Introduction

*Jatinder Mann*¹

I am very pleased to see the second issue of the *Journal of Australian, Canadian, and Aotearoa New Zealand Studies (JACANZS)* published. As with the first issue it was very much a labour of love, especially so as during my work on it I left my previous position, moved back home to the United Kingdom, and decided not to take up another position in Asia. So, I am very proud to see the issue come to fruition and maintain the level of cutting edge research that the first issue of *JACANZS* included. This issue has an excellent range of articles in terms of discipline, including ones on Indigenous studies, history and politics, and literature. I am especially pleased to see two articles on literature as *JACANZS* is a multidisciplinary journal and aims to include articles from history, politics, literature, law, anthropology, and Indigenous studies.

Geographically, in regard to articles, this issue covers two of the three countries of its focus: Australia and Canada; and two articles are comparative ones, which is wonderful to see, as publishing comparative works is one of *JACANZS*' key objectives. Furthermore, half of the book reviews included in the issue are on Aotearoa New Zealand. In any case I do not think it is necessary to have articles on all three countries of focus of the journal in every issue. There may be some issues where there are no articles covering a particular country, but in another issue there might be two. It will balance out. Economies of scale play a part too, in that there are more scholars working on Australia and Canada than Aotearoa New Zealand. So, equal representation overall is probably an unrealistic goal in any case. This issue of

¹ I would like to thank Benjamin Jones for peer reviewing this introduction and for his comments and suggestions.

JACANZS also has a good range in terms of the stage of careers of the authors of the articles, including Ph.D. students and early to mid-career scholars. Although it will be nice to have some articles published by senior scholars in the future.

I thought I would devote space to talk about the challenges that I have faced as Editor-in-chief of the journal. The greatest challenge, and I am sure it is one faced by many other Editor-in-chiefs, is securing reviewers for manuscripts that you receive, especially when the subject of the article is niche. I think part of the problem with this generally is the fact that reviewing articles is an unpaid activity and very often not seen as a priority by academics who have ever increasing workloads. As with the first issue I was able to draw on the wonderful support of the editorial board of JACANZS, who either kindly agreed to review manuscripts themselves or offered advice and guidance on other potential reviewers. However, even when you secure a reviewer for an article you then sometimes find that the reviewer never sends their review back. This I have to say I do find extremely frustrating and unprofessional. When you send out a manuscript for review, you give an estimated timeframe to the author about when they should receive the two peer reviews of their article back. But when a reviewer does not send their review back as promised, the poor author is left waiting. I personally feel that if you do not have the time to review an article then just say no when asked by an Editor-in-chief, as it will make their life a lot easier in the long run. However, unlike other journals, JACANZS does not make a profit and is completely open access. As a result, academics who do complete reviews for the journal can at least take comfort from the knowledge that they are genuinely helping scholars disseminate their research and not just doing unpaid work for a large publishing house.

As with my introduction to the first issue of *JACANZS* I also want to discuss the Book Reviews section of the journal. This is an integral part of *JACANZS* and I want to thank the Book Reviews Editor, Ms. Emily Cornish for her wonderful work again on this issue. We have a great collection of reviews of some fascinating books that have been published in Australian, Canadian, and Aotearoa New Zealand Studies. As mentioned above half of the reviews focus on books on Aotearoa New Zealand. The reason for this is the Book Reviews section in the first issue was quite light on Aotearoa New Zealand and so Emily and I wanted to rebalance this in the second issue. The second largest number of book reviews is on Canada, which reflects the fact that there were more reviews on Australia compared to Canada in the first issue of *JACANZS*.

Along with trying our best to include books on all three countries of focus of the journal, another primary consideration that Emily and I have when we decide on which book reviews that we have received to include in a particular issue is the year of publication. We strive to include reviews of books roughly in the order which they were published, so prioritise older ones. With reviews of books published more recently appearing in later issues. But both concerns are, of course, dependent on when book reviewers send their reviews back to us in terms of the production schedule of the journal (which is why there were not many reviews on Aotearoa New Zealand in the first issue). Regarding challenges that Emily has faced as Book Reviews Editor they are common ones to those that I have faced as Editor-in-Chief, i.e., trying to find reviewers for books, and reviewers who have agreed to review a book but then changing their mind, usually just before the review is due. Again, I believe this is due to book reviewing being an underrated aspect of academia and it not being seen as a priority by academics who have ever increasing workloads.

However, once more I would suggest that it is better to just say no when asked to review a book if you do not have the time to do so. However, I do strongly believe that writing book reviews is a valuable academic activity. The way I have always seen it is if we want other academics to review our books then we should be willing to do the same. And writing book reviews can be useful, especially for Ph.D. students, as it is a publication to add to your CV and a way to raise your profile in your field.

The difficulty in securing reviewers for books has been compounded by the fact that an increasing number of publishers are now only offering electronic copies of books for review. Although a minority of potential reviewers in our experience do not mind this, the vast majority are unhappy about not being able to receive a hardcopy of a book they have agreed to review, as this is one of the few practical benefits of doing what is an unpaid, voluntary activity as I mentioned above. This shift by more and more publishers is only going to make it harder to secure reviewers for books, which if they want their books reviewed, is extremely counterproductive in my opinion. Ultimately it will be the authors of those books who will suffer, as there will be less reviews of their book, which is very unfair to them.

