

THE VOICE REFERENDUM

A Statement on Behalf of the
British Australian Community

FRANK SALTER

QUADRANT BOOKS
SYDNEY

Copyright © Frank Salter 2023

First published September 1 2023

Quadrant Books

2/5 Rosebery Place

Balmain NSW 2041

Sydney, Australia

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright recorded above, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise), without the prior written permission of both the copyright owner and the publisher of this book.

Acknowledgment

I thank the many individuals who commented on drafts of this document, and Tom Salter's forensic proofing. In particular I thank Harry Richardson for his critical reading and edits.

— Frank Salter

CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary	4
2. Referendum content	5
3. Evaluative criteria	6
4. Context, Part 1: The exclusion of Anglos from the voice debate	9
5. Context, Part 2: The exclusion of Anglos ethnic politics in general	16
6. Context, Part 3: The Stolen Commonwealth	19
7. Stakeholders real, alleged, and ignored	25
8. Invidious outcomes	38
9. Improper process	47
10. Conclusion, Part 1: Referendum advice	52
11. Conclusion, Part 2: A vision of genuine reconciliation	54

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The British Australian Community (BAC) calls on Australians to vote No in the referendum on a constitutionally mandated indigenous advisory body, an “indigenous voice to parliament”.

Our criticisms of the voice proposal include some already made by commentators. A constitutionally mandated voice would undermine democracy and the supremacy of federal parliament, establish ethnic privilege, and encourage undemocratic judicial activism. Recognition should not take the form of a constitutional voice but a legislated one, or a declaration in a preamble to the Constitution. Additionally, the BAC argues that a constitutional voice would be bad for Anglo-Australians by distorting federal governance, in which all citizens are stakeholders.

The present paper evaluates the proposed voice from the perspective of Anglo and national interests. The referendum can only be judged by considering its context. Anglo advocates have been completely excluded from the consultations and deliberations that formulated the voice proposal. This has been a continuation of a broader context. Anglo-Australians have been excluded from fair representation in ethnic politics in general – on issues of immigration, multiculturalism, and indigenous affairs. Overall, the referendum context is that Anglo-Australians are under siege by an establishment that is subjecting them to institutional Anglophobia. This includes a hostile media environment and the indoctrination of Anglo children at school to despise their ancestors. Undemocratic immigration policy will reduce the founding ethnic group to minority status within a few decades. This is the context in which Anglo-Australians are being asked to change the Constitution to privilege indigenous peoples and pay for the inevitable vast voice bureaucracy.

All Australians have an interest in good governance by the Commonwealth. However, Anglo-Australians have a special interest as the founding people of the Australian nation. Failure to recognise them would further alienate the nation from the Commonwealth it created.

The voice proposal might have been less biased if the consultation process that informed it had included a fair number of Anglo advocates.

The paper concludes by sketching conditions for genuine long-term reconciliation. This includes a realistic history of the special relationship that developed between indigenous peoples and the Anglo settler society. Reconciliation can only occur as a reciprocal settlement between the two peoples, both of whom have contributed to national identity.

2. REFERENDUM CONTENT

The wording of the voice referendum was finalised in March 2023 by the Albanese Labor government. The question to be put to voters will be:

“A Proposed Law: to alter the Constitution to recognise the First Peoples of Australia by establishing an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Voice. Do you approve this proposed alteration?”

The proposed alteration is a new Section 129 in the Constitution, as follows:

“Chapter IX Recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples

129 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Voice In recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the First Peoples of Australia:

1. There shall be a body, to be called the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Voice;
2. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Voice may make representations to the Parliament and the Executive Government of the Commonwealth on matters relating to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples;
3. The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws with respect to matters relating to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Voice, including its composition, functions, powers and procedures.”¹

Some commentary to be quoted in this paper referred to the early government draft of the referendum. Only the third provision was modified from the draft released in 2022. The original draft read:

“3. The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws with respect to the composition, functions, powers and procedures of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Voice.”

The change affects only the order of words, not their meaning.

The voice proposal expresses a collective wish concerning perceived ethnic interests, at least among an influential segment of the indigenous community and their non-indigenous supporters. The voice idea was stated in the document, *Uluru Statement from the Heart*, which expresses unreserved ethnic identity and asserts collective interests. It is one answer to the implicit question, “Is it good for indigenous-Australians?”

¹ National Indigenous Australians Agency (2023). Referendum on an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Voice, March, <https://www.niaa.gov.au/indigenous-affairs/referendum-aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-voice>, accessed 20.4.2023.

3. EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

The present paper is written on behalf of the British Australian Community (BAC). Like other multicultural lobbies, the BAC is a community service organisation. Instead of the usual minority orientation, the BAC is dedicated to celebrating and defending the history, culture, and interests of the Australian nation's core Anglo identity going back to and before the First Fleet.

Therefore, the BAC's rationale in formulating positions on all proposals, including the voice, has two parts. We ask whether the proposal is good for the security and prosperity of the Commonwealth and all its citizens. We also ask whether the proposal is good for Anglo-Australians. The two considerations are interwoven, because Anglo-Australians, like all citizens, are affected by how well their Commonwealth is governed, and because the Commonwealth's viability and unity depend to a large extent on its founding by Anglos, who continue to provide the bulk of its population, prosperity, core values, identity, and cohesion. The interweaving also springs from the fact that the historic Anglo nation created the commonwealth explicitly to protect and advance its interests.

Some definitions are needed here. Indigenous-Australians are those descended in significant part from Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. For mixed-race individuals who can pass as non-indigenous, self identity and acceptance by a local community also contribute to indigeneity. We take "Anglo-Australian" to mean Australians descended in significant part from the indigenous population of the British Isles as well as those who have assimilated into that population and culture. That includes many Australians with indigenous ancestry.

Continuing to define terms, an ethnic group is a named population that believes itself to be descended from the same ancestors who lived in a particular homeland. Indigenous- and Anglo-Australians began as separate ethnic groups, though there is growing overlap. A nation is an ethnic group living in its homeland. Thus it is valid to add the term "first nations" to indigenous-Australians only when they live on their ancestral clan countries. "First peoples" designates all indigenous peoples, wherever they live. Anglo-Australians made up the first continent-wide Australian nation, and remain the core identity of that now diverse society.

A state apparatus such as the Australian Commonwealth is a set of organisations that together administer a population by monopolising the legitimate use of violence within a demarcated territory. The political establishment or "deep state" includes non-governmental bodies such as corporations, especially the corporate media, and the mainstream cultural elite.

A nation state is a self-governing nation, typically with its own state apparatus. In this case, national and state territorial boundaries overlap or coincide.² The term “Australian nation” is often used imprecisely to mean the Commonwealth, though in reality the Commonwealth is a state apparatus. National consciousness arose before federation. The nation played a major role in creating the Commonwealth, as discussed further below. The Australian nation is not the same as the population of Australia. It is a subset, consisting of people who identify with the culture and history of “Australia”.

In describing the BAC’s rationales, we positioned the good of the Commonwealth before that of Anglo-Australians. This is not meant to signify the order of importance of these two criteria. Both state (Commonwealth) and nation are worthy of protection. However, it should be made clear that, when pressed, we put loyalty to nation before loyalty to state. The BAC’s loyalty to the Commonwealth is conditional on that state apparatus serving the interests of the nation, because the nation is people and therefore more intrinsically valuable than organisations constructed to administer them. Parliaments and bureaucracies may be demolished and rebuilt; humans and their bonds should not be. The Australian nation draws its core identity mainly, now and historically, from the Anglo population that made it. From the beginning there were participants not descended from the British-Isles. But they were few, they assimilated to the mainstream, and they contributed as individuals, not as members of the colonising and nation-building identity. As a result, their cultural identities did not become core components of the nation. The exception that proves the rule is Irish Catholics, ethnically similar to the British but initially treated antagonistically due to religious and national conflict in the Old World. As they entered the mainstream, they brought their culture and religion with them, helped by them being a significant fraction of the founding people.

These distinctions remain true now that Australia has become a diverse society. Diversity in Australia looks very different to diversity in Nigeria or Malaysia, because the core identities are different. Australian diversity has an Anglo core; diversity in Nigeria or Malaysia has an African or a Malay one, respectively.

Attempting to influence government policies is normal in multicultural politics. It is common, indeed expected, for minority ethnic organisations to lobby for policies and executive actions that serve their interests. In a democracy these are legitimate grass root actions, unsullied by the criminal origins of political multiculturalism.³ It is commonplace for ethnic organisations to seek to normalise the immigration of their co-ethnics and chastise opponents using govern-

² For further details, see Richardson, H. and F. K. Salter (2023). *Anglophobia: The unrecognised hatred*. Sydney, Social Technologies, Create Space, pp. 10-15

³ Richardson, H. and F. K. Salter (2023). *Anglophobia: The unrecognised hatred*. Sydney, Social Technologies, Create Space, Chapter 9.

ment agencies and friendly media. The multicultural movement has become a significant part of the hegemonic cultural and political establishment. This new amalgam, a multicultural deep state, is now attempting to use its position of power to change Australia's Constitution to further remove the Commonwealth from the hands of Anglo-Australia and fashion it into a more efficacious instrument of non-Anglo and corporate rule.

It is thus normal and proper for Anglo-Australians to think ethnically about the voice proposal, because their interests are not respected by either side of the debate. This is not new. Anglo-Australians' ethnic interests have been ignored by Australian governments since the 1960s.

Relegation of Anglo-Australia applies in particular to the referendum for an indigenous voice, as it does generally to the broad spectrum of ethnic affairs.

4. CONTEXT, PART 1: THE EXCLUSION OF ANGLOS FROM THE VOICE DEBATE

The demand for an indigenous voice to Parliament comes at a time of crisis for Anglo-Australia and the nation as a whole. The demand cannot be considered outside of this context. It is a fire sale being conducted by the arsonists. The history of Anglo dispossession is the context in which a voice is being demanded. That history explains why *not one* Anglo advocate was included in the consultative process that formulated the voice referendum.⁴ The voice proposal fits this pattern by conforming to globalist anti-Western and anti-national ideology.

The exclusion is profound. Commentator Paul Kelly notes that the voice process has offered “extremely limited consultation with the public – no constitutional convention, no parliamentary committee collaborating on the model, ... not even the release of legal advice from the Solicitor-General ...”⁵ The process has been more extreme for Anglo-Australians, because their representatives have been excluded from participating in a matter of group rights and national origins.

Anglo exclusion from the voice process goes back to its beginnings. In 2012 prime minister Julia Gillard appointed an “Expert Panel” to consider constitutional recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. All members of the panel were either indigenous activists, their white supporters, or other minority advocates. It was appropriate to ensure strong representation by indigenous leaders, which should have been broadened to include more delegates from the regions.⁶ But there was not one defender of Anglo interests in all their diverse locations and economic dispositions throughout Australia. Subsequent Coalition governments continued Gillard’s discriminatory practice in appointing committees to advise on indigenous recognition, though prime minister Tony Abbott intended to consult more widely.⁷ As journalist Chris Kenny observes, the Coalition participated in the voice process and helped formulate the referen-

⁴ Salter, The misguided case for indigenous recognition, op cit.

⁵ Kelly, Paul (2023). Albanese’s flawed voice fails the test, *The Weekend Australian*, 25 march, pp. 17, 20. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/anthony-albaneses-flawed-indigenous-voice-to-parliament-fails-the-test/news-story/d96cd012a35919935dd0847d65c86f76>

⁶ Mundine, Nyunggai Warren (2023). Real voices gagged by grand gesture to absolve white guilt, *The Weekend Australian*, 15 April, p. 15. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/real-voices-gagged-by-grand-gesture-to-absolve-white-guilt/news-story/85ddf8ebd8fce2c2212e344c980462d6>

⁷ Salter, F. K. (2014). The misguided case for indigenous recognition in the Constitution. Part II: Race and the culture wars, <https://quadrant.org.au/magazine/2014/01-02/misguided-case-indigenous-recognition-constitution-part-ii/>. *Quadrant* 58(1): 32-40. Reprinted in: Salter, F. K. (2018). *The Aboriginal question: Australian racial politics of indigenous recognition and Anglo de-recognition. Collected essays II*, Social Technologies., Sydney.

dum model.⁸ The new Albanese Labor government is also excluding Anglo advocates from its advisory bodies.⁹

The extent to which Anglo-Australians have been excluded from the voice process becomes apparent by comparing commentators who support the voice with those who disagree with it.

Noel Pearson is a leading Aboriginal advocate of constitutional recognition and the voice. He is approved by the multicultural political class, is afforded prestigious platforms, and is reviewed with reverence. He is a leading architect of the Uluru Statement from the Heart, upon which the voice proposal is based. Pearson recently argued his case in the 2022 Boyer Lectures.

Pearson's voice proposal is based in significant part on dehumanising assumptions, assumptions that have proliferated among commentators of radical bent and even among some confused conservatives. This becomes clear when he proposes three sources of national identity. The first source, he states, is the First Nations, i.e. the peoples and cultures of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations. The second source consisted of Anglo institutions, such as parliamentary government and common law. Pearson notes British-derived culture but does not recognise the ethnicity – he would say the “race” – that made the country.¹⁰ The third source of identity consisted of post-Second-World-War immigrants.

Pearson's theory omits Anglos as flesh and blood people, unlike indigenous people and immigrants. They contributed nothing, he states, except for institutions and culture. Pearson would have us believe that democracy, technology, language, common law and Christianity came as disembodied spirits, that they were not carried in the minds of ordinary people. On the contrary, settlers from the British Isles were Australia's principal population for our entire history. British and other European settlers formed the demographic and cultural basis of the nation, from its origins in 1788 until well after the Second World War. Still today they form the core identity and cohesive bond of the nation. After all, it was mainly they who mapped, named and built Australia. Indigenous peoples were granted early citizenship in most of the colonies and over time added a unique texture to the emerging national identity.

The dehumanisation of Anglos appears to have been taken up by others. Gabrielle Appleby, professor of law at the University of New South Wales and leading legal proponent of the voice, discounts the existence of the Australian

⁸ Kenny, Chris (2023). 15 questions, now for the answers, *The Weekend Australian*, 11 February, p. 21. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/indigenous-voice-to-parliament-15-key-questions-answered/news-story/1e996b65527b14fc011e5cad72bf68b2>

⁹ Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Voice (2023). Who is involved. <https://voice.niaa.gov.au/who-involved#workinggroup>, accessed 11.3.2022.

¹⁰ Pearson, N. (2011). Constitutional reform crucial to indigenous wellbeing. *The Weekend Australian*, 24 December, p. 20. <https://capeyorkpartnership.org.au/noel-pearson-constitutional-reform-crucial-to-indigenous-wellbeing-the-australian/>, accessed 15.3.2023.

nation when she describes the Australian population as consisting of “settler and First Nation communities”.¹¹ Will Anglos and others who arrived in the last quarter millennium forever remain “settlers”? Do they not have any ingredients of indigeneity, no matter how many generations their families have lived here? Do ATSI peoples make up the only nations in Australia? Anglo-Australians have manifestly been moved by the sense of nationhood. Why else did they make sacrifices to fight the World Wars? The denial of Anglo peoplehood by Pearson and Appleby occurs all too commonly in the multicultural-approved indigenous movement. The denial’s withdrawal and repudiation will be necessary for genuine reconciliation.

