Peripheral voices, marginal lives: Representation, subalternity, and proximate suffering

Ramaswami Harindranath, University of New South Wales, r.hari@unsw.edu.au

Abstract

It has been argued that indigenous and refugee communities, along with the impoverished, comprise the global subaltern. While the reasons for their current precarity, as well as the various aspects that comprise their subaltern conditions, differ significantly between these groups, the politics of 'race', ethnicity and exclusion, and of representation and 'voice', appear to impinge on both their material and their media presence in similar ways. Our ethical (non-)responses to more proximate suffering, and to the visibility/audibility and perceptions of the racial subaltern who are among us rather than in distant locations raise deeper issues and more critical questions, such as what constitutes 'distant' suffering – is it geographic distance or sociocultural-racial distance? How is this related to the marginalisation of indigenous communities, particularly in settler colonies, and to the responses to the plight of those who, fleeing conflict and/or disasters, have arrived on our shores? It can be argued that refugees constitute a mobile South, while indigenous communities comprise what could be called a rooted South. Their presence demands an examination of the politics of voice and of representation, and the systemic features of the 'imperial debris' that continue to marginalise particular communities. Finally, this marginalisation also demands a reconsideration of the prevalent understanding of the Global South.

Keywords: Global South; Indigenous; race; refugee; voice

In her book exploring the cultural politics of postcolonial hospitality, Rosello (2001, p. 2) recounts the incidents in Paris in the summer of 1996, 'when French people, perhaps for the first time, had the opportunity to hear the voice of the demonized *clandestins*' as a result of 300 African men and women occupying public spaces before arriving at the Church of Saint Bernard with the intention of proposing 'an alternative interpretation of their presence in France and to inform the public about the perverse consequences' of punitive French laws. They described themselves as *sans-papiers*, and challenged the depiction of them as *clandestins*, a symbolic victory, according to Rosello, and a 'linguistic watershed' that was 'a social and political event' thanks to the intensive media coverage that raised its profile. For the purposes of this article, these incidents underline the significance of race and representation, of the need to challenge portrayals of refugees and asylum seekers as illegal aliens (which the term '*clandestins*' implies), and of the politics of mobility, liberal notions of hospitality and citizenship. More recent representations of and responses to those fleeing conflicts in West Asia and Africa and seeking asylum in Europe, North America and Australia, not

to mention the plight of the Rohingya community in Myanmar, underline the persistence of such issues – which, perversely, have figured even more prominently in election campaigns and in the discourses of the far right. If these issues exemplify the precarity of refugee populations, the predicament of indigenous populations in settler colonies is also indicative of what Wolfe (2001) refers to as the 'elementary structures of race'. While transnational mobility characterises 'refugee-ness', and colonial conquest and expropriation are emblematic of indigeneity, this article contends that they share several common features, including the politics of race, denial of voice and questions of citizenship rights, and that recent debates on who or what constitutes the Global South and our responses to distant and proximate suffering are pertinent to both refugee issues and indigenous politics.

A few recent, and pertinent, 'snapshots' exemplify the different dimensions of the issues covered in this article:

- In October 2016, in an interview with the African-American poet and novelist Paul Beatty for a *Guardian* Books podcast, the presenter, Claire Armitstead, suggested that there were passages in his book that she, as a white woman, found offensive – particularly his use of the 'N-word'. Beatty's response was that the word had a specific purpose in his book, and that the history of that 'awful word' helped him to capture the sign of the times, in particular the history of racism and discrimination in the United States, liberal politics and the question of representation.

- On 25 April 2017, *The Guardian* (2017) carried a call from the Munduruku people, an indigenous community in Brazil, claiming that 'a government of death is plundering our ancient Munduruju lands. Help us stop it.' It cited Brazil's '1988 constitution', which 'has an entire chapter dedicated to indigenous peoples'; this was part of a campaign to protect aboriginal lands from a dam project, which also highlights the persistent neglect of the lasting concerns of aboriginal populations and life practices in settler colonies.

