



Submission FOB251

Simone N

From: [REDACTED]
To: [FedRedistribution - TAS](#)
Subject: [Redistribution TAS - Submission] *WWW* [SEC=OFFICIAL]
Date: Tuesday, 21 July 2026 5:03:34 PM
Attachments: [\[Redistribution\]-Feedback-N-Simone.docx](#)

Form submitted: 21/07/2026 04:59 PM

N, Simone - Redistribution TAS - Submission on the proposed Tasmanian redistribution (feedback)

Personal details

First name: Simone
Surname: N
Email: [REDACTED]

Submission on the proposed Tasmanian redistribution details

Category: Names
Details:

Submission opposing the name change of the Electorate of Franklin to Tongerlongeter

I am writing to oppose the above-mentioned name change from Franklin to Tongerlongeter.

I question the rationale to change the name to Tongerlongeter based on the following quote found on the AEC webpage.

“His life and legacy continue to illustrate Aboriginal resistance to colonisation and the enduring connection of Tasmanian Aboriginal people to Country.”

<https://www.aec.gov.au/redistributions/2024/tas/announcement.html>

This is more grievance narratives found everywhere in modern Australia. From Invasion Day to welcome to country, or from slogans such as ‘*always was, always will be aboriginal land*’ or ‘*you’re on stolen land*’ all echo the same grievance sentiment that is the subtext for the narrative of ‘*resistance to colonisation*’. Is Tongerlongeter’s legacy for future generations about resistance to Australian sovereignty and by undermining it? Is that what you are proposing?

It’s not acceptable to be renaming any place based on grievances that have an underlying political agenda. In this case the constant guilt-tripping exercise of the purported ills of the Tasmanian colony of early Australia. The idea that colonial Australia is based on nothing more than settler-colonial violence with the forced dispossession of the land from Indigenous peoples is 100% post-colonial theory as purported by Marxist theorists. So yes, a political agenda and definitely not neutral.

You have stated that “*Tongerlongeter is recognised by historians* – which historians exactly? Have you consulted with the historians from Dark Emu Exposed – And the Assault on Australian History? They have used the “*The Aboriginal Collective Conflicts Database*” by Christophe Darmangeat, Lecturer in Economics and Social Anthropology, Université de Paris and the author of ‘Justice and Warfare in Aboriginal’, and historian Ray Kerkhove’s cited works, and many others.

See here: <https://www.dark-emu-exposed.org/home/2016/2/6/chairs-for-the-foyer-yrkzx>

You go on to say that ‘*as one of the most significant Aboriginal leaders in Tasmania during the early period of British colonisation. During the Black War, he emerged as a leader of the federation of Oyster Bay clans and played a prominent role in Aboriginal resistance to colonial expansion*’ What you failed to mention was that in 1828 Tongerlongeter and his group of Oyster Bay aborigines were known to have murdered many people. If you condone the murder of two white women, two little girls and a young boy who were speared and clubbed to death by Tongerlongeter as ‘resistance’, then you are condoning murder in cold blood. Sadly, as a result of these wars, it is estimated around 200 White settlers died as a result of the violence between aboriginals and settlers in Tasmania during the course of this conflict. That is not something that should be promoted let alone rewarded with the naming of an electorate.

It was not aboriginal tribes that established electorates. That was the work of the early pioneers of the Australian colonies. Representative democracy was entirely unknown to the aboriginal people for the thousands of years that had lived on this continent. AEC electoral divisions and names is a British infrastructure to ensure fair representation in Parliament. It is system that is still used to this day.

Rear-Admiral Sir John Franklin KCH FRS FLS FRGS was an honourable man, having served diligently as a naval officer, Lieutenant Governor of Van Dieman's Land and explorer of the Nth-West Passage and where he met his death in his pursuit of the betterment of humanity. Franklin was a great role model and still is to this day.

The Electoral Commission has a duty of care to ensure that any decision it makes is politically free and impartial to their Australian constituents. Yet it is clear to me that this proposed name change is politically driven by aboriginal social justice warriors because justifying the name change was to "*illustrate Aboriginal resistance to colonisation*". How could this be considered neutral language? It's not.

Based on the above, I am offended that the AEC see fit that a murderer is given this kind of reward of a name change for being so violent. If a white person had done what Tongerlongeter did, there would be an outcry, and rightly so. It is disturbing to think that the electorate would live under the shadow of a murderer.

I completely disagree with any name change and that the electorate remains Franklin and in line with ensuring neutrality.

Yours sincerely,

Simone N