As for Pearson’s third wave, it is true that the post-War migrants added to the nation’s culture, though they were the main beneficiaries of their migration. That’s why they came to Australia. The key point is that when the first post-War migrants arrived in the late 1940s, Australia had already been created through the sweat and toil of largely Anglo pioneers. As discussed in the final section, indigenous peoples participated in that nation-building project. The post-Second World War immigrants added to our culture and economy; they did not create the country. Australia had already fought two world wars, again with indigenous participation. Every city, every state, was already in place and flourishing. We were a leading nation in terms of material progress, civil liberties, per capita contributions to science and technology, and dignified treatment of the indigenous population. Our nation was not perfect. But it was a functioning whole that, like the United States, Canada and New Zealand, demonstrated once again that British Isles people could flourish in environments far removed from their mother country.

Another assumption hostile to Anglo-Australians is Pearson’s view that Australians do not like Aborigines. He claims this dislike is correlated with estrangement, that Australians do not like indigenous people despite not knowing them. But Pearson himself has explained that estrangement is often due to Aboriginal behaviour. His extensive writings on the nature of indigenous disability tend to contradict what he is now writing, because they suggest that the views most hostile to Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders come from those closest to them, those most familiar with their behaviour. It is true that many non-indigenous people are unfamiliar with indigenous-Australians. But they are often the ones most disposed to support them, at least they have done so by paying taxes for ATSI assistance and accepting the elevation of their formal sta-

¹¹ Gabrielle Appleby quoted in: Albrechtsen, Janet (2023). Dear voters, please read this letter to appreciate what ‘Yes’ will mean, *The Weekend Australian*, 8 April, p. 20. The full quote: “[constitutional change] may allow the voice, working with parliament, to be an alternative site for decision-making about how settler and First Nations communities can manage their shared (or conflicting) resources, institutions and spaces in ways that accommodate each community to the other.”

tus wrought by the Mabo decision and government policies. This has implications for the reconciliation process.

Pearson has characterised Aboriginal disability, from high rates of domestic violence, child neglect, crime, substance abuse, and poor educational outcomes, as comparable to that found in the Third World, despite Australia being a First World country. He and some other indigenous activists blame Anglos for causing maladaptive Aboriginal behaviour. He claims that the disability would be repaired if Anglos only voted for the voice, to allow indigenous-Australians to manage their own affairs.

Essentially the same argument was made by Pearson back in 2011 when he argued passionately for recognition of indigenous-Australians in the Constitution.¹² He now supports the voice and disparages recognition as mere window dressing. The new push is for power and sovereignty, though the arguments remain the same.

This claim needs to be distinguished from the more limited view that closing the Gap will be facilitated by government liaising with local communities. This claim has been well made by Senator Patrick Dodson with respect to crime by indigenous youth.¹³ Previous prime minister Scott Morrison expressed this view more broadly and perhaps too confidently: "This is not some political exercise. For us to close the gap on infant mortality in Indigenous communities, to reduce substance dependence, to reduce child abuse, to get kids in school, to ensure that we can improve maternal health, to get young people and their parents into jobs, to do that you have to work in partnership with local Indigenous communities."

Pearson's error is to imagine that Morrison's opinion is a proven fact, and that a constitutionally mandated voice would close the gap by forcing government to consult local indigenous communities. Such speculative confidence might have been sobered by the presence of independently-minded members of the committees that formulated the voice proposal, such as people with proven sympathy for indigenous-Australians who also advocated for white Australia.

Anglo interests have also been ignored on the Coalition side of the voice debate, in contrast to the care taken to consult Aboriginal spokesmen.

Long-time Liberal prime minister John Howard (1996-2007) conducted a referendum which asked, among other things, whether citizens supported recognising indigenous-Australians in a preamble to the Constitution. At no point in the debate did Howard also propose acknowledging the Anglo founders of the nation. He stated his view that Australia is a multi-racial nation unified by a common culture and common citizenship, without identifying the origins of those commonalities.

¹² Pearson, Noel (2011). Constitutional reform crucial to indigenous wellbeing.

¹³ Dodson, Patrick (2022). The deadly spiral of law-and-order 'solutions' has to stop. *The Weekend Australian*, 26 November, p. 24. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/the-deadly-spiral-of-law-and-order-solutions-has-to-stop/news-story/0dfd461de14ad90b9a0ef0c67442b20b>, accessed 19.2.2023.

Tony Abbott was Liberal prime minister from 2013 to 2015 and before that a minister in John Howard's government. His position on the voice proposal resembles Howard's, that it should be contained in a preamble to the Constitution, not in the legally-binding body of the document. Creditably, in 2014 Abbott appointed an advisory body whose terms of reference would have required it to consult not only indigenous people but the broader community, "because the constitution belongs to everyone". Abbott's plan for the acknowledgment process to consult non-indigenous peoples was dropped by his successor, Malcolm Turnbull, who was Australia's prime minister from 2015 until 2018. The result was that the process reverted to the previous Labor government's exclusive focus on indigenous interests, an approach that effectively disenfranchised Anglo-Australians and prevented genuine reciprocal reconciliation. However procedurally worthy, Abbott was hindered by a false notion of Australia's identity, perhaps due to the influence of Noel Pearson. Abbott improves on Pearson, because his version of the Anglo component appears to allow that they contributed not only institutions but demography and culture. He recommends the preamble:

"Whereas the people ... have agreed to unite in one indissoluble federal commonwealth, with an Indigenous heritage, a British foundation, and an immigrant character ..."¹⁴

Despite modification, this formulation is fatally burdened by Pearson's original error of scale. If anything, the lack of ambiguity in Abbott's version highlights the anachronism more than does Pearson's version. As discussed further in the final section, the Commonwealth's indigenous heritage is one of texture and identity, not economic, cultural, or demographic weight. The nation was forged largely by Anglo (and other European) settlers and their native-born children. Neither did Australia of 1901 have an "immigrant character" that was much different to an Anglo character. Any honest acknowledgement of national origins should dwell mainly on British settlement, while recognising the prior settlement and cultural input of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders and their interactions with the settlers.

These Liberal prime ministers were radically out of touch with the attitudes of Australia's founders, who knew and valued their ethnic identity. Unlike the nation's founders, they did not care about the dire fall in relative Anglo numbers and rank in the ethnic hierarchy. Nor did they care about, empirically or intuitively, the danger posed to democracy by rising ethnic diversity. This danger was apparent to observers such as philosopher John Stuart Mill and Australian politician Sir Henry Parkes in the nineteenth century and became more apparent

¹⁴ Abbott, Tony (2022). Pass or fail, this referendum will surely leave us worse off, *The Weekend Australian*, 5 November, p. 16. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/pass-or-fail-this-referendum-will-surely-leave-us-worse-off/news-story/761616d76aaa8e5e308ed9ce1d04c8ba>, accessed 2.2.2023.

in the years after the Second World War. Their view was confirmed scientifically around the end of the twentieth century.¹⁵ The replacement of Anglo-Australia could not have occurred without the failure of Liberal “conservative” leadership.

Even No campaigner Nyunggai Warren Mundine, himself of Aboriginal heritage and no client of the multicultural establishment, proposes acknowledging migrants as well as indigenous-Australians, but not Anglos. Neither Mundine or other No proponents thought to consult, let alone recognise, the people who created modern Australia and formed the self-consciously Anglo nation that made the Commonwealth.¹⁶

The abandonment of Anglo-Australia by political elites provides grounds for sympathising with voice exponents. Neither Anglos, Aborigines, or Torres Strait Islanders are recognised by the present Constitution.

A typical conservative criticism of the proposed voice is that it would sully Australia’s constitution. They assert that the constitution has been a great success, so why change it? This is largely true, but does not fully answer the indigenous complaint that the constitution ignores their foundational role. Consider commentator Greg Sheridan’s criticism of the voice:

“An Australian citizen who is a Chinese immigrant from Hong Kong, or an Indian immigrant from Kolkata, or a Hmong hill tribesman from Laos who took out Australian citizenship one day ago, as a citizen is just as good as me, and just as good as Aboriginal Australians.”¹⁷

What Sheridan probably meant is true, that as a matter of law, all citizens have equal rights. But the imprecision of his language betrays a much larger assumption, because “just as good” also encompasses the meaning “of equal value or importance to the nation”. In that sense, the assertion is plainly false. Just as members of ethnic minorities can be expected to celebrate and defend

¹⁵ Mill, J. S. (1960/1861). Chapter XVI: On nationality, as connected to representative government. *Representative government. Three essays by John Stuart Mill*. J. S. Mill. London, Oxford University Press: 380-388, pp. 381-382.

Mill’s view that ethnic diversity harms democracy was shared by Sir Henry Parkes, father of Australian federation. See: Salter, F. K. (2020). Sir Henry Parkes’s liberal-ethnic nationalism, *Sydney Trads: Weblog of the Sydney Traditionalist Forum*, 18 December. <https://sydneytrads.com/2020/12/18/sir-henry-parkess-liberal-ethnic-nationalism/>

Calwell, A. A. (1978/1972). *Be just and fear not*. Adelaide, Rigby.

Berghe, P. L. v. d. (1981). *The ethnic phenomenon*. New York, Elsevier.

Salter, F. K. (2018). The biosocial study of ethnicity. *The Oxford handbook of evolution, biology, and society*. R. L. Hopcroft. New York, Oxford University Press: 543-568 [selected pages available at <https://www.amazon.com/Handbook-Evolution-Biology-Society-Handbooks/dp/0190299320>].

¹⁶ Karp, P. (2023). Voice to parliament no campaign to push for recognition of migrants as well as Indigenous people, *The Guardian*, 29 January. <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2023/jan/29/voice-to-parliament-no-campaign-to-push-for-recognition-of-migrants-as-well-as-indigenous-people>, accessed 31.1.2023.

¹⁷ Sheridan, Greg (2022). Liberalism equals equality, *The Weekend Australian*, 26 November, p. 24. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/racebased-voice-a-dagger-to-the-heart-of-liberalism/news-story/4849bcb6296f5109d25b842107b1c241>, accessed 20.1.2023.

their shared identities, so nations consist of psychological ties cued by shared identity. That is why the distinctions between ethnies, nations, and states (in Section 3) are so important for an understanding of the national question.

Citizenship is not as good at creating social cohesion as are national ties. However, Sheridan is right to the extent that the Constitution does not challenge official levelling through citizenship. The administrative state seeks to reduce the national ties of culture, history, and kinship to possession of a legal document. In the eyes of multi-cultural ideologues, memberships issued yesterday by administrative fiat are “just as good” as ancient affiliations. The Constitution does not acknowledge that Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders were the first inhabitants and that they contributed to national country and identity. In doing so it is not singling-out indigenous peoples. The Constitution has no favourites. It does not even recognise the leading historical role played by the Anglo creators of the Australian nation, the Commonwealth, and the Constitution itself. The Constitution is as cavalier towards community and belonging as its champion Greg Sheridan, who once quipped that Anglo-Australia had undergone “benign cultural genocide”.¹⁸ In reality, it is surely reasonable for any people or nation to wish to avoid cultural genocide, benign or otherwise. Whether viewed through indigenous or Anglo eyes, the Constitution is a cold-blooded document that has afforded the nation inadequate protection against ruthless elites.

Much as a prosecution needs a defence lawyer to achieve fairness, Anglo-Australians need champions who are willing to take their side in the voice argument. Freedom rests on balancing adversarial relations in politics, business, and culture. Monopolies rest on eliminating or preventing adversaries. They tend to be oppressive. The revolutionary demographic change afflicting many Western countries could not have occurred had the majority’s ethnic interests been represented in politics and culture. Similarly, the inverted ethnic hierarchy imposed by multicultural regimes could not have arisen or been sustained if governments had not turned against the founding ethnicity. This is perhaps the reason why political multiculturalism has been authoritarian, for example in “anti-hate” laws, censorship, and most recently cancellation by Big Tech social media platforms and payment systems. Tolerance of majority identity and expression would have moderated extremist replacement ideology.

All ethnic groups with a stake in Australia’s Constitution should be treated as flesh-and-blood people with interests of life, dignity, and demographic continuity. Advocates of Anglo interests have been effectively silenced in the present debate over an indigenous voice. The same has been true for decades concerning public discussion of ethnic affairs in general.

¹⁸ Sheridan, G. (2014). Constitutional change will divide not unite the nation, *The Australian*, 20 September.

5. CONTEXT, PART 2: THE EXCLUSION OF ANGLOS FROM ETHNIC POLITICS IN GENERAL

The absence of Anglo-Australian advocates in the voice consultative process is part of a broader pattern of exclusion and subordination. As noted earlier, Paul Kelly called out prime minister Albanese for minimising public consultation on the voice proposal.¹⁹ One might add that this has been true of tactics used for decades against Anglo-Australians with respect to ethnic affairs – immigration, multiculturalism, and indigenous relations.

The ethnic bias against Anglo-Australia was obvious to historian Geoffrey Blainey by the 1980s. Blainey noted that Australia's immigration policy "gives the tiny Asian portion of the Australian population four of every ten migrant places."²⁰ This correctly implied that immigration of fellow ethnics is a benefit, a gift, to the receiving group. Political scientist David Brown has explained that Anglo-Australia's relative demographic and political decline since the 1970s has been due to it losing Commonwealth support.²¹ Blainey also concluded that the ideology of multiculturalism was based on a double standard. When Anglo-Celtic Australians showed the same ethnic preference as minorities, they were denounced as racists.²²

Post-WWII immigration was facilitated by a bipartisan agreement between the major parties to keep immigration off the political agenda.²³ That bipartisanship was aligned with public sentiment. Australians knew that traditional restrictions applied. After the experience of the War, most agreed that the country had to, as the saying went, "populate or perish". However, the bipartisan agreement among the major political parties remained intact even as they shifted policy away from majority preference and began to cater to minorities. Immigration policy has become administratively imposed, as documented by Catherine Betts in her 1999 text, *The Great Divide*.²⁴ Multiculturalism was also imposed bureaucratically, as shown by Mark Lopez in his 2000 book, *The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics 1945-1975*.²⁵ Multiculturalism's official public face, of free cultural expression and association, of some light cultural seasoning, is a forgotten fantasy. The reality takes the form of the draconian Section 18c of

¹⁹ Kelly, Paul (2023). Albanese's flawed voice fails the test, *The Weekend Australian*, 25 march, pp. 17, 20. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/anthony-albaneses-flawed-indigenous-voice-to-parliament-fails-the-test/news-story/d96cd012a35919935dd0847d65c86f76>

²⁰ Blainey, G. (1984). *All for Australia*. North Ryde, Australia, Methuen Haynes, p. 167.

²¹ Brown, David (2000). *Contemporary nationalism. Civic, ethnocultural and multicultural politics*. London, Routledge.

²² Blainey, G. (1994). Melting pot on the boil. *The Bulletin*, 30 August, pp. 22-25, p. 25

²³ Tavan, G. (2005). *The long, slow death of white Australia*. Melbourne, Scribe, p. 229.

²⁴ Betts, K. (1999). *The great divide*. Sydney, Duffy & Snellgrove.

²⁵ Lopez, M. (2000). *The origins of multiculturalism in Australian politics 1945-1975*. Melbourne, Melbourne University Press.

the Racial Discrimination Act and immigrant mono-cultures growing across our cities.

