



5-2018

The British Colonization of Australia: An Exposé of the Models, Impacts and Pertinent Questions

Peter Genger

University of Manitoba, gengerp@myumanitoba.ca

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/pcs>



Part of the [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Genger, Peter (2018) "The British Colonization of Australia: An Exposé of the Models, Impacts and Pertinent Questions," *Peace and Conflict Studies*: Vol. 25 : No. 1 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/pcs/vol25/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the CAHSS Journals at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Peace and Conflict Studies by an authorized editor of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.

The British Colonization of Australia: An Exposé of the Models, Impacts and Pertinent Questions

Abstract

By adopting the purview of Peace and Conflict Studies and the expository approach of historical archaeology of colonialism, this paper succeeds in enumerating the models the British used to establish and perpetuate colonial violence on the Indigenous Australians, and the traumatizing impacts the violence is exerting on them. The sole essence of the paper is not only to re-establish that the British colonization of Australia was deliberate, just as the heinous models they used. Most essentially, the paper identifies the following institutions: Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS), the UN and challenges them to move from their current inert condemnation of colonial violence and adopt effective, concrete and practical frameworks that will “overthrow” the Australian colonial violence. Their sincere disposition and uncompromised commitment to this cause is important and imperative. In conclusion, the paper poses some pertinent questions to prove that colonialism is a dispensable evil.

Keywords: *Indigenous Australians, Colonialism, Colonial Violence, British Colonial Models, Convicts and Free, Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS), United Nations (UN), Social Change Agents*

Author Bio(s)

Peter Genger is a scholar and practitioner in Peace and Conflict Resolution and inter-cultural dialogue. He holds an MEd in Inter-religious Dialogue (Boston College), an MA in Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS) (University of Manitoba) and a PACS PhD Candidate at the same university. His areas of research include Indigenous Peacemaking, mainstreaming the African and Indigenous Peacemaking Approaches (AIPA), critical Indigenous research, decolonization, indigenous knowledge and pedagogy, conflict transformation, restorative justice, Inter-cultural dialogue, and world religions in search of community and peace.

Email: gengerpeter@myumanitoba.ca

The British Colonization of Australia: An Exposé of the Models, Impacts, and Pertinent Questions

Peter Genger

The Dutchman, Willem Jansz, was the first European to access the Greater Australian lands in 1606; however, the first British voyage into the region was managed by William Dampier in 1699. The two voyages had shared interest in the acquisition of knowledge about the Pacific Ocean, the Australian lands, and the suspected maritime trade routes, and on how to take control of all these. The second British voyage into the region was led by Captain James Cook, with Botanist Joseph Banks in company. The two parties arrived in the territory of the Ghadiga Band, known today as Botany Bay, on the 29th of April 1770, and as mandated by King Georgy III, they mapped out the Australian lands for British annexation (Smith, 2011). This cartographic voyage was immediately followed by the first fleet of convicts, led by Captain Arthur Philips in 1788, who without delay began the rapid colonization of Australia (Rogers, 2001). With the continued inflow of British convict fleets, and the use of other strategies, the British established a colonial state over the Indigenous Australians to this day.

Stein (2011) described historical archaeology of colonialism as the study concerned with addressing the quandary of colonies, colonization and colonialism, and associated issues such as motives, models, and impacts. On the other hand, the field of Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS) condemns colonialism as a violence that must not be allowed to persist. The essence of this paper is to participate in the progressing discourse on colonialism by presenting a historical exposé of the models the British used to colonize Australia. By using Sharp's (2003) arguments, the paper conceptualizes the "framework for liberation" and calls on PACS, the United Nations (UN), and social change agents to use the elucidated steps for the emancipation of the Indigenous Australians still sweltering under colonial violence (p. 39).

Pre-Colonial Australians: Peoplehood, Land, and Culture

European scientists are still working with archaeological formulas, mathematical figures, and Darwinian evolutionary theories to determine when the Aborigines began to exist on Australian lands. The archaeologists contend that it was sometime between 35,000 to 40,000 BC, or 50,000 to 60,000 BC, or 116,000 to 176,000 BC, or when Homo Sapiens migrated from Africa (O'Connell & Allen, 2004). Australian Indigenous Peoples have however repeatedly established that they have been existing on their ancestral lands "from time immemorial"

(National Museum of Australia, 2001, p.3). The Anbarra clan, for example, explains that the lands, fauna, flora, aqua, sediments, aerial and human knowledge (collectively called in their language a *wangarr*) were created by the Supreme spirit in the time before living memory (Jaconline, n.d).

Economically, pre-colonial Indigenous Australians engaged in complex trade exchanges in landed, mining, and quarry materials such as flint, pituri, ochre, pearl shells, drum, canoe, artifacts, etc., with other peoples and those from Indonesia (National Museum of Australia, 2001, p.8). They did not privatize land but owned it communally and used it respectfully as a sacred value. The introduction of large-scale, commercial and private land ownership later by the British colonizers facilitated capitalist laws, policies, and practices that destroyed the sense of sacredness associated with the Australian lands (Petitt, 2015).

The Indigenous Australians' culture has not lost its intrinsic material and spiritual dimensions. Materially, they were well established in hunting and food gathering. They lived in different clan groupings, and had their unique laws, indigenous conflict resolution principles, customary practices, and social activities. They are still strongly homogenized around their core values such as relationality, communal harmony, restorative welfare, religious beliefs, and respect for the sanctity of life. Their conflicts weren't imperial; they were fraternal misunderstandings that didn't result in warfare. Their spirituality is rooted in dreaming, and it upholds an interminable interconnection between the creative Spirit, nature, and humanity (Petitt, 2015).

Generally, the social organization and "government throughout Aboriginal Australia is, or was, very largely informal and loosely organized. Inevitably, this has continued to have a direct bearing on the maintenance of law and order" in their communities (Berndt & Berndt, 1999, p. 336). William Dampier and James Cook appreciated this indigenous civilization when they first encountered the Indigenous Australian, but for colonial interests, the British colonialists denied it and took to terrorizing, subduing, and destroying the entire pre-invasion context (Rogers, 2001, Jalata, 2013), thereby jeopardizing their sociogenic and psychogenic worldviews and powers.

The Motives Behind the British Colonization of Australia: The Push and Pull Factors

This paper identifies and expounds three arguments to explain the motives behind the British colonization of Australia: the "pull factor s" representing capitalist interests, the "push

factors” representing internal social pressures, and the “peer factor” representing the peer pressure of the time.

Above all others, the capitalist pull factors were the major reasons that motivated the British colonization of Australia (Paterson, 2011). The capitalist pull factors variegated in the accessibility of the Pacific waterways, the hospitality of the Indigenous inhabitants, the large availability of water and land resources, the possibility for early mining ventures, and the quick take-off of agro-economic activities. It is significant to learn that the British colonizers were also motivated by their desire and ambition to access and control the Indo-China trade routes on the Pacific waters (Ballyn, 2011a, 2011b).

Furthermore, Hirst and MacIntyre (2016) explained that it was the capitalist motive to safeguard British economic interests that kept the French, the Dutch, and other European nations from accessing, occupying, or controlling any Australian land. The capitalist motive also provided the incentive for which the British colonizers expediently established a liberal economic system upon arriving in Australia. They used the entire colonial system as intended to service the economic needs of the frontier and the Crown. In fact, pulled by capitalist interests, Captain Cook and Botanist Joseph Banks dominated the Botany Bay Debate with the strong arguments to justify the colonial exploration, occupation, and harnessing of the Australian resources for the empire’s economy (Hirst & MacIntyre, 2016). Attard (2008) asserted that the capitalist factors might not have been immediately obvious, but they were deeply embedded in the initial conception and eventual colonization of Australia.

