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UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW
Scaling Colonial Violence: One Day Celebrations in Fremantle, WA

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to analyse the Fremantle City Council’s decision to celebrate One Day on January 28th 2017 instead of the usual Australia Day on January 26th, as well as the ensuing media debate between its supporters and opponents, especially Noongar leaders and WA Government. The discourse is examined in the context of the disruption of colonial violence. The City of Fremantle, as a place, itself serves as a point of reference for the analysis. Although today Fremantle is often perceived as a “progressive island” in a largely conservative Western Australia, the Fremantle prison and nearby Rottnest Island are stark reminders of the maltreatment of the Whadjuk people after the formation of the Swan River Colony in 1829.

In December 2016, I attended the International Australian Studies Association’s conference in Fremantle, Western Australia (WA). The conference was titled “Re-imagining Australia: Encounter, Recognition, Responsibility.” Going there, I had little knowledge of Fremantle itself, and it was my first visit to WA. I read up on the city’s history and was looking forward to visiting the famous Maritime Museum and Fremantle Prison. It was not until I met my hosts, whom I found via a traveller website that I heard about, how progressive Fremantle was supposed to be, especially compared to the rest of Western Australia. The couple seemed to have quite a liberal approach to issues such as immigration, personal freedoms, etc. On the following day, prompted by the news on TV, they told me about the Fremantle City Council’s decision to move the celebrations of Australia Day from January 26th to January 28th in 2017. They were outraged and insisted that the celebrations of Australia Day had nothing to do with the history of genocide, and that they were about the wonderful and multicultural nation that Australia has become. I was perplexed not only by the argument itself, but also by what seemed to me like a dissonance in their attitudes toward immigrants and the Indigenous Peoples of Australia. Later on in our discussion, it also turned out
that their attitudes toward the issues faced by Indigenous communities, such as crime, incarceration or alcoholism were definitely not ones one would normally associate with left-wing views. They not only blamed Indigenous communities for their fate, but also saw Australian society as the saviour of the Indigenous victims of crime and neglect saying, for example, that if some Aboriginal children had not been taken away from their families, they would have died.

The National Australia Day Council, which was founded in 1979, views Australia Day as “a day to reflect on what we have achieved and what we can be proud of in our great nation,” and a “day for us to re-commit to making Australia an even better place for the generations to come” (National Australia Day Council; qtd. in Korff 2018). Australia Day is supposed to be a commemoration of Captain Arthur Phillip’s formal possession of the colony of New South Wales, on January 26th, 1788, when he raised the British flag for the first time in Sydney Cove (Korff 2018). It became a public holiday in 1818 and in the early 1880s, it was known as “First Landing,” “Anniversary Day,” or “Foundation Day.” In 1946 the Commonwealth and state governments agreed to unify the celebrations on January 26 and call it “Australia Day” (Korff 2018). Since 1994 all states and territories celebrate Australia Day together on that day, during which citizenship ceremonies are held. People also celebrate with barbecues, contests, parades, performances, fireworks and other fun events.

1. ‘Change the Date’ Debate

However, for many Indigenous Australians, there is not much to celebrate. Quite the contrary, it is a commemoration of a deep loss for them: “loss of their sovereign rights to their land, loss of family, loss of the right to practice their culture” (Korff 2018). As stated by Aboriginal activist Michael Mansell, “Australia Day is 26 January, a date whose only significance is to mark the coming to Australia of the white people in 1788. It’s not a date that is particularly pleasing for Aborigines” (qtd. in Korff 2018). Such sentiments have been present for a very long time. In 1938, on the holiday’s 150th anniversary, William Cooper, a member of the Aboriginal Progressive Association, declared it a “Day of Mourning,” referring to the annual re-enactment of Phillip’s landing (Korff 2018). Cooper, together with Jack Patten and William Ferguson organised a conference to “grieve the collective loss of freedom and self-determination of Aboriginal communities as well as those killed during and after European settlement in 1788” (Korff 2018). By 1988, the re-enactments were stopped.