- In 2016, two young asylum seekers – one from Iran and the other from Somalia – who were both detained in camps in Nauru, set themselves alight as a desperate form of protest (Doherty & Davidson, 2016).

- In early May 2017, as an instance of internecine conflicts that have become a feature of the main political parties in Australia, a former conservative prime minister lamented what he characterised as the 'cultural cowardice' displayed by an 'officialdom' paralysed by 'self-doubt about anything that might be labelled anti-youth, anti-women, anti-black or, perhaps worst of all, anti-Muslim', and called for a robust defence and celebration of 'Gospel values' and the 'abiding virtues and benefits of western civilisation' to counter the 'march of identity politics' (Murphy, 2017). This careless and callous disregard of the role of 'western civilisation' in the colonisation of Australia and the near-elimination of Aboriginal populations and the appropriation of their lands (Wolfe 2006) is matched in its brutal disregard only by the ruthlessness of the policies adopted by the Australian state against asylum seekers arriving by boat, who are herded into offshore detention camps. Feelings of despair and hopelessness have

subsequently driven several of those in these camps to various kinds of self-harm, including self-immolation (Davidson, 2017).

In significant respects these cases capture some of the issues explored in this paper, including race, oppression, cultural and political expression, subalternity and representation, and the politics of 'voice'. Given the prevalence of far right discourses and ethnic violence in places like Myanmar, one doesn't need to labour the point about the persistence of race in contemporary politics and forms of nationalism. This article, however, seeks to trace the overlaps in the racial politics that inform responses to refugee crises and the treatment of refugees and asylum seekers, and of the continuing marginalisation of Indigenous peoples. It presents a few preliminary thoughts on the basis that, first, these overlaps illustrate the ongoing effects of imperial formations, particularly in setter colonies, that include a continuing denial of voice to groups such as refugees and indigenous peoples, and our own responses to these instances of proximate suffering, and finally, how as a consequence of such overlaps in experience, these groups can be seen as constituting different types of the Global South. This article therefore presents an as yet inchoate theoretical intervention that combines the politics of voice and listening with postcolonial theory and a critique of current conceptions of the Global South.

Refugee and Aboriginal experience and 'imperial debris'

The 'snapshots' mentioned earlier instantiate issues of voice, recognition and the struggle for socio-political change that continue to plague marginalised communities, the problematics that underlie liberal responses to ethnic cultural expression and the racial and historical dynamics that underpin policies that serve to manage ethnic minorities, indigenous communities and national borders. With regard to the last of these, as Gregory (2004, p. 258, emphasis in original) points out, the arrival of the asylum seeker and the refugee throws into crisis what Agamben calls "the originary fiction of sovereignty" because it calls into question the connective imperative that makes *nativity* the foundation of *nationality* and hence of the sovereign space of the *nation-state*'. If the image of the refugee is perceived to pose a threat to the territorial and political coherence of the state, the fiction of nativity that is overlaid on and colours ideas of national identity – particularly in settler colonies – simultaneously hides the violent appropriation and conquest of native land, and as a consequence renders Indigenous populations largely invisible in proclamations of nationality or national 'values'. As demonstrated in the plea by the Munduruku, and as evident in the continuing struggle by Aboriginal Australians for land rights, this near-invisibility of Indigeneity – other than in profitable forms of cultural expression such as Aboriginal art or in carefully managed performances that are emptied of much of cultural or political significance – matches attempts to keep the asylum seeker out of bounds and out of sight in internment camps.

Bhabha's (2011) intervention on the subject of survival and citizenship, in which he argues against Hardt and Negri's (2000) celebration of nomadism and miscegenation as positive steps towards an emancipatory 'global citizenship', is pertinent here: Bhabha (2011, p. 3) argues that such an ideal,

so fixed on the *flowing*, borderless, global world, neglects to confront the fact that migrants, refugees or nomads do not merely circulate. They need to settle, claim asylum or nationality, demand housing and education, assert their economic and cultural rights, and seek the status of citizenship.