The social push factors served as the second motive for the British colonial choice of Australia. Britain was always confronted with the social problems of an increasing crime rate, the explosion of convict population, the congestion of prisons, the heavy prison budgetary expenses, and the pressure to purge it of all miscreants. Some of the convicts in British custody were mostly aliens (largely Irish convicts). It became very compelling, therefore, for Britain to sanitize itself of these social challenges. Already used to transporting convict labor, Britain began to ship its felons to its penal colonies in North America (Ballyn, 2011b; Butler, 1896). It is estimated that between 1718 and 1775, over 52,000 British felons were shipped off to the American colonies (Novak, 2015). However, shipping convicts to North America eventually became difficult for three significant reasons. One, the British merchants and fleets began to demur at the inhumanity of the practice, and refused to further cooperate. Two, the 1775-1783

American war left dwindling impacts on both the American and British economic enterprises, thus impairing further shipment of convicts to the American colonies (Butler, 1896). Three, there was also a strong legislation that prohibited further importation of convicts from Europe (Vaver, 2009). These factors compelled Britain to look elsewhere to dump its felons and convicts. A look at the West African coastal regions failed because of the hostility of the waterways, lands, and the Indigenous people of the region. This failure caused the British to opt for Australia, which became a strong penal colony for their convict populations (Christopher, 2011).

Britain was equally motivated by some *peer influences* or *factors* of the time. Williams (1992) observed that some powerful European nations nursed the ambition to expand and spread their political and cultural influences around the globe, like that of the Roman Empire. This imitational ambition significantly impacted the prestigious successes in ship building, sea faring, imperial control, and domination of the maritime trades in the Indian and Pacific Oceans by the Spanish, the Portuguese, and the Dutch. It was the imitational ambition and prestigious successes that would exert peer influences on the British to also embark on the colonial enterprise of Australia. Spurred by this ambition, the British quickly arrived, drove out the French, and thwarted the efforts of other European rivals from accessing Australia (Davison, Hirst, & MacIntyre, 2016).

This section has argued that capitalist interests, above all, motivated the British colonization of Australia. In the same vein, Stuchtey (2011) observed that the early period of the colonial occupation experienced a heavy flow of Euro-Christian culture. However, it was not these two ideological dynamics (Christianization and Europeanization), but the capitalist cost benefits and calculations that were the key ideological motives, as they manifested in the transformation of the convict population into a labor resource to develop Britain's economy. Despite being the primary motive, the capitalist pull factors have not been given much research argument. In response to this, Patterson (2011) explained that scholars became more inclined towards archaeological research and debates on the social push factors to prove and defend the Indigeneity of the Native People to the Australian lands, than articulating the exposé of the capitalist drives and imperial models used by the British to colonize Australia. How then did the British successfully colonize Australia? What colonial models did they develop and how did they use them?

The British Models of Colonizing Australia

British colonizers used four types of models to colonize their various colonies. They colonized: (a) through the transplantation of settlers to the frontiers or colonies; (b) through indirect colonialism, that is, the use of local powers; (c) through direct colonialism, that is, express colonial rule with British colonial administrators; and (d) through hybrid colonialism, which is the combination of the settler type with either the direct or indirect rule (Lange, Mahoney, & Hau, 2006). In Australia, they used the hybrid type with the aid of the models expounded below.

Convict and Free Transportation Model

Three important themes dominate the explanation of the convict and free transportation model. They are: penal colony, convict labor, and “insular frontier” (Steffen, 1980, p. xi). Recall that with the Botany Bay Debate, Botanist Joseph Banks convinced the British authorities that Australia was very suitable for agro-economic benefits and a penal colony for evicted convicts who would become a free labor force in building other colonies in Australia (Davison, Hirst, & MacIntyre, 2016). Thus upon the arrival of the first convict and subsequent convict fleets, Governor Philips coordinated a free and non-negotiated rapid expansion, quick claims, and massive economic usage of the Indigenous Australians’ lands. For example, in 1791, George Vancouver claimed the Albany region in the name of King George III. In 1801, Matthew Flinders, for the same purpose arrived and undertook further survey, investigation, and mapping of Australian lands. In 1803, a party of soldiers, convicts, and free settlers was sent to establish a colony at the mouth of Port Phillip, Victoria. All these groups occupied lands without negotiating with the Indigenous Peoples, they also wasted no time in embarking on commercial farming and mining ventures (Davison, Hirst, & MacIntyre, 2016).

The transportation of convicts and free British men and women to Australia continued so that by 1850, over 160,000 convicts and 806 ships were sent from England. By 1815, eight different colonial locations were occupied by the teeming British populations comprised of convicts and free persons and their newly born children. Governor Arthur Philip constituted the public works and colonial administration labor force by categorizing the convicts according to their skills into brick makers, carpenters, nurses, servants, cattlemen, shepherds, and farmers. The educated convicts worked as record-keepers. Female convicts were married and served as wives and mothers. In all, convict labor helped immensely in developing the public facilities of

the colonies such as roads, causeways, bridges, courthouses, and hospitals. Free settlers became small landholders (Davison, Hirst, & MacIntyre, 2016; Ballyn, 2011b).

Evicted convicts were also manipulated into what has been described as “insular frontier” (Steffen, 1980, p. xi; Gaye, 2011, p. 2). The insular frontier consisted of convicts, ship fleet officials, and other imported free settlers. Functionally, the insular frontier symbolized the British occupation and ownership of the space, the institutionalization of British or cosmopolitan cultural systems, and the establishment of British imperial presence. These symbols were needed to communicate the British colonial control of the area, and to ward off competing colonial European interests from Australia (Steffen, 1980). The frontier community was also used to brush aside and extinguish Indigenous Peoples’ cultural identities and values, and to implant British social and cultural systems in the colony. In condemnatory terms, Davis (2005) declared that the insular force model was “one of the most pervasive, evocative tropes underlying the production of national identity in Australia”; it grossly impacted the Indigenous culture (p. 7).

The Fuzzy Logic Model of Terra Nullius

The 1493 Papal Bull, *Inter Caetera*, allowed and recognized Spanish colonial occupations, and made Spain a fief of the Church. This development excited the interests of other European powers at the time (William, 1992, p. 8). Thus by 1670, English jurists began to work toward the formulation of a law that would warrant the occupation of deserted and uncultivated lands within the kingdom, by and for the Crown. The Latin phrase they used to represent the emerging law was *terra nullius*. By the 17th, 18th, and later centuries, British colonialists extrapolated *terra nullius*, which they paralleled with *Inter Caetera*. They used it as a local subpoena to justify the Crown’s occupation of empty lands in England, and to defend the Crown’s occupation of Australian lands. During the process of extrapolation, Joseph Banks, who had acknowledged the existence of the hospitable Indigenous Australians and their ownership and occupation of the favorable lands (Smith, 2011; Rogers, 2001), rescinded his statement and declared that “most of the continent was uninhabited” and could be occupied for the Crown (Knafla, 2010, p. 2). This debate created the niche for the twisted or fuzzy logic (*terra nullius*) to thrive and be used to avert colonial guilt, and thus facilitate an unhindered colonization of Australia.

