

## Victoria – No ‘Treaty’ Required!

By Dr David Barton

22/11/2024

Our ABC loves to tell us their news bulletins and in some other programs that they are “Coming to you from the land of the Gadigal people”. They’re not; like much of what is now spruiked on the ABC, it’s a lie. Australia is ‘owned’ and governed by our federal and state governments, that’s all.

This paper demonstrates that the foundations to claims by Aboriginal elites for a ‘treaty’, for ‘reparations’ and for ‘resource sharing’ are based upon distortions and falsehoods and should not be entertained. The new Aboriginal industry and the current Aboriginalisation of Australia should be immediately stopped and reversed.

There are two main arguments propounded by activists, elites and gullible yet perhaps well meaning ignorant people who continue to claim Aboriginal ‘sovereignty’ over Australia. These two arguments often advanced for Australia still being ‘owned’ by Aborigines are, firstly, that Australia was ‘never ceded’, that is, Aboriginal people never agreed to their country being invaded and taken over by overseas settlers. Whilst arguably on the face of it that may have an element of truth to it, like so much other propaganda it is not the whole story, and nor is it to the point. Secondly, the other false argument is that Aborigines didn’t lose the so-called ‘Frontier Wars’ and there was no surrender, no truce and no treaty, so a treaty should be made now. Whilst arguably less true, again that’s not the whole story, and nor is it to the point either. These are both specious falsehoods propagated by activists with a separate agenda. Australian history is being re-imagined and re-written based on ignorance, fiction, hidden agendas, and lies.

Irrespective as to whether or not contemporary Australians think it was ‘the right thing’ for the British to annex Australia, the fact remains that they did. Australia was settled under the terms of then applicable international law. Indeed, if it hadn’t been the British, it would have been the French, who arrived six days after Captain Arthur Phillip to do exactly the same thing. Under the French (at that time just entering into the French Revolution) Australia would have been a very different place from what it is today; our institutions would all look very different and we’d all be speaking French! The annexation of Australia by a foreign superpower was inevitable, so there is no point whatsoever bemoaning that it happened. We can never go back.

The State of Victoria is currently well down the track of establishing a ‘Treaty’ with the descendents of Victoria’s supposedly ‘first nations people’. The government’s ‘treaty’ website states:

Treaty is the embodiment of Aboriginal self-determination. Treaty provides a path to negotiate the transfer of power and resources for First Peoples to control matters which impact their lives. Treaty is also an opportunity to recognise and celebrate the unique status, rights, cultures and histories of First Peoples.<sup>1</sup>

Clearly, ‘Treaty’ is the way of segregation, division and institutionalised racism. A Treaty has nothing whatsoever to do with reconciliation and everything to do with division along the lines of race. We are no longer to be treated as equals. “Power”

(administrative and political) and “resources” (mineral wealth, public land, material assets and taxpayer money) are to be freely given to people who identify as Aborigines, with the State asking little of them in return. (There is also no mention of how their ‘control [of] matters’ will impact the lives of every other Victorian as well.) We are told to “recognise and celebrate the unique status, rights, cultures and histories of First Peoples” without that ever being explained to us. For example, why does any person who may have had an Aboriginal great, great grandmother four generations ago, but who has lived amongst us as an ordinary citizen for over 100 years, now enjoy unique status, or rights, or a (largely recently invented, stilted and modernised) ‘culture’ or history, not to mention substantial financial advantages and privileges over their fellow citizens? Without doubt we are being divided by race, and no rational Australian wants that. Why are Australians being told that a certain section of society, ie: people who identify as Aborigines, are now more important than all other Australians? And all of this is based upon a bogus re-interpretation of our factual history.

Further, it has been clear for some time now that Aboriginal ‘self-determination’ in fact means that people who identify as Aborigines can basically have what they want and do what they want, and the long-suffering Australia taxpayer can pay for it. There is never any suggestion that ‘self-determination’ will actually equate to self-sufficiency. It only means ‘rent-seeking’, that is, living off the benefit of what others produce or own. In the modern industrialised world, this is lazy, unethical and immoral. People should be rewarded on the basis of their work and effort, not simply sponge off the work and effort of others. As I have often argued in other writings, ‘self determination’ is actually the problem, not the solution.