Today, the day is called “Invasion Day,” “Day of Mourning,” or “Survival Day” by many Aboriginal people. In 1992 the first Survival Day concert was held in Sydney. On this occasion, Indigenous and non-Indigenous artists play music or dance, information is made available about Indigenous issues, arts and crafts are
sold, and one can buy food and bush tucker. The name “Survival Day” underscores the fact that Aboriginal culture is still strong despite all that has happened (Korff 2018). In major cities you can visit alternative concerts where mostly Aboriginal people gather. Since 2006, the name “Aboriginal Sovereignty Day” has also been used to emphasise that “all Aboriginal nations are sovereign and should be united in the continuous fight for their rights” (Korff 2018).

Survival Day concerts and Indigenous activism have led to an increase of public awareness about the controversial nature of Australia Day, and have fostered a discussion about “changing the date.” Many Indigenous Australians, including Mick Dodson, Aboriginal Law Professor and 2009 Australian of the Year, are hopeful that Australia will be celebrated on a different day: “To most Indigenous Australians, it really reflects the day on which our world came crashing down. Many Indigenous people regard it as Invasion Day,” he said bluntly (2010, 21). He continued: “And if we look at the recent survey that showed 90 per cent of people are saying Australia Day should be inclusive of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures, I firmly believe that someday we will choose a date that is a comprehensive and inclusive date for all Australians” (21).

There have been several local responses to the debate, e.g. Flinders Island Council in Tasmania decided to end its January 26 celebrations in November 2013, and instead support the three-day-long Furneaux Islands Festival held in January and organised by the Flinders Island Aboriginal Association Incorporated (FIAAI). Fremantle City Council’s decision to celebrate One Day can definitely be seen as one of such local responses to the ‘change the date’ debate.

Although the Fremantle City Council had announced that it would be hosting a special event to celebrate Australia on 28 January 2017, already a year before, the story made headlines towards the end of November 2016, with the Council’s proclamation of the celebrations of One Day. This “free, family-friendly event is a culturally-inclusive alternative to traditional Australia Day celebrations” was to see “some of Australia’s finest artists take the stage” (“World-class artists” 2016). On the one hand, the Council’s decision was met with praise from the traditional owners of the land, the Noongar people, and Australians who condemn the celebration of the anniversary of the arrival of the first fleet of British ships to Port Jackson in 1788. On the other hand, the proclamation sparked outrage in Western Australia, threats on the part of the federal government, and was widely commented nationwide. The issue was also discussed during the conference, and a special panel was held, with Robert Eggington, Noongar Elder, and Executive Officer of Dumbartung Aboriginal Corporation, as well as a member of the City Council, and other members of the community participating.

This paper aims to analyse the Council’s decision as well as the ensuing media debate between its supporters and opponents, especially Noongar leaders and the WA Government in the context of the disruption of colonial violence. The City of Fremantle, as a place, will itself serve as a point of reference for the
analysis. As aptly put by Suvendrini Perera, “Certainly, this small Indian Ocean
town suddenly finds itself at the forefront of the Change the Date movement which
is gathering daily momentum in the media” (2016). Nonetheless, many Whadjuk
and Noongar people living in the area see the celebrations of Australia Day and
the strong reactions to their cancellation by the Fremantle City Council not only
as an obstacle to creating an Australian society that would be inclusive of its
Indigenous population, but also as a reminder and continuation of the violence that
they have endured since the creation of the Swan River Colony in 1829. Therefore,
the author sees it as important that the discussion around the announcement
of One Day celebrations is not only considered as part of the national Change
the Date debate, but that it is also viewed in light of the local history of colonial
violence, particularly Aboriginal imprisonment and removal from land in what is
today Fremantle and its surrounding area. The study considers online articles in the
regional WA News as well as in the national media outlet SBS. The examination
of colonial violence is carried out in view of Tanganekald Meintangk Boandik
scholar Irene Watson’s considerations of the issue, who argues that “the greatest
tensions arise out of the state’s justification of the theft of Aboriginal lands and
the absorption of Aboriginal lands into western property paradigms” (Watson
2009a: 2). Of equal importance, she claims, is the state’s “failure to acknowledge
Aboriginal sovereignty and the absorption of Aboriginal political identities into
the ‘one nation’ Australian state” (Watson 2009, 2).