Other implications of the fuzzy logic model included the dehumanization and devaluation of the Indigenous Australians. The British used the logic to deny the pre-contact presence of the

Indigenous Australians and their ownership of their lands, to destroy their Indigenous identity, peoplehood, and cultural powers, and to entrench the British imperial structures and culture. The dehumanization and devaluation of Indigenous Australians and their plights continued until 1992, when the Australian High Court in the *Mabo vs Queensland Land Case* quashed *terra nullius* as invalid and declared them the original owners of their lands.

The international community was likely to oppose the British occupation of Australia; however, British colonialists successfully used this fuzzy logic to hoax the international community into believing that while taking and handing out Australian lands to the transported free and convict populations, the rights, identity, and demography of the Indigenous Australians were not violated and destroyed (Gaye, 2011).

British colonialists also used *terra nullius* to avoid colonial treaties in Australia. This is because previous British colonial treaties in other places were trailed with many setbacks and troubling controversies. In North America, earlier British colonial adventures were modeled on treaty deals. However, only one instance of a treaty deal was ever struck in Australia, namely when John Batman signed two “treaties” with Kulin people in 1835 to “purchase” 600,000 acres of land (Australian Government, 2015).

With the aid of the deceitful, dehumanizing and destructive *terra nullius* model, British colonialists succeeded in creating Port Leschenault as the first satellite settlement on the Upper Swan in 1830 (Gaye, 2011), and many other settlements in subsequent years, leading to the entrenchment of the extant colonial Australian government. Indigenous Australians’ agitations for the end of colonial harms, for justice and for the retrieval of their identity, Peoplehood, land control, free access to resources, and cultural practices lost to British colonial aggression are all rooted in the fraudulent *terra nullius* logic and discourse (Netheim, 1999).

The Genocide Models

Genocide was deliberately used as a model to consolidate colonialism in Africa, and most notoriously in Australia, New Zealand, and North America. For example, Canada’s *Truth and Reconciliation Commission* (2015) acknowledged that British and French colonialists devised and used “cultural genocide” in different ways, such as employing the residential schools to destroy the basic structures and social practices of the Indigenous Peoples of Canada. In the same light, Wolfe (2006) stated that cultural or “structural genocide” as a model of colonialism was developed for the complete elimination of the Natives of Africa, America, Canada, New

Zealand, and Australia. Wolfe (2006) explained further that genocidal strategies were used to render the surviving numbers “dependent on the introduced economy” (p. 295). This means they would be conditioned to remain reliant on crumps from their stocks, after the Europeans had first raided and maximally optimized core benefits of the stocks. For Jalata (2013), the continued colonial genocide on the Indigenous Australians was akin to the terror or criminal horrors meted against humanity, and the International Community must not ignore it. Tatz and Higgins (2016) have categorized the colonial genocidal model used in Australia into physical, biological, and cultural.

The British use of the free people and convicts to mete out physical genocide on Indigenous Australians was a dehumanizing experience. Indigenous Australians were very hospitable to the early new settlers. They supported them with provisions, tours around the lands, and canoeing on the waters. Spiritually, they thought of the British as their ancestors who had come to visit (Russell, 2005). They also had friendly understandings and trades with the new settlers. However, hostilities erupted when the Indigenous community began to realize that their lands, resources, and cultural order upon which they depended were being taken over and seriously disrupted by the arriving colonial population. As a result, “between 1790 and 1810, members of the Eora group in the Sydney area, led by Pemulwuy of the Bidjigal clan, undertook a campaign of resistance against the English colonizers in a series of attacks” (Australian Government, 2015, p.2). This unfortunately led to a heavy initial, and subsequent brutal, series of British counteractions that consistently saw the Natives killed *en masse*.

The physical genocidal wars had shreds of chemical and contagious diseases. The chemical or industrial products the British brought had deplorable impacts on the reproductive health and demographic number of the Indigenous Australians (Wolfe, 1994; Renes, 2011). The British colonial settlers introduced contagious diseases, such as “smallpox, syphilis, typhoid, whooping cough, diphtheria, tuberculosis, measles, dysentery, and influenza,” which seriously ravaged the Indigenous population. Their chauvinistic attitudes of the colonial settlers destroyed the traditional medicines of the Indigenous communities, thereby rendering them vulnerable to these new diseases (Wolfe, 1994; Campbell, 1983, p. 125). According to Tatz and Higgins (2016), a handful of scholars have argued that the British colonizers likely inflicted poisonous weaponry or “various matter” on Australian Aboriginals, especially during combat (p. 57). A similar claim has been made against the Whites and army of the United States—that they genocidally

distributed blankets smeared with smallpox to extirpate the American Indigenous populations (Gill, 2004; Koster, 2017).

“Cultural genocide” (Tatz & Higgins, 2016) or “ontological violence” (Walker, 2004) was another colonial strategy. Cultural genocide through the enforcement of European social institutions and culture targeted the gamut of the Indigenous Peoples’ heritage: language, homes, beliefs, practices, structures, and investments that would empower them to continue as a People. For example, Gaye (2011) and Renes (2011) asserted that colonial cultural genocide destroyed the very fabrics that defined the Australian Indigenous Peoples, with the view of achieving the grand design, to make the Natives “be like us” (Jaconline, n.d, p. 7). Consequently, Australian Aboriginals are still living with the realities of the cultural genocide model manifest in the coercive assimilationist programs, such as settlement on the reserves, separation from families, and education in Western thought forms (Russell, 2005).

Colonial genocide was also used with the implications of eugenics. Tatz and Higgins (2016) called it “biological genocide” (p.57), and it was used to destroy and distort the reproductive capabilities of the Indigenous Australians. Ballyn (2011b) insisted that the forceful removal of half-caste and Indigenous children and adults from their families to distant unfamiliar terrains, thousands of miles away, to be “educated” in British culture, had eugenics intent. Traumatized by their removal and inability to reunite with their separated family members, many of the displaced lost their lives. Another horrifying aspect of this model was that once the colonizers foresaw no “viable future for the ‘primitive’ in the face of Europe’s civilization and ‘racial superiority,’” and no ability “to develop ‘civilized’ standards of behavior, the ‘full-blood’ Aborigine was considered expendable and doomed to extinction” (Renes, 2011, p. 32).

The Liberal Economic Model

As observed by Lange et al. (2006), in contrast to the Spanish mercantilist economic colonialism that sought to enrich the Spanish Crown, British colonialists opted for liberal colonial economy in Australia, so that both the Crown and the frontier would access the wealth of the colony. Scholars have clearly posited that although the British were strongly motivated to colonize Australia for penal reasons, their lust to acquire Australian territories for economic and imperial purposes was primary (Wolfe, 1994; Lange et al., 2006). Motivated by economic interests, British colonizers embarked on a variety of liberal economic ventures pertaining to massive land accumulation, farming, mining, and trade.

After laying claim over the lands, the British colonizers began maritime farming, such as pearling and whaling (Australian Government, 2007). They began to trade in the by-products of these items with Indonesia and America. Pearls were used industrially for making buttons, cutlery, hair combs, and jewelry. Industrial whaling and trade began in the 1790s (Australian Government, 2013). Whale oil was used for lamps, candles, lubrication, perfume, and soap (Australian Government, 2013, 2007).