Both Bhabha (2011) and Chakrabarty (2012) are surely right in their observation that minorities, refugees, asylum seekers and migrant workers constitute the new subaltern classes, but what is crucial in the present context is Bhabha's acknowledgement that the politics of survival for these new subalterns might entail the disruption of their 'full civic participation' or their rights to citizenship. As Chakrabarty (2012, p. 6) points out, Bhabha's challenge to Hardt and Negri (2000) involves the ability 'to think contradictorily – to think mobility (survival) and stasis (civic participation) at the same time'. This inherent contradiction in the lives of the nomadic, mobile subaltern classes is also evident in the lives and status of many indigenous communities in settler colonies, despite the fact that their survival does not include crossing national borders.

Gregory's (2004, p. 258) argument that the 'extra-territoriality of Camp X-Ray in Guantanamo' finds echoes in the detention of asylum seekers by the Australian state in the outback and in camps located in Nauru and Papua New Guinea can be extended to Aboriginal populations not only in the outback but also in cities, who do not quite fit into the exultations of the merits of 'Western civilization' that are seen as marking colonial outposts such as Australia, which thus maintains its cultural links to Europe despite geographical distance. The racial politics inherent in discourses of national sovereignty that portray asylum seekers, refugees and Asian/African immigrants as potentially undermining the integrity of the nation, along the perception of the arrival of such figures as an 'invasion' that threatens to dilute or modify the 'national character' by their very presence within the body-politic of the nation-state, also pervades the political and economic invisibility of Indigenous communities. As Wolfe (2001, p. 868; see also Wolfe, 2006) argues, 'settler colonialism introduces a zero-sum contest over land on which conflicting modes of production could not ultimately coexist. Thus the primary logic of settler colonialism can be characterized as one of elimination.' This defines the context in which ethnic media representation and the responses to it need to be considered.

It is not difficult to see the connections between the histories of colonialism, slavery and indentured labour, and the contemporary manifestations of racism, racial violence, marginalisation and the increase in and consolidation of anti-immigrant sentiments that pervade and provide a spurious credibility to assertions of national identity that rest on proclamations of 'cultural' uniqueness. These are some of the 'ruins and ruination' that Stoler (2008, p. 193) perceives as 'imperial debris': 'the longevity of structures of dominance, and the uneven pace with which people can extract themselves from the colonial order of things' – a term she prefers to others such as 'colonial legacy', as she seeks to engage with 'the evasive space of imperial formations past and present as well as the perceptions and practices by which people are forced to reckon with features of those formations in which they remain vividly and imperceptibly bound.' The response that '*All* lives matter', heard all too often as a counter to the Black Lives Matter movement, is a spectacular instance of missing the point, as are declarations of 'Indigenous' status by second-generation white settlers in

Australia purely on the basis of them having been born in the country. Revealed in such responses and sentiments is a disturbing unwillingness to take into account, or a wilful blindness to, the historical, structural, institutional aspects of a racial reality – the 'imperial debris' – in which the lives of those who are not white matter less.

Mitchell's (2012, p. 14) argument is pertinent here: while he agrees with scholars such as Appiah that race is an *illusion*, this view is only partial, since race is also *real* both in a profound and in an everyday sense:

> race is *both* an illusion *and* a reality that resists critical demolition or replacement by other terms such as ethnicity, nationality, civilization, or culture. The notion of race-as-medium, in fact, relieves us of the necessity of a decision between these alternatives, allowing us to understand that racial medium is (like any other medium) a vehicle for *both* fantasy *and* reality. Contrary to Appiah's claim that 'there is nothing in the world that can do all we ask 'race' to do for us', the truth is that there is *nothing else* in the world, or in language, that can do all that we ask race to do for us. (emphasis in original)