2. One Day Media Debate

In response to the Council’s announcement, West Australian Liberal MP Ben
Morton flagged his concerns about the Council’s actions in a letter to the Assistant
Minister for Immigration and Border Protection, Alex Hawke, who in turn wrote
a letter to the city in which he claimed the Council would be banned from holding
citizen ceremonies because it breached the Australian Citizenship Act of 2007 by
“politicizing” its fireworks ban. He stated that the government’s position was very
clear and “if the council are unable to reconcile their political views with their
civic duty, I will consider revoking authorization from those persons in the City of
Fremantle who can currently receive a pledge of commitment at citizenship ceremo-
nies” (2016; qtd. in Fremantle Australia Day fireworks). He also noted that a similar
situation had occurred twice in the past decade and the Government would be
“monitoring the situation closely” (2016; qtd. in Fremantle Australia Day fireworks).

Fremantle council fired back, saying it would not be bullied by the Turnbull
government into moving its One Day in Fremantle event back to January 26.
The council assured that its decision “was not to denigrate Australia Day or
those who celebrated it, but to hold an event on January 28 that would be “more
respectful and inclusive for the entire community” (qtd. in Young 2016).
Different public figures and local groups also reacted. Not wanting to miss out on one of the biggest trading days of the year, businesses jointly raised the $50,000 needed to salvage the traditional fireworks display on Australia Day. Visitors and residents thus had a choice: the fireworks, which were part of a four-day fiesta called “Australia Week” or the council’s alternative event “One Day in Freo” on the 28th (Moodie 2017). In addition, far right groups Reclaim Australia and the United Patriots Front planned to congregate in Fremantle on Australia Day to protest against what they called “an act of betrayal against Australia” (Moodie 2017).

Brent Fleeton, Councillor for nearby Bayswater, slightly less radically, although still showing ignorance of the Indigenous community’s argument, stated “[I’m] sick of being made to feel guilty for wanting to celebrate Australia on the anniversary of the first British settlement,” and “Not everyone likes this day for various reasons, I understand that, but that doesn’t mean the rest of us should be shamed into wearing black armbands and apologizing for being here” (qtd. in Young 2016).

Western Australia’s Premier, Colin Barnett, on the other hand, asked in a much more accusatory manner: “Maybe they are going to ban Christmas because Muslims don’t celebrate Christmas; what’s next?” (qtd. in Young 2016). He also called the move “unAustralian” and, by twisting the cause and effect of the council’s action, an “exaggerated” attempt to prevent people taking part in citizenship ceremonies on a day that meant something to them (qtd. in Young 2016). “I think it’s a selfish act by the Fremantle council to deny new people to this country the right to become Australians on Australia Day” he stated (qtd. in Young 2016).

Robert Eggington responded to the Premier stating that “Comparing the decision to banning Christmas and then attaching the Muslim face is absurd. You would expect it to come from the mouth of an uneducated redneck, not the Premier of Western Australia” (qtd. in Young 2016). He also poignantly noted that “Deep in the minds of people who are accessing their citizenship rights through these ceremonies would be a consciousness that this country has been founded on the dispossession of Aboriginal people […] especially since many come from countries that are war-torn and may know what it’s like to be impoverished, or face genocide” (qtd. in Young 2016). He went on to praise the Council’s decision: “This is a historical moment; the first time the status quo of celebrating Australia’s identity, its nationhood, has been challenged by any government instrument” (qtd. in Young 2016). “We are upon the oldest ceremonial grounds on the planet. For people to savagely attack him like this just shows that they don’t understand the nature of this land, its beauty and its indigenous practice” (qtd. in Young 2016).

However, not all Indigenous voices in Western Australia were unanimous about the council’s decision. For example, Noongar elder, former West Australian of the Year, and ambassador for the Australia Day WA Council, Robert Isaacs, disagreed, stating that his fellow Indigenous Australians were causing divisions
by opposing Australia Day. “We’re one nation of people and we’ve just got to try
and not forget that we need to go forward and don’t look back” (qtd. in Moodie
2017). Dr Isaacs was scathing about the City of Fremantle’s alternative celebration
and argued that hundreds of Aboriginal families attended Perth’s Skyworks each
year after a “survival concert” in the city centre (qtd. in Moodie 2017).

