

## THE "VOICE" - A CULTIVATED CRISIS

Australia is on a collision course with itself over the "Voice" referendum.

Following the "Uluru Statement from the Heart" there has been a momentous, but non-detailed drive, towards a constitutional change referred to as "The Voice." All we have been told by the "Yes" case is that this constitutional amendment will provide disadvantaged aboriginals with a necessary means to fix their problems and bring about "reconciliation". Is this the case?

Quadrant Online published the following statements; *"What is now apparent, thanks to the excellent research done by Nyunggal Warren Mundine (well known aboriginal leader) is that the grand assembly of the Voice at Uluru in 2017 was not a get-together of genuinely independent representatives of the Aboriginal people of Australia but a specially selected gathering of those the organisers knew would vote the way they wanted. Writing in the Daily Telegraph April 26, Mundine said the delegates were handpicked from 12 "dialogues" and one "information day" over the previous 6 months. The Referendum Council says attendance was by invitation only, which ensured each session reached consensus. Mundine observed, "I take this to mean dissenting opinions were avoided."* Mundine has often pointed out that nobody has explained just how the Voice constitutional change will cure any of the complicated issues facing disadvantaged aboriginals.

"No" advocates suggest the "Voice" is primarily the product of the theories, agendas, hopes and dreams of white left wing elites and that small minority of aggressive aboriginal activists. It is driven by ideology and money rather than a genuine and deep concern for the black disadvantaged.

The "Voice" emerged through the findings of the "Uluru Statement from the Heart?" Three demands emerged.

1. The "Voice"
2. A Makarrata Commission
3. Truth telling about aboriginal history

The first point, "The Voice," is being dealt with by a constitutional referendum before the end of the year. (2023) We have been given no crucial details on how it will be implemented, funded, or likely consequences. Is this lack of detail a purposeful strategy because people would almost certainly vote "No" if they knew what the longer term consequences of a "Yes" vote would lead too?

The "Makarrata" is interesting. What does this word actually mean? According to an ABC News article posted by Luke Pearson (10-8-2017) which quoted a Gumatj woman, Merrikiyawuy Ganambarr-Stubbs who is principal of Arnhem Land's Yirrkala School;

*Quote; Makarrata has so many layers of meaning. The first one, and main one, is peace after a dispute. Makarrata literally means a spear penetrating, usually a thigh, of a person that has done wrong so that they cannot hunt anymore, that they cannot walk properly, that they cannot run properly; to maim them, to settle them down, to calm them-that's Makarrata."*

The ABC article continues, *"One of the other layers of meaning is more aligned to the spirit of what many hope a **treaty** process would look like. It can be a negotiation of peace."* Makarrata recommends, ***"Recognition of prior ownership, compensation and return of lands, reserved Indigenous seats in government, Indigenous employment in government agencies and return of artefacts and human remains from museums."***

In short, the original violent meaning of "Makarrata" has been twisted to mean - meeting every demand that the white woke lefties and indigenous activists may care to demand. In reality it is a pale version of "Apartheid" – i.e. Unequal privileges by LAWS BASED ON RACE! (e.g. reserved black parliamentary seats)

The third demand is "Truth Telling about aboriginal history." This writing is mostly concerned with this particular demand. Of recent times there has been a concerted campaign to present aboriginal life and times before the advent of white settlement as a wonderful, peaceful, plentiful, stress free, grand paradise. This idyllic and romanticised view of their past is a fantasy. It is no more than a "Paradise Lost Strategy" to corrupt the white man's conscience with guilt. **"Guilt" has become the currency to deliver "Compensation."**

The Australian public have wilted under the "guilt barrage." The positive side of white settlement is never considered. We have had our thinking cultivated and rearranged and been educated into an unbalanced and lopsided view.

Let's begin this "Truth Telling Exercise" from the start.

### **The Average Aussie**

It is an illuminating exercise to examine the long propaganda/disinformation preparation deliberately designed to manipulate our minds and cultivate a "Yes" outcome. **The "laid back" attitude of most Aussies has been an ideal springboard for mind manipulation.**

The average Aussie has never really wanted to be over active in political or controversial affairs. But times are now forcing a change to our mental attitudes. Consider the following (partly taken from an internet posting) division and trauma that has infested and contaminated Australia's good natured acceptance of our differences.

*We never bothered about the odd homosexual/trans person sprinkled throughout our communities, until they became aggressive at promoting their habits to our children.*

*We trusted the state with the education of our children until education morphed into dangerous woke indoctrination.*

*We never cared about different skin colour until we were told to be ashamed of being white and accused of being the “white privileged.”*

*We judged no one on their political affiliation until we began to be attacked for our own point of view.*

*We never cared about where you were born or which country you came from until you demonised our history and blamed our pioneers and ancestors for problems of your own making.*

*We never cared about a diversity of beliefs until you insisted our beliefs were all wrong and then aggressively shut us down by labelling us with insulting names.*

*We were always in favour of a cohesive and inclusive nation until the “Inclusive Promoters” twisted “inclusion” into meaning “exclusion.”*

We just wanted to live and let live - we didn't pay attention to those small calibrated steps that slowly reset our national values, exploited our tolerance, shamed our once proud history and replaced truth with woke ideology. Our minds have been worked over like a cultivated field. The seeds of disunity and discontent have now germinated - especially amongst the fields of our young people. All extraneous thoughts and actions that don't fit the narrative are treated like weeds – they are set upon and eradicated. **Australia is being transformed into a nation of monoculture minds.** We have been trained to think and act within the boundaries of the cultivated psychosis agenda.