And now to deal with the two falsehoods upon which the ‘treaty’ scam is based:

### **Never Ceded:**

Claims that Australia’s original ‘indigenous’\* inhabitants ‘never ceded’ this country to the British Crown are patently false; they are lies. As historical records clearly demonstrate in numerous accounts, many Aboriginal people were more than happy to gravitate towards the British settlements and avail themselves of the free food the British provided for them. This process was known as the ‘coming in’ where (for better or worse) many Aboriginal people gave up their tribal hunter-gatherer ways and ‘came in’ to live with the new settlers. For many Aborigines, this reliable source of food, clothing, tools and shelter was arguably better than their old tribal ways. In addition, many Aboriginal women (and men) received protection from the British settlers against the often cruel, abusive and violent ‘cultural’ treatment they received in their tribes, with many preferring to live with the white man. And this is not to mention the grave falsehood and misrepresentation of the so-called ‘stolen generations’, a separate issue for another time.

Indeed, arguably nothing has changed since those earlier times, except that today’s people who identify as ‘Aborigines’ are substantially more greedy than their forebears – now they want everything! As was once fairly common knowledge, pre-settlement

\* NB: The word ‘indigenous’ is not ever used by this author to describe Aboriginal people. A person ‘indigenous’ to Australia is any person who is born in Australia.

Aboriginal tribes (or 'bands', to use the Canadian term) were multitudinous disparate essentially extended family groups who were often at war with each other, stealing each others women, food and implements, and fighting, often as a result of blaming other tribes for 'sorcery' against them. Food, life and existence was a daily struggle, and as William Buckley often observed, could be snuffed out in an instant from a surprise attack by enemies of superior numbers.<sup>2</sup> Traditional Aboriginal life was harsh and often short.

Whilst the vocal elites of Aboriginal activism continue to claim the 'unceded sovereignty' of Aboriginal people all over Australia, factually and historically these claims are completely untrue. Gradually, bit by bit over the course of 100 years, the ceding of Australia took place, whether some Aboriginal people wanted it to happen or not; whilst some Aborigines fought against the British, they were by no means the majority.

Indeed, in many areas, the ceding of land from Aborigines to whites was either carried out by force, or by a gradual squeezing out from their usual territory (not 'traditionally owned' lands) putting pressure on other tribes who saw those tribes moving into their lands as an incursion, thereby sparking more fights and deaths. However, it's a bit late now in this modern era, and a bit rich to claim 'unfair' and say that their ancestors didn't agree. Many did agree and, like Marcus Stewart's Aboriginal great, great grandfather John Franklin<sup>3</sup>, saw the new regime as an opportunity for personal advancement. Indeed, the very fact that there are no longer any full-descent Aboriginal people left in Victoria shows how willing both races were, and still are, prepared to interbreed with each other.

The advancement of settlers in Victoria, especially into the golden era post-1850, was rapid, relentless and overwhelming for Aboriginal people. Added to this expansion were the remnants of smallpox which was already evident in the Aboriginal population prior to the settlement of Victoria. Smallpox is widely viewed as having been introduced to Australia via Arnhem Land pre-1788 by Macassan fishermen from Sulawesi, Indonesia, from as early as 1700<sup>4</sup>, thence spreading across to and down the east coast of Australia, eventually to Victoria. The new settlers are often blamed for introducing this disease, however it was already prevalent well before the British arrived, many of whom succumbed to the disease themselves.

The settlement of Australia by the British is unique. There is no comparison to any other country in the world about what occurred in Australia, and that is wholly because of the extremely primitive stone-age nature of the Aboriginal first inhabitants, their dispersed tribal structure and their lack of any cohesive government with which to negotiate. Notwithstanding the sometimes complex nature of Aboriginal familial, societal and inter-tribal relationships, there were no other such backward, ragtag Paleolithic peoples on the planet, and that is why modern day Australia has developed as it has. To claim that all other colonised nations had a treaty with their indigenous peoples again misleadingly misses the point. Australian Aborigines had no united governance structures with whom to negotiate any treaty. To suggest otherwise now is simply a lie. The British could not negotiate a 'treaty' with thousands of disparate tribes, and nor can they now.