Building on Fanon's insights about structural and affective links between different forms of racism, Mitchell conceives of race as a medium in order to engage with the notion of race and how it manifests in diverse forms of discrimination. By conceiving 'race as a medium', he means that race is not just a 'visible stigmata' (2012, p. 12) or representation, but also 'a medium and an iconic form – not simply something to be seen, but itself a framework for seeing through or (as Wittgenstein would put it) seeing *as*' (2012, p. 13, emphasis in original). As an 'intervening substance', race as medium is 'most explicit in the visual language of race which continually invokes the figures of the veil, the screen, the lens, the face, the mirror, the profile, line and color, and its paradoxical fusion in the figure of the "color line"' (2012, p. 13). Any attempt to argue that we now live in a post-racial world, or to relinquish race as a concept – however strongly we may agree, intellectually, on the fictional nature of racial distinctions – is to overlook the persistence of racial discrimination and the daily encounters with racism from fellow citizens, from institutions, from laws.

The relationship between the terms 'race' and 'racism', Mitchell (2012, p. 19)argues, is the reverse of that between 'ideal' and 'idealism', or 'matter' and 'materialism', where the '-ism' derives from the root:

> With race and racism, it is exactly the opposite. Racism is the brute fact, the bodily reality, and race is the derivative term, devised either as an imaginary cause for the effects of racism or as an attempt to provide a rational explanation, a 'realistic picture' and diagnosis of this mysterious syndrome known as racism. Race is not the cause of racism but its excuse, alibi, explanation, or reaction formation.

In the case of seekers of asylum, this manifests not just in media discourses and public responses to them, but also in the technologies of bureaucracy that are deployed at the points of entry:

> Images go 'before' the immigrant in the sense that before the immigrant arrives, his or her image comes first in the form of stereotypes, search templates, tables of classification, and patterns of recognition. At the moment of first encounter, the immigrant arrives as an image-text whose documents go before him or her at the moment of crossing the border. (Mitchell, 2012, p. 127)

For the *sans papier* refugee or immigrant, whose personhood itself at stake without supporting documentary evidence that attests that they are who they claim to be, there is little hope of crossing the barrier of the border. An instance of what the geographer Doreen Massey terms the 'power-geometry' of space, this represents a near-perfect demonstration of Bhabha's fundamental distinction between two types of encounters with the regime of border policing: 'The globe shrinks for those who own it', but 'for the displaced or the dispossessed, the migrant or the refugee, no distance is more awesome than the few feet across borders or frontiers' (quoted in Gregory, 2004, p. 257).

If the denial of entry into spaces of security marks the experience of the global refugee, who is thereby rendered powerless and abject, remaining largely invisible, confined to internment camps for indefinite durations, the conditions of life for indigenous communities – the original inhabitants of lands conquered and settled – are rendered equally abject and mostly invisible, their existence a constant and ongoing struggle against hydro-electric projects, pipelines or mining rights, all instruments of the neo-liberal state and all challenging aboriginal land rights. Along with those living below the poverty line, indigenous communities as well as those fleeing persecution, war and environmental disaster constitute the Global South, one group *rooted* and the other *mobile*. They remain voiceless victims of policies and of prejudices – racial and moral – that, as the anthropologist Herzfeld (1992) demonstrated some time ago, inform national bureaucratic practices.

Representation and voice

The various racial politics underpinning the anti-refugee and anti-asylum seeker discourses that inform attitudes to these communities and underpin state policies exemplify what Johan Galtung (1990, p. 291) describes as 'cultural violence', through which other kinds of violence are made acceptable in society. For him, cultural violence constitutes 'those aspects of culture, the symbolic sphere of our existence … that can be used to justify or legitimize direct or structural violence'. In his book *Fear of Small Numbers*, anthropologist Arjun Appadurai (2006, p. 4) makes a similar argument: that the idea of a national ethnos, a national peoplehood, 'is the Achilles heel of modern liberal societies', which manifests in the various forms of social anxieties that plague the current globalised world and at times provokes elements of the majority ethnic populations within a state to seek 'a macabre form of certainty' in violence. A direct consequence of this could be the breakdown of inter-ethnic dialogue or communication across perceived cultural divides, of the increase in the perception of the Other as a direct threat to one's own livelihood, and of the cohesion of multicultural societies.