When Geoffrey Blainey began writing about immigration, Bob Hawke was prime minister. In 1993 Hawke indicated that he and his predecessors on both sides of politics had adopted a bipartisan policy – an “implicit pact” – to impose non-European immigration on Australians despite the public not endorsing the policy. They had done so by keeping the issue off the agenda.²⁶ That implied that the pact included the mainstream media, academia, and corporations. Sociologist Katherine Betts attributed the pact to the shared ideology of tertiary-educated professionals who ignored popular discontent with diverse immigration.²⁷

The previous prime minister, Malcolm Fraser (1975-1983), confirmed Hawke’s approach, writing in his memoirs that Australians should never be given the opportunity to vote on immigration because in the past they had favoured immigrants close to their own identity.²⁸ Fraser was on the other side of mainstream politics to Hawke, but they both approved of excluding majorities from consultation about ethnic policy – to do with indigenous affairs, immigration, and multiculturalism.

The demographic transformation of Australia since the 1970s has not been due to reasoned public debate and democratically decided policy. Across the English-speaking world, ethnic politics has been conducted using culture war tactics aimed at suppressing Anglo identity.²⁹

The cultural establishment remains oblivious to Anglo interests but firmly supportive of minority empowerment. Observers note that all elite sectors support the voice proposal. Journalist Chris Kenny, who supports the voice, admits that “the bureaucracy, educational institutions, digital giants, corporate ESG activists, and public broadcasters” are sympathetic to the voice proposal.³⁰ Another journalist, veteran columnist Paul Kelly, observes the extraordinary consensus among elites that the voice referendum must pass:

²⁶ Collins, Carolyn; and Eccleston, Roy. Pact with Libs dictated policy, says Hawke, *The Australian*, 25 May 1993.

²⁷ Collins and Eccleston, Pact with Libs. Betts, *The great divide*.

²⁸ Fraser, M. (2003). *Common ground: Issues that should bind and not divide us*. Camberwell, Victoria, Penguin, p. 250.

²⁹ Kaufmann, Eric (2018). *Whiteshift: Populism, immigration, and the future of white majorities*, London: Penguin.

³⁰ Kenny, Chris (2023). 15 questions, now for the answers, *The Weekend Australian*, 11 February, p. 21. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/indigenous-voice-to-parliament-15-key-questions-answered/news-story/1e996b65527b14fc011e5cad72bf68b2>
Law professor Allan James confirms the bias of the universities.

Allan, James (2023). Conservatives on campus hit the wall of censor sensibility, *The Weekend Australian*, 4 February, p. 15. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/conservatives-on-campus-hit-the-wall-of-censor-sensibility/news-story/47a9e0e8b388dcc38090de3ed3a266d5>

“Our elites have come together – political, corporate, financial, university, media, sporting, trade union and religious – to persuade and intimidate the Australian people to put an Indigenous voice into the Constitution.”³¹

The same elites are as one in supporting multicultural dogma, which includes the imperative of excluding Anglos from participation in ethnic politics.

³¹ Kelly, Paul (2023). Deception is no path to reconciliation, *The Weekend Australian*, 27 May, pp. 17, 20. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/division-is-no-path-to-reconciliation-via-the-indigenous-voice-to-parliament/news-story/b48c599822686f80098a83d05722b57f>

6. CONTEXT, PART 3: THE STOLEN COMMONWEALTH

Exclusion from the voice process and from ethnic politics in general has contributed to Anglo-Australians being stripped of their special ties to the Commonwealth, an institution they created. Losing ownership of and special status within the Commonwealth effectively cut their lifeline and set them on the path to demographic replacement.

In democracies the majority are supposed to control policy, as was once the case in Australia regarding immigration. Minority rights are protected but they do not rule. In terms of David Brown's theory, the anti-white emphasis of immigration policy has been facilitated by the Commonwealth switching its loyalty from the founding majority to ethnic minorities. Under the Immigration Restriction Act 1901, the Anglo majority was "politically licensed" by the state in a manner consistent with democratic principles. Multiculturalism transfers this licence to minorities instead.³²

The Anglophobia of the Commonwealth after it succumbed to the cultural revolution of the 1960s and 1970s has been apparent. Poet Les Murray expressed the subordination of Anglos in his volume, *Subhuman Redneck Poems*:

"They are creating an Australia that is exclusive. Multicultural, they call it. But they are discriminatory; they exclude. They are the ruling elite of today's Australia: the cultural bureaucrats, the academics, the intellectuals . . . They are excluding people like me from their Australia—the country people, the red-necks, the Anglo-Celts, the farming people—they have turned their backs on us. They act as though they despise us . . . We Old Australians, not always Anglo but having no other country but this one, are now mostly caught and silenced between the indigenous and the multicultural."³³

In 1900, on the eve of the Commonwealth's birth, the Australian people saw that structure as their instrument of self-government. For decades the colonies had their own parliaments and administrative arms. The Commonwealth would mean something more – *national* independence, an institution designed to defend the new continent-wide nation's collective interests in trade, diplomacy, defence, and immigration. That instrument, which now informally extends to the cultural, media, and financial establishments, was lost in the 1960s and 1970s to the counter-culture spreading throughout the universities and mass media. The loss of proportional control over the Commonwealth meant that national independence was compromised. Anglo-Australians became a defeated people, though the cultural war against them had never been formally declared.

³² Brown, David (2000). *Contemporary nationalism*, pp. 139-40.

³³ Murray, L. (1997). *Subhuman redneck poems*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux. Quoted in Paul Sheehan, 1998, *Among the Barbarians: The Dividing of Australia*, Random House, Milsons Point, p. 141.

Constitutional law academic Andrew Fraser concluded a decade ago that Anglo-Australians were being dispossessed of the Commonwealth they created, that they were on-track to become a stateless people and a minority.³⁴ By then, Anglo school children were being indoctrinated to dislike their ancestors and their nation. Public broadcasting catered to minority interests. SBS television, which served immigrant communities, was a free-to-air media network, as now is National Indigenous TV (NITV). The channel is expressly dedicated to serve ATSI people, despite its audience being only 4 percent of the population. The Anglo majority has no partisan mainstream media platform at all. The Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) has leant towards the Anglophobic left since its news and current affairs division was captured by Marxists in the 1960s.³⁵

By 1981 the senior public service was displaying Anglophobic tendencies. In that year the NSW Department of Aboriginal Affairs published a paper by Peter Read it had commissioned. The paper would become a foundational document of the “Stolen Generation” thesis, a name invented by Read, who appears to be an Anglo-Australian. The report was titled, *The Stolen Generations: The removal of Aboriginal children in New South Wales 1883 to 1969*. Whatever the document’s merits, it is also plainly racist in its treatment of white Australians. For example, its opening paragraph contains these words:

“White people have never been able to leave Aborigines alone. Children particularly have suffered. Missionaries, teachers, government officials have believed that the best way to make black people behave like white people was to get hold of the children who had not yet learned Aboriginal lifeways. They thought that children’s minds were like a kind of blackboard on which the European secrets could be written.”³⁶

Among other defects, this is an appalling breach of scholarly and civilised standards. The first words are Anglophobic, consisting of a categorical accusation about white people. The words also ignore the humanitarian motivations of missionaries and others in contact with indigenous communities. Read pretended that Aboriginal communities did not have problems such as neglect and abuse of children.³⁷ The public would have reasonably expected a balanced, unprejudiced report from the government.

The implications are sobering. As early as 1981 the NSW government bureaucracy was partly infiltrated by Anglophobic ideologues. That a document

³⁴ Fraser, Andrew (2011). *The WASP question: An essay on the biocultural evolution, present predicament, and future prospects of the invisible race*. London, Arktos.

³⁵ Inglis, Ken S. (1983). *This is the ABC: The Australian Broadcasting Commission 1932-1983*, Black Inc.

³⁶ Read, Peter (1981/2006). *The Stolen Generations: The removal of Aboriginal children in New South Wales 1883 to 1969*. Surry Hills, NSW Department of Aboriginal Affairs.

³⁷ Read's shoddy scholarship has been exposed recently by Doug Brown, a retired public servant: Brown, Doug (2022). The fictional history of Peter Read, *Quadrant*, 5 September.

<https://quadrant.org.au/magazine/2022/09/the-fictional-history-of-peter-read/>, accessed 12.5.2023.

as manifestly racist as this should have been published by a government bureaucracy raises questions. Which other departments had been infiltrated? Was the department of education affected at this stage? Was this a natural consequence of the political bias of the universities or were there other sources involved? Did any politicians or bureaucrats or journalists or academics object to the document's racism or general emotionality?

The Stolen Generation is discussed further in Section 7.

The rise of the multicultural deep state explains the disconnect between the loud complaints about indigenous disadvantage and the total silence concerning the wholesale assault on Anglo-Australia.

The proposed voice bears a striking resemblance to the 2007 UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), which Australia ratified in 2009.³⁸ The resemblance is not surprising, because UNDRIP was a master document to the *Report of the Expert Panel on Constitutional Recognition of Indigenous Australians*, released in 2012.³⁹ This is evidence of foreign globalist influence on the voice process. UNDRIP epitomises the top-down character of the voice proposal, which has elite origins, not grassroot ones.

UNDRIP is cited in reverential tones by voice proponents, such as June Oscar, since 2017 the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner. Oscar states:

"The Declaration is the most comprehensive tool we have available to advance and protect the rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. I use the Declaration as my guide as Social Justice Commissioner."⁴⁰

The first principle praised in the Declaration is "self-determination", not for ethnic groups in general, and not for Anglo-Australia with their track record of self government, but for indigenous peoples only. Predictably, the establishment is invested in the document. For example, the Law Council of Australia accuses Australia – by which it means white Australians – of horrific treatment of indigenous people, and calls for UNDRIP to be fully adopted.⁴¹

Yet the Declaration is riddled with self-contradictions, tendentious definitions, and racist demands, just the sort of flaws that should be apparent to legal

³⁸ Clegg, Louise (2023). Legal implications should send a shiver up our spines, *The Weekend Australian*, 11 February, p. 20. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/legal-implications-over-indigenous-voice-to-parliament-should-give-us-the-chills/news-story/aea435f0d2baf416d6659caec257741>

³⁹ Expert Panel on Constitutional Recognition of Indigenous Australians (2012). *Recognising Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in the Constitution. Report of the Expert Panel –* <https://www.indigenousjustice.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/mp/files/resources/files/12-01-16-indigenous-recognition-expert-panel-report.pdf>. Canberra, Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs.

⁴⁰ (2021). UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Australian Human Rights Commission, <https://humanrights.gov.au/our-work/aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-social-justice/projects/un-declaration-rights>, accessed 21.4.2023.

⁴¹ Law Council of Australia (2022). Australia must formally adopt UN Declaration on Rights of Indigenous People, 8 July. <https://www.lawcouncil.asn.au/media/media-releases/australia-must-formally-adopt-un-declaration-on-rights-of-indigenous-people>, accessed 21.4.2023.

minds. It declares against national rights and in favour of indigenous rights.⁴² This was the reason the Howard Coalition government refused to ratify the document in 2007. In effect UNDRIP advocates a form of minority ethnic supremacism. There is more. As the following examples show, the Declaration asserts the indigenous right to discriminate against the majority, in Australia's case, Anglos. And it privileges indigenous ethnic loyalty over national loyalty, as revealed by the following content:

Article 16(1) declares the indigenous right to "establish their own media in their own languages" while enjoying full and equal access to non-indigenous media. This right can only be exercised by discriminating to form organisations along ethnic lines, through preferentially employing indigenous people and determining media content. Indigenous people are to have their own media, while retaining the right to join non-indigenous media. This is not a formula for equity of opportunity.

Article 20 declares the right of indigenous peoples to "maintain and develop their political, economic and social systems or institutions". Article 23 declares the indigenous right to determine their development priorities and to administer their health, housing and other economic and social programs "through their own institutions". These rights mean nothing if they do not allow the indigenous to discriminate when hiring staff and associates. At the same time, the UN International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination condemns such discrimination by Western majorities.

Articles 35 to 37 come close to demanding state sovereignty for indigenous peoples. Article 35 declares the right of "Indigenous peoples ... to determine the responsibilities of individuals to their communities". Authoritative prescription of responsibilities of people is normally a state power. That power cannot be ethnically directed without categorical treatment by ethnicity, such as excluding people from employment and right of membership. Article 37 goes further in the direction of statehood by entitling indigenous peoples to recognise, observe and enforce treaties and agreements made with states and to have the latter honour those arrangements.

Other articles of UNDRIP evoke the Aboriginal industry's open-ended ethnocentric goals. Article 26 declares the indigenous right to "lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used or acquired", without reference to history or the rights or interests of other citizens individually or collectively.

⁴² Salter, F. K. (2014). The misguided case for indigenous recognition in the Constitution. Part II: Race and the culture wars. *Quadrant* 58(1): 32-40. <https://quadrant.org.au/magazine/2014/01-02/misguided-case-indigenous-recognition-constitution-part-ii/>, accessed 10.5.2023.
Reprinted in: Salter, F. K. (2018). *The Aboriginal question: Australian racial politics of indigenous recognition and Anglo de-recognition. Collected essays II*, Social Technologies, Sydney.

Like the Australian voice proposals, the UN Declaration does not limit indigenous rights by time or culture. No mention is made of accepted international laws of possession that operated in past centuries. The declared rights are not limited to peoples recently colonised or who retain their indigenous traditions and attachment to the land, as did the High Court in its *Mabo* decision.

These are some of the outcomes intended by UNDRIP, the master document of the voice proposal. Anglo-Australians should pay close attention because UNDRIP's policies are invidious for founding ethnicities. They would exclude Anglo-Australians from pursuing group interests altogether, while urging minorities to lobby for their own ethnic advantage within the multicultural system. Despite being the core of Australian national identity, the Declaration denies Anglo-Australians the right to organise in their own interests or to maintain territorial integrity. Though produced by professed anti-racists, UNDRIP is intended to be an instrument of minority ethnic nationalism directed especially against Western societies. Australia has been too willing to lend its support to United Nations declarations and treaties that offend against truth and undermine social cohesion.

Context is important. Anglo-Australians who are alert to their people's needs might look more favourably on an indigenous voice to parliament if Australia had a manageable and stable level of ethnic diversity; if Anglo-Australians felt confident as the undisputed majority-founding culture; if they were not being rapidly displaced from that status by government immigration policy; if they retained democratic control of the Commonwealth ethnic policy; if their children were not being indoctrinated in the schools against their own people; if they were able to express their ethnic interests without being persecuted by the mainstream media or by UN-mandated "human rights" agencies; if large swathes of land had not been alienated to indigenous sovereignty far beyond the High Court's *Mabo* decision; and of special relevance here, if the indigenous rights movement was mostly a loyal partner of the Anglo nation; or if the radical wing of that movement had not allied itself with the Anglo-hating multicultural left. However, none of these conditions apply.

The reality is very different. The demand for an indigenous voice is being made at a time when Anglo-Australia is under siege, when we have been marginalised, defamed, and hounded in the country our ancestors built.

Being targeted by the state apparatus is not unusual globally. State-sponsored persecution of ethnicities and religions frequently occurs in diverse societies. Ethnic competition is a major cause of conflict and poverty around the world. Australia is in a better condition because, though conflict has been on the rise since its traditional immigration policy was abandoned around 1970, the country is still wealthy.

It is in this context that the likely operation of an indigenous voice must be evaluated. Whatever its merits and demerits, the voice proposal must also be evaluated according to criteria of national and therefore Anglo interests if bitter divisions are to be avoided.

It is not good enough that the only stakeholders acknowledged by the multicultural state are minorities and their supporters. In this instance, they seek to privilege indigenous citizens. The reality is that all citizens, indigenous and otherwise, are stakeholders in the good governance of the Commonwealth.