Whilst many Aboriginal people might not have wanted the takeover to happen, it nevertheless did happen and many Aboriginal people made good use of the new reality, happily interbreeding with the new settlers (and in doing so, creating a whole new set of problems for both races). What occurred for many, many Aboriginal people was indeed a tragedy. But that tragedy cannot be undone and nor should it be used as a basis, some 230 years later, to divide Australia along lines of race using a reinvented interpretation of history.

With all that has gone before in Australia's history, we now live in one country with one flag and it's called Australia. That said, Australia has one flag, the Australian National Flag, not three flags. Rather than appropriation of our national flag by stealth, if the Labor socialists wish to change our flag they should come up with some other options and put them to the Australian people to democratically choose. In addition, Torres Strait Islanders never lived on mainland Australia, so why is their 'flag' everywhere? Indeed, there would appear to be more Torres Strait Islander flags on mainland Australia than there are Torres Strait Islanders!

### **Frontier Wars:**

The second falsehood claims that the Aborigines of 150 to 200 years ago 'never surrendered' in the so-called 'Frontier Wars', and are therefore 'still at war' with the descendents of the British, that is, all other 'non-indigenous' Australians. These claims are also patently false. There never were any frontier 'wars', as the concept of 'war' has always been properly understood, that is a major conflict between the armies of sovereign states. No, there were simply miscellaneous uncoordinated skirmishes between Aborigines and the British, and these skirmishes pale into insignificance when compared to the numbers of Aborigines who were murdered by other Aborigines, or those who 'came in' to live side by side with the British and avail themselves of all the benefits the British provided.

If there was a 'Frontier War', which there clearly was not, then the Aborigines lost. They were defeated, and the British took their land. The British also put a stop to the inter-tribal wars, to infanticide and to other grotesque practices (like cannibalism and male and female circumcision) indulged in as a part of 'culture' by Aboriginal tribes. For this many Aboriginal people at the time were very thankful.

Let us not ever forget that what the British found of the Aboriginal peoples when they first arrived on this continent was a primitive stone-age Paleolithic (not Mesolithic or Neolithic) peoples who were involved in (despite Bruce Pascoe's fantasies) a hunter-gatherer lifestyle, partook of grotesque 'cultural ceremonies' (like cicatrices) and were constantly in deadly warfare with one another, often successfully seeking to wipe out other tribes in their entirety. We can only be thankful that the British put a stop to all that.

In addition, the claimed 'massacres' (and by extension, the alleged 'genocide') of Aboriginal people by settlers are often exaggerated and in many cases entirely unsubstantiated. Whilst undoubtedly some mass killings of Aboriginal people did take place and cannot be justified at all, so too did mass killings of Aboriginal people by other Aboriginal people also continue to take place until stopped by the British. This is not to mention the large numbers of settlers who were also murdered by

Aborigines. In many cases, punishment was meted out to both Aborigines and to settlers who were found guilty of such murders.

Indeed, acclaimed author Richard Broome notes that Aboriginal people were not the “passive victims” of “massacres” and that the word is “overused”, stating that:

Some incidents were not ‘massacres’ but battles in which one side suffered severe losses. The details of the action are too vague in many incidents to confidently label them ‘massacres’ rather than ‘defeats’.<sup>5</sup>

There were no ‘Frontier Wars’. In all the skirmishes that took place, the Aborigines lost; they were defeated. End of story. A further argument used to bolster the activist’s cause is the oft repeated yet entirely false claim that Australia was seen as ‘Terra Nullius’ (land inhabited by and belonging to no-one) by the British Government and early settlers. This claim is patently ridiculous, as the above paragraphs clearly demonstrate.