3. A History of Colonial Violence in Fremantle

Indigenous Australians have long used terms such as Shame Day, Invasion Day
and Day of Mourning to describe this date. According to Professor Suvendrini
Perera, a resident of Fremantle of fifteen years:

> Among non-Anglo migrants and refugee Australians, the sickening rise in racist
slurs and attacks in the lead-up to January 26 is an all-too-well-known experience.
Changing the date may well lead to an initial increase in these kinds of abuse, but
even as we dread the influx of flag-waving racists into the streets of Fremantle, […]
the council’s decision is undoubtedly one that moves us forward into a less racist
future. (2016)

She examines the council’s move in a local context, seeing the Change the Date
push as an example of how, “at the edges of […] frightening and well–worn
scripts, others are being acted out, and new stories are being written.” She gives
several other examples of such “new stories,” e.g., the inscription of Kim Scott’s
poem “Kaya” in Noongar language on the walls of the new Perth Stadium, “liter-
ally, into the concrete façade,” greeting all manner of motley arrivals to Whadjuk
Country; the NoongarPedia project, “a living testament to the survival and sharing
of the language of the place”; the projected display of the state’s maritime heritage
featuring the Bremen, a boat that successfully evaded extensive surveillance to
sail straight into Geraldton Harbour in 2013, carrying 67 asylum seekers from Sri
Lanka (2016). She also states that the same urgent imperative to “find possibilities
for the country” shaped the conference, Reimagining Australia that took place
in Fremantle from December 7–9 2016 (2016). The “well-worn scripts” on the
other hand, are expressed in WA’s plummeting economy caused by a recurring

fly-in fly-out ghost towns fuelling support for One Nation and a Trump-style poli-
tics of white grievance; of a state government scandalously indifferent to shocking
Indigenous suicide rates in the Kimberley and elsewhere; to the recent racist
violence in Kalgoorlie leading up to the death of 14-year-old Elijah Doughty; and
to the obscene and antiquated laws that led to the jailing of Ms Dhu in a Port Hedland
cell where she died in agony. (Perera 2016)
The Fremantle prison and nearby Rottnest Island are also stark reminders of the city’s history of maltreatment of the Noongar people after the formation of the Swan River Colony in 1829. Rottnest Island, now a popular tourist destination, lies 20 km off the coast of Western Australia and is clearly visible from Fremantle. It received its first prisoners in 1838 and formally came into existence as a prison in 1841.

The Swan River Colony, which later became Fremantle, was not established as a penal colony, unlike the colonies already founded in the eastern part of the continent, as it was a military and civilian settlement, not a settlement for convicts (“Fremantle History…”). The ‘free’ status of the colony was ended by the English before 1850: “The settlers were not happy about the proposition of turning the colony into a penal colony. They were concerned that it was against the founding ‘free’ principles of the colony – what had been ‘promised’ to them in England. They opposed the arrival of convicts as they felt they would bring stigma and trouble” (“Fremantle History…”). In November 1849, it was officially announced that the Swan River Colony had been constituted a penal settlement to accelerate the economic growth, despite public opinion. Over nine-thousand convicts were brought to Fremantle from England on 43 voyages. Importantly, two thirds of the convicts remained in the colony after they were released from prison and by 1868 the population had reached 22,738 (“Fremantle History…”). Until the 1870s, the city’s economy was based on meat, wheat and wool.

From the Noongar perspective, however, the establishment of the colony had a grave impact on the lives of their communities. As noted by Karen Jacobs, a Noongar woman and former member of the Rottnest Island Board, “all of a sudden fences were going up, people were being pushed off their land and we were marginalised” (qtd. in Melville 2016). She continues:

Then they started bringing in a law that passed judgment over us, when we’d had our own governance structure for thousands and thousands and thousands of years. They cleared the land and blocked all the freshwater springs that ran through the city. This meant all the medicinal plants, all of the traditional vegetation and animals were all gone. Our whole hunting ground was gone within three years of settlement. (qtd. in Melville 2016)

Irene Watson also comments on the legal implications of colonization in Australia with regard to land, noting that individual ownership was a very different concept to an Aboriginal relationship to land, which was collective: “all Aboriginal relationships to land were deemed by British law to be non-existent. Aboriginal peoples were held to have no legal ownership of land or political identity as sovereign peoples” (Watson 2009a, 2, after Watson 2009b; Schlunke 2009).

As food supplies became scarce, Noongar men started hunting any animal they saw, including sheep, chicken or cows, without realizing that animals can belong to people under white man’s law (Melville 2016). To them, animals
belonged to the land. In consequence, Noongar people started being arrested for theft and trespassing, and they started to fill up the prisons.