So here we are! Our tolerance, our compliance, our apathy, our silence, our lack of moral courage - have brought us to this impasse where we simply **MUST** make a stand. Firstly, we need to pay attention. We need to defend what we instinctively know to be true. We need to think deeply about where some of these woke cultivated agendas are leading us. We need to recognise that our minds have been manipulated and subjected to long term generational propaganda. If we continue to be too timid to resist then the lunacy will be ratcheted up to the next level. Alexander Solzhenitsyn summed up what needs to be done in a single sentence, **“Don't let their lies live through you!”**

Where do we go from here? What is programmed as the next step towards the “woke utopia.” That's an easy question to answer. Next step is; “THE VOICE.” The “Voice” is being marketed as an obvious and overdue next step in the recognition and inclusion of our aboriginal citizens. The Prime Minister tells us it is a simple choice – no need to think about it – just give us a blank check and trust us to fill in the details later - just vote “Yes.”

NO SO FAST! We have been too gullible in the past. This time we MUST do our homework. Let's start by going back in time to where the propaganda began to cultivate our minds in preparation for the desired "Yes" vote.

### **Terra Nullius**

When Captain Cook discovered Australia and the first fleet began settlement, the continent was declared "Terra Nullius." This was a legal term which meant Australia was unoccupied – it belonged to nobody. This was largely true for the vast majority of Australia's land mass. Ours is a dry continent. Availability of surface water restricted human occupation to coastal areas, river lands and permanent water holes. Aboriginal tribes were scattered and had no concept of nationhood. Australia at time of settlement could be compared to today's Antarctica as far as human occupation goes. Antarctica has a number of confined settlements but it is mostly an unoccupied, freezing, empty wasteland that is seldom traversed. It is understandable that the colonists perceived Australia's vastness and scarcity of people as "Terra Nullius." Even the habitable areas could not have supported a large population. Population numbers at settlement can only be a guess – but we do know that 140 years later the 1929 census recorded a mere 78,430 aboriginals.

The 1992 High Court abolished the Terra Nullius concept. This is a correct ruling because, after all, there were people living in Australia and small areas were occupied. It is how this finding was distorted and utilised to push an agenda that began us on the road to the "Voice" referendum.

In the 1960's there emerged this new concept that Australia had not been "settled" as previously understood. Australia, we were now told, had been "invaded" by the British. What does that mean exactly and how does it change things? The dictionary defines the primary meaning of "invade" as "*to enter a country or territory by military force*" and "invasion" as "*the act of invading with military force.*"

Australia was NOT entered "*by force.*" It is a distortion to describe a handful of soldiers from the first fleet as a "*military force or Invasion Army.*" There were exactly 245 marines who disembarked at Sydney Cove. Their orders were to keep law and order in the new colony and especially maintain discipline amongst the 778 law breaking convicts. They were not an invasion force. They were primarily a Police Force. They were there to keep the peace. There was no invasion – just settlement. The following years did see some conflict where settlers and aboriginal activity overlapped but there was also a healthy measure of co-operation and give and take – especially by the settlers who pioneered remote areas and depended on peace with local tribe's people.

To describe Australia Day (26 January) as "invasion day" is historically wrong and deliberately misleading. **The "invasion day" invention was the first step to rewrite history**

**so as to plant a victim complex amongst aboriginals and also burden the rest of the Australian population with a “guilt mentality.”**

### **Aboriginal Occupation Time**

How long have aboriginals been in Australia? We hear a wide range of estimates. Initially their occupation was given as 8,000 years in 1961, then it blew out to 40,000 years but of recent times it's been inflated up to 65,000 or even 80,000 years. One thing is certain – **there is no point in asking any aboriginal this question because they hadn't invented a calendar.** They had no way of measuring time and no way of keeping written records. They did have word of mouth but the human memory cannot be relied upon, even over relatively short periods of time.

In fact, without white man's sophisticated dating technology, they have no idea on this question. Aboriginal occupation estimates are totally reliant on white man's science telling them. Professor Elkin (1891-1979), a leading Australian anthropologist and indigenous expert has written, *“The Australian aborigines took possession of Australia, spread over its surface and by 1788 numbered, as far as we can calculate about 300,000.”* This was accepted as a best estimate. It is a stretch to maintain so few people could make claims of fully occupying the 7,741,020 square kilometres of such a vast continent.

More on occupation time later.

### **Aboriginal Ownership/First Australians**

**The aboriginals claim to ownership of Australia is entirely based upon the claim that they were the original and only occupants on this continent.** Does this claim withstand objective scrutiny?