### **What is Sovereignty and *Terra Nullius*?**

Regarding the international law applicable at the time of settlement in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and the term ‘legal sovereignty’, the ‘Rule of Law Education Centre’ notes:

During the 18th century, Europeans could ‘legally’ gain sovereignty of a country in three distinct ways:

1. By conquest: sovereignty by way of force, such as through military force.
2. By cession: sovereignty by means of a treaty, whereby the previous government gives power to the new government.
3. By occupation: sovereignty by acquisition of a land currently ruled by no government or sovereign power (ie: *terra nullius*).<sup>6</sup>

Part 2 does not apply to Australia as there was no “previous government” as recognised in 18<sup>th</sup> century law. To claim otherwise, as contemporary activists are apt to attempt, is demonstrably false. Australia as it was then could not be ‘ceded’ as there was no-one to cede it.

Section 1 applies in part. Despite the claims of ‘Frontier Wars’, which in fact were never more than a series of skirmishes at various times in various places, there was no ‘war’ with the indigenous population at the time of settlement. A real ‘war’ was not even really possible given the immeasurably superior weaponry and numbers of the ever-encroaching settlers. An actual war is defined as ‘a state of usually open and declared armed hostile conflict between states or nations’. What occurred with Aboriginal people during the settlement of Australia does not meet that definition. There was no declaration of war by one country against another.

Again, to claim larger agglomerated Aboriginal tribal areas as ‘nations’ is to be disingenuous, misleading and plainly false, creating a modern day illusion for plainly political purposes. There were never any such ‘nations’, and hence no ‘treaties’ were ever possible. Today’s Aboriginal ‘nations’ are no more than modern-day inventions.

That leaves us with Part 3, which is in fact what happened. Australia was annexed by Great Britain on the basis that the land was “currently ruled by no government or sovereign power (ie: [the real meaning] of *terra nullius*)”. Whether that be right or

wrong in today's modern understanding, that's the reality, despite the activists attempts to reinvent history and to change the meaning of long accepted words and language.

The fact is that the term '*Terra Nullius*' means, and has up until very recently always meant, 'land over which no previous sovereignty has been exercised'. Clearly, the term '*Terra Nullius*' has been hijacked by activists and the socialist Left, reinterpreted to mean, in a most derogatory anti-white fashion, something that it has never meant in the past. Indeed, the very concept that the term now irrationally alleged by activists to mean 'uninhabited', which was never the case, is plainly ridiculous, given the fact that from the very earliest times of exploration everyone knew that this new great southern land was inhabited by wandering native stone-age peoples. That much was always obvious. Today, *Terra Nullius* is both sham and scam!

One simply cannot, as the High Court has done, declare the old international law and doctrine of *Terra Nullius* as invalid as it no longer suits their ideological agenda, and set about reshaping the entire nation on the basis of some new modern irrational interpretation. Yet this is exactly what has happened and is happening more and more, in much the same way that Aristotelian and Plutonic thought and Socratic method are now being supplanted and replaced with Post-Modern Marxist concepts that no longer rely upon rational thought, logical process, reasoned argument or common sense. This can be clearly seen in the so-called 'gender wars' where society is now instructed that a woman cannot be defined, and if a man wants to, he can be (or 'identify as') a real and genuine woman, and vice versa, although mostly it is the former. Such misogyny is truly astounding.

### **What is a Nation?**

It is claimed that the Dja Dja Wurrung and Taungurung tribes are a part of the 'Kulin Nation'. By definition, there was no 'Kulin Nation'. The old definition of a 'nation' that schools once taught (and were found in older dictionaries) was "a territory where its people are led by the same government" and "an aggregation of people or peoples of one or more cultures, races, etc, organized into a single state". Note the words 'same government' and 'single state'; these are important.

However, over time and in line with the Marxist Left's revision of the English language and the meaning of words, a 'nation' has now become defined (as found in modern on-line dictionaries) as "a cultural identity without statehood. The nation does not govern a sovereign territory. This applies to ethnic groups but also religions, multi-ethnic language groups, etc. Examples include Jews and Armenians" and "a large body of people united by common descent, history, culture, or language, inhabiting a particular country or territory". Surely a 'nation' cannot be both a government yet have no government, or hold statehood without actually being a state. It would appear that the word 'nation' has been reinvented to accommodate the meanings that activists would like it to have. Such revisionism is now used to underpin false claims that imply that pre-settlement Aborigines had some form of widespread and cohesive 'government'. They did not.