Grazing and cropping also began immediately. According to Wells (2015), Arthur Phillip's fleet arrived with seven horses, seven cattle, twenty-nine sheep, seventy-four pigs, five rabbits, eighteen turkeys, twenty-nine geese, thirty-five ducks, and 209 fowls. They were immediately put to grazing at the same time as crop cultivation.

Mining activities equally commenced rapidly. Lead was first mined in 1841, followed by gold, which led to a "goldrush" during the 1850s. As a result, the young colony continued to expand in its export of precious stones to Northwestern European countries (Australian Government, n.d.).

The transportation of agroeconomic goods was facilitated with trolleys pulled by bulls, and water transportation was done with boats and steamers, which were later refrigerated for food exportation. Agroeconomic farms and companies also developed quickly. For example, the Elizabeth Farm was established in 1793, and by 1796, exported its first manually fleeced Merino wool to the UK. In 1824, the Australian Agricultural Company was commissioned, and it boosted animal husbandry and exports in Merino wool and dairies (Wells, 2015).

In general, the British liberal economic model dispossessed the Indigenous Peoples of their lands. It took away their freedom to access the resources they had hitherto enjoyed unrestrained. It also introduced a gentry system, which is a social classism that disenfranchised the Indigenous Peoples of their wealth and gave it to the settlers.

Miscellaneous Models

There were other models that the British used to consolidate the colonization of Australia. Colonies with sparse populations were best colonized with the frontier model, through the appointment of colonial administrators (Lange et al., 2006). It was in this light that King George III appointed Captain Arthur Philip to be the governor of Botany Bay, and to immediately colonize Australia for the Crown.

The presence of other nations on the Pacific and Indian Oceans prior to, during, and after the first British convict fleet in 1788 was not a welcome experience to the British, who felt their colonial interests could be hampered, as the French did in North America. In fact, two French ships had also arrived at Botany Bay in 1788, but left due to British hostile attitudes. Henceforth, preventing further European interest became a pattern or model for consolidating the British colonial adventure in Australia. The British settlers' rapid expansion, the arbitrary dishing out of lands to ex-convicts, the introduction of colonial administrators, the influx of their sons and daughters, and the erection of the British flags at strategic locations are evidences of their protective hostility to keep away other imperial nations from Australia (Gaye, 2011).

The British also used bait-gesture or the friendship-gifting-trading model. In other words, they approached pre-colonial societies in the name of friendship, and with this cajoled them with exotic gifts and the promises of mutually benefiting trades, which the locals accepted without suspecting they were colonial baits. The bait-gesture model was also used with Africans (Boahen, 2011) who failed to realize the gestures were not altruistic benefits, but were instead, what Freire (2000, p. 44) called "false generosity," or a good gesture with malignant intent. In Australia, the bait-gesture included exchanges in food, water, axes, cloth, and artifact, while the British colonial arrivals received hospitable receptions and cartographic tours across Australian lands. However, this honeymoon period did not last long as the Aboriginals began to realize the rapid loss of their lands and resources, and the disruption of their social processes, and the rejection of their spiritual values to the "unsolicited encounter" and visitors (Pratt, 2007, p. 401). Consequently, they began to launch anti-colonial hostilities against the settlers who had more muskets and canons and Gatling rapid-fire guns.

Colonial Plights of the Indigenous Australians

With the continued use of these models, the British successfully decimated the Australian Indigenous population to a very insignificant number of less than a million, as indicated in the 2010 Australian Census report (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011). The implication is that the bastardization and reduction of the Australian Indigenous population has rendered them hardly able to make any economic, political, and cultural impacts in the ongoing political processes in Australia. Indigenous Australians are still ontologically violated by being marginalized and conditioned to perpetual dependence on the political dictates and cultural forms of the colonial settler government. Dockery(2010) bemoaned the continued loss of the Indigenous population

and their cultural powers. The Indigenous People's wellbeing is ignored, leaving them under deplorable conditions. Their marginalization is manifest in the lack of equity and equality in terms of socio-economic, educational, employment, income, and political opportunities. Their demand for self-determination is always frustrated and opposed. There are increasing cases of racial discrimination and cultural genocide via reinforced programs of assimilation. In general, Dockery (2010) stated that,

...from the arrival of the first fleet in 1788, to the emergence of the present dominant Western society, the market economy, political institutions, legal formulas, and the attitudes of the colonial community have been made to oscillate against the Indigenous population, and to blame them as the problem and not a potential part of the solution is an Indigenous disadvantage in Australia. (p. 2)

In a similar vein, Dirk (2010) condemned the colonial government for "infantalizing Indigenous people by casting them as agentless victims of colonialism and rendering them dependent on welfare and white liberal beneficence" (p.10), and blaming them for their colonial plights as if they solicited for the encounter. But why should Indigenous Australians be held scapegoat for their colonial plights and for resisting assimilation, when they didn't solicit for them?

Despite the huge outcry and settler-government's humanitarian intervention programs, such as *Overcome Indigenous Disadvantage*, emerging reports have consistently shown that across virtually all the indicators, wide gaps remain in the outcomes between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians (Dirk, 2010; Davidoff & Duhs, 2008). In contrast with the experiences of non-Indigenous Australians, the indicators depict that the life expectancy of Indigenous Australians is seventeen (17) years shorter, and they are thirteen (13) times more likely to be jailed, and four (4) times more likely to be abused, neglected, and discriminated against. Since the arrival of the imperial settlers, the Indigenous people's life has been subjected to firm political control. The welfare service programs run by the government are assessed dysfunctional to the family and the sociocultural values of the Indigenous Australians. The programs have also impacted them with cultural violence, as well as unemployment, welfare dependence, low self-respect, and little or no hope for self-reliance. In terms of mental health, they are faced with transgenerational trauma. Indigenous Australians are bitter about being profiled, put under surveillance and subjected to repression by the colonial state police and

military. Davidoff and Duhs (2008) rebuffed this oppressive attitude and likened it to when the Australian government sent out “troops into the Solomon Islands to try to restore civil order” there, with brutal force (p. 7).

The Australian settler-government often devalues the colonial plights of the Indigenous Australians. For example, ex-Prime Minister John W. Howard repeatedly stated that the so-called historical injustices, social plights, deplorable conditions, and fate of the Indigenous Australians have been exaggerated (Laccino, 2014, p. 1). Rather than see them as destroyed, lost and stolen, Howard invectively claimed that Indigenous Australians have been found, rescued, and civilized through British colonialism. Howard did not “believe that the current generation should apologize for things done in earlier times” against the indigenous population (Davidoff & Duhs, 2008; Laccino, 2014). In a remorseful counteraction and acknowledgement of the colonial harms, the serving Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull broke “down in tears describing the plight of the Aborigines” as dehumanizing and “totally unacceptable”(Pearlman, 2016, p. 2). Prime Minister Malcolm called on the dominant Western community to stop pathologizing the Indigenous population (Dirk, 2010), but make for concerted efforts for justice, saying, “We should do things *with* Indigenous Australians, not *to* them. We must recognize that diversity and be guided by Indigenous Australians. Empowered communities make their own choices” (Pearlman, 2016, p. 2; emphasis added). Malcolm’s position contradicted that of Howard, though he did not promise to grant self-determination or self-governance as demanded by the Indigenous Australians. It can also be assessed that in his conclusions and appeal, he reinforced the marginal protégé status of the Indigenous Australians by asking the colonial population to be lenient rather than asking them to ensure the actualization of the Indigenous People’s demand for emancipatory justice from colonial subjugation.