From 1969 to 1974 there were ancient skeletal remains discovered at Lake Mungo from which DNA was retrieved and examined. There was an A.B.C. Science Article published on the finding of Mungo Man dated 1-1-2001. Quote; *“... the meticulous process of retrieving DNA from the bits of bone that had chipped off Mungo Man's remains.....Comparison of the mitochondrial DNA with that of ancient and modern Aboriginal peoples led to the conclusion that **Mungo Man fell outside the range of genetic variation seen in Australian Aboriginal people.**”* The article also says, *“In other words, Mungo man's gene is extinct. But there he was, a physically modern man living in Australia 60,000 years ago.”* Perhaps these Mungo inhabitants, who were no relation to the Australian Aboriginals as we know them, were the

original Australians. The article also poses the question, *“Had they been wiped out in a prehistoric case of ethnic cleansing?”*

The modern claim that Australian aboriginals were resident as far back as 65,000 to 80,000 years ago must be questioned because, according to the ABC article, *“The current mainstream thinking, the recent African origin of modern humans model, suggests that all humans outside Africa alive today descended from a small group which left Africa at a specific time, currently generally estimated at about 60,000 years ago.”* If the ABC article is correct then there’s no way our Aboriginals could possibly be in Australia **before Africa man left Africa!!** They certainly cannot have been here 80,000 years ago or even 60,000 years ago.

Further evidence casting doubt on just who the “First Australians” (first occupiers) may have been, can be obtained in the written report by English navigator, William Dampier. He visited the west coast of Australia (then called New Holland) in 1688. He describes the natives along the shore line that he encountered during his 2 months stay as having, *“Curley hair like the Negroes.”* That’s an interesting observation because any of the old photographs or drawings of the original Tasmanian natives show them as also having the tight curly hair indicative of Papuan natives.

In April 1898, Professor Haddon led the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to the Torres Strait and carried out research in Australia. In 1909 Haddon published “The Races of Man” and exposed the invasion of Australia by the Dravidians. Note; Dravidians are described as people from Central India, Ceylon, Malaya.

Quote: *“Australia was originally inhabited by Papuans or Negritos, who wandered on foot to the extreme south of the continent. When Bass Strait was formed, those who were cut off from the mainland formed the ancestors of the Tasmanians. Later a Pre-Dravidian race migrated into Australia and absorbed the sparse aboriginal (i.e.Papuan) population. The latter being driven off or exterminated, or even partially assimilated, but the formation of Bass Strait prevented the entry of the Pre-Dravidians (Indian, Ceylon people) into Tasmania.”*

It is now established that the modern day aboriginal’s genome reveals strong genetic links to Papua and Micronesia. The Papuans would have migrated into Australia when a land bridge existed connecting Northern Australia to New Guinea. That land bridge existed as recently as 6,000 to 8,000 years ago.

Further evidence comes from “The Australian Aborigines” by Professor A. P. Elkin, Emeritus Professor of Anthropology, University of Sydney, during the 1950’s. Quote; *“Was there a preceding race in Australia, namely the Tasmanians? The latter were a Negroid group related to the Melanesians and Papuans. If the Tasmanians were living in parts of Australia at the time the aborigines commenced their invasion they must have been conquered and*

*absorbed, or extinguished. It is also possible that the Tasmanians were already in their island home as well as on the mainland at the time of Australoid Invasion.”*

More evidence comes from E.R. Gribble who wrote “The Despised Race.” Quote; **“The first inhabitants were a Negroid race being curly haired. Later came the Dravidians.... The Dravidians were huntsman and brought the dog with them.”** (dingo)

The history of the dingo reveals interesting evidence. Fossil records etc suggest the entrance of the dingo into Australia sometime around 4,000 to 5,000 years ago. Geneticists in India have been focusing on the Australia-India link and according to SBS Executive Producer Kumud Merani publishing in 2014. *“The Anthropological Survey of India supports a deep genetic link between Indian tribes and Australian Aborigines. When the Anthropological Survey of India sampled 966 samples of individuals from 26 modern-day India tribes, they found a genetic marker that until recently had only been seen in Australian Aborigines.”*

Lead researcher Dr. Raghvendra Rao confirms a deep Indian link to Australian Aborigines via maternal DNA. What was surprising to this research *“was the substantial gene flow from another wave of people who arrived in Australia, some 4,000 years ago – **long after the first Australians (Papuan/Melansians)** settled the continent, and all the evidence places the origins of that influx of people somewhere in the south of India.”*

The Indian study also states, *“Geneticists now believe that the DNA record has solved another mystery of ancient Australia – the introduction of the dingo and a sudden spread of sophisticated stone tools across the continent. The genetic link has been actually dated back through molecular dating to 4,300 years. And through that time we see actually the microlithic tools and the development of other tools for human survival which came into existence and also **the fossils of the dingo** were discovered at the same time in Australia.”*

It is now clear that the geneticists are uncovering several waves of early migration into Australia, some of which were as late as 4,300 years ago. Were these late comers the ancestors of today’s aborigines? It is a complex patchwork – from Mungo Man to Papuans to Melanesians to Indians.

So who are the “First Australians?”