According to Green (2011, 78), between 1838 and 1931, more than 3670 Aboriginal men served one or more sentences on Rottnest Island and 365 are buried there. An Aboriginal cemetery is located within the Thomson Bay Settlement. The 1850 land regulations provided for pastoral leases to a maximum of 20,000 acres and the lease was extended from one year to eight years (still six years less than in New South Wales). At the insistence of Earl Grey of the British Colonial Office, after 1851 the form of lease included a clause giving Aboriginal people a right of access to pastoral leases to seek their subsistence, a right which continues to the present. New land regulations in 1864 raised the maximum lease area to 100,000 acres and offered a generous rent concession to those willing to pioneer new districts of the North-West. This inevitably brought settlers into conflict with Aboriginal people on the expanding pastoral frontier: “Thomas and Stewart (1978), in their study of imprisonment in Western Australia argued that in the early years, settler fear of Aboriginal people influenced the arrests but later in the century fear gave way to a ‘dislike of the native population’ and eventually to contempt, shown in the lack of compassion. They noted, ‘very rarely in the history of the legislature is there a categorical denunciation of the conditions under which Aborigines were imprisoned’” (qtd. in Green 2011, 78).

Although the Aboriginal prison officially closed in 1902, it became an annex of Fremantle prison the following year, and received Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal low-risk prisoners to do maintenance work on the tourist holiday cottages, roads and pathways until 1931 (Green 2011, 78). According to Green, during the collation of data for Far from Home, it became apparent that the advance of the pastoral frontiers between 1854 and 1900 was reflected in the Rottnest prison population (2011, 77–78). For example, the overall preponderance of prisoners from the South-West reflects the early establishment of pastoral settlement in that region. Similarly, stock killing was by far the most common conviction. There was a marked increase in the number of prisoners sent to Rottnest from the 1860s, as the pastoral frontier expanded, especially following the 1864 regulations and their incentives. This reached a striking peak in the 1880s. Closer inspection of the data showed that in 1884, for example, prisoners form the Murchison and Gascoyne regions accounted for more than half of the Rottnest prisoners, with the most convictions for stock killing (2011, 78).

Watson also argues that demonizing Aboriginal culture allows an opening for the state to appear as “a crusader and rescuer of Aboriginal women and children,” especially from violence committed by Aboriginal men (a view most definitely shared by my hosts in Fremantle) (2009, 4, after Watson 2005 and 2007). The scholar asks whether a long process of vilification assists in the assimilation of Aboriginal peoples and the commodification of their lands into Australian real property. In her view it does, as the state becomes “the knower of what is
Aboriginal culture while Aboriginal peoples and communities are positioned as mere actors, acting out a deemed and ‘known’ cultural practice. The state as knower of ‘objectionable practices’ has power to construct what Aboriginal culture is and to analyse, vilify, and ultimately undermine the right of peoples to self-determination” (Watson 2009a, 4). In her considerations of colonial violence, Irene Watson has compared such reality to entrapment: “Aboriginal men are hunted into a confined space, or removed from collectivity to prison or the isolation of individualised spaces” (2009a, 4); “Collective land ownership is thus made vulnerable, demolished and replaced by individualized land ownership” (2005, 15).

Conclusion

For many Australians, “1788 brings to mind the ‘Old Sydney Town’ version of history, with red coated soldiers and convicts subjected to cruelty for an arrogant English aristocracy” (Faruqi 2017). However, “clinging to the myth that invasion, occupation, colonisation and settlement are somehow peaceful processes and something to be celebrated continues to hurt us all,” says Mehreen Faruqi, Pakistani-born Australian Greens MP for the New South Wales Legislative Council (2017). Supporters of the Change the Date campaign, including many Whadjuk and other Noongar people see the celebrations of Australia Day and the strong reactions to their cancellation by the Fremantle City Council as both a reminder and continuation of that violence, and an obstacle to creating an Australian society
that would be inclusive of its Indigenous population. Keeping the date allows the
state to retain the power to construct what Aboriginal culture and history means,
thereby not only ignoring 200 years of imprisonment, land grabs and other forms
of colonial violence, but also undermining Indigenous peoples’ rights to self-
determination and their rights as Australian citizens. Changing the date would thus
mean that the state (and mainstream society) no longer yield that power. Perhaps
this is one of the reasons why Fremantle Council’s decision was met with such
strong resistance and why many do not want to see the date changed.