How do we understand the fatal self-immolation of the young Iranian refugee Omid Masoumali, and the attempted suicide by self-immolation of the Somali refugee Hodan Yasin, both in the Australian internment camps in the island of Nauru? As expressions of frustration? As desperate final statements by those denied a voice or any other way of communicating? Their actions recall Gayatri Spivak's (1988) account, in her well-known essay, 'Can the Subaltern Speak?', of the suicide of Bhuvaneswari Bhaduri in 1926. Bhuvaneswari, a member of the armed struggle for independence, 'had known that her death would be diagnosed as the outcome of illegitimate passion. She had therefore waited for the onset of menstruation' to ensure that her act would not be interpreted as resulting from illicit pregnancy (1988, p. 307). Despite these precautions, her demise was recalled later by her relatives as a consequence of an illegitimate love affair. To Spivak, Bhuvaneswari's act – the interpretation of which had employed Indian patriarchal or British imperial codes – is emblematic of the subaltern's inability to speak.

The intense academic debates that Spivak's conceptualisation of subalternity and representation has provoked do not need to detain us here. There are, however, two connected issues that are important in the present context. The first is Spivak's insistence on the difficulty, if not impossibility, of recovering subaltern consciousness, given the dominant cultural and political formations that impose specific frames of reference. Second, and as a consequence, when the subaltern speaks, she 'cannot be heard or read'. 'For me,' she declared in 1990, '"Who should speak?" is less crucial than "Who will listen?".'

Two pertinent issues arise from what is often seen to be an overworked concept and an outmoded discussion, the continuing relevance of which needs to be established. As Chakrabarty (2012, p. 4) reminds us, in providing a post-structuralist critique of the subject, Spivak's essay, along with Bhabha's later extension of it, initiated 'a turn that both appreciated difference as a philosophical question and at the same time repudiated its essentialization by identity politics'. One of the consequences of this has been the underlining of the need to hold, simultaneously, two seemingly contradictory conceptions of the human: 'the human as a rights-bearing subject and the figure of the human glimpsed through the critique of the subject' (Chakrabarty, 2012, p. 5), which in turn informs arguments such as that of Bhabha on the contradictions between survival and citizenship mentioned earlier; these are relevant – albeit in different ways – to the experiences of both refugees and indigenous communities.

This touches on recent discussions of voice and listening in media and cultural politics (Couldry, 2009, 2010). Without the corresponding practice of listening, as Couldry (2009) argues, 'voice' remains in isolation and is therefore politically impotent. The politics of 'voice' should mean 'the implicitly linked practices of speaking and listening' (2009, p. 580). In addition, Coronil's (1994, p. 649) insightful observation that, since 'dominance and subalternity are not inherent, but relational characterizations', the notion of subalternity 'defines not the being of a subject, but a subjected state of being', when considered in connection with voice and listening, raises the question of whether, given the relational nature of subalternity and dominance, representational justice involves assertions of positive differences, as Young (1990, p. 11) argues, in an effort to 'identify liberation with social equality that

affirms group difference and fosters the inclusion and participation of all groups in public life'. Crucial for her is the belief that political and social change occurs only through dominant representations and liberal insistence on 'fairness' being challenged alongside the raising of consciousness of racial and oppressed minorities: cultural change occurs 'when despised groups seize the means of cultural expression to redefine a positive image of themselves' (1990, p. 11). She goes on to state, 'I argue that sometimes recognizing particular rights for groups is the only way to promote their full participation' (1990, p. 11).