The relationship of historical colonial architecture with conflict resolution is the established imperative for emancipatory and empowerment justice. The posture of our democratic culture should not give room for any form of justice for colonial violence, other than what Cesare (2000) conceptualizes as the “overthrow” of colonialism. According to Césaire, colonialism, an oppressive, characteristically racial, barbaric, genocidal, brutal, predatory, and melancholic system, and “whose victims [have been] the Indians, the yellow people, and the Negroes” should be confronted with concerted efforts and coordinated “struggle for [its] total overthrow” (p. 10). The loss of civilization, sincerity, integrity, humanity, justice, and charity is

shared by both the colonizer and colonized; colonial violence also necessitates the overthrow of colonialism. Furthermore, considering that colonialism misleads the colonizer and colonized to believe that its outcomes are altruistic, whereas they are “false altruism” (Bishop, 2012, p. 84) and “false generosity” (Freire, 2000, p. 44), means it should not be allowed to stand anywhere. Suffice it to be reiterated that colonialism erodes the dignity of the colonizer and the colonized, and it leaves them in dire need of the restoration of their humanity, integrity, and self-worth. Therefore, no debate that sets out to glorify, justify, and support colonialism—thereby altering the moral certainties established against colonial violence—should be entertained.

There is strong need to depart from what has been an inert approach against colonial violence, namely, the mere condemnation of colonialism, especially in the Australian case. A credible approach is one that denounces colonial violence and accompanies the condemnation with a convincing concrete plan of action to “overthrow” it. To address the gaps and the inert attitude towards colonialism, and facilitate the anti-colonial debate, this paper will articulate some innovative arguments and recommend them for adoption by these three institutions of peacebuilding: PACS, social change agents, and the United Nations (UN). The author believes that by adopting these innovative approaches, the three institutions will significantly advance the overthrow of colonial violence in Australia.

Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS) and Colonial Violence

As an instrumental and directly aggressive activity, colonialism destroys, exploits, and conditions its targets, and leaves them with deeply seated psychological, social, and physical injuries. The relationship between PACS and colonial violence stems from the its abhorrence of the latter, and its interests in the liberational discourses that characterize post-colonial (Steinberg, 2007), social justice (Hurlbert, 2011), decolonization, and emancipatory studies (Walker, 2004), as well as PACS’ ideological interest in “positive peace” (Galtung, 1969). The combination of these intrinsic interests pitches PACS against colonialism.

In the above light, PACS has been committed to promoting various debates and practices of non-violence and humanitarian interventions. However, one thing that is noticeably lacking about PACS is the momentum to curb or overthrow colonial violence. Having emerged from the Westphalian State context, PACS is known to have a penchant for research and practice to enhance democratic peace and resolve zero-sum conflicts. This penchant is seen in its numerous “problem-solving workshops [and community engagements] by John Burton, Dennis Sandole,

Leonard Doob, Ronald Fisher, Herb Kelman, Edward Azar, John Paul Lederach” (Byrne & Senehi, 2011. P.3; Lederach, 1995). PACS is also the *avant-garde* for the emancipation and empowerment of marginalized communities, and a strong arguer for the adoption of Indigenous justice and peacemaking wisdom (Byrne & Senehi, 2009). In addition, PACS has progressively supported the UN’s *Agenda for Peace*, proclaimed in 1992, with a focus on how to improve peacebuilding, peacemaking, and peacekeeping in post-conflicts societies. As a result, PACS has enabled the agenda for peace to become the universal template for peacebuilding and interventions (Jeong, 2005). Furthermore, PACS argues for “both force and consent” to the strategies of peace and justice that have been devised to advance the development of post-conflict societies (Rubenstein, 2012). Since the 9/11 terrorist disaster, PACS has impactfully joined the anti-terrorism war and debates through “publishing editorials, interviewing for radio and television programs, and hosting panel discussions and conferences” (Sayre, 2003). By assessment therefore, PACS is doing visibly well in its focus and belief; it is making a “quantum leap forward—with constellation of ideas, diversity of approaches, disciplinary roots, and topic areas” (Byrne & Senehi, 2009, p. 525).

Despite its commendable focus and commitment, PACS is reticent in addressing colonial violence. What is behooving of PACS, therefore, is to make more commitment and show greater measure of attention toward the overthrow of Australian colonial violence. PACS can legitimately develop a template of purposeful and concrete action for decolonization. It can also make massive investment in problem-solving workshops on anti-colonialism. It is proper for PACS to initiate impactful practical engagements and research, which should be focused on resistance, agency, decolonization, emancipation, and indigeneity. The energy and strategic activities that PACS shows by holding protest rallies, solidarity parades, and legislative lobbying to end violence associated with women, children, sex, feminism, and gender can, in a greater measure, be used to agitate for the end of colonial quandary anywhere. The same passion that PACS shows in researching and addressing the horror of the 9/11 terrorist attacks can be exhibited in the overthrow of the Australian colonial experience, as well as, the emancipation and empowerment of the Indigenous Australians.

PACS’ denouncement of colonial violence must transcend its current analytic resolution that simply identifies, expounds, and condemns colonial violence. Greater attention must be placed in practical actions, such as enumerated above. PACS’ renewed attention and actions

should be the true representation of what Césaire (2000) recommended as a concerted struggle to overthrow colonialism. In their update on the activities of PACS, Byrne and Senehi (2011) stated that “conflict analysis and resolution as a multidiscipline [is] a work in progress” (p. 3). This assertion implies that PACS, as a discipline, has the potential to present an impactful campaign for the “overthrow” of colonialism or the end of colonial violence.

It is already argued above that the colonizers are also in dire need of re-humanization. This means, the innovative framework for liberation adopted by PACS ought to encompass the re-humanization of the colonial aggressor—in this case the colonial population in Australia. This is another way of justifying the integrity and the commitment of PACS to positive peace.

PACS has a moral obligation to empirically mobilize for the overthrow of colonial violence, and the failure to do so especially in the case of Australia will connote nothing other than compromise and hypocrisy. Already, PACS is accused of subtly tolerating the perpetuation of some violence and conflicts, thus compromising its standards to please its funders (Sayre, 2003). The absence of empirical activities to overthrow the Australian colonial violence will make PACS look suspicious of hypocrisy, self-contradictions, as well as political and cultural biases that favor the status quo (Sayre, 2003; Prothrow-Smith & Spivak, 2003).

Social Change Agents

The same argument for innovative engagement to overthrow the Australian colonial violence can be made for social change agents. These are social activists whose stance for social justice also deals with the themes of freedom, human rights, gender equality and sensitivity, eco-safety and green revolution, anti-war, anti-dictatorship, and anti-colonialism. Sharp (2007) described social change activists as non-violent actors who are uncompromisingly committed to addressing “acute conflicts”—a term referring to dictatorial and repressive systems that deprive people of their fundamental rights such as freedom, empowerment, and self-determination. According to Sharp (2007), such situations are “not deemed suitable for resolution by any methods that involve compromise” (Sharp, 2007, p.11). In other words, there is no room for allowing or overlooking an oppressive system to persist.