Another newly minted term of the Mabo era is 'Traditional Owners'. This term is another misnomer because, as we know, there was no land 'ownership' by Aboriginal

people. Indeed, the concept was, until the arrival of activists, quite unknown to them. The facts are that Aboriginal people were wandering hunter-gatherers who, mostly in sparse numbers, ranged over very wide areas, usually only being constricted by adjacent warring tribes. Such areas had very fluid and constantly moving borders, or boundaries, as some tribes rose in ascendancy and others disappeared or moved on. Much of what is claimed to be a 'nation' today simply represents the state of play when the settlers arrived, as it wasn't long before such fluidity became more static as the settlers influence over the land increased.

### **What is Native Title?**

Native title was originally intended to be the recognition in Australian law that *some* Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people continued to hold rights and interests in land and water. Clearly, this is not *all* people who identify as Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, yet that is the direction this has now moved. Arguably, the new concept of Native Title in law, essentially invented by the High Court judges, was an erroneous conclusion, and many over the decades have argued so. Further, even the Victorian Government notes that:

The source of native title lies in the laws and customs observed by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people when Australia was colonised by Europeans. For native title to be recognised, those laws and customs *must have been acknowledged and observed in a 'substantially uninterrupted' way from the time of settlement until now.*<sup>7</sup> (Emphasis added)

Clearly, Aboriginal "laws and customs" have been *very* substantially interrupted since the time of settlement, so how can the same Victorian Government now hand over in freehold 'Aboriginal Title' what was public Crown land to private Aboriginal corporations? How and why can this be happening?

In addition, Native Title specifically excluded commercial rights to minerals, gas, and petroleum. How is it then that people who identify as Aborigines and are a member of what are essentially private Aboriginal corporations are now able to negotiate (perhaps through subtle coercion) a 'royalty' (in effect a mineral rent tax) on mining output and profits?

It appears that even the factually incorrect Native Title determination has now had its boundaries pushed ever further into areas that were never intended (or perhaps they were) meaning for example that in Victoria the Dja Dja Wurrung will now receive a proportion, a royalty, of the profits from the very successful Fosterville Gold Mine.<sup>8</sup> This will mean millions of dollars flowing to the 2,500 Dja Dja Wurrung members for not even doing a thing (except having a few parts of Aboriginal DNA in their historic genetics) and allegedly to address Dja Dja Wurrung "disadvantage" – what disadvantage? This is classic rent seeking – getting something for nothing, a profit for the idle from the work of others. Have we not all realised that this is a scam? Have we not realised that this is unfair, discriminatory and even racist towards everyone else? Have we not all realised that the Emperor has no clothes?

Anglo-Saxon Western and Christian principles of law are now being applied by Aboriginal activists to falsely lay claim to large swaths of Australia and its resources, essentially stealing it from the people of Australia. By using techniques of gradualism,

stealth, language revision, reinvention of history and outright lies, they have been largely successful, and in many ways thanks to misguided, guilt-ridden, ignorant ‘useful idiot’ white Australians.

### **What is the UNDRIP?**

Much of what is happening in Australia is based upon the entirely unrealistic, impractical, unfair and totally unachievable yet increasingly traction-gaining *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (UNDRIP) as co-authored by Australia’s own Mick Dodson and Megan Davis who cannot argue that they do not have a vested interest in this UN declaration. Indeed, as the Australian Government notes, Australia played a substantial and significant role in the 1982 United Nations’ Working Group on Indigenous Populations (WGIP):

Indigenous Australians participated in this WGIP process and played a significant role in the consultation and drafting of UNDRIP. Across various meetings of the WGIP throughout the 1980s and 1990s, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander organisations made significant contributions to discussions and consultations leading to the draft declaration. This included:

- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission
- National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services Secretariat
- Anyinginyi Congress Aboriginal Corporation (Tennant Creek)
- Central Land Council
- FAIRA Aboriginal Corporation (FAIRA)
- The National Federation of Land Councils
- Kimberley Land Council
- National Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisation
- Northern Land Council
- NSW Aboriginal Land Council
- Secretariat of National Aboriginal Islander Child Care
- Torres Strait Regional Authority.<sup>9</sup>

By playing such a key role in the development of the UNDRIP it’s clear that there is a large part of vested interest in the process and a clear intention to undermine and destabilise Australia as a cohesive society and to divide it up along the lines of race. Further, in 2022 Senator Patrick Dodson (Mick’s brother) was appointed to chair a Senate Committee to investigate the implementation of the UNDRIP in Australia.

But as Zimmermann and Moens point out in their 2024 paper *Enforcing the Globalist Agenda of Indigenous Self-determination*<sup>10</sup>, the UNDRIP is contrary to the very fundamental foundations of the egalitarian nature of the Australian Constitution and the inherent equity contained therein, and indeed, contrary to the United Nations very own *International Convention on All Forms of Racial Discrimination* and Australia’s own *Racial Discrimination Act 1975*, which clearly states that it “promotes equality before the law for all people regardless of race, colour or national or ethnic origin. It is unlawful to discrimination against people on the basis of race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin.”<sup>11</sup>

Not to mention Victoria’s own *Equal Opportunity Act 2010* which claims that “The law protects your right to be treated equally, no matter where you are from or the colour of your skin. It’s against the law to discriminate against you or vilify you because of your race, ethnicity, skin colour, or any characteristics associated with a



particular race.”<sup>12</sup> Increasingly however, this apparently does not seem to apply to white people, to males or to Christians.

Nevertheless, such discrimination has been occurring in Victoria, and Australia-wide, for decades, and why? Because Aboriginal people are now somehow viewed as ‘special’ and this in itself is a racist concept. Aboriginal people are not special; they are not different; they do not hold special ‘knowledge’ that no-one else has; no, they are just ordinary individuals, like the rest of us – Australians!

Yet the intent of the UNDRIP is to create a section of so-called ‘indigenous’ society which are to become nothing more than parasites feeding from its host, the long-suffering Australian taxpayer. These hunter-gatherer rent seekers are acting in a way wholly reminiscent of their ‘coming in’ forebears. Using Marxist dogma and techniques, they’ve just become very modern and sophisticated about how they go about it, increasingly aided and abetted by ignorant bleeding-heart foolish ‘useful idiot’ Australians who seem to know no better. Sadly, many of these fools are to be found within the Christian churches.

If today’s Aboriginal people wish to be truly free and independent, then they should work for and provide their own sources of income, and not be parasites feeding from the host state based upon a self-created sense of victimhood. Carried to its logical conclusion, this means that ultimately such activists ‘want *their* country back’ or they want a separate country of their own within our country of Australia. This I believe is what the proposed, and resoundingly defeated, “Voice to Parliament” sought to achieve, and we cannot ever allow this to happen to Australia.

What the current moves towards ‘land and waters rights’ (and ‘resources rights’) really means is that a certain select group of people who now identify as Aborigines want to do what they like and have the rest of the hardworking Australian community pay for it! All of this is really just about power, money and control – but mainly the money, for a small group of elite people to benefit. Human nature does not change, irrespective of ‘race’.

What this means is that ‘self-determination’ and ‘reconciliation’ will never be complete and will never end until the people who identify as Aborigines have taken over complete control. Really, what is ‘self-determination’ and what is ‘reconciliation’ and, at the end on the day, who pays for all of this? What are the limits to ‘self-determination’ and ‘reconciliation’? How do we know when we have arrived at the destination, and will we all be happy then? Of course not.

Of further concern is that the ‘Aboriginal Industry’ is widely acknowledged to be riddled with fakes – people identifying as ‘Aboriginal’ who are in fact not at all. Probably the most famous of these is Professor Bruce Pascoe, the so-called ‘Enterprise Professor of Indigenous Agriculture’ at Melbourne University. Does Bruce Pascoe even have a PhD, a requirement to be a ‘Professor’? Apparently not. To this day Pascoe has failed to prove who his ‘Aboriginal ancestors’ in fact were or that ‘Aboriginal agriculture’ ever occurred on the scale which he alleges.