On one level, Young's position seems counter to Gilroy's (2000) concern that affirmations of the particular, of 'difference' risks losing sight of the universal, 'human identity', the 'anti-anthropological sameness' that he feels is a crucial component of multicultural and multiracial politics. Gilroy's justifiable worry about the politics of particularism needs to be considered alongside the identify formation, the dialectic of the universal and the particular that is intrinsic to social and representational justice, and the complexity of the politics of representation that engages with both the experience of the subaltern – in this instance, asylum seekers, refugees and aboriginal communities – and their agency.

Proximate suffering

Several issues regarding 'ethnic' representations and cultural expressions, and who they address, are pertinent here. Are they meant for specific audiences/readers, employing particular modes of address and sociocultural and/or political content, or are they – like mainstream cultural production – propelled by the market logic inherent in cultural industries? In other words, do such forms of ethnic media representations and other forms of minority cultural expression continue to suffer from the burden of representation, weighed down with a kind of unarticulated responsibility that then carries expectations beyond the topics they address? It should be noted that not all 'ethnic' or newly migrant groups are oppressed, marginalised or ill-treated as asylum seekers/refugees and indigenous communities.

Discussions of subaltern agency demand an engagement with issues of representation and voice. These two issues coalesce in contemporary manifestations of subalternity, as demonstrated in official proclamations on the status and treatment of refugees and asylum seekers, which coincide with the acute lack of engagement – evident in official discourse – with the everyday experiences of refugee and asylum seeker communities. This lack of engagement, and the consequent treatment of asylum seekers in Europe and in Australia mostly as a *problem* to be dealt with, contribute to these communities becoming the quintessential transnational subalterns, or the *mobile South*, fleeing from persecution and in search of a safe location, and different in some ways from the aboriginal populations in settler colonies, who can be considered as the *rooted South*, struggling for civil and land rights and representational justice. What links them is their subaltern condition, characterised by having to engage with the contradictory politics of survival and citizenship, as mentioned earlier.

The issue is one of addressing the non-reciprocal recognition of the subaltern. Subaltern demand is for participation in a dialogue, for mutual and reciprocal

recognition. The politics of representation alluded to here involves the recognition of subaltern expressions as arising from particular historical and social locations – the 'locus of enunciation' – that contain within them the various coordinates that constitute subaltern culture, including racism, and economic and social inequality. More than a question of an alleged authenticity, therefore, the struggle entails locational or perspectival legitimacy. Moreover, it also involves safeguarding the legitimacy of subaltern cultural expression, since 'when the self-image of a dominant culture meets up with the self-image of a subaltern culture on a world historical stage, the former all too easily destroys all subaltern defence on behalf of itself and prescribes its own mode of cognition as the answer to the subaltern question' (Radhakrishnan, 2003: 57).

Two issues arise from this: conceptions of the Global South and the idea of 'distant suffering', and our responses to its representations in the media. The term 'Global South', when used synonymously with 'the developing world', overlooks the presence of the South in the North and the North in the South – in other words, the transnationality of economic, political and cultural privilege, and also of precarity, marginalisation and exploitation:

> If 'South', unmoored from strict geographic associations, becomes a marker
> for power compromised by political and economic disenfranchisement and
> distributed unequally via the conventional hierarchies of gender, race, and
> class, then we can find 'South' in many places: north, east, west and south.
> (Trefzer et al., 2014: 2)

My distinction between the 'mobile South' and the 'rooted South' builds on and extends Trefzer and colleagues' use of the idea of 'decentered interlocality' to suggest the interplay between the Global North and the Global South in transnational circuits of power and powerlessness.