7. STAKEHOLDERS REAL, ALLEGED, AND IGNORED

Who has a stake in the proposed voice? To answer that question requires a typology of stakeholders. To be discussed are four categories – individual citizens, Australia’s many ethnic groups, in particular Aborigines, Torres Strait Islanders, and Anglo-Australians, and the multicultural movement.

The population as a whole has a shared interest in the country being effectively governed, in maintaining social cohesion, and in retaining the Commonwealth’s territory. This general interest extends to members of Australia’s many ethnic groups, who have collective stakes in protecting and growing their groups, because those groups are sources of identity, cultural and genetic kinship, and relatively intense altruism, an important basis of community in multicultural societies.⁴³ All citizens have a stake in the Constitution at the individual, family, ethnic and national levels.

In addition to general interests, Anglo- and indigenous-Australians have a special stake in Australia because they are its founding peoples. They make up the core identity of those Australians who have greater emotional and proprietorial investment in the homeland and in the institution of the Commonwealth. Affection and feelings of ownership are consistent with a greater sense of responsibility.

The proprietorial status of small minorities such as ATSI peoples can only be defended by participating in a powerful alliance, such as with the Commonwealth or the nation. For Anglo-Australians, democratic control of the Commonwealth has depended on remaining the super-majority. This affected civil liberties, because the more secure a majority feels, the more liberal it can afford to be. Now that Anglos are becoming a minority, liberal democracy is being compromised by the multicultural strategy of imposing draconian controls on speech and freedom of association.

Not all of these interests are recognised.

Conservatives recognise the general interest of good governance, but fail to comprehend the special stake of the founding peoples. Somewhat inconsistently, they can see a point in recognising indigenous-Australians but it never seems to have crossed their minds that Anglo interests are also worthy of recognition.

Stakeholders are perceived differently by the multicultural establishment, which is politically represented by elements of the Liberal Party and the present Labor government. The multiculturalists advocate what they claim are collective indigenous interests, which they pitch against an allegedly deep-seated white racism. This adds an Anglophobic sting to the narrative shared with conserva-

⁴³ Salter, F. K. (2007/2003). *On genetic interests: Family, ethnicity, and humanity in an age of mass migration*. New Brunswick, N.J., Transaction Publishers.

tives, that Anglos have no legitimate collective interests, such as keeping a democratic share of influence over ethnic policy (indigenous affairs, immigration, and multiculturalism). The same perspective directs the establishment's strategy of seeking coalition with immigrant communities. The multicultural movement applies the victim narrative to Aborigines and immigrants alike, pitting both against Anglo-Australia as the common enemy.

The multicultural movement is a vehicle for various interests – utopian socialist ideology, corporate globalism, minority tribalism, and political entrepreneurs. From the start, multiculturalism has been a coalition between the radical left and various ethnic minorities. This union of opposites – cosmopolitan left-liberals and the tribal right – has only cohered due to shared opposition to the Anglo majority. Hence the hostility towards white interests on the part of states influenced by multiculturalism, a trend also present in American multiculturalism.⁴⁴

Those driving the multicultural movement have never been large in number. They are elitist, with allies in government, the universities, and in the mainstream media. Multiculturalists constitute an element of the establishment that has been influential in culture and politics since the 1970s. Though many are Anglos, they are alienated from that population, its history and the nation it created. The multicultural establishment threatens both general and national interests. It mentors Aboriginal clients who share its goals, and by doing so helps radicalise them. Due to their alienation from the nation, multicultural elites behave as if they have less at stake in good governance.

Some of these points are fleshed out in the remainder of this section.

All Australians are stakeholders in the good governance of Australia. Aborigines, Torres Strait Islanders, and Anglo-Australians have the additional interest of being at the heart of national identity and ties to homeland. That is also true of immigrant communities that have acculturated or assimilated to the mainstream. However, many immigrants are so recently arrived that Australia is not yet in their memories or hearts, as was the case with British arrivals in the early decades of colonisation.

The indigenous sense of ownership derives from long occupation and resulting deep familiarity and spiritual connection with country. The Anglo sense of ownership also derives from occupation and familiarity, though usually not of spiritual intensity. By the second half of the nineteenth century, many white settlers had developed an intimate affinity with and sense of belonging to the countryside, as expressed in the Heidelberg School of art.⁴⁵ There are additional dimensions of the Anglo stake in Australia. Anglos and other mostly

⁴⁴ Kaufmann, Eric (2004). *The rise and fall of Anglo-America*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, p. 193.

⁴⁵ Allen, Christopher (2023). History wars behind Australiana, *The Weekend Australian Review*, 6 May, pp. 18-19.

white settlers largely created the nation, its culture, farms, industry, roads and towns, established the six self-governing colonies and in January 1901 their own Federal Commonwealth, all under the British crown. These governmental structures were intended in part to perpetuate the founders' national interests, at first British, then Anglo-Australian. The nation began and remained for much of its existence as an expression of Anglo identity and demography, textured by a distinct input from the indigenous peoples.

Australia's British origins are obvious in the historical record, yet denial of Anglos as stakeholders in the country's governance is repeated across the political spectrum, even by commentators as inclusive in their thinking as Frank Brennan, a Jesuit priest, human rights lawyer, and professor of law at the Australian Catholic University. In an article titled "Voice to parliament: look for wording all stakeholders can support", Brennan names just three stakeholders: indigenous people, parliament, and "the nation".⁴⁶ The last concept includes all ethnicities but does not, in Brennan's usage, imply any in particular. He approvingly quotes Murry Gleeson, a member of the Referendum Council and retired High Court justice. Gleeson asked: "How does it offend some principle of equality now to provide that, in recognition of the unique position of Indigenous people in the nation's history, parliament shall establish a representative body which has a particular function of giving advice about such laws?" In other words, it is a sufficient justification for a voice that indigenous-Australians have a special position in Australia's history, presumably a position that includes a special relationship with the land and the experience of dispossession.

Gleeson and Brennan fail to notice that the people who created the nation and still constitute its core identity and taxpayer base also have a unique position in Australia's history. As such they have a large stake in the country's governance and in the Constitution in particular. Furthermore, they identify with Australia as their homeland and are undergoing dispossession. The exclusion of Anglos from consideration as stakeholders does indeed offend an obvious principle of equality.

The inequality remains if the voice proposal is moderated, as suggested by Brennan. In his view, the voice's wording in the Constitution should be reduced to the minimum requirement: "There shall be an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Voice with such structure and functions as the parliament deems necessary to facilitate consultation prior to the making of special laws with respect to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, and with such other functions as the parliament determines." This wording still unfairly privileges indigenous- over Anglo-Australians, who have no such recognition or representation.

⁴⁶ Brennan, Frank (2023). Voice to parliament: look for wording all stakeholders can support, *The Weekend Australian*, 25 February, p. 21. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/voice-to-parliament-look-for-wording-all-stakeholders-can-support/news-story/bf3f1abf0a05899d2d6f8c44eadc094a>

Australia has many politicians who openly advocate for Aboriginal interests but not one who advocates expressly for Anglo interests.

The alienation of the Commonwealth from its founding people should be taken as a warning. Anglo-Australians have a stake in resisting any systematic change, such as a constitutional amendment, that further alienates them from their Commonwealth. All Australians have a stake in effective constitutional government, and Anglos are the first and largest such stakeholders. Though they no longer comprise the overwhelming majority of the Australian population, as citizens and as a large ethnic group, they have a vital interest in preserving the Commonwealth. At the same time they have a special interest in reversing the Commonwealth's hostility to them, rekindling its even-handedness and, where appropriate, having it recognise them as the founding people.

Indigenous Australians share many of the same interests as Anglos. It is not in their or any citizens' interests to disrupt constitutional government or harm national identity or unity. All citizens have an interest in the cohesion bestowed by national identity, which originates in the founding ethnicity.⁴⁷ Additionally, ATSI people have an interest in being recognised as founding contributors to that identity.

The interests of small minorities such as ATSI peoples rests on the maintenance of strong allies, including liberal democratic states such as the Australian Commonwealth. Until recent decades, Anglo-Australians assumed they could rely on overwhelming numbers to defend their domestic group interests. This has changed with their declining numbers, and they now have an interest in participating in the multicultural system, or rather the normative, theoretical model, not the present Anglophobic ethnic-hierarchical reality. Genuine multiculturalism should be attractive to Anglos and Aborigines alike because they have a stake in being heard instead of silenced, acknowledged instead of ignored.

Indigenous Australians grapple with issues of status and dignity, but it is not at all clear that a constitutionally mandated voice would make a difference. There are also extreme demands made by some that would, if successful, endanger stable governance and national unity. The proposed voice is an example.

It is significant that the voice proposal does not come from Aborigines alone. It is also a project of the multicultural establishment and the same elite that has, for decades, disregarded the interests of Australia's Anglo founders. Indigenous activists' connection with peak multicultural bodies has produced extreme demands such as the irredentist voice proposal. Irredentism is the aspiration to reclaim lost territory. It has been a perennial source of tribal and national conflict. Far left agitation of indigenous grievance was documented by ex-Communist Geoff McDonald in his 1982 book, *Red over Black: Behind the Aboriginal*

⁴⁷ Smith, A. D. (1986). *The ethnic origins of nations*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Land Rights. The sophisticated lawyers hired to argue for land rights also contributed anti-white defamation, wrapped in abstruse leftist theorising.⁴⁸

Paul Keating provided another historical link between Anglophobic multiculturalism and the Aboriginal rights movement. In the 1990s the Keating Labor government added the Orwellian Section 18C to the Racial Discrimination Act. Elite multiculturalists formulated and lobbied for the amendment.⁴⁹ The Labor Party had pioneered political multiculturalism during the Whitlam years, and also advanced indigenous policy that promoted separatism and self-government. Subsequent administrations – led by Malcolm Fraser, Bob Hawke, and Paul Keating – continued to pursue radical multicultural and indigenous policy.⁵⁰ On the indigenous side, Keating delivered the Anglophobic Redfern Park Speech in 1992, blaming the Gap on white settlement. His government also passed the Native Title Act 1993 that facilitated indigenous people claiming a third of the continent by expanding and codifying the High Court’s Mabo decision.⁵¹ Behind the scenes was senior bureaucrat Herbert “Nugget” Coombs (1906-1997). Following his doctoral training at the Fabian-Socialist inspired London School of Economics, Coombs became a radical influence within Federal politics from the 1940s to the 1970s, well after his retirement. Coombs’s far-left utopian vision for Australia encompassed multiculturalism and indigenous separatism.⁵²

Further evidence of multicultural support for Aboriginal nationalism is the backing given to the Uluru Statement by nine community organisations, including the major body, the Federation of Ethnic Communities’ Councils of Australia (FECCA). FECCA is an immigrant-based organisation that supports the voice referendum.⁵³ Diverse religious groups have also come out in support of the 2018 2017 Uluru Statement from the Heart, which proposed a voice to parliament, including the Catholic, Uniting, and Anglican churches, the Australian National Council of Imams, and the Executive Council of Australian Jewry. Other reli-

⁴⁸ McDonald, Geoff (1982). *Red over black. Behind the Aboriginal land rights*. Bullsbrook, West. Australia, Veritas Publishing Company, p. 36.

⁴⁹ Richardson, H. and F. K. Salter (2023). *Anglophobia: The unrecognised hatred*. Sydney, Social Technologies, Create Space, p. 106.

⁵⁰ Windschuttle, Keith (2016). *The break-up of Australia: The real agenda behind Aboriginal recognition*. Sydney, Quadrant Books, pp. 299-300.

⁵¹ Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (2022). About native title, <https://aiatsis.gov.au/about-native-title>, accessed 8 May 2023. An example of expansion of Mabo is provision for compensation based on the Racial Discrimination Act 1975.

⁵² Deane, William (1997). *Eulogy for Dr H.C. 'Nugget' Coombs*, Sydney, 14 November 1997, Parliament of Australia, <https://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=Id:%22media/pressrel/ZBN30%22>, accessed 8.5.2023. Deane Williams was Governor General from 1996 to 2001.

⁵³ Karp, Paul (2023). Voice to parliament no campaign to push for recognition of migrants as well as Indigenous people, *The Guardian*, 29 January. <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2023/jan/29/voice-to-parliament-no-campaign-to-push-for-recognition-of-migrants-as-well-as-indigenous-people>, accessed 31.1.2023.

gions that adopted this position were Australian Sikhs, Buddhists, Hindus and the National Council of Churches.⁵⁴

Comprehensive research was not located, but it seems that the overwhelming majority of multicultural groups support the referendum. Further evidence is that during the consultation process leading to the voice proposal, whites contributed about 90 percent of submissions to the National Co-Design Group appointed in 2020 by the Morrison government. About 80 percent of Co-Design Group surveys were completed by whites.⁵⁵

The only multicultural group observed to declare against the voice referendum has been the private organisation, the Australian Jewish Association, which has been criticised by voice supporter Mark Leibler as an extreme conservative group.⁵⁶

Indigenous voice advocates are mainly drawn from the urban Aboriginal elite.⁵⁷ Such individuals often have had personal or professional connections with leading multiculturalists. Examples include Professor Marcia Langton and Noel Pearson. Both have categorically vilified Anglo-Australians.⁵⁸

Professor Marcia Langton has been an Aboriginal activist for decades. She was invited to give the prestigious Boyer Lectures in 2012, and has been fully accepted by mainstream academia and media, from which honours and awards have flowed. She has made few if any intellectual contributions outside of Aboriginal identity and advocacy. Marcia Langton has been able to make a career as a professional ethnic in big-city multicultural Australia.

Noel Pearson, head of the Cape York Institute, has for many years been promoted by the mainstream media, a major component of the multicultural establishment. He gave the prestigious Boyer lectures in 2022. Pearson was mentored, as a law graduate, by lawyers Ron Castan and Mark Leibler, both influential in the multicultural community.⁵⁹ Leibler was appointed by Julia Gillard to co-

⁵⁴ Taylor, P. (2022). Aussie religious leaders call for an Indigenous Voice to Parliament, *The Australian*, 27 May, <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/the-oz/news/aussie-religious-leaders-call-for-an-indigenous-voice-to-parliament/news-story/0f440d4098b87120ef33593ed121ae65>, accessed 13.2.2023.

⁵⁵ Mundine (2023). Real voices gagged by grand gesture, <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/real-voices-gagged-by-grand-gesture-to-absolve-white-guilt/news-story/85ddf8ebd8fce2c2212e344c980462d6>

⁵⁶ Dudley, Ellie (2023). Jews at odds over Yes or No on Indigenous voice, *The Australian*, 9 February, <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/nation/politics/jews-at-odds-over-yes-or-no-on-indigenous-voice/news-story/cd7de6137dfbe3c7263f147c7ca35bb0>

⁵⁷ Johns, G. (2023). *The burden of culture: How to dismantle the Aboriginal industry and give hope to its victims*. Sydney, Quadrant Books.

⁵⁸ Richardson, H. and F. K. Salter (2023). *Anglophobia: The unrecognised hatred*. Sydney, Social Technologies, Create Space, p. 32.

Bolt, Andrew (2014). Noel Pearson is not a god and cannot be excused this behaviour, *Herald Sun*, 18 August. <https://www.heraldsun.com.au/blogs/andrew-bolt/noel-pearson-is-not-a-god-and-cannot-be-excused-this-behaviour/news-story/35d5318c839354a63c78d3d70c15ec7b>, accessed 13.3.2023.