Indeed, SBS television reports that: “University of Sydney post-graduate student and Wiradjuri woman Suzanne Ingram described [fakes] as ‘race-shifting’ [and in]

critiquing the validity of the beyond birth rate increase in the First Nations population, Ms Ingram argued, if the newly identified group were to be tested against the three-point criteria, from the 812,728 people who self-identified as Indigenous, 'there has been data to suggest that [the population] should actually be about 300,000 less.'<sup>13</sup>

Who are these fakes, grifters and freeloaders and how many of them are on the Boards of these new private 'Aboriginal Corporations' to whom our public land, resources and assets are being gifted? How can we know that it is not 'white people' with no Aboriginal ancestry at all who are gaining an advantage here at the expense of people who are truly genuinely Aboriginal? How do we know who is really an 'Aborigine' in Victoria today?

Much is being made of a reinvigorated Aboriginal 'culture' and many argue that 'Aboriginality' should now be defined by 'culture', not 'blood quantum'. If a person is to now be defined as an 'Aborigine' on the basis of how they live 'culturally', rather than by 'blood lines' would that not mean that virtually all 'Aborigines' in Victoria are not 'Aborigines' at all, as they now live a fully culturally Westernised lifestyle? Wouldn't this mean in reality that there are actually no 'Aborigines' left in Victoria?

For example, no thinking person who sees an ordinary citizen in Melbourne dressed in ordinary clothes, working an ordinary 9-5 job, living in an ordinary suburban street, driving an ordinary motor vehicle and shopping at their local Coles supermarket who then dresses up on weekends in feathers and paint (often culturally appropriated from other groups) as an 'Aborigine' and performs some (invented) ritual dances in front of a crowd at a local park would be classed as a 'real' Aborigine. The idea is preposterous and no more makes that person an Aborigine as dressing up as a knight in chain mail with a sword and helmet at Kyal Castle makes that person a real-life medieval baron.

Given the apparent increase in fakes and shape-shifters, along with increasingly distant blood lines, it's long overdue that the definition of what it is or means to be an 'Aborigine' is completely overhauled. In 100 years time, is a person with an Aboriginal 25 x great grandparent still going to be an 'Aborigine'?

What is being foisted upon Victorians by governments and bureaucrats is neither legal nor moral nor ethical – indeed it is one giant scam the Victorian government and its minions of bureaucrats are highly complicit. We, the people, must dismantle this new edifice before it destroys us all. We can refer to this process as the whitewashing of what was once real black 'culture', and all of this has only been possible because of the faux guilt apparently felt by sympathisers with what happened to early Aboriginal Australians.

A quote apparently attributed to German historian and philosopher Hannah Arendt says:

This constant lying is not aimed at making the people believe a lie, but at ensuring that no one believes anything anymore. A people that can no longer distinguish between truth and lies cannot distinguish between right and wrong. And such a people, deprived of the power to think and judge, is, without knowing

and willing it, completely subjected to the rule of lies. With such a people, you can do whatever you want.

It seems implausible that no-one is picking up on what seems to be an obvious flaw underpinning this whole Aboriginalisation of Australia movement – that it's all based upon a farrago of lies. Aborigines *did* in fact cede Australia to the settlers (whether they wanted to or not) and *did* in fact lose all the violent skirmishes that ensued. To put it in modern parlance, sure the British 'invaded' and the Aborigines lost, but this is what has happened across the world throughout the centuries, so get over it and move on! That's the reality and there is no 'treaty', no compensation and no reparations required, especially to people who are today not even 'Aborigines' in the true sense of the word.

To conclude, it is clear that what is happening both in Victoria and Australia-wide has no basis in history or in law. The very foundations underpinning land claims, treaty and reparations are based upon ignoring factual history and a reinvention of that history to promote the modern day agenda of greedy (and lazy) activists and elites. It is very clear that Aboriginal people did in fact (rightly or wrongly) cede the land upon which they roamed to the numerically and technologically superior settlers, and that in fact there were no 'frontier wars' and even if there had been, the Aboriginal people lost those battles, were defeated, and as a consequence lost their lands. These have been accepted facts for over 180 years.