**All the evidence clearly identifies the Papuan as being the original First Australian.** Numerous anthropologists have acknowledged that fact, but are ignored by the Universities who are paid millions of dollars to force feed the public with a false pre-history of Australia.

The migrating Indians would appear to be the latest migrants around 4,300 years ago bringing the dingo (sometimes called the Indian Jackal) with them as shown by considerable fossil evidence.

For the modern day Aborigines to make the claim of being the “First Australians” is an imaginary stretch. Of themselves, they have no idea of the distant past. **Beyond recent**

**memory is just a blur which they describe as “Dream Time.”** To be perfectly honest, determining just who were the original Australian occupants is a work in progress for scientists. While Aboriginal activists often parrot the catchcry “Australia **always was and always will be** Aboriginal land” this is entirely unsupported by the evidence. It is a slogan designed to induce black sympathy and white guilt.

When aboriginal activists decry “invasion day,” we may well ask - Which invasion day are you referring to? Was it the one that exterminated Mungo Man? Was it the Papuan, Melanesian invasion? Was it the more recent tribal Indian invasion? Of course, our present day woke whites and aboriginal activists are not interested in calling any of their own ancestor’s displacement of occupying tribes in Australian pre-history as an “Invasion.”

It suits the compensation/land rights/treaty agenda of the left wing activists to ignore the non-white invasion history of Australia but bewail the British occupation.

Once again, the Aussie’s sense of fairness is being cultivated and manipulated so that there will be capitulation to the pre-determined activist’s demands.

### **Incorrect Insults**

We have been indoctrinated with a number of insults designed to feed our guilt complex and entrench all aboriginals as disinherited victims.

We have already dealt with the “**First Australians**” fiction. But this falsehood is a clear slight on all the rest of us Aussies because it clearly implies that “Aboriginals are the first occupiers so therefore they must be afforded special privileges and everyone else comes second.” The truth of the matter is that current day aboriginals were not the first Australians. It is also a very divisive statement. **Statements like this cultivate an “us and them” attitude.**

Then we have the “**First Nations**” fable. What exactly constitutes a “*nation*?” According to the dictionary a nation is defined as; “*an aggregation of people organised into a single state; a federation of tribes; a community of persons bound by common descent, language or history.*”

The aboriginal tribes were certainly not organised into anything remotely resembling a “**state.**” While there was obviously interaction between one tribe and another (sometimes peaceful and sometimes not) these very localised and irregular gatherings cannot be defined as a “**nation or federation.**” The aboriginal tribes dispersed across the huge Australian continent can hardly be described as a “**community.**” The prime meaning of “community” suggests a confined location. The tribes spoke 250 different languages and 800 dialects. The official government body, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) says, “***Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australia is made up of many different and distinct groups, each with their own culture, customs, languages and laws.***” That effectively rules out any “**bound by commonality.**”



Australia became a “nation” at federation in 1901.

The “**Traditional Owners**” claim; at the time of British settlement the aboriginals were the “traditional owners.” But 4,000 years ago, before the migrations from India and Melanesia, the Mungo and Papuan people were the “traditional owners.” Today, all the people born in Australia are the “traditional owners” together with the aboriginals – both lots are “indigenous.” That is their “tradition.” To pretend you must be aboriginal to be a “traditional owner” is not only incorrect – it is an insult.

The latest fad imposed on us guilt ridden “white privileged invaders” is the “**Welcome to Country and Smoking Ceremony.**” AITSIS, in their literature, poses the question – “*Whose country am I on?*” They then give us their answer! “*Whenever you are in Australia you are on the lands and waters of Australia’s First Peoples. Only traditional custodians can speak for and welcome visitors to their homelands.*” We have been indoctrinated to believe only aboriginals can be “traditional custodians.”

Not so! If you were born in Australia, irrespective of race, creed or colour, Australia is your ancestral home. Australia is your established, historic, fixed, customary country. That is what “traditional” actually means. What does “custodian” mean? It means “*a person who is a keeper or a guard.*” The population of Australia fought two world wars as custodians of this nation. **The entire population of Australia are the custodians of Australia because this country is our traditional homeland.**

If you travel from one state to another in Australia you will not have to suffer some variety of welcoming ritual. That is because we are a united “nation” at peace with one another. However, if you travel from one tribal area to another, then we must suffer a “welcoming ceremony.” This is because, historically, these tribes were never united into any “federation or nation” and were often at war with one another. Freedom to travel between different tribal areas required permission.

In Australia today there is no need to seek permission to venture away from your normal locality. **Welcoming Australians into their own home as if they are strangers in a foreign land is an insult to those brave custodians who sacrificed their lives in the protection of this country.**

The “Welcome to Country” words are grossly over used. They have become a boring, ritualistic, virtue signalling, meaningless charade. They do nothing for the wellbeing of aboriginal people. In fact, all it does is reinforce the “us and them” divisions.

The “Smoking Ceremony,” which has now been popularised since 1976 after Ernie Dingo and Richard Walley first performed it, has become a lucrative money spinner for the local indigenous. They are paid between \$300 and \$1,500 per ceremony – depending on the performance. The early explorers or pioneers seemed to be either, unaware of this ritual or

failed to document it, so there is a question as to which tribes or how many tribes did the smoking ceremony as part of their culture. It is clear that not all tribes took part.