⁵⁹ Robinson, Natasha (2015). Noel Pearson takes lead from Jewish storytelling, *The Australian*, 7 February. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/in-depth/journey-to-recognition/news-story/fcc85b7ac224e45583c3798c931f3b32>, accessed 7.2.2023.

chair the “Expert Panel” on constitutional recognition, which included Pearson. The Panel’s report took guidance from a notorious Second World War tract of pro-Soviet propaganda written by Ashley Montagu, claiming that race is only skin deep.⁶⁰ Montagu was an Anglophobic intellectual who praised Stalin’s nationality policies, the same policies that killed or ethnically-cleansed millions of Ukrainians and other nationalities. This esoteric aspect of the anti-Western culture wars is far removed from the world of regional Aborigines, yet it was made part of the process leading to the voice referendum. Pearson adopts doctrinaire leftist positions, such as the notion that Aboriginal identity is unrelated to race and only to culture. This is a convenient position at a time when Aborigines are rapidly assimilating, in the process losing racial distinctiveness. Many individuals who identify as Aboriginal have more Anglo than indigenous ancestors, and live and work without hindrance in mainstream society. As discussed in the concluding section, the definition of Aboriginality needs to be settled if an indigenous voice is to be elected in a legitimate manner.

Though Pearson was mentored and supported by the multicultural movement, he has adopted independent policy positions. Neither he nor Langton automatically adopt multicultural policies.

Another example of leftist sponsoring of Aboriginal irredentism concerns Eddie Mabo, a Torres Strait Islander who was mentored by the historian Henry Reynolds. The historian persuaded Mabo to take his land claim to court. Mabo was then assisted by volunteer white lawyer Greg McIntyre, who recruited the barrister Ron Castan, who headed Mabo’s legal team.⁶¹ Castan had a long history of multicultural activism, including a period as Human Rights Commissioner and legal actions in favour of Aboriginal land rights. He displayed authoritarian tendencies early by supporting censorship of “race hate” speech. When serving as a Human Rights Commissioner in 1994, Castan alleged in a judgment that Aboriginal people had been subjected to “vicious racist violence ... over the whole of Australia’s history”.⁶² In a speech following the Mabo decision, Castan

⁶⁰ Montagu, M. F. A. (1942). *Man's most dangerous myth: The fallacy of race*. New York, Columbia University Press.

The book is cited in:

Expert Panel on Constitutional Recognition of Indigenous Australians (2012). *Recognising Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in the Constitution*. Report of the Expert Panel – <https://www.indigenousjustice.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/mp/files/resources/files/12-01-16-indigenous-recognition-expert-panel-report.pdf>. Canberra, Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, p. 139.

⁶¹ Obituary: Ron Castan AM QC, 29.10.1939-21.10.1999.

<http://classic.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/AltLawJl/1999/102.pdf>, accessed 7.2.2023.

⁶² Castan, Ron. (1994). Targets of race hate entitled to redress, *The Australian*, 15 November, p. 17. Quoted in Plevitz, L. R. d. (2000). *The failure of Australian legislation on indirect discrimination to detect the systemic racism which prevents Aboriginal people from fully participating in the workforce*, Thesis submitted for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at the Queensland University of Technology, Centre for Public and Comparative Law, Faculty of Law, https://eprints.qut.edu.au/29025/1/Loretta_de_Plevitz_Thesis.pdf, accessed 7.2.2023, p. 122.

claimed that Australia's 1901 Constitution was a document in which "the very existence, the very humanity of Aboriginal people was denied."⁶³ He spoke of parallels between Australia and Nazi Germany. He revealed himself to be a revolutionary ideologue who wanted to transform all national institutions and the psychology of all Australians to root out their racism.

Thus the landmark Mabo legal case was conceived and executed largely by urban-based radical multicultural elites. That might explain why individuals in the indigenous movement influenced by multiculturalism are prone to advance one-sided notions of what constitutes "reconciliation".

The relationship between the multicultural and globalist movements and indigenous people is asymmetrical. The movement patronises the urban elite of the Aboriginal movement, a trend going back to the 1960s and 1970s.⁶⁴ It is no accident that those mentored by Anglophobic multiculturalists are prone to advocate irredentist nationalist policies of unrestrained land claims, treaties, apology, reparations, anti-white vilification, denial of responsibility for indigenous misbehaviour, a voice, and sooner or later, secession. These radical positions are incentivised. They bring jobs in the bureaucracy, in public broadcasting, in corporations, and in universities. These are jobs for which Anglo advocates, and sometimes Anglos of any persuasion, need not apply. Radical, anti-national views bring status and influence, for example through access to prestigious media platforms. The patrons also suppress critics of radical indigenous claims, such as occurred in the prosecution of commentator Andrew Bolt in 2011. At the same time, the relationship leaves most Aborigines ill-served by multicultural-approved elites, out on a limb, isolated from leaders who understand their way of life and particular local problems. And it risks marginalising white Australia. This is the quid pro quo of the deal, because a powerful segment of the multicultural leadership is intent on weakening Anglos politically and culturally.⁶⁵ This is obviously bad for Anglos. It is also bad for indigenous-Australians because white Australia is their long-term irreplaceable ally.

The multicultural lobby does not share class or ethnic interests with Aborigines. Like other citizens, Aborigines are part of the nation and rely upon it for their external and internal security and support. But the multicultural industry supports radical Aborigines claims against the nation.

Indigenous Australians are being hurt by the demotion and replacement of Anglo-Australia by mass Third World immigration. Governments on both sides

⁶³ Castan, R. (1993). Native land title in Australia: Reflections on Mabo. Speech delivered to the Australian Jewish Democratic Society, December, Castan Centre for Human Rights Law, <https://www.monash.edu/law/research/centres/castancentre/about/roncastan/native-land-title-in-australia-reflections-on-mabo>, accessed 7.2.2023.

⁶⁴ Windschuttle, K. (2016). *The break-up of Australia: The real agenda behind Aboriginal recognition*. Sydney, Quadrant Books, pp. 295-296.

⁶⁵ Richardson, H. and F. K. Salter (2023). *Anglophobia: The unrecognised hatred*. Sydney, Social Technologies, Create Space.

of politics have been captured by Big Australia advocates of various stripes and are pushing for intake targets as reckless as those of the Howard government in 2007-2008. At a time of a housing crisis, Treasury predicts an intake of 650,000 immigrants in the two years 2023-2024.⁶⁶ That is an annual intake of well over one percent of the population, the equivalent of India or China accepting over 14 million migrants annually. At the same time, the Murdoch press, a relentless promoter of mass immigration, has lavished Pearson with positive coverage. Aborigines should worry about immigrants' competitive qualities. They are usually hard working, well-adjusted, and fiercely ambitious for their children. They have not acquired the pathological, guilt-ridden, self-loathing, and rootless ideology inculcated by Western cultural elites. These are healthy people who feel good about themselves, as they should. They bring with them the unadulterated (though sometimes harsh) ethnocentric cultures of their countries of origin, and are under no pressure from Australian authorities to abandon those cultures. That is the essence of multiculturalism. The two highest contributors of immigrants to Australia are India and China, whose capacity to give more immigrants is effectively infinite.

Very few of these masses of immigrants will share memories with Australians, such as memories of the historical special relationship between Anglos and Aborigines. They will have no reason to feel guilt or sympathy for Aborigines in particular. A leaked report to the American Department of Defence reports that China, and by extension other countries in the region, harbour harsh racial attitudes. This has long been known about Japanese cultural assumptions. Chinese typically rank countries and ethnic groups in a manner invidious for poor minorities, especially when they are racially and culturally distant.⁶⁷ The children of these immigrants have dominated selective schools for many years, putting them on the fast track to senior positions in the professions, the media, and the bureaucracy.⁶⁸ At the same time, the Equal Employment and Opportunity industry, the forerunner to the openly Anglophobic Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion movement, has been discriminating against the hiring and promotion of white men.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Dusevic, Tom (2023). Australia will experience biggest two-year population surge in its history, with an extra 650,000 migrants this financial year and next, *The Weekend Australian*, 3 April, <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/nation/australia-will-experience-biggest-two-year-population-surge-in-its-history-with-an-extra-650000-migrants-this-financial-year/news-story/fceff5a7690273c264db601230b5af79>, accessed 29.4.2023.

⁶⁷ Thayer Limited (2013). *The strategic consequences of Chinese racism: A strategic asymmetry for the United States*. A. Marshall, Office of Net Assessment, U.S. Department of Defense: 254 pp.

⁶⁸ Wilkinson, Peter (2007). *The Howard legacy: Displacement of traditional Australia from the professional and managerial classes*. Essendon, Australia, Independent Australian Publishers.

⁶⁹ Richardson, H. and F. K. Salter (2023). *Anglophobia: The unrecognised hatred*, Sydney, Social Technologies, Create Space, pp. 162-163.

The multicultural movement to which many Aboriginal leaders are beholden, has lobbied Canberra for half a century to diversify the Australian population, creating a future hostile environment for indigenous aspirations.

The filthy lie at the heart of the informal deal between a section of the indigenous leadership and the multicultural establishment is that it is a relationship between equals. In fact, it is an abusive relationship, an exploitative relationship, because the multiculturalists would bring down Aborigines' greatest ally, Anglo-Australians, a majority of whom feel genuine responsibility and warmth towards them, and who have prioritised their welfare, who are pouring in taxpayer resources, and who secure the nation as a whole from external attack and internal lawlessness.

It is therefore good news that many indigenous Australians do not think they have a stake in the voice, despite the mainstream media exaggerating its popularity.

After years of heavy media promotion, the voice idea is not unanimously supported by indigenous-Australians. A January 2023 Ipsos poll of about 300 indigenous-Australians found that 10 percent of indigenous people were explicitly opposed to a constitutionally mandated voice to parliament, with another 10 percent being unsure.⁷⁰ Despite the 2017 Uluru Convention being hand-picked to promote consensus, some Aboriginal representatives walked out to demonstrate their rejection of the Statement. The Ngaanyatjarra Council argues that there is a "real risk that distilling voices from 500 Indigenous clans into a collection of regional groups would effectively nullify authentic Indigenous voices".⁷¹ Tasmanian Aboriginal Land Council leader Michael Mansell disagrees with Noel Pearson's view that a referendum is necessary to establish the viability of a voice. He supports Liberal leader Peter Dutton's claim that the referendum questions should be legislated before the referendum is held.⁷² Dissent from the voice proposal has origins in popular Aboriginal distrust of separatism.

In 2009 the Rudd government had the Human Rights Commission devise a new elected indigenous advisory body. The Commission is part of the multicultural establishment. The next year the National Congress of Australia's First Peoples began operation. Indigenous people could elect delegates if they registered. The Congress was organised along parliamentary lines, with three chambers.

⁷⁰ Allam, Lorena (2023). Uluru statement architect confident of Indigenous voice success despite Invasion Day calls to vote no, *The Guardian*, 27 January, <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2023/jan/27/uluru-statement-architect-confident-of-indigenous-voice-success-despite-invasion-day-calls-to-vote-no>. Also reported by Uluru Dialogue.

⁷¹ Mundine (2023). Real voices gagged by grand gesture, <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/real-voices-gagged-by-grand-gesture-to-absolve-white-guilt/news-story/85ddf8ebd8fce2c2212e344c980462d6>

⁷² Mansell, M. and M. Leibler (2023). Letters regarding voice matters, *The Australian*, 24 January, <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/commentary/letters/no-true-peace-in-ukraine-when-world-negotiates-with-putin/news-story/6cae512f821e44301668978f24287d15>

Pearson was critical of the body, showing his independence of the multicultural establishment. Only 10,000 registered. The body closed in 2019. The Congress failed to gain popular support.

Many Aboriginal leaders not supported by multicultural elites, such as Jacinta Price, Nyunggai Warren Mundine and Josephine Cashman, are also opposed to the voice proposal. This is part of a broader policy conflict between them and establishment-supported figures such as Noel Pearson.⁷³

Earlier evidence that establishment-approved indigenous elites do not represent ordinary Aborigines came from the experience of conservative Aboriginal leader Bess Price, a Walpiri woman. Price was a Country Liberal MP in the Northern Territory parliament and an outspoken critic of domestic violence in outback Aboriginal communities. In 2007 she incurred the enmity of leftist indigenous intellectuals when she supported the Howard government's intervention in Northern Territory Aboriginal communities, an attempt to curb high levels of child sexual abuse and neglect. One critic was indigenous lawyer Larissa Behrendt, a graduate of Harvard Law School. Another critic was the indigenous support unit at Griffith University in Brisbane, which barred Price from visiting its offices. This was at a tax-payer funded university. When Price hit back at Behrendt she alluded to her European appearance and big-city lifestyle. Price called Behrendt a "white blackfella" who was out of touch with Central Australian Aborigines.⁷⁴

A recent example of policy differences between conservative Aborigines and those allied with the left-multicultural establishment comes from Noel Pearson's attack on Senator Jacinta Price (daughter of Bess Price), a "Walpiri-Celtic" woman from Alice Springs. Price is critical of the voice proposal because it would empower "elite" indigenous leaders who have failed vulnerable Aborigines for decades.⁷⁵ In a November 2022 ABC interview, Pearson accused Price of "punching down on blackfellas in a redneck celebrity vortex". The statement was not contested or queried by the interviewer. Price accused the ABC of showing bias against her because she is a conservative, while treating Pearson and other radical indigenous figures with uncritical respect.

⁷³ Salter, F. K. (2015). The Pearson factor. *Quadrant Online*, 22 July. <https://quadrant.org.au/opinion/bennelong-papers/2015/07/pearson-factor/>, accessed 10.5.2023. Reprinted in: Salter, F. K. (2018). *The Aboriginal question: Australian racial politics of indigenous recognition and Anglo de-recognition. Collected essays II*, Social Technologies., Sydney.

⁷⁴ Kerr, Christian (2013). Uni body bans outspoken indigenous leader as 'unhealthy' for staff, *The Australian*, 19 July, p. 3.

⁷⁵ Vincent, Peter (2023). Jacinta Price says the ABC has 'racially vilified' her but gone easy on other Indigenous leaders because she's a 'conservative Aboriginal woman', *Daily Mail*, 16 February, <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-11756189/Jacinta-Price-claims-ABC-racially-vilified-shes-conservative-Aboriginal-woman.html>, accessed 17.2.2023.

Senator Price criticises the voice proposal and accuses its proponents of being culturally alienated from the most marginalised Aborigines, many of whom do not have English as their first language.

“For Aboriginal Australians who weren’t necessarily part of the Stolen Generation, they are amongst the most marginalized Australians in this country. They have their language. They have a version of culture which is utterly dysfunctional because there’s so much alcohol and substance abuse. Yet they are the most ignored group of people in this country. And they are ignored by the Stolen Generation who are largely in control of large Aboriginal organisations, who have had the opportunity to gain an education and access to all the services and everything that this country has to offer, yet they’re setting the policies for children in these circumstances in places like the Northern Territory.”⁷⁶

In late 2022, the Minister for Indigenous Affairs in the Albanese government, Linda Burney, tacitly agreed that many rural Aborigines are marginalised. She indicated that disadvantaged rural communities would receive greater representation in a voice.⁷⁷

The Stolen Generation consists of mixed-race Aborigines who, as children, were removed by state governments from their parents and put up for adoption, usually with white families. They were removed because administrators judged them to be at risk of neglect or abuse.