As argued by Watson, the state “still has assimilation agendas, intent upon
the removal of Aboriginal peoples from traditional lands and the absorption of
Aboriginality into a ‘white Australia’” (2009a, 1). Celebrating Australia Day on
the 26th of January can definitely be seen as part of such an agenda. Unfortunately,
we cannot have justice or the possibility of de-colonising the past injustices of
colonialism, when “the state is committed to a one dimensional universal world
order, one which disallows for the diversity of peoples and cultures” (Watson
2009a, 1, after Watson 2006). The Fremantle City Council’s decision may thus be
viewed as a form of disrupting the status quo, and a move toward de-colonising
past and present injustices toward Indigenous Australians.

To come back to Suvendrini Perera, in commenting on the council’s deci-
sion, she wrote: “it seems that something is shifting here at the edges. Yes,
something is happening here, at the edges: a stirring and unsettling of words, an
unmooring of certainties, a small change of dates” (2016). Indeed, other councils
have followed Fremantle’s suit. On August 15th, 2017, City of Yarra councillors
in Melbourne voted unanimously to no longer refer to 26 January as Australia
Day in all official documents, but as “January 26” instead, to stop citizenship
ceremonies on that date, and to support the campaign to change Australia Day
recognizing that it is “a day of distress for many Aboriginal people” (Korff 2018).
However, in response, the federal government stripped the council of the power
to hold citizenship ceremonies on that date, and to support the campaign to change Australia Day
recognizing that it is “a day of distress for many Aboriginal people” (Korff 2018).
About a week later, neighbouring Darebin council also voted in favour of not calling 26 January
Australia Day, and on September 13th 2017, Moreland City Council (a neighbour
of Darebin) did as well, although it will still hold citizenship ceremonies, as in
2015, it moved its annual citizen awards ceremony from January 26th to October,
out of respect for Aboriginal people (Korff 2018). Hopefully, more of such “small
changes of dates” continue to take place, ultimately leading to a new, inclusive
and non-violent date for celebrating Australia Day.
Notes

1 Whadjuk is the name of a Noongar dialectal group from the Perth area. The major cities and towns within the Whadjuk region include Perth, Fremantle, Joondalup, Armadale, Toodyay, Wundowie, Bullsbrook and Chidlow. The approximate size of the Whadjuk region is 5,580 km (“About the Whadjuk region” 2018).

2 Aboriginal people refused to participate in the re-enactment because it included chasing away a party of Aboriginal people (Korff 2018).

3 Noongar “Noongar means ‘a person of the south-west of Western Australia,’ or the name for the ‘original inhabitants of the south-west of Western Australia’ and [they] are one of the largest Aboriginal cultural blocks in Australia. Noongar are made up of fourteen different language groups (which may be spelt in different ways): Amangu, Yued/Yuat, Whadjuk/Wajuk, Binjareb/ Pinjarup, Wardandi, Balardong/Ballardong, Nyakinyaki, Wilman, Ganeang, Bibulmun/Piblemen, Mineng, Goreng and Wudjari and Njungga. Each of these language groups correlates with different geographic areas with ecological distinctions” (https://www.noongarculture.org.au/noongar).

4 Elijah Doughty was a fourteen-year-old Indigenous Australian, who was killed by a 56-year-old white man driving a ute, while riding a stolen motorbike on 29 August 2016. There is no evidence that Elijah had stolen the motorbike. The driver of the ute was also the owner of the stolen motorcycle. He was charged with manslaughter, but was acquitted by a jury on 21 July 2017 after a trial at the Supreme Court of Western Australia; however he was found guilty of the lesser charge of dangerous driving causing death (“Death of Elijah Doughty” 2018). Julieka Dhu, commonly referred to as Ms Dhu in Australian media, was a 24-year-old Aboriginal woman who died in police custody in 2014. Between 2 and 4 August 2014, she was detained in custody in a police watch house in South Hedland, Western Australia on unpaid fines. On Monday 4 August, she was pronounced dead. Dhu’s was the 340th Aboriginal death in custody since the conclusion of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody in 1992 (“Death of Ms Dhu” 2018).

5 Far from Home – the tenth volume of the Dictionary of Western Australians which identifies Aboriginal prisoners of Rottnest Island in the years 1838–1931 (Green and Moon 1999).
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