Former indigenous Northern Territory Minister Bess Price (a full blood aboriginal and mother of N.T. Senator Jacinta Price) says, ***“Paying respect to elders and smoking ceremonies are bulls\*\*\*.”***

Of recent times there has been publicity of aboriginals reclaiming some of their artefacts that the British had “stolen” more than 200 years ago. These spears/stone axes etc were held in pristine condition by the British museum. Chances are these items were not stolen but were acquired as a result of bartering and fair trading. The good news is that somebody had the foresight to preserve these items. **How many artefacts have been preserved in such excellent condition by the aboriginals themselves? None!** Most aboriginal artefacts are found lying about in the bush, forgotten and unwanted. Surely it is somewhat harsh to accuse the British of “theft” when they have diligently cared enough about Aboriginal heritage and culture to preserve it for hundreds of years.

All of these twisted words and not so subtle insults are designed to do just two things. Firstly, cultivate an overwhelming guilty, remorseful complex amongst all white Australians, so that secondly, the coming demands for enormous amounts of compensation will have to be paid to ease our culpable conscience. Unfortunately there is a devastating side effect. The more this nonsense is promoted – the greater Australia will be divided by race.

### **The Oldest Surviving Culture**

This is a proud claim. We are suitably impressed that a people can survive for several millennia under such harsh conditions. Being able to permanently exist in a country as challenging as Australia is impressive; lack of water, endless droughts, burning heat, vast distances, poisonous snakes, deadly fires, raging floods etc – aboriginals had a lot to survive. Being able to survive is admirable **but how the culture could remain unchanged for thousands of years is a mystery.**

Necessity is the mother of invention – that is a universal truth. When something is needed badly enough then a better way or improvement will be found. The ancestors of all people alive today, irrespective of race or locality, began the long road to modern civilisation from a primitive Stone Age culture. Slowly but surely, necessity and survival drove their innovation instincts; from clubs to spears; from sharp stones to bone knives to steel knives; from bows and arrows to cross bows to guns etc. from gathering seeds to planting seeds; from caves to houses. Every little improvement enhanced their comfort and survivability. Modern day people and cultures all went through this process. Their cultures have evolved an enormous extent from where it all began.

But not the Aboriginal culture; **it has remained stagnant and unchanged for thousands of years.** It has not remained unchanged because their environment was a paradise and there

was no need for improvement. Australia is a harsh place. The “necessity” was there but no innovation happened.

The question must be asked – Is this lack of inventiveness, absence of resourcefulness, evolution and innovation something we must now venerate? **The only reason Aboriginals can say they have the oldest surviving culture is because they have not had the capacity to evolve their culture.**

The “oldest surviving culture” story is designed to make the rest of us feel bad about disinherit such a clever people. Really?

It is often stated, with pride, that the Australian Aboriginal invented the Boomerang. Unfortunately, this is not the case at all.

Stencils and paintings of boomerangs appear in the rock art of Papua. Boomerangs have been found in ancient Europe, Egypt, North America and Southern India. Native Americans in Arizona and California used boomerangs. A boomerang was discovered in Oblazowa Cave in Poland made out of elephant tusk and dated at 30,000 years. Four boomerangs were found in the tomb of Egyptian King Tutankhamun who died 3,300 years ago.

The truth is – nobody knows who invented the boomerang. There is no doubt that **the boomerang was imported into Australia during one of the several migrations** – just like the dingo. It was part of aboriginal culture but **it is not an Aboriginal invention.** That’s a little more “truth telling.”

### **A Cultural Earthquake**

When a modern culture collides with a Stone Age culture, there is always going to be massive disruption and heartache. History is awash with examples of advanced civilizations overwhelming more primitive ones. This has happened throughout Africa, North and South America, China, Asia, parts of Europe etc. Australia is a more recent example. This situation is a reality that cannot be avoided. It is inevitable that at some point in history, the primitive life styles are going to be dragged, whether they like it or not, into the modern world. Even though actions may be driven by the best of intentions, it is devastating for those generations whose culture is engulfed. But the truth of the matter is that somebody had to do it.

However, it is not all tragedy and devastation for the overwhelmed cultures – especially for Indigenous Australians. Over time, they have inherited the benefits of the white man’s culture – modern medicine instead of witch doctors, a reliable supply of food instead of chance hunting, access to centrelink as a backup for lean times, use of roads and transport instead of long walking tracks through other tribal lands, protection from the weather via modern housing instead of gunyas, a rising length of life expectancy, clothes instead of... mostly wearing nothing etc.

How many of the present day aboriginals would forgo all this white man's culture and prefer a return to traditional tribal life; a survival existence with spear and boomerang in the challenging Australian wilderness? They now have plenty of land to do this. There has been no rush return to tribal life as yet!

But that's not all they have inherited from the white man! Aboriginal owned land in Australia now totals 134 million hectares. (17% of the entire continent) Land under Indigenous management is 174 million hectares. (22%) There is now 337 million hectares (44%) subject to special Indigenous Rights. So **Indigenous Australians now have a claim on 44% of the whole nation** even though their numbers are only 3.8% of the population.