To enhance the emancipatory activities of non-violent actors who counter acute conflicts, Sharp (2003) developed “a conceptual framework for liberation,” which outlined the “strategic planning” and political activities that will enhance emancipation (p. 37). The strategies included: making public formal statements, communicating with wider audiences, organizing group

presentations, producing symbolic public arts, mounting pressure on the oppressor, producing theater and music, holding processions, honoring the dead, and putting together public assemblies and activities of withdrawal and renunciation. Others included non-cooperation, economic boycotts, criticism of authority, and physical intervention such as sit-in, stand-in, ride in, and wade in (Sharp, 2007). Furthermore, Sharp acknowledged that Indigenous Peoples and cultures have been colonially violated by “major political powers” (2007, p. 521). However, violent approaches should not be adopted to overthrow violence to avoid aiding the rapid “annihilation and genocide of the population” (p. 521). Alternatively, Indigenous change actors and their allies should assume non-violent strategies for liberation, like those enumerated above.

Two historical inspirations in the non-violent struggle for emancipation by Indigenous Australian activists deserve mention at this point. The first is the 1967 referendum which was actively mobilized by the Indigenous community to repeal the denial of their existence, peoplehood, and franchise. Though the referendum failed passage, the event represents a brave act of emancipation (Attwood & Markus, 1998). The second is the 1992 Australian High Court ruling in favor of Eddie Mabo, in the Mabo vs. Queensland land legal saga. The court ruling declared that the Indigenous Australians have always been the owners of Australian lands, and not the settlers who fraudulently claimed ownership via *terra nullius* (Reynolds, 1999). The works of Attwood and Markus (1998) and Russell (2005) indicate that these two historical events for decolonization were largely acts of resistance, withdrawal, renunciation, and public presentation by Indigenous activists. In a similar fashion, the work of Harris (2003) depicts how the Indigenous Australian activists adopted strategies such as the erection of memorial centers, cemeteries, parks, lawns, and arts galleries to protest colonialism and to preserve their Australian Indigeneity.

Sharp’s (2007) framework for liberation clearly suits the context of the Indigenous Australians. The framework offers viable strategic which non-violent actors or activists can use for the overthrow of colonial oppression. It is also important for change agents across the world to be concerned with the plights of the oppressed everywhere and join in the strategic struggles for emancipation. In the case of Australia, the works of Attwood and Markus (1998), Harris (2003), and Russell (2005) indicated that the Indigenous Australians are the major activists for their liberation. For Australian decolonization struggles to succeed, change actors everywhere must be part of the process.

The lack of global network of activism against colonial injustice makes it easy for the colonial governments to continue to subvert and frustrate emancipatory struggles, especially by Indigenous Australians (Reynolds, 1999; Russell, 2005; Scholtz, 2013; Nettheim, 1995). In the absence of this network, the recent dehumanizing position by Senator Lynn Beyak—that the Canadian First Nations should give up or forget their Indigenous status card and immerse in the colonial system or risk survival (Tasker, 2017)—has gone without an impactful global condemnation. The need for global unity against colonial violence by change actors cannot be overemphasized.

The United Nations (UN)

PACS and the UN share a common peace ideology. For the former, peace is enhanced by justice (Steinberg, 2007), and for the latter, the respect of human rights enhances peace (Mertus & Jeffrey, 2006). The two ideological dimensions are dialectically concerned with the fundamental goal of addressing every oppressive status quo and emancipating the subjugated. It is on this basis that the UN is expected to take as a paramount concern the project to overthrow the colonial violence in Australia.

The UN has a Special Committee on Decolonization. It is mostly concerned with Non-Self-Governing Territories, which numbered seventy-two in 1946 (Nations United, 2015), and seventeen in the current period (United Nations, 2014). To ensure the decolonization of these Self-Governing Territories, the Special Committee has outlined the following plans and steps: (a) to lead anti-colonialization and decolonization campaigns in the Territories; (b) to give direct assistance to the Non-Self-Governing Territories; (c) to ensure the full development of the political and constitutional orders of the Territories; (d) to visit the Territories for on-site assessment; and (e) to conduct a case-by-case program of decolonization for each of the Territories. This UN framework of action can be used for the overthrow of colonialism in Australia.

The UN proclaimed the Declaration on the Rights of the Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), but failed to design the program of action that will facilitate their self-determination (Stilz, 2015; Webb, 2007). There is need to fill this vacuum with clearly defined steps akin to those designed for the decolonization of the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

The UN has been criticized for grossly under-achieving its decolonization goals. This is because many decades have passed, self-determination is still a mirage to the remaining

seventeen Non-Self Governing Territories, and other Indigenous communities are still sweltering under colonial governments (Webb, 2007; Nations United, 2015). This growing criticism demands the UN to renew its commitment and adopt innovative strategies for emancipation and self-determination of colonized nations, like the Indigenous populations in Australia, as well as Canada, New Zealand. U.S. Critics have argued that the UN has underachieved in this direction because it is conniving with the settler governments to perpetuate colonial control over the Indigenous Peoples and their territories (Pearson, 2017). Given this suspicion, Pearson (2017) cautioned the UN against “the politics of international colonial oversight in the era of decolonization” (p. 525). Stimulated by this suspicion, the colonized Indigenous populations are consistently asking, “What can the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) do for us?” (Lovelace, 2013, P. 2). In other words, they are asking the UN to develop a clear and acceptable framework that will actualize their liberation warranted in the UNRIP. It has become clear that the UN should stand as the pillar of hope for the oppressed, and to publicly condemn the colonial violence in Australia, launching a special program for self-determination. If the UN has succeeded in “eradicating colonialism” in 55 former Non-Self-Governing Territories (United Nations, 2014, 2015), it can also mobilize its power and resources for the emancipation of the Indigenous Australians.

Conclusion and Pertinent Questions

Every person has the right to life, dignity, and identity, and as a community, the right to “peoplehood, autonomy, territory, and equality” (Nettheim, 1995, p. 116). Thus, any experience that stands in the way of self-determination or deters self-esteem, self-assertion, and self-development such as the perpetuating colonial violence against the Indigenous Australians must be questioned and challenged for change. In the democratizing world, every colonial government, like any military or oppressive dictatorship, is an aberration. As recommended by Cesaire (2000) and Sharp (2007), it should be overthrown. The Australian settler-government continues to oppress and destroy the Indigenous culture and peoplehood with more assimilationist social programs. The UN must innovate to tip the balance (United Nations, 2015). Similarly, the call for PACS to attend to the matters that bother Indigenous communities (Byrne & Senehi, 2009) must be heeded without delay. To be very effective, change activists must expand from parochial to global solidarity in their struggle for justice. With the proper

disposition and innovative approaches, these institutions will significantly contribute to the “overthrow” of colonialism in Australia or risk the people’s disappointment.

Some pertinent questions continue to irritate our minds. Why is the Australian colonial government still intensifying assimilationists’ programs on the Indigenous communities, despite their outcry against the “white beneficence” (Dirk, 2010, p. 10) it was supposed they would accept with all delight? Despite the growing humanism and multiculturalism, why is the European colonial community afraid of “being Aboriginalised” (Ang, 2003, p. 60; Renes, 2011, p. 45), but insistent on Europeanizing the Indigenous Australians? Will the dismantling of the Australian colonial government create an explosive situation?