Similarly, Boltanski's (1993) theorisation of a kind of politicised humanitarianism rests on the 'distance' between the victim or sufferer, and the witness or the media spectator, and ways to overcome this distance – central to which are media representations. As Robbins (2012, p. 68) points out, Boltanski's notion of distance could be exemplified as a First World audience being addressed on the topic of Third World poverty: 'How can the connection between unfortunate and persecutor be made to stick' (Boltanski, 1993, p. 62). Robbins (2012, p. 87) underlines the importance of engaging with analyses of 'the system' such as Wallerstein's: 'in order to blame well, one has to know that this is not just any random suffering, the result of nature or accident or perhaps even the fault of the sufferer'. Robbins' suggestions make sense for academic debates and analyses, but not so much for effecting socio-political change. On the other hand, Chouliaraki's (2010) idea of 'ethical witnessing' is likewise based on a conception of ethics as what the spectator *ought* to feel, and on the establishment of an empathetic relationship with the sufferer.

It is possible to argue that, without a sufficiently robust engagement with the politics of voice, the continuing structural aspects intrinsic to realities that are part of the 'imperial debris', and the problematic conceptions of national identity and national 'values' that ignore the mobile South and the rooted South, indigenous communities as well as asylum seekers are condemned to retain their subaltern status.

References

Appadurai, A. (2006). *Fear of Small Numbers*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bhabha, H. (2011). *Our Neighbours, Ourselves: Contemporary Reflections on Survival*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Boltanski, L (1993). *Distant Suffering: Morality, Media and Politics*, trans. G. Burchell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chakrabarty, D. (2012). Postcolonial studies and the challenge of climate change. *New Literary History*, 43(1), 1–18.

Chouliaraki, L. (2010). Ordinary witnessing in post-television news: Towards a new moral imagination. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 7(4), 305–19.

Coronil, F. (1994). Listening to the subaltern: the poetics of neo-colonial states. *Poetics Today*, 15(4), 642–58.

Couldry, N. (2009). Rethinking the politics of voice. *Continuum*, 23(4), 579–82.

—— (2010) *Why Voice Matters: Culture and Politics After Neoliberalism*. London: Sage.

Davidson, H. (2017). Nauru self-immolation led to 'up to 50' similar threats and attempts. *The Guardian*, 3 May, https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2017/may/03/nauru-self-immolation-led-to-up-to-50-similar-threats-and-attempts.

Doherty, B. & Davidson, H. (2016). Self-immolation: desperate protests against Australia's detention regime. *The Guardian*, 3 May, https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2016/may/03/asylum-seekers-set-themselves-alight-nauru.

Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 27(3), 291–305.

Gilroy, P. (2000). *Between Camps … Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*. New York: Penguin.

Gregory, D. (2004). *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq*. Oxford: Blackwell.

The Guardian (2017). A government of death is plundering our ancient Munduruku lands. Help us stop it, 25 April, https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2017/apr/25/a-government-of-death-is-plundering-our-ancient-munduruku-lands-help-us-stop-it-brazil-amazon.

Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Herzfeld, M. (1992). *The Social Production of Indifference: Exploring the Symbolic Roots of Western Bureaucracy*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Mitchell, W.J.T. (2012). *Seeing Through Race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Murphy, K. (2017). Tony Abbott: Liberals must resist 'cultural cowardice' and stand up for western values. *The Guardian*, 3 May, https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2017/may/03/tony-abbott-liberals-must-resist-cultural-cowardice-and-stand-up-for-western-values.

Radhakrishnan, R. (2003). *Theory in an Uneven World*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Robbins, B. (2012). *Perpetual War: Cosmopolitanism from the Viewpoint of Violence*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Rosello, M. (2001). *Postcolonial Hospitality: The Immigrant as Guest*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Spivak, G. (1990). *The Post-Colonial Critic*. New York: Routledge.

Stoler, A.L. (2008). Imperial debris: reflections on ruins and ruination. *Cultural Anthropology*, 23(2), 191–219.

Trefzer, A., Jackson, J.T., McKee, K. & Dellinger, K. (2014). Introduction: The Global South and/in the Global North: Interdisciplinary investigations. *The Global South*, 8(2), 1–15.

Wolfe, P. (2001). Land, labor, and difference: Elementary structures of race. *The American Historical Review*, 106(3), 66–905.

—— (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4), 387–409.

Young, I.M. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.