But there's more! The accepted and publicised figure of tax payers' dollars that are spent by all governments, state and federal, on indigenous programmes, amounts to over \$38 Billion. **That equates to \$38,000 for every existing indigenous** in the country. Note; This figure includes a large percentage of people who "self identify" as indigenous but whose dominate bloodline is otherwise.

That is a huge tax payer commitment. Considering the entire Australian defence budget, which is responsible for the security of 23 million Aussies and protection of our entire nation is just 10 billion more at \$48 billion. **That's about \$2,180 per Aussie.**

One of the points of cultural clash is the subject of "Sacred Sites." Nobody doubts that certain ceremonies or locations were of special significance or religious belief to particular aboriginal tribes. The problem begins when the "Sacred Site" issue is overplayed. Anything and everything that indicates aboriginal occupation is often interpreted as "Sacred." **The fallout from everything being "sacred" is that nothing is "sacred" anymore.** Today's younger indigenous show little genuine interest or respect for the old peoples "Sacred Sites." But the "Sacred Site" claims are still used as a way of increasing aboriginal land ownership.

### **The Reconciliation Problem**

Almost every day we are being preached at by somebody telling us we must have "Reconciliation" with our indigenous people. So what exactly is meant by "Reconciliation?" How do we know if and when we achieve "Reconciliation?"

The dictionary says you are "reconciled" if you "*no longer oppose; acquiesce; agree without protest*" The Reconciliation Australia Group defines "Reconciliation" as; "*being based on historical acceptance, race relations, equality and equity, institutional integrity and unity.*" This definition directly refers to Australia indigenous issues.

The first thing that strikes you about both of these definitions is that reconciliation is a state of mind; it depends on a mindset rather than anything material. It cannot be purchased, objectively measured or scientifically described.

Therefore, as to whether “reconciliation” has happened or not will always remain a matter of mindset – or opinion.

The implementation of today’s Reconciliation Policy is dependent upon our government and the taxpayers providing handouts, land grants and easy money. This will never achieve anything except further demands for more handouts, more land grabs and more easy money. Reconciliation has become a big successful business. **While the rewards for feeling “non-reconciled” results in generous handouts, no indigenous group is going to say, “That’s enough – we now feel reconciled!”** After all, it provides the aboriginal industry with an annual income of \$38 billion and influence over 44% of Australia’s total real estate. Sadly, the tragedy of all this is that the indigenous elite are growing rich while the average aboriginal is still living in well below average or destitute conditions.

**Reconciliation cannot start with material gifts.** It has to start in the mind and it **has to start in the aboriginal mind**. While ever the “invasion day” resentment festers there can be no reconciliation with reality. While ever there is mourning for the loss of their mythological past paradise and every other wrong doing – real or imagined – there cannot be an acceptance. “Sorry Days” or “Apologies” do nothing useful for grassroots aboriginals but instead, inflame bad memories and entrench further bitterness. This virtue signalling may make woke whites feel warm and virtuous but for the disadvantaged aboriginals, it stirs up and perpetuates resentment.

Aboriginals have had an enormous amount to cope with and overcome. When transitioning into the modern world there is always going to be injustices; but not all the calamity has been one way. We are continually reminded of past killings and massacres of aboriginals by whites but we are attacked as racist if we produce government documents to show examples of the savagery and cannibalism inflicted by aboriginals throughout Cape York Peninsula or elsewhere. There are many recorded examples of unprovoked atrocities committed by blacks upon white settlers, shipwrecked survivors, miners, and particularly the Chinese gold miners.

The whites have mentally placed their grievances into the past. The vast majority of Aussies have no ill feeling about the pain of the past and today, wish only the best for aboriginals. There is a good reason why Christianity teaches “forgiveness.” For opposing parties to be reconciled they must hit the reset button and give themselves a chance to, not forget, but to accept and to forgive. Without forgiveness from both sides the hurt, bitterness and revenge continue indefinitely. This is why “true and lasting reconciliation” is a mental state – not a material state.

The Reconciliation Australia Group (quoted above) says “historical acceptance” is a big part of reconciliation. That is correct but the historical acceptance must come from the indigenous mind. What has happened to them must be “historically accepted” by them otherwise the future will always be fermented by past grievances. The plea for “equity and

unity” by the Reconciliation Australia Group is being substantially undermined by the “Voice Referendum.” If Australians vote “Yes,” the “us and them” divisions will be forever legally entrenched. Dividing Australians into racial groups and allocating privileges by race is not “Unity or Equality.” If Australians vote “No,” this will be interpreted as a racist outcome and the media will ignite a barrage of ill-feeling. **Either way, the “Voice” is a killer for reconciliation.**

### **What Needs to be Said.**

Let’s consider “land ownership.” Who really owns the land?

The Australian aboriginal believes they own all of Australia because they occupied it for a few thousand years. White Australians believe they own their personal patch of real estate because they have the legal documentation (deeds) to prove it. All people and companies, irrespective of race or nationality, who purchase and pay for land describe themselves as “land owners.”