Perhaps, the Post-Apartheid South African context can be an instance of hope and confidence in the discourse on ending the Australian colonial violence. Through consequential efforts from the academic, political, and humanitarian communities, the South African apartheid was made to crumble. In addition, many programs enhancing the restoration of the humanity and relationship of the white settler population and the Indigenous South African community are effectively ongoing. A similar feat is feasible with the Australian colonial situation, but the three institutions and the global community must muster courage to mobilize for themselves in the manner it did against the South African apartheid. In addition, the successful re-humanization process contradicts the skepticism and fear as expressed by Brahm (2005) that the attainment of self-determination for any colonized community, such as the Indigenous Australians, is utopian, and if done would usher in “an explosive situation” between Indigenous and the settler communities (p. 3). The South African case has provided a good nomothetic argument for the overthrow of colonial violence in Australia and elsewhere, without getting into anarchy.

It must always be remembered that colonialism and its motivating factors violate the ontology of both the colonizer and the colonized; thus, creating “structural violence” (Galtung 1969, p. 173). As rightly captured, its outcomes are nothing short of “negative generosity” (Freire, 2000, p. 44) and “negative altruism” (Bishop, 2005, p. 84). With such malignant implications, this paper reiterates the Cesairean (2000) position for the total overthrow of colonialism. The paper is inviting the UN, PACS, social agents, and the global community to introduce consequential innovative strategies that will adequately address the Australian colonial quandary by emancipating and humanizing all the affected parties.

References

- Ang, I. (2003). From white Australia to fortress Australia: The anxious nation in the new century. In L. Jayasuria, D. Walker, & G. J. Crawley (Eds.), *Legacies of white Australia: Race, culture and nation* (pp. 51-69). New Western Australia: University of Western Australia Press.
- Attard, B. (2008). The economic history of Australia from 1788: An introduction. *EH.net*, 1–9. Retrieved from <https://eh.net/encyclopedia/the-economic-history-of-australia-from-1788-an-introduction/>
- Attwood, B. & Markus, A. (1998). (The) 1967 (referendum) and all that: Narrative and myth, Aborigines and Australia. *Australian Historical Studies*, 29(October 2013), 267–288. doi:10.1080/10314619808596073
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2012, August 22). *Census of population and housing - Counts of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians*. Retrieved from <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/2075.0Main%20Features52011?open=document&tabname=Summary&prodno=2075.0&issue=2011&num=&view=>
- Australian Government. (n.d.). *History of the minerals industry. Australian atlas of resource, mines and processing centers*. Retrieved from <http://www.australianminesatlas.gov.au/history/index.html>
- Australian Government. (2007, December 11). *Australia's pearling industry*. [australia.gov.au/about-australia]. Retrieved from <http://www.australia.gov.au/about-australia/australian-story/australias-pearling-industry>
- Australian Government. (2013, November 20). *Australia's whaling industry and whales*. Retrieved from <http://www.australia.gov.au/about-australia/australian-story/australias-whaling-industry-and-whales>
- Australian Government. (2015, March 31). *European discovery and the colonization of Australia*. Retrieved from <http://www.australia.gov.au/about-australia/australian-story/european-discovery-and-colonization>
- Ballyn, S. (2011a). The why and the “therefore” of human migration. A brief overview. In M. Renes (Ed.), *Lives in migration: Rupture and continuity* (pp. 6-15). Australian Studies Centre, Catalanes, Spain: University of Barcelona.
- Ballyn, S. (2011b). The British invasion of Australia. convicts: Exile and dislocation. In M. Renes (Ed.), *Lives in migration: Rupture and continuity* (pp. 16-29). Australian Studies Centre, Catalans, Spain: University of Barcelona.
- Berndt, M. R. & Berndt, H. C. (1999). *World Of The First Australians: Aboriginal Traditional Life - Past And Present*. Canberra, Australia: Aboriginal Studies Press.

- Boahen, A. A. (2011). *African perspectives on European colonialism*. New York, NY: Diasporic Africa Press.
- Brahm, E. (September 2005). Self-determination procedures. In G. Burgess & H. Burgess, (Eds.), *Beyond Intractability*. Retrieved December 28, 2017, from www.beyondintractability.org/essay/self-determination
- Butler, D. J. (1896). British convicts shipped to American colonies. *The American Historical Review*, 2(1), 12-33.
- Byrne, S. & Senehi, J. (2009). Revisiting the CAR field. In J. D. D. Sandole, S. Byrne, Sandole-Staroste, & J. Senehi (Eds.), *Handbook of conflict analysis and resolution* (pp. 475–494). New York, NY: RoutledgeTaylor and Francis.
- Byrne, S. & Senehi, J. (2011). Conflict analysis and resolution as a multidiscipline: A work in progress. In J. D. D. Sandole, S. Byrne, Sandole-Staroste, & J. Senehi (Eds.), *Handbook of conflict analysis and resolution* (pp. 1–16). New York, NY: RoutledgeTaylor and Francis.
- Campbell, J. (1983). Smallpox in Aboriginal Australia. *Historical Studies*, 20(81), 536-556.
- Césaire, A. (2000). Discourse on colonialism. *New York*, 1–31. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004
- Christopher, E. (2011). *A merciless place: The fate of Britain's convicts after the American revolution*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Davidoff, L. & Duhs, A. (2008). Aboriginal Australia: An economic history of failed welfare policy. *Australian Indigenous HealthInfoNet*. Retrieved from <http://www.healthinfonet.edu.au/key-resources/bibliography?lid=15952>
- Davison, G., Hirst, J., & MacIntyre, S. (Eds.). (2016, January 20). *Convicts and the British colonies in Australia*. Retrieved from <http://www.australia.gov.au/about-australia/australian-story/convicts-and-the-british-colonies>
- Dirk, A. M. (2010). Time, indigeneity, and peoplehood: the postcolony in Australia. *Postcolonial Studies*, 13(1), 9–32. doi:10.1080/13688790903490850
- Dockery, A. M. (2010). Culture and wellbeing: The case of Indigenous Australians. *Social Indicators Research*, 99(2), 315–332. doi:10.1007/s11205-010-9582-y
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167–191. doi:10.1177/002234336900600301

- Gaye, N. (2011). *The archaeology of market capitalism: A western Australian perspective*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Gill, B. H. (2004). Colonial germ warfare. *Army Chemical Review*, 3(4), pp 8-11. Retrieved from [http://www.wood.army.mil/chmdsd/images/pdfs/2004 Oct/Col Germ Warfare-04-2.pdf](http://www.wood.army.mil/chmdsd/images/pdfs/2004%20Oct/Col%20Germ%20Warfare-04-2.pdf)
- Harris, M. (2003). Mapping Australian postcolonial landscapes: From resistance to reconciliation? *Law Text Culture*, 7, 8–23. doi:10.3868/s050-004-015-0003-8
- Hurlbert, A. M. (2011). *Pursuing justice: An introduction to justice studies*. Winnipeg, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.
- Jaconline. (n.d). Chapter 1: First Australians. *Humanities Alive*. Retrieved on May 24, 2016, from www.jaconline.com.au/humanitiesalive/ha3/downloads/HA3_01.pdf
- Jalata, A. (2013). The impacts of English colonial terrorism and genocide on Indigenous/ Black Australians. *Sage Open Access*.
- Jeong, H-W. (2005). *Peacebuilding in Postconflict Societies: Strategy and Process*. Colorado, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Knafla, A. L. (2010). This is our land: Aboriginal title at customary and common law in comparative contexts. In A. Knafla & H. Westra (Eds.), *Aboriginal title and Indigenous Peoples: Canada, Australia, and New Zealand* (pp. 1-6). Canberra, Australia: Australian National University Press.
- Koster, J. (2017). *Smallpox in the blankets*. Retrieved on April 2, 2018, from <http://www.historynet.com/smallpox-in-the-blankets.htm>
- Laccino, L. (2014). *Ex-Australian Prime Minister John Howard denies Aboriginal genocide claims: Who were the stolen generations?* Retrieved January 15, 2018, from <http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/ex-australian-prime-minister-john-howard-denies-aboriginal-genocide-claims-who-were-stolen-1466646>
- Lange, M., Mahoney, J., & Hau, V. M. (2006). Colonialism and development: A comparative analysis of Spanish and British colonies. *American Journal of Sociology*, 111(5), 1412–1462.
- Lederach, J. P. (1995). *Preparing for peace: Conflict transformation across cultures*. New York, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Lovelace, R. (2013). *Decolonization: The fundamental struggle for liberation*. Retrieved January 8, 2018, from <http://rabble.ca/news/2013/06/decolonization-fundamental-struggle-liberation>
- Mertus, A. J. & Jeffrey, H. W. (2006). *Human rights: Exploring the links between rights, law and peacebuilding*. (A. J. Mertus & H. W. Jeffrey, Eds.). Washington DC: United States Institute for Peace Press.