However, on a more positive note this issue of *JACANZS* has some fantastic articles which as with the first issue illustrate the cutting-edge research that is taking place in Australian, Canadian, and Aotearoa New Zealand Studies. According to Samantha Stevens in her article on 'Canadian Rangers: Community, Autonomy, and Sovereignty' Indigenous members of the Canadian Forces (CF) are an integral part of the organization, working and fighting alongside their non-Indigenous colleagues all over the world. As a non-combative sub-set of the CF, however, the Canadian Rangers are a unique branch of the Reserves that are without compare. Functioning

primarily for their communities, the Rangers represent the potential for the CF to effectively work with Indigenous communities and culture, while maintaining CF operational objectives in the Arctic. This article explores how the Rangers balance the sovereignty of their communities with the aims of the CF by integrating Indigenous cultures, language, and ways of knowing into their operational and capabilities, while remaining semi-autonomous from the CF culture and hierarchy. The article concludes that while the Rangers are an example of the potential for Indigenous and Canadian partnerships, there is also an alarming disparity and inequitable access to secure full-time employment and healthcare. Moreover, Rangers face many of the same issues as those in the communities they strive to serve. Therefore, this article argues that if Canada is serious about reconciliation and creating more opportunities for Indigenous persons in the Arctic, then part of that aim should also include providing the Rangers with the same support other areas of the CF are privileged to receive.

Piper Rodd's 'Wars of Resistance and Rebellion: The Myth of Protest and Popular Dissent against the Vietnam War in Australia and Canada' traces the history of war resistance in both Australia and Canada during the era of the War in Vietnam that became so culturally resonant with popular dissent from the status quo. Unlike all other major international conflicts in the twentieth century, this war represented a point of departure for Australia and Canada. Australia faithfully committed fully to the American effort, while Canada refused to commit militarily, shifting its focus to one of diplomacy. This article provides a comparison of acts of resistance to the war, arguing that while the two countries resisted the war differently a sense of national identity shifted for both, even if slowly and subtly.

The history of war and nationalism engendered through its engagement needs to be nuanced enough to view acts of resistance and protest as being integrally bound together. The inevitably politicised nature of war means that the memory of war and its practice is often viewed in complete distinction and isolation from war resistance and the memory of anti-war protest. War and war resistance, Piper argues, are not binary opposites, not two sides of the same socio-political coin. Instead, the article calls for a consideration of these issues together and critically, not artificially separating war from peace and warring from acts of resistance to it.

Crystopher Spicer in his article on 'Louis Becke's Modern Buccaneer: The transformation of William "Bully" Hayes into the first modern literary pirate of the Pacific' maintains that during his career, Louis Becke, the most internationally well-known Australian writer of the South Pacific region at the turn of the nineteenth century, wrote a series of novellas, stories, and articles that featured the infamous conman and thief, Captain William 'Bully' Hayes, with whom he had sailed through the Pacific Islands for a short period. Influenced by the work of Robert Louis Stevenson and earlier accounts of piracy in the Pacific, Becke's fictionalized version of Hayes was the original archetypal South Pacific pirate character: a Long John Silver of the South Seas. Beginning with the first major work about Hayes, *A Modern Buccaneer*, substantially written by Becke although published under Boldrewood's name, Becke's re-imagined Hayes became the pervasive Pacific pirate literary trope not only throughout Becke's books, stories, and articles but also within the work of subsequent writers.

'Witnessing the Violence of the Settler State in Alexis Wright's *Carpentaria* and Lee Maracle's *Celia's Song*' by Laura Hamilton showcases that as a Canadian literary scholar based in Australia, she reads 'Aboriginal/Indigenous' Australian and

Canadian literatures in English as sites where the ways in which we perceive racial and cultural violence might be re-configured. Cognizant of the role that literary studies discourse has had and continues to have in these nations as a tool for the maintenance of official, state-recognised 'reconciliation' narratives, her work looks instead to the literary encounter itself as a potential site for registering, or witnessing, the violence that the settler state attempts to screen off behind the scenes of its official attitudes towards reconciliation. This article explores the concept of literary witnessing in an archive of trans-Indigenous literature across settler colonial states, linking award-winning authors Alexis Wright (Waanyi, writing in Australia) and Lee Maracle (Sto:lo, writing in Canada). Analysing Wright's *Carpentaria* and Maracle's *Celia's Song*, she traces how these novels enact and inspire, but also complicate, witnessing in Canada and Australia (both of which maintain official policies of inclusion and multiculturalism, but are actually held up by a regime of continuing racialized violence). She also examines how these works of literature model ignorance and choosing to turn away as a form of violence and a roadblock to justice. Finally, she asks how these novels might provide models for subjectivity and justice that subvert the judiciary systems of these settler states, dislodging 'witnessing' from its place in discourses of state-authorized 'justice,' and placing it in the realm of Indigenous law and the potential of an ethical (literary) encounter.