In reality, **“NOBODY OWNS THE LAND.”** The land is immortal. It continues on from generation to generation irrespective of which humans claim ownership. **There is a world of difference between “occupying land” and “owning land.”**

You may occupy a rented house for a hundred years but if that house is owned by somebody else then the length of your occupation provides no claim on ownership. Even those landholders who hold a debt free deed in their hands have no claim on “ownership.” That deed merely provides the “Right to Occupy” that land. The “occupation right” endures until the land is sold or death intervenes and then the “occupation right” is passed on.

So if the occupiers don’t actually own the land, who does?

All land belongs to the One who made it. **THE LAND IS GOD’S INTERLECTUAL PROPERTY.** God created it so God owns it.

*“In the beginning **God created the heavens and the earth.**”* Geneses 1. God created the land so that humanity and life could occupy it.

*“And God said, Let us make man....and let them have dominion....upon the earth.”* Genesis 1:26 *“And God **blessed** them...”* Genesis 1:28

God gave man authority (dominion) to occupy, and subdue the earth but at no stage did God hand over ownership.

Land occupation is a blessing derived from God. **ABORIGINALS HAVE NEVER EVER “OWNED AUSTRALIA.”** All they owned was the God given blessing of “occupation of Australia.” Nothing has been taken away from them because **their right to occupy (their blessing) still exists.** Australia is still their homeland. Aboriginals are mourning the loss of land they never really owned. This may appear to some as somewhat simplistic but from a Christian

perspective – God created the land - God owns the land – **occupation is a blessing dependent on God’s grace.** It is God’s rightful choice as to who has the blessing of occupation and for how long.

Since 1788 there has been people coming into Australia from all over the world. These new people have also been blessed with the occupation of the “Lucky Country.” **The blessing of occupation is no longer exclusive to aboriginals but is now a shared blessing.** Aboriginals have had their primitive lifestyle and culture superseded by the modern world. That is what they have lost. But any aboriginals mourning the loss of their previous Spartan Lifestyle are perfectly free to reject all other cultures and return to their ancient ways.

### **The “Voice” Choice**

Prime Minister Albanese has repeatedly insisted that although referendums are historically difficult to get a “Yes” vote, this time it is different. He is confident the Australian people will agree to the “Voice.” What is the basis of this confidence? **He knows the ground has been well prepared.** The generational indoctrination that has planted and nourished the growth of white guilt – the fear of being labelled a racist – our instinct to do the helpful thing, can be depended upon to intimidate our thinking. There is a good chance he is right. Only time will tell.

This booklet is an attempt to debrief our deliberately cultivated and manipulated minds by some honest “truth-telling”. There is no need to be pressured by guilt – we have done way more good than harm. Our decision on the “Voice” must be based on what’s best for all Australians and our democracy.

Unfortunately, Albanese and the “Yes” supporters have not made it easy to know exactly what we are being asked to approve. We are being told via the “Yes” case advertising that it is just about **recognising the aboriginals in the Australian Constitution.** That has already been done. The May 1967 referendum, known as the **Indigenous Referendum**, saw overwhelming support for Indigenous recognition. In fact **91% of Aussies voted in favour** of this. That’s the first falsehood exposed. Albanese is relying on the fact that you have to be over 70 years old to remember this.

Another major concern is Albanese’s refusal to publically release the Solicitor General’s advice on the legal ramifications of the proposed Constitutional changes. Why? - Especially when there is an army of independent legal opinion advocating that severely damaging and unchangeable outcomes could result. If the Solicitor General’s advice could calm this storm then surely we would be told about it. Suspicious behaviour indeed, to keep us all in the dark!

A big part of Albanese’s “Yes” campaign is to get all the sporting authorities, big business, unions, banks, movie stars, charities etc to publically endorse the “Voice.” Never before have these types of organisations been dragged into a political debate. Why is this

happening? Let's just follow the money. Many of these organisations are dependent upon government for subsidies, handouts, grants, bureaucratic approvals of various types etc.etc. This is not a suggestion of bribery. Bribery is not necessary. These organisations know who holds the cards and how to play the game. A little virtue signalling may reap future rewards.

**This whole referendum debate is quickly turning into an “Elites v. The Average Aussie” contest.** The more we are told “The Elites” want the “Voice,” the more our suspicions grow.

Albanese has not said that if the “Voice” is approved and set up, there will be a cut back in the more than 1,000 bureaucratic aboriginal representative bodies that currently exist. (Figure quoted by Nationals Leader David Littleproud) If \$38 billion per year and 1,000 pro aboriginal bodies can't close the gap between black and white then one more bureaucracy will not help.

The way it stands at the moment we have to be suspicious. Nobody is explaining if the “Voice” personnel will be elected, (if so by whom?) appointed or anointed and who will have the power to do either. Nobody has explained the limits of the power of the “Voice.” Can it propose legislation as if it's a second parliament? Can it delay/veto parliamentary decisions? How much will it cost the taxpayer and what will its budget be? Will disagreements lead to expensive High Court legal challengers? More importantly, nobody has explained just how this “Voice” is going to close the gap for the most disadvantaged aboriginals of all – those in remote and rural areas.