- National Museum of Australia. (2001). Telling our indigenous story. *National Museum of Australia and Ryebuck Media*. Retrieved from http://www.nma.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/18903/Telling_Indigenous_stories_all_colour.pdf
- Nettheim, G. (1995). Mabo and legal pluralism. In K. Hazlehurst (Ed.), *Legal pluralism and the colonial legacy* (pp. 103-130). Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing House.
- Novak, M. (2015, May 30). *Britain sent loads of convicts to America, not just Australia*. Retrieved from <https://www.gizmodo.com.au/2015/05/britain-sent-thousands-of-its-convicts-to-america-not-just-australia/>
- O'Connell, J. F. & Allen, J. (2004). Dating the colonization of Sahul Pleistocene Australia–New Guinea): A review of recent research. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 31, 835–853.
- Paterson, A. (2011). Considering colonialism and capitalism in Australian historical archaeology: Two case studies of culture contact from the pastoral domain. *ResearchGate*, (September 2015). doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-0192-6
- Pearlman, J. (2016, September). Australian PM breaks down in tears describing plight of Aborigines. *The Telegraph*, pp. 9–10. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews>
- Pearson, J. L. (2017). Defending empire at the United Nations: The politics of international colonial oversight in the era of decolonisation. *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 45(3), 525–549. doi:10.1080/03086534.2017.1332133
- Petitt, J. E. (2015). Aborigines' dreaming or Britain's terra nullius: Perceptions of land use in colonial Australia. *Iowa Historical Review*, 5(1), 23-60.
- Pratt, M. L. (2007). Afterword: Indigeneity today. In M. Cadena & O. Starn (Eds.), *Indigenous experience today*, 397–404. New York, NY: Berg.
- Prothrow-Smith, D. & Spivak, H. (2003). *Murder is no accident: Understanding and preventing youth violence in America*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Renes, M. (2011). The stolen generations, a narrative of removal, displacement and recovery. In M. Renes (Ed.), *Lives in migration: Rupture and continuity* (pp. 64-79). Australian Studies Centre, Catalanes, Spain: University of Barcelona.
- Reynolds, H. (1999). *Why weren't we told: A personal search for the truth about our history*. New South Wales, Australia: Penguin Books.
- Rogers, J. C. (2001). *Voyages. Scientific circumnavigations 1679-1859*. St. Louis, MO: Linda Hall Library.
- Rubenstein, E. R. (2012). Insitutions. In *Conflict: From Analysis to Intervention* (pp. 195–216). New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.

- Russell, P. (2005). *Recognizing Aboriginal title: The Mabo case and indigenous resistance to English-settler colonialism*. Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Sayre, B. (2003). Peace studies at war against America. *Peace Study Criticism*. Retrieved from <http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=7583%0APeace>
- Scholtz, C. (2013). Federalism and policy change: An analytic narrative of Indigenous land rights policy in Australia (1966–1978). *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 46(2) 397–418.
- Sharp, G. (2003). *From dictatorship to democracy: A conception framework for liberation*. Boston, MA: Albert Einstein Institution.
- Sharp, G. (2007). *Waging nonviolent struggle: 20th century practice and 21st century potential*. Boston, MA: Extending Horizons Books.
- Smith, C. (2011). *William Dampier and James Cook: Two windows into the British enlightened exploration of the cultures and societies of the pacific* (Master thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.
- Steffen, J. (1980). *Comparative frontiers*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Stein, J. G. (2011). Introduction: The comparative archaeology of colonial encounters. In J. G. Stein (Ed.), *The archaeology of colonial encounters: Comparative perspectives*. Sante Fe, NM: School of American Research Press
- Steinberg, G. M. (2007). Postcolonial theory and the ideology of peace studies. *Israel Affairs*, 13(February 2015), 786–796. doi:10.1080/13537120701445166
- Stilz, A. (2015). Decolonization and self-determination. *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 32(1), 1–24. doi:10.1017/S0265052515000059
- Strega, S. & Brown, L. (2015). *Research as resistance: Critical, indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches*. (S. Brown, Leslie Strega, Ed.). Toronto, Canada: Canada Scholars' Press Inc.
- Stuchtey, B. (2011, January 21). Colonialism and imperialism, 1450-1950. *European History Online*. Retrieved from <http://ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/backgrounds/colonialism-and-imperialism/benedikt-stuchtey-colonialism-and-imperialism-1450-1950>
- Tasker J. P. (2017). *Senator Lynn Beyak says First Nations should give up status cards - politics*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/beyak-indian-status-canadian-citizens-1.4284671>
- Tatz, C. M. & Higgins, W. (2016). *The magnitude of genocide*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- United Nations. (2008). *United Nations declaration on the rights of Indigenous Peoples* (No. A/61/L.67 and Add.1). New York, NY. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf

- United Nations. (2014). *The United Nations and decolonization: Trust and non-self-governing territories*. Retrieved on January 8, 2018, from [http://www.un.org /en/decolonization/nonselgov.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/nonselgov.shtml)
- United Nations. (2015). *United Nations should eradicate colonialism by 2020*. New York, NY. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/press/en/2015/gacol3277.doc.htm>
- Vaver, A. (2009). The end of convict transportation: One last gasp and the Australian solution. *Early American Crime*. Retrieved May 5, 2018, from <http://www.earlyamericancrime.com/convict-transportation/end-of-transportation/australian-solution>
- Walker, O. P. (2004). Decolonizing conflict resolution: Addressing the ontological violence of westernization. *American Indian Quarterly*, 28, 527-549. doi:10.1353 /aiq.2004.0108
- Webb, J. (2007). Indigenous peoples and the right to self-determination. *Journal of Indigenous Policy*, (13), 75–102. Retrieved from <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/JIIndigP/2012/7.pdf>
- Wells, K. (2015, March 31). *Australian farming and agriculture – grazing and cropping*. Retrieved from <http://www.australia.gov.au/about-australia/australian-story/austn-farming-and-agri culture>.
- Wolfe, P. (1994). Nation and miscegenation: Discursive continuity in the post-Mabo era. *Journal of Social and Cultural Practice*, 36, 93-152.
- Wolfe, P (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4), 387–409.