Senator Price describes the Stolen Generation as better educated than many Aborigines. English is their first language, and they are more likely to live in urban centres. These factors combine to set the Stolen Generation apart from fellow Aborigines who live in regional centres and smaller isolated communities. Price asserts that this Westernised generation has influenced the making of indigenous policy.

It is a savage irony that those helped most by Anglo-Australia, both at the level of government and the level of adopting families, are now, according to Senator Price, part of the Aboriginal leadership that does not grasp the reality of regional Aboriginal life. Despite the trauma, the Stolen Generation received benefits such as law and order and education which they have been instrumental in denying the ones left behind.

The voice proposal is radical in that it seeks to maximise indigenous self-rule and welfare while ignoring other stakeholders. Responsible democratic pol-

⁷⁶ Price, Jacinta. Interview, *Sky News*, 27 January 2023, <https://www.skynews.com.au/australia-news/politics/jacinta-price-vows-to-continue-fighting-for-vulnerable-residents-of-alice-springs-and-accuses-pm-of-ignoring-aboriginal-voices/news-story/8db42d3ee7cfdcc19e8a601e187e9f0>, accessed 28.1.2023, from 2:20 minutes.

⁷⁷ Bearup, Greg, and Taylor, Paige (2022). Louder voice needed for those far away, *The Weekend Australian*, 26 Nov., p. 7. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/nation/linda-burney-visits-remote-communities-to-help-magnify-their-voices/news-story/75be373c9258a6df12c735dd55529a72>, accessed 17.2.2023.

icies do not attempt to maximise particular interests but to optimise competing claims, thus providing the best outcome for society as a whole.

Multiculturalists, a powerful force behind the voice proposal, are also radical because they are willing to dispose of the present Constitution and national sovereignty over the Australian continent. Patriots, most of whom are Anglo-Australians, view these interests very differently. For them, the Constitution and the Australian continent form their political and geographic homelands. They see retention of a tried-and-tested constitutional order and a unified national territory as existential interests. They are likely to view attempts to mutilate the Constitution or divide up Australia as unacceptable.

The brightest future for indigenous Australians lies in them remaining part of the nation constitutionally and territorially. They and Anglo-Australians form the core national identity. The two people's fates are intertwined and will, over time, become one. Many individuals with Aboriginal ancestors also have Anglo ancestors. They have become an organic part of the core Australian identity. Even indigenous-Australians who have no white ancestry benefit from the implicit duty of care felt by Anglos towards them. No larger category of Australians, not aloof elites and not foreigners, feel obligated to First Nations people. Where Anglo-Australians are diminished, where they are subordinated and displaced, so will indigenous freedom and welfare follow.

The implication is that Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders are serving their interests when they refrain from harming the nation.

The following section discusses likely outcomes should the voice referendum succeed, in relation to the national context and interests.

8. INVIDIOUS OUTCOMES

Voice advocates assert that substantial benefits will accrue to indigenous-Australians. On the other side of the debate, legal experts have predicted several invidious outcomes. Before briefly reviewing the arguments on both sides, we shall consider the likely impact on Anglo-Australians.

An indigenous voice as proposed would harm the standing of Anglo-Australians by elevating indigenous people to a privileged status, one that would give political advantage to their elites and entitle them to a permanent transfer of wealth from non-indigenous citizens. This constitutionally-mandated ethnic hierarchy is likely to compromise the forbearance of non-indigenous citizens and thus cleave the nation.

Even the Coalition's preferred alternative to the voice – recognition of indigenous peoples in a preamble to the Constitution – would demean Anglo-Australians if they were not likewise acknowledged. This is understood by intellectuals influential in the voice process, such as Julian Leeser and Damien Freeman, long-term advisers to Noel Pearson. Perhaps as early as 2013 Leeser and Freeman had the idea of a constitutional declaration, which would become a key element of the voice proposal. Such a declaration would “change the cultural position of indigenous Australians in the national story”, Leeser noted in 2015. Without mentioning the leading role of Anglos, Leeser argued that “the declaration of recognition, through its repetition” would “imprint the story of the place of indigenous people ... on the minds of Australians for future generations”.⁷⁸ This led to Pearson working with Leeser, Freeman, and Professor Greg Craven for years to develop the voice proposal, a constitutional model of recognition meant to have practical value.⁷⁹ Recognising only ATSI people without also recognising the leading role of people with a British-Isles background would be a lie that would falsify national identity to the unfair disadvantage of Anglo-Australia.

Another negative outcome of the voice being approved at referendum, is that its bureaucracy would probably become a strategic asset in separatist, anti-Anglo, agitation. This situation is best averted by preventing a voice from being inserted in the Constitution. A less satisfactory remedy would be to balance the voice with a separate voice, also in the Constitution, representing the nation.

⁷⁸ Robinson, Natasha (2015). Noel Pearson takes lead from Jewish storytelling, *The Australian*, 25 April. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/in-depth/journey-to-recognition/news-story/fcc85b7ac224e45583c3798c931f3b32>, accessed 3.5.2023.

⁷⁹ Bramston, Troy (2023). Final frontier: 'If voice wins, it will change the nation ... There's no Plan B', *Weekend Australian Magazine*, 29 April, pp. 18-24. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/weekend-australian-magazine/indigenous-voice-to-parliament-why-time-is-running-out-for-noel-pearson-and-reconciliation/news-story/7c57c015e8703b7f84bdc53525c540d3>, p. 22.

However, extra chambers of parliament would likely make governance unworkable.

As discussed in Section 6 above, negative impacts on Anglos and other non-indigenous citizens are predictable from the fact that a master document of the voice is a chauvinistic ideological tract, the United Nation's Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

Let us now turn to the claim that a constitutionally-mandated voice would bring palpable benefits to indigenous-Australians. Two claims stand out.

Advocates state that the advisory body will cause legislation and government decisions to become more responsive to local indigenous needs. Responsiveness will come from the representative nature of the voice combined with its unassailable position in the Constitution, they maintain. An objection to this is that, even if true, those benefits would also flow from a legislated voice. Legislation has the advantage of being readily adjusted to changing needs.

Noel Pearson continues this argument using the example of the destruction of an Aboriginal heritage site – rock shelters at Juukan Gorge in Western Australia's Pilbara region occupied for over 40,000 years. Mining company Rio Tinto destroyed the shelters in pursuit of iron ore in 2020. He claims that this is the "most blatant" example of the need for the voice to be embedded in the Constitution.⁸⁰ The argument is that the government would have been forced to listen to local advice if there had been a voice. The destruction of the caves was a tragedy, but not sufficient reason to change Australia's system of government. Formal and informal processes are doing a reasonable job of protecting indigenous heritage sites. In response to the destruction, state and federal governments enacted reforms to better protect them. Governmental and public reactions were so strong that three of Rio Tinto executive officers – including the CEO – lost their jobs as a result. Other mining companies and politicians are bound to have learnt the lesson.

A second benefit posited by Noel Pearson and others is that a constitutionally mandated voice will bring dignity of recognition, which will improve the wellbeing of indigenous people. This closely resembles the argument made by Pearson in a 2011 article concerning constitutional recognition. Both arguments are sound regarding recognition, but they are too optimistic about what recognition can achieve. In 2011 Pearson asserted that residual racism in the Constitution, plus absence of recognition, had brought many Aborigines to a low socio-economic position. He predicted that amending the Constitution would improve Aboriginal health, educational outcomes, domestic violence, and

⁸⁰ Neill, Rosemary (2023). On-the-ground change: Yes or no? *The Weekend Australian*, 6 May, p. 24. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/can-the-indigenous-voice-to-parliament-lead-to-practical-improvements-in-indigenous-peoples-lives/news-story/966d3b24c3953c4fd4e008137ca1ebe2>

more.⁸¹ However, an examination of his sources failed to reveal any proof of this assertion.⁸²

Unlike baseless claims about psychological and health benefits, it is undoubtedly true that self-rule is a universal aspiration and a mainstay of national independence around the world. It is quite normal that self-rule appeals to many Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. If trends in the rest of the world over the last two centuries are any guide, this nationalism will persist and grow while indigenous identity remains strong. The process is far from complete. Aborigines are in the process of ethnogenesis, as 500 linguistic groups, which really are different countries, merge to form a single, continent-wide identity. It is irredentist, as are other nationalisms in similar situations. Being inevitable, it must be accommodated. The question is, which accommodation will prevail? Will it be the multicultural type that is willing to sacrifice the Australian nation to indigenous and other minority interests, or a patriotic type that seeks reciprocal reconciliation with the Australian nation? Aboriginal self-rule should be accommodated to the extent practicable at the local level. However, a voice is not a suitable vehicle. Additionally, difficulties are predictable if full sovereignty comes about, to be discussed later in this section.

Ex-High Court justice Ian Callinan predicts that a constitutionally mandated indigenous voice would trigger a period of judicial activism.⁸³ “A voice in any form, in my view, will give rise to many arguments and division, legal and otherwise.” A likely outcome of litigation and judicial activism is that the High Court will interpret the draft words – that the voice “may make representations to Parliament and the Executive Government” – to imply that the government has a *duty* to consult the voice. James Allan, professor of constitutional law at Queensland University, agrees with Callinan.⁸⁴

Controversy has arisen within the pro-voice movement concerning the initial draft’s impact on the Executive Government. The Solicitor-General of the Albanese Labor government officially cautioned against inclusion of “Executive Government”. This advice was relayed by the Attorney-General Mark Dreyfus to the Referendum Working Group. The concern was that the voice would dis-

⁸¹ Pearson, Noel (2011). Constitutional reform crucial to indigenous wellbeing, *The Weekend Australian*, 24-25 December, p. 20.

⁸² Salter, F. K. (2013). The misguided case for indigenous recognition in the Constitution. Part I: The muddled debate over racial discrimination *Quadrant* 57(12): 28-40, <https://quadrant.org.au/magazine/2013/12/misguided-case-indigenous-recognition-constitution/>. Reprinted in: Salter, F. K. (2018). *The Aboriginal question: Australian racial politics of indigenous recognition and Anglo de-recognition. Collected essays II*, Social Technologies., Sydney.

⁸³ Callinan, Ian (2022). Examining the case for the voice – an argument against, *The Weekend Australian*, 17 December, p. 20. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/examining-the-case-for-the-voice-an-argument-against/news-story/e30c8f2ffcbae73eaa3921e82bf174a9>, accessed 18.2.2023.

⁸⁴ Allan, James (2020). Activist justices’ alien view of court’s power, *The Australian*, 14 February. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/business/legal-affairs/activist-justices-alien-view-of-courts-power/news-story/bfff4c2f860a65426ddaf5f91cf9ff6>, accessed 18.2.2023.

rupt the functions of government. A further risk is that the public will perceive this danger and vote against the referendum. Dreyfus advised the Working Group to change the draft amendment to reduce the legal effect of voice representations on the executive.⁸⁵ His advice was rejected by the Albanese government. This attempt at preventing public concern came late in the process. It might be too late to save the voice proposal from being rejected in the referendum.

Callinan concluded that the voice is, in effect, a proposal for a separate indigenous parliament. He identified a number of poorly specified aspects of the voice that could form in that direction. When Callinan wrote it was not clear that membership of the voice would be appointed, not elected. Nevertheless, his queries are still pertinent because elections would yield greater legitimacy, and thus remain an attractive alternative.

Another fundamental criticism raised by Ian Callinan is that the proposed voice does not contain much detail. It gives parliament a blank cheque to determine the voice's size (representatives, employees, budget), composition, eligibility, method of election, and jurisdiction.⁸⁶ These all relate to minimum characteristics for a viable voice. On the face of it, the words to be inserted in the Constitution authorise the parliament to effectively reduce or increase the voice's resources. The fact that the Constitution mandates a voice that may proffer advice is, by itself, a hollow promise, absent governmental support or High Court intervention on the matter of scale. If the High Court approved, government might be able to cripple the voice, for example by altering the number and choice of indigenous representatives or by reducing the voice's staff and funding. Alternatively, parliament could grow a voice into a bureaucratic, budgetary and political monster, a super ATSI that unbalances the tripartite distinction of powers. Should not both extremes be circumscribed by putting more detail into the Constitution?

Complicating this problem of scale, the proposed voice is ethnically selective. If passed it will therefore tread a fine line between being under- or over-representative, between disadvantaging and privileging indigenous people. It runs the danger of exacerbating other ethnic grievances, including those of the founding Anglo population.

Put differently, the words proposed to be added to the Constitution lack the detail to prevent a voice becoming too weak or too strong in relation to the size, needs, and entitlement of the population it is meant to serve. The obvious answer, and it is a convincing one, is that Parliament can be trusted to get the balance right. But in that case, why not have a legislated voice?

⁸⁵ Shanahan, Dennis (2023). Quietly and behind closed doors, Labor alters its draft. *The Weekend Australian*, 18 March, p. 23.

⁸⁶ Callinan, Ian (2022). Examining the case for the voice. Robert Hardie (2023). Letter: Details matter and voice advocates should demand them, *The Weekend Australian*, 7 January, p. 10.

Another question of detail Callinan raised will become relevant should the voice ever be elected. Would the right to vote for it be defined – by region, by language, or some other criterion? Would voters be compelled to register or to vote? Would a court, such as the High Court, be nominated as the Court of Disputed Returns? “Will the voice need not only its own extensive premises in Canberra and in many other places but also its own executive and other staff to assist it? Will it have a cabinet?” Would the major political parties strive to dominate it?

There are other important details to be discovered. Will the present method for proving indigenous identity remain valid down the generations, or will it be necessary to use cultural or genetic tests? Some argue that Aborigines are a descent group, and call for minimal genetic makeup. That is another invidious issue, but how else to determine descent as populations become progressively mixed?

Australians are mistaken to think that a voice will at last resolve indigenous grievance. It is more likely to open a Pandora’s Box of demands – for treaties, more land hand-overs, further subversion of school curricula, and reparations. Minority advocacy is served by professionals who make their living from finding grievances and litigating for redress. At the same time, the judiciary has been infiltrated by progressives as part of the general leftwards march of the universities. James Allan reports that he is one of the “very few” conservative constitutional law professors in Australia.⁸⁷ The combination of factors can produce bizarre judgments by the High Court.

In 2020 the High Court decided in *Love versus Commonwealth of Australia* that Aborigines, even when born overseas, cannot be categorised as non-citizens under section 51(xix) of the Constitution. This decision created a racial category of Australian citizenship, one that takes priority over criteria once applicable to everyone.⁸⁸ Justice Gordon expressed this view thus: “[E]ven if an Aboriginal Australian’s birth is not registered and as a result no citizenship is recorded, or an Aboriginal Australian is born overseas without obtaining Australian citizenship, they are not susceptible to legislation made pursuant to the aliens power or detention and deportation under such legislation.”⁸⁹ This High Court judg-

⁸⁷ Allan, James (2022). Roll of the dice on voice, *The Weekend Australian*, 31 December, p. 19. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/judges-make-it-a-roll-of-the-dice-on-voice/news-story/1b099f806b9007a5e152a30886df48e9>, accessed 5.1.2023.

⁸⁸ Allan, James (2020). Activist justices’ alien view of court’s power, *The Australian*, 14 February. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/business/legal-affairs/activist-justices-alien-view-of-courts-power/news-story/bfff4c2f860a65426dddaf5f91cf9ff6>, accessed 18.2.2023.

Allan, James (2023). Roll of the dice on voice, *The Weekend Australian*, 31 December., p. 19. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/judges-make-it-a-roll-of-the-dice-on-voice/news-story/1b099f806b9007a5e152a30886df48e9>, accessed 5.1.2023.