If we don't know, we will have to vote “No.”

But there is still more deviousness lurking behind the “Voice” agenda which we are not being told about. The Makarrata Commission, an integral part of the “Voice,” is determined on a Treaty. The ABC actually interprets *“Makarrata as being synonymous with “treaty.”* (ABC News posted 10 Aug 2017) If the “Voice” is enshrined into the Constitution there will then be a proper legally constituted body through which the treaty process can be negotiated and implemented. An already accepted part of the expected Makarrata treaty is *“compensation, return of lands, reserved indigenous seats in government.”* That last point does not sound too democratic!

Sky News host, Chris Kenny, is an outspoken supporter of the “Voice.” No doubt his intentions are genuine and he believes in creating the best outcomes possible for our indigenous Australians. Kenny is dismissive of any concerns about legal issues; about different laws based on race or entrenched division. Perhaps he has faith that Australians are far too sensible to allow any of the predicted fiascos to happen? What Chris Kenny needs to do is have a good look at the New Zealand experience. What has happened there with the “Maori Voice” is an accurate foretaste.

All the good intentions in New Zealand have degenerated into endless legal wrangles, compensation that is never enough, the emergence of new grievances and no new benefits



for the Maori disadvantaged. Even an alternative justice system is being instituted along with co-ownership of public facilities such as water. (Maoris will now receive royalties on water usage) This whole woke disaster is now being opposed by Maori groups themselves. They don't like what's happening because it's the opposite of what was predicted. Casey Costello, a Northern Maori woman, who heads up the Hobson's Pledge Association (A group devoted to the uniting of all New Zealanders with equality) has released an interview with John Storey from the Institute of Public Affairs. She says, **"N.Z. is now under co-governance with traditional democracy falling apart and an ethnic national state is evolving. What began as a reconciliation process has turned into the entrenchment of racial division."** That is the reality of the "Voice" in implementation.

Will Australia have enough sense (as Chris Kenny believes) to avoid such disastrous outcomes? Apparently not! Western Australia's government is passing "The Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Bill" to come into effect 1<sup>st</sup> July. The farming industry is outraged over the conditions contained therein. It will affect every landholder in the state. Any ground disturbance to a depth of 50mm (2 inches) or more will require permits from Local Aboriginal Cultural Service officers. This means all fencing, ploughing, drainage, stump removal, shed building, seeding etc cannot commence when the job needs to be done but must wait at the pleasure of the permit providers. This effectively kills farming. That won't cause any racial division and anger, will it???

Anthony Albanese said in 2020 that Australia should follow New Zealand to achieve "reconciliation." He has not withdrawn that statement. Imagine having New Zealand's problems enshrined into our constitution – unchangeable and forever!

Another very real problem that is conveniently never mentioned is – How will the "Voice" arrive at a consensus between the numerous Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders when they are so diverse and divided in needs? They are like any other people spread out over vast areas. One voice will not fit all. There are already well established tribal jealousies in play.

This consensus problem is illustrated by a native title claim which was placed over North Stradbroke Island in 1995. Although the claimant group was small (only 12 families) and all other interested parties had agreement, (Qld government, local council, sand miners and the islands white residents) it took 16 years before consensus emerged because one aboriginal family withdrew agreement.

Many of these land claims devolve into bitter feuds because two or more aboriginal groups or tribes are contesting the same areas. Unfortunately, tribal divisiveness is an integral part of land claims.

Most Aussies (those who have no personal experience with aboriginals) believe the Aboriginals are a united, cohesive consensual lot. Not so! They are just like the rest of

humanity – their opinions and beliefs are multifaceted. Factional interests often undermine group consensus. **The notion that a handful of elected or anointed aboriginal spokespeople can speak as a consensus with accuracy and truth for all aboriginals is extremely naive.**

Aboriginal leader, Warren Mundine, explains the difficulty of consensus this way, *“Here’s where Voice advocates are ignorant or deliberately ignoring Aboriginal cultures. No Aboriginal person can speak for another country, only their own. Where’s the proposal for a constitutional voice for the Bundjalung people (my country on my father’s side) or the Gumbayngirr or Yuin people (on my mother’s side)?*

The “Voice” is guaranteed to cause division across the whole Australian racial perspective, both black and white. There is no case for a “Yes” vote that makes any sense.

Most Australians would love the Aboriginals to feel “reconciled” but achieving this is a prickly problem. The answer will not emerge from virtue signalling or devious political agendas that claim to unite us but instead entrench racial division and legal nightmares. All power to those morally courageous indigenous leaders who speak the truth for their people and are driven by outcomes rather than ideologies.

The final word belongs to Warren Mundine, ***“The Voice won’t, and can’t, represent Indigenous people as a group.”***

*If you are concerned about Australia’s democracy being divided by race via the “Voice” Referendum.....*

**PLEASE USE YOUR VOICE AND DISTRIBUTE THIS BOOKLET.**

*More or bulk copies available at;*

*D. J. Pinwill*

*1 Gibson St.*

*Tingoora 4608*

*Qld. Ph. 07 41685471*

For a free email copy: [donpinwill@gmail.com](mailto:donpinwill@gmail.com)

