRUARY 2016
9.30 – 4.00PM

THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Morning Tea, Afternoon Tea and Lunch Provided
Cost: $55.00

FOR MORE INFORMATION
CONTACT: THE WESTERLY CENTRE  WESTERLY@UWA.EDU.AU
OR TONY HUGHES—D’AETH  TONY.HDA@UWA.EDU.AU
CHAPTER 1
The New Arrival

THE bush was alive with excitement. Mrs Koala had a brand new baby, and the news spread like wildfire. The kookaburras in the highest gum-trees heard of it, and laughed and chuckled at the idea. In and out of their burrows the rabbits came scuttling, their big brown eyes opening wide with wonder as they heard the news. Over the grass the message went where Mrs

©Written and Illustrated by Dorothy Wall (first published in 1939)
We have wonderful news from two of our members:
In fact, our executive board is happy to announce an addition to the GAST family:

Dear Friends and Colleagues,

Some of you know already: We are delighted to announce the birth of our son, Felix Kolya Bernzen, on 4 December 2015.
For lovers of facts & figures: 2.45 am, 3630g, 54cm. And: big feet!
We are all well and Felix the "Happy" has been living up to his name so far, being a very content and uncomplicated little fellow.

Amelie Bernzen & Thomas Lauterbach

Lieber Vorstand,

hiermit verkünde ich die Geburt des neuesten GAST-Mitgliedes Lucy Sophie Althans, geboren am 5.11.15. Sie wird nicht lange neuestes Mitglied bleiben!

Katrin Meyer-Althans

Congratulations!