⁸⁹ Carroll, John, Cain Sibley, and Neil Cuthbert (2020). The Constitutional limits on defining an “alien”, 5 March, <https://www.claytonutz.com/knowledge/2020/march/the-constitutional-limits-on-defining-an-alien>

ment was really a legislative act, beyond the Court's remit. Such judicial activism is another reason to reject an indigenous voice, especially one embedded in the Constitution. As noted earlier, the proposed voice would greatly increase the scope for judicial activism. Instead, the High Court should be given no wriggle room to pursue further activism that legislates non-indigenous-Australian second class citizenship.

One sure outcome is a decline in coherent government due to the intrusions of a voice. The proposed voice would necessarily be served by an extensive bureaucracy, deepening and solidifying this department of the multicultural infrastructure. It would expand the number and influence of individuals, both indigenous and non-indigenous, with a stake in separatism. Many of the voice's administrative staff would necessarily be non-indigenous, most likely drawn from the same New Class ideological pool typical in Canberra and the ABC. The new formation would therefore increase the influence of anti-Anglo prejudice. That alone is sufficient risk to call the voice proposal into doubt. The Yes campaign needs to show that a voice bureaucracy will not become a vehicle for anti-white sentiment.

Over the last several decades Aborigines have been developing a separate national consciousness, often while retaining their local clan affiliations. The process is far from complete, though urban elites aligned with the multicultural movement have encouraged that process by adopting the Aboriginal flag, pressing for open-ended land rights, securing a tax-payer-funded free-to-air television channel, and enforcing the implicitly Anglophobic "acknowledgment of country" or welcome to country ceremonies at sports events, schools and other state and corporate meetings. The privileged status of indigenous people is signalled by the Aboriginal flag flying on public buildings despite not representing any democratically-elected government. Indigenous privilege is signalled by the Taxation Office excusing indigenous-Australians from paying taxes on income gained from native title land or benefits.⁹⁰ However, income from native title is taxed if some of it goes to non-indigenous individuals.⁹¹ The voice proposal is an expression of this elite-enforced privilege.

⁹⁰ Australian Taxation Office (2022). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander individual tax, Australian Government, 23 November. <https://www.ato.gov.au/General/Aboriginal-and-Torres-Strait-Islander-people/Aboriginal-and-Torres-Strait-Islanders-and-individual-tax/>, accessed 9.5.2023. "Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and Indigenous holding entities don't need to pay income tax or capital gains tax on native title payments or benefits."

⁹¹ Australian Taxation Office (2022). Receiving native title benefits, Australian Government, 1 July. <https://www.ato.gov.au/General/Aboriginal-and-Torres-Strait-Islander-people/Aboriginal-and-Torres-Strait-Islanders-and-individual-tax/Receiving-native-title-benefits/>, accessed 9.5.2023.

An example provided by the document:

"Mae is an Aboriginal woman who lives in Western Australia. Every year, she receives a \$100,000 native title benefit from a mining company. The mining company uses the land to mine for iron ore. Mae is not taxed on this \$100,000 because it is a native title benefit, which is NANE income and is not taxable."

Another example provided by the document:

At the popular level, the aspiration of a nation to have its own state is understandable but not always feasible, which is the situation with indigenous-Australians. The unfeasibility of a break-away indigenous state makes any significant move towards secession invidious. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander secession would be unfeasible for reasons which we shall now discuss.

Firstly, a nation might be too small to form a viable economy or to defend itself in an anarchic international system. Examples include the often voluntary union of small states into larger ones, such as those which happened during the nineteenth century in Italy and Germany. Indigenous-Australians form about 4 percent of the overall population. That is one million people, scattered across the continent. The situation is more extreme in the case of Torres Strait Islanders. There are only about 4,000 residents of the Islands, with a further 30,000 living on the Australian mainland.

Another factor is slow economic development, especially regarding the formation of a professional and commercial middle class. That class is prerequisite to statehood in the modern world. Indigenous Australians have poor average educational and business outcomes.⁹² Exacerbating economic weakness are elevated levels of some chronic illnesses among Aboriginals, including diabetes, kidney failure, alcoholism, and drug abuse. These factors taken together would fiscally burden a break-away Aboriginal state and reduce its viability.

A further impediment to indigenous secession is the lack of a unifying identity. Although portrayed by the media as one culture, indigenous-Australians are actually diverse. In 1788 Aborigines did not have a collective conscious identity, instead being fragmented into approximately 500 linguistically-different clans. Language is a strong ethnic marker and thus a facilitator of cooperation.⁹³ Despite two centuries of consolidation and acquisition of English, identity is still not unified. In addition to the 500 clans, there are regional identities including the Murri people of Queensland and north-western New South Wales, the Koori people of southern New South Wales, the Palawa people of Tasmania, the Noon-gar people of the south-west of Western Australia, the Arrernte people of central Australia, the Arnhem Land people of the Northern Territory, and the Torres

“ABC Enterprises Trust is paid a native title benefit of \$500,000. This payment is part of the income of the trust. The trust is not an Indigenous holding entity because its beneficiaries are not limited to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.”

⁹² For discussion with sources, see:

Salter, F. K. (2013). The misguided case for indigenous recognition in the Constitution. Part I: The muddled debate over racial discrimination, *Quadrant* 57(12): 28-40.

<https://quadrant.org.au/magazine/2013/12/misguided-case-indigenous-recognition-constitution/>
 Republished in: Salter, F. K. (2018). *The Aboriginal question: Australian racial politics of indigenous recognition and Anglo de-recognition. Collected essays II*, Social Technologies, pp. 45-47.

⁹³ Eibl-Eibesfeldt, Irenaeus (1972/1970). *Love and hate: The natural history of behavior patterns*. New York (Original German edition 1970, R. Piper, Munich), Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Berghe, Pierre L. v. d. (1981). *The ethnic phenomenon*. New York, Elsevier.

Pagel, Mark (2019). Human tribalism: A curse of our evolutionary past? *Gifford Lectures 2019*, lecture 3, <https://youtu.be/pBPpiRP8NQw>, accessed 19.5.2023.

Strait Islander people. In addition, city folk differ profoundly to their country cousins in life experience. Then there is diversity caused by degrees of hybridity, cultural and genetic. For reasons of sentiment or interests, some of these identity groups might choose to remain within the Australian Commonwealth, instead of risking union with an alien and likely unviable state.

A final impediment to a break-away indigenous country is when a nation is situated in one or more states whose territorial interests conflict with the aspiration for self-rule. The Kurds are an example, spread between Turkey, Iraq, Syria, and Iran. In the Australian case, the Commonwealth and the nation that made it cannot afford to have Aboriginal nationalism go so far that it forms a break-away state. The growing risk of indigenous secession was studied in 2016 by Keith Windschuttle in his book, *The Break-up of Australia: The Real Agenda Behind Aboriginal Recognition*.⁹⁴ The symbolism of the voice is likely to embolden indigenous separatism. It is openly declared by Aboriginal nationalists such as Senator Lidia Thorpe that a constitutionally mandated voice will be followed by demands for treaties and a so-called “truth telling” commission. Those demands are also made in the Uluru Statement.⁹⁵ As Tony Abbott succinctly puts it, truth-telling in this context will mean uncovering “further injustices that Indigenous people had suffered”.⁹⁶

Should secession happen or be imminent, the nation is bound to object, even if the multicultural establishment attempts to keep control using its media and “human rights” assets. That is predictable from historical and cross-cultural comparisons. Nations resist loss of territory. They also react against foreign influence, which would follow inevitably should an indigenous state be established that exercises autonomous foreign policy. Therefore, indigenous separatism is likely to cause divisions within the broader Australian population.

Another outcome is economic dependence on the non-indigenous taxpayer. Whether or not indigenous nationalism does lead to secession, a voice to parliament and the accompanying politics of privilege would draw attention to the large annual flow of resources – at present in the vicinity of \$33 billion – into indigenous welfare and health programs.⁹⁷ This is about twice the per capita expenditure on non-indigenous citizens. Such a large wealth transfer might

⁹⁴ Windschuttle, K. (2016). *The break-up of Australia: The real agenda behind Aboriginal recognition*. Sydney, Quadrant Books.

⁹⁵ Delegates to the First Nations National Constitutional Convention (2017). *Uluru Statement from the Heart*, 26 May, <https://ulurustatement.org/the-statement/view-the-statement/>, accessed 1 March.

⁹⁶ Abbott, Tony (2022). Pass or fail, this referendum will surely leave us worse off, *The Weekend Australian*, 5 November, p. 16. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/pass-or-fail-this-referendum-will-surely-leave-us-worse-off/news-story/761616d76aaa8e5e308ed9ce1d04c8ba>, accessed 2.2.2023.

⁹⁷ In 2017 the Productivity Commission estimated that indigenous-specific expenditure had increased to \$33.4 billion. <https://www.pc.gov.au/ongoing/indigenous-expenditure-report/2017/ier-2017-indigenous-expenditure-report.pdf>, accessed 12.3.2023. p. 6. This was 6% of total government expenditures at a time when indigenous citizens numbered 3.1% of the population. See https://healthinonet.ecu.edu.au/healthinonet/getContent.php?linkid=597498&title=Summary+of+Aboriginal+and+Torres+Strait+Islander+health+status+2015&contentid=33480_1, accessed 12.3.2023.

remain tolerable if indigenous people remained equal Australians. But if they become a privileged ethnicity or worse, an ethnically-defined state, the annual transfers are likely to be perceived as exploitation, as a form of taxation without representation. Taxpayers could move to reduce their financial support for the indigenous community if the alliance between elements of the indigenous elite and peak multicultural bodies continues to propose extreme policies.

To conclude this section, the case for a voice is flimsy, yet it stands a chance of being passed at referendum, when it would disrupt government and put non-indigenous-Australians at a substantial disadvantage. For these reasons it is unwise and cruel to encourage indigenous separatism. That is a further reason not to artificially foster irredentist nationalism with measures such as a voice to parliament.

The outcomes discussed above appear invidious for all stakeholders in the Commonwealth, especially Anglo-Australians. There is the prospect of serious damage to governance, to community standing, and to national finances. The risks are too high to undertake the monumental experiment of changing a system of government which, though surely not perfect, has served us well.

This gloomy prognosis is the result of major stakeholders being excluded from the process of consultation that generated the voice proposal.

9. IMPROPER PROCESS

This paper has already discussed several examples of flawed process, such as the total exclusion of Anglo advocates from the consultation process and from deliberative committees. This section brings together these and other improprieties in the voice process. Let us begin by restating the point about excluding stakeholders.

It is difficult to overstate the potential for an indigenous voice and constitutional indigenous recognition in general to damage the well-being of non-indigenous-Australians, including Anglos. That is why, as noted earlier, any legitimate procedure to amend the Constitution or make laws to enact a voice should have – must have – included Anglo and other non-indigenous advocates in the consultative process. Only then would the reckless demands, often initiated by white radicals, be moderated and the reconciliation process made fair and equitable. Excluding Anglo advocates from the voice process and overlooking their collective interests is treatment to be expected from an occupying army, not from a democratic government. Indeed, if China or India invaded and conquered Australia, they would be well advised to break national resistance by putting an indigenous voice in the constitution (and perhaps other voices but never an Anglo one), retaining the anti-Anglo indoctrination already practised in Australian schools, and continuing high levels of Third World immigration, especially from their own countries. (Actually, the occupiers might substantially reduce present levels of immigration to avoid being accused of committing cultural genocide.)

The exclusion of Anglo-Australians from the voice process was aided by another Soviet-style method. The consultations leading to the Uluru Statement were hemmed in by the “imposed assumption” that the voice was the only possible solution. Alternative approaches were not even canvassed.⁹⁸ A constitutional convention with wide representation would have allowed a more open democratic process.

The corrupt voice process is a hallmark of the Anglophobic multicultural lobby, whose ruthlessness was discussed earlier in Section 7 on stakeholders. The same section shows that multicultural elites guided the Uluru Statement and subsequent voice deliberations.

It is important to settle on just process because if the voice wins at referendum despite (or due to) being illegitimate, many Anglo-Australians and other non-indigenous citizens are unlikely to feel any obligation to accept the resulting constitutional or legislative changes.

⁹⁸ Mundine (2023). Real voices gagged by grand gesture, <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/real-voices-gagged-by-grand-gesture-to-absolve-white-guilt/news-story/85ddf8ebd8fce2c2212e344c980462d6>

One frequent flaw in the voice process is the lack of detail in government statements concerning the referendum. The declared aim is to keep the public focussed on the need to have a voice, not any particular version. This point was made by Mark Leibler, a leading advocate of the voice.⁹⁹ Leibler summarised several arguments for keeping the referendum simple. Unfortunately, some of the omitted details concern serious matters, to be discussed here. All of these arguments amount to the wish for the public to trust government and approve the broad goal of a voice, any voice, without seeing the detail of how it will work. The stink of utopianism is strong.

An important matter of detail not discussed in the voice process is the definition of indigeneity. Who is Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander? Which criteria apply? These questions need to be answered for a voice to function properly. As indigenous historian Victoria Grieves Williams points out, both sides of the voice debate have been silent on this issue. Yet the numbers claiming to be indigenous affect government spending, statistics on Closing the Gap, cultural representation, and therefore indigenous health and wellbeing.¹⁰⁰ Demographic accuracy is important if the gap is to be measured and resources allocated according to need. Inflated numbers risk diverting resources from genuinely needy cases. Also, a voice or treaty will necessitate an accurate count for the purposes of allocating infrastructure and organising elections or selecting representatives.

At present, indigeneity is determined by the combination of self-identification, descent, and acceptance by the local community. This standard has seen the official indigenous population increase by 23 percent over the five years to June 2021, according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics. During the same period, due largely to mass immigration, the non-indigenous population rose by 5.5 percent.¹⁰¹ The extraordinary increase in indigenous numbers could not have been due to births alone, but must have resulted from individuals discovering or imagining Aboriginal ancestors. This is, in itself, an indication of the benefit that Australians perceive from being identified as having Aboriginal heritage. Whilst elites and academics are constantly talking about the benefits of “white privilege,” many ordinary Australians are voting with their feet and moving to embrace what they perceive to be the benefits of black privilege.

⁹⁹ Leibler, Mark (2022). Want a voice? It should be a simple Yes or No, *Weekend Australian*, 23 July, p. 13. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/commentary/want-a-voice-it-should-be-a-simple-yes-or-no/news-story/a70fa5f3df50c056cfde1a738c947bfb>, accessed 18.2.2023.

¹⁰⁰ Williams, Victoria Grieves (2023). Much more truth-talking needed in Indigenous affairs, *The Weekend Australian*, 28 January, p. 17. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/much-more-truth-talking-needed-in-indigenous-affairs/news-story/880e7266077c0826e9a6c3c23f76a8bf>, accessed 17.2.2023.

¹⁰¹ Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population approaching 1 million, Media release, Australian Bureau of Statistics, 21 September 2022. <https://www.abs.gov.au/media-centre/media-releases/aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-population-approaching-1-million>, accessed 13.3.2023.

For Australia to strike a stable settlement between the nation and its indigenous citizens, the answers to questions about identity must continue to apply in the future. A large number, perhaps a majority, of those who identify mainly as Aborigines (their foreground identity) are also Anglos to some extent (their background identity), often to a great extent. And some with an Anglo foreground identity also have Aboriginal ancestors. As other criteria fade, indigenous identification will rest on ancestry to a larger degree.