That being the case, there is absolutely no basis for the advancement of the claims to 'land rights', to 'treaty' or to 'reparations', or for the active divisiveness along the lines of race that has now been occurring for the better part of fifty years. We are all Australians and every person should be treated equally and in accordance with his or her efforts and behaviour. Nobody of any particular race should be getting 'something for nothing' especially when someone else has to work to pay for it. Any taxpayer-funded assistance should not be based upon race, or on a black armband<sup>14</sup> view of history, but be on the basis of need and need alone.

None of these land claims or 'treaties' should ever have been countenanced by government or the judiciary. To have done so has now cost Australia billions of dollars, did in fact introduce a 'slippery slope' of land rights (and now resource rights) as predicted at the time, and has introduced divisiveness into our society from which we may never recover.

Australia is now already headlong down a very dangerous and divisive path which, based upon a clear fantasy, has already resulted in a great deal of resentment, which may indeed eventually spill over to insurrection or even to civil war. It is long overdue that all Australians woke up to this charade!

\* \* \* \* \*

**Sources:**

- <sup>1</sup> <https://www.firstpeoplesrelations.vic.gov.au/treaty-victoria>
- <sup>2</sup> Buckley, William; Flannery, Tim; and Morgan, John. (2017). *The Life and Adventures of William Buckley*. Melbourne, Vic: Text Publishing.
- <sup>3</sup> <https://quadrant.org.au/opinion/identity/2023/03/a-family-heritage-overpainted-with-ochre/>
- <sup>4</sup> <https://www.nma.gov.au/defining-moments/resources/trade-with-the-makasar>
- <sup>5</sup> Broome, R. 2005. *Aboriginal Victorians*. Sydney, NSW: Allen & Unwin. p. 81.
- <sup>6</sup> <https://www.ruleoflaw.org.au/education/australian-colonies/terra-nullius/#:~:text=The%20term%20terra%20nullius%20means,to%20the%20colonisation%20of%20Australia>
- <sup>7</sup> <https://www.firstpeoplesrelations.vic.gov.au/what-is-native-title>
- <sup>8</sup> <https://nit.com.au/14-05-2024/11390/dja-dja-wurrung-traditional-owners-strike-profit-sharing-deal-with-gold-mine>
- <sup>9</sup> [https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary\\_Business/Committees/Joint/Aboriginal\\_and\\_Torres\\_Strait\\_Islander\\_Affairs/UNDRIP/Report/Chapter\\_1\\_-\\_Introduction\\_and\\_UNDRIP\\_Background](https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Aboriginal_and_Torres_Strait_Islander_Affairs/UNDRIP/Report/Chapter_1_-_Introduction_and_UNDRIP_Background)
- <sup>10</sup> <https://closethegapresearch.org.au/Assets/Files/CtGR%20Indigenous%20Self%20Determination%20Paper.pdf>
- <sup>11</sup> <https://humanrights.gov.au/our-work/legal/legislation#:~:text=The%20Racial%20Discrimination%20Act%201975,or%20national%20or%20ethnic%20origin.>
- <sup>12</sup> <https://www.humanrights.vic.gov.au/for-individuals/race/>
- <sup>13</sup> <https://www.sbs.com.au/news/insight/article/community-leaders-warn-many-who-claim-to-be-indigenous-could-be-fakes/bc6c8bneg>
- <sup>14</sup> “The black arm-band view of history implies that Australia’s failures exceed its successes, and that the treatment of the environment and the Aborigines are two of the facets which, in total, are so shameful that they outweigh the nation’s successes.”  
Source: <http://www8.austlii.edu.au/cgi-bin/viewdoc/au/journals/SGSocUphAUCon/2000/14.html#:~:text=The%20black%20arm%20band%20view%20of%20history%20implies%20that%20Australia's,they%20outweigh%20the%20nation's%20successes>