Ancestry cannot be ignored as an important criterion of ethnic identity, though other criteria play roles. The reality of foreground versus background identity, and community acceptance, complicate the choice of a mandatory fraction. The matter has been debated, for example in Tasmania. There should be a cut-off percentage below which an individual is not categorised as indigenous. The remaining questions concern the percentage and methods for determining it. Possible methods include gene assay, which is now almost as simple as administering a roadside alcohol breath test.

If such methods are considered unacceptable, that should count against having a voice at all.

These principles raise the question, which fraction of ancestry should count an individual as indigenous? Full blood? Half? An eighth? One sixty fourth? This valid question has been suppressed by the multicultural establishment, which adopts Noel Pearson's position that ancestry does not matter. Pearson seeks to de-emphasise ancestry, even adopting the Marxian notion that "[r]ace is really only an instrument of class".¹⁰² He also stated: "Indigeneity, however, is not about race. . . . Indigeneity is about historical connection and political status, and the rights and interests arising therefrom."¹⁰³ This implies that culture and subjective identification are sufficient criteria to accredit someone indigenous. The opposed view is championed by journalist Andrew Bolt, who was found guilty of racial vilification for daring to suggest that it is unrealistic to categorise an individual as indigenous for the purpose of allocating affirmative assistance, when he or she does not have much indigenous ancestry.¹⁰⁴

The idea that a citizen should be considered disadvantaged, and deserving of some kind of reparations or advantage simply because they have discovered a great-great grandparent who was Aboriginal is *prima facie*, absurd. On the other hand, the idea that an indigenous British, Chinese or Indian person should

¹⁰² Pearson, N. (2011). *Up from the mission: Selected writings*. Collingwood, Victoria, Schwartz Media, Kindle edition, loc. 4136.

¹⁰³ Pearson, Noel (2015). Indigenous people need a lot more than just symbolism, Cape York Institute, 4 July. <https://capeyorkpartnership.org.au/indigenous-people-need-a-lot-more-than-just-symbolism-noel-pearson/>, accessed 13.3.2023. Originally published in *The Australian*, 4 July 2015.

¹⁰⁴ Bolt, A. (2009). It's so hip to be black. *Herald-Sun*, Melbourne, News Ltd. 15 April.
Quinn, K. (2010). Aborigines sue Bolt over racial writings. *The Age*. Melbourne, Fairfax. 18 September, <https://www.theage.com.au/national/victoria/aborigines-sue-bolt-over-racial-writings-20100917-15gk7.html>, accessed 19.8.2021.

be eligible for some form of restitution for historical grievances because they live in an Aboriginal settlement and are accepted by “the community” is even less credible.

Political censorship, formal and informal, has discouraged conservatives from airing views on identity issues. The censorship began soon after ethno-cultural diversity began to rise, enforced by emerging multicultural elites. It is so ubiquitous that it carries popular names such as “political correctness” and “wokeness”. Thus, the intolerance of the multicultural movement has itself impeded democratic deliberation of the voice proposal.

More needs to be said about the voice process’s exclusion of Anglo and other non-indigenous advocates. It is telling that in the debate about the voice, neither side has considered how the proposed changes to the Constitution might affect non-indigenous interests, in particular Anglo interests.

The exclusion of Anglo and other non-indigenous interests is an extraordinary omission of process, because all citizens, including the Anglo population, are stakeholders in the Commonwealth. That is clearly the case for Anglo-Australians because it is primarily they who are held accountable for indigenous disability, which allegedly includes being omitted from the Constitution. The assertion that Anglos are accountable is a backhanded acknowledgment of British-Australian centrality to Australia’s national story. They are attributed with agency but only as it involves alleged wrongdoing. Mr. Albanese cannot have it both ways. A principled resolution requires that he acknowledge the historic Anglo nation as the creator of the colonies and the Commonwealth and the bearer of the core national identity. Then we can reckon any obligation to indigenous people. But it is unprincipled to deny Australia’s Anglo roots while simultaneously blaming white Australia for the supposed sins of the nation’s colonial past.

Prime Minister Anthony Albanese considers it “good manners” to give indigenous people a voice in the Constitution. He likens the Constitution to the nation’s “birth certificate”, and as such thinks it should record all those present at the birth, including those who inhabited the continent long before. The Prime Minister contradicts himself by not recognising Anglos and by excluding their advocates from the voice process. If the Constitution-as-birth-certificate metaphor is to be adopted, how can Anglo-Australians, the parents of the nation, be excluded from the family tree? Why have Albanese and his predecessors been working to deny Anglo paternity altogether? The voice process has resembled kidnapping more than fair and informed midwifery.

The Anglophobia in the voice process has been, and still is, palpable. Both sides of politics are guilty. The Coalition participated in the voice process without challenging the exclusion of Anglo-Australian advocates, even when in government.

The final process issue is observed by Ian Callinan – the government’s reluctance to fund the Yes and No campaigns for the upcoming referendum. One might add the government’s failure to hold a constitutional convention to deliberate the voice proposal. Instead, the government has promised to educate the public about the issue, which Callinan feels is ominous and Orwellian.¹⁰⁵ The context is widespread corporate and institutional support for the voice. The government’s decision means, in effect, that the Yes case will receive indirect institutional support from Government and its media and educational assets as well as corporations, including most media corporations. By contrast, the No case will receive little funding. This is typical of the radical intolerance that contradicts traditions of fair play and due process. The government might get away with this manoeuvre in the short term. However, if a voice is approved, the failure to ensure a level playing field by funding both the Yes and No cases and holding a constitutional convention will undercut the legitimacy of the Voice, and it will become an open wound in our society. The government’s rigging of procedure is another reason to think that the voice proposal has been insufficiently deliberated upon.

¹⁰⁵ Callinan, Ian (2022). Examining the case for the voice.

10. CONCLUSION, PART 1: REFERENDUM ADVICE

The British Australian Community calls on Australians to vote No in the referendum on a constitutionally mandated indigenous advisory body, an “indigenous voice to parliament”.

Other recommendations concern desirable processes and goals should a voice proposal be advanced again in the future.

1. Any voice should be created by legislation, not through constitutional amendment.
2. If the constitutional route is chosen, recognition should go in a preamble to the Constitution, not in the legally-binding main text.
3. Indigenous recognition should be balanced by the equivalent for Anglo-Australia.
4. These matters should be negotiated by the representatives of all major stakeholders. The greatest flaw in the voice process has been the total exclusion of Anglo advocates. This alone is a fatal shortcoming of the voice process.

The BAC rejects the voice referendum for the reasons of likely outcomes and flawed process. A constitutionally-mandated voice would most likely amount to an indigenous parliament. It would impede governance of the Commonwealth, create ethnic privilege, and empower both the Anglophobic multicultural movement and separatist Aboriginal nationalism. All these outcomes are unacceptable.

The proposed constitutional amendment was developed in a process that, from beginning to end, systematically excluded advocates of almost all non-indigenous ethnic group in general and advocates of the nation and its core identity in particular. This not only insults the great majority of citizens, but if the referendum passes, would require them to fund an indigenous voice without having representation within it.

Another reason to reject the referendum is that it comes at a time when the nation is under siege. The antagonist is the multicultural administrative state – university-trained Anglophobes embedded in the upper reaches of the education system, the senior bureaucracy, the corporate media including public broadcasting, and multinational corporations. These elites promote indigenous separatism as part of a broader agenda of licensing minorities and delicensing the founding majority, in effect taking the Commonwealth away from the people that created it. They simultaneously conduct hostilities against Anglo-Australia. We are confronted by a rogue Commonwealth. It should be treated with caution, more so when it proposes to fix a Constitution that is not broken.

The avowed motivation for the referendum is to close the “gap” between indigenous and typical Australian living conditions. Proponents assert that the gap cannot be closed until indigenous peoples have a voice to parliament. But Anglo-Australians also suffer from a gap, a deficiency of democratic representation. They are being undemocratically subordinated and their Commonwealth stolen from them. Anglo-Australians should not vote for a fundamental change to their way of government when there is a desperate need to close the democracy gap that has been imposed on them.

Any recognition of national origins should include Australia’s historic Anglo nation. Sir Henry Parkes, father of federation, spoke of the crimson thread of kinship that united the colonies and would bind the planned Commonwealth.¹⁰⁶ Now we must declare a red line in the sand, marked by the sign: You will not take our Commonwealth, our creation, from us. Morally it belongs to us, because our forefathers constructed it explicitly to serve our ethnic interests, as well as the needs of indigenous-Australians and all citizens.

At the same time the BAC suggests a way forward. The nation’s origins and indigenous prior settlement should be recognised in a preamble to the Constitution, as set out in the next section. That way emphasises genuine reconciliation based on procedure in which all major stakeholders are represented.

The next and final section discusses the broader principles for achieving genuine reconciliation.

¹⁰⁶ Salter, F. K. (2020). Sir Henry Parkes's liberal-ethnic nationalism, *Sydney Trads: Weblog of the Sydney Traditionalist Forum*, <https://sydneytrads.com/2020/12/18/sir-henry-parkess-liberal-ethnic-nationalism/>.
 Garran, Robert R. (1897). *The coming commonwealth: An Australian handbook of federal government*. Sydney and London, Angus & Robertson. Garran, a legal scholar, leading member of the Australian federation movement, and the first Commonwealth public servant, compared various states around the world. He concluded thus:
 “The conditions favourable to the development and maintenance of the federal system are three —(1) There must be among the people of the federating States some community of origin or history, to form a basis for the common national life. The ‘crimson thread of kinship’ is not absolutely essential (witness Switzerland and Canada), but greatly helps the welding of the nation.”
<https://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/garran-sir-robert-randolph-410>, accessed 7.4.2023.

11. CONCLUSION, PART 2: A VISION OF GENUINE RECONCILIATION

The voice referendum is presented as a means of ensuring that indigenous people are heard, thus helping to resolve grievance. That is why it has been attractive to many people of good will. This final section therefore addresses the larger issue of reconciliation, because disputation cannot be ended until amends heal legitimate grievances and reciprocity is shown to friendly actions. That will involve recognition of Anglo as well as indigenous grievances. In doing so, realism is essential. Lasting reconciliation must be based on the true histories of the peoples involved and their interactions. And it will be based on acceptance of human nature as it is, not as imagined by ideologues. Only then can grievances be acknowledged and reconciliation achieved.

A good starting point is to describe the particular relationship that has developed between Anglos and indigenous-Australians since the First Fleet. That relationship bears on the need and potential for reconciliation. A final just reckoning will be, in part, fair compensation and recognition, if needed, in addition to securing the rights of all citizens. In principle, this will come from both sides, but mainly from the historically stronger party, the Commonwealth, and therefore indirectly from the Anglo-core nation. The nation has shown that it is willing to make the settlement but should only do so from a position of security and strength, not as the craven begging of the defeated, not as appeasement, but as an act of leadership.

The history of Anglo-indigenous relations begins with one fact generally accepted, and reinforced by the Mabo decision, that the continent and associated islands were annexed by Great Britain and the Australian nation was built over the next century on land that had been occupied by Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders since time immemorial. After that there is less consensus.

The dominant historical narrative, the one taught in schools and universities and by the media, assumes that British settlement frustrated indigenous achievement of national consciousness and self-rule. Expressed as an explicit claim, this view is certainly false, if British colonisation is set in historical context. That context is well documented though not taught in schools.

By 1788 the world was shrinking at an accelerating pace. The states of Britain, Holland and France were competing to build global trading empires. Spain and Portugal had already been marginalised from that competition, as industry and naval power shifted to northern Europe. Just four days after the First Fleet arrived in Botany Bay, it was joined by two French ships commanded by Jean-Francois de Galaup, Comte de la Perouse. At this time the Russian empire was also expanding, though across land towards Siberia and finally Alaska. That empire would begin to compete with Britain's by the 1850s, when the two powers

went to war in Crimea. It was in the 1850s that the New South Wales colony fortified a small island in Sydney Harbour, now known as Fort Denison, in case of Russian or French attack. Australia was coveted from afar.

Though the colonial initiative lay with European states in the 18th and 19th centuries, those states did not monopolise the capacity to project power. In the 15th century China had experimented with ocean-going ships, visiting Africa. Closer to Australia, Java, Sumatra and Bali had been linked by sea trade routes to southern India since the first century AD.¹⁰⁷ Polynesians originating in Taiwan and Melanesia had developed ocean-going vessels, horticulture and a warlike culture to spread across the Pacific for perhaps 3,000 years, settling on islands as far apart as New Zealand and Hawaii.

The continent that Indonesian mariners called “Marege”, the Dutch named “New Holland” and the British called “Australia”, was about to enter this ferment. It was bound to be a shocking experience due to long isolation from trade and migration routes. The small Torres Strait Islanders population arrived relatively late, but Aborigines are estimated to have been occupants for about 50 millennia. Genetic analysis indicates that the ancestors of Aboriginal Australians arrived in one migration event originating in Africa. By 31,000 years ago Aboriginal populations became genetically isolated from the rest of the world and largely from each other.¹⁰⁸

The continent would not remain a backwater for long. Its hunter-gatherer population was tiny compared to the agricultural societies to their north. Typically, agriculture and herding have been spread by migration, “demic expansion” – local growth in agricultural populations leading to out-migration.¹⁰⁹ This was Europe’s experience, of being repeatedly colonised and invaded over many thousands of years. Even if Aborigines of 1788 or 1688 or 1588 had somehow adopted agriculture and herding without being colonised, they would have needed many centuries to grow their population and technology to a level where they could defend themselves against replacement migration.

It is difficult to transition from the hunter-gatherer lifestyle to farming. The transition can reduce nutrition for generations as a balanced hunter-gatherer diet is replaced by one heavy in carbohydrates. Contrary to Bruce Pascoe’s popular account in his book *Dark Emu*, a book often taught in schools, Aborigines

¹⁰⁷ <https://www.esamskriti.com/e/History/Indian-Influence-Abroad/Historical-Ties-India-and-Indonesia-1.aspx>, accessed 1.1.2023.

¹⁰⁸ Malaspina, A.-S. et al. (2016). A genomic history of Aboriginal Australia. *Nature* 538(21 September): 207–214.
There was possibly a small internal migration about 4,000 years ago that affected language and tool-making.

¹⁰⁹ Cavalli-Sforza, L. L., P. Menozzi and A. Piazza (1994). *The history and geography of human genes*, abridged edition. Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, p. 108.

did not practise agriculture.¹¹⁰ That was even true in northern Queensland where they lived close to and traded with Torres Strait Islanders for at least 2,500 years. The latter culture practised gardening, part of their traditional Melanesian culture.¹¹¹ More than 200 years after the First Fleet brought farming to Australia there are still few Aboriginal farmers. The federal government's analysis of the agricultural sector in 2023 fails to mention indigenous farms, even on Aboriginal land, a telling admission-by-omission by our politicised bureaucracy.¹¹² The lack of Aboriginal farmers is remarkable, because in 2021 indigenous-Australians controlled 54 percent of Australia's land mass. Yet in that year only one percent of the agricultural workforce identified as indigenous. In 2011 indigenous people formed 3 percent of the population in inner regional areas, 6 percent in outer regional areas and 15 percent in remote areas.¹¹³ In 2021 just five indigenous students graduated in agriculture across all universities and colleges. Concerned commentators report a lack of interest in agriculture among indigenous communities. Despair is evident in their recommended solution. They urge the agricultural sector, one of the most efficient and technically advanced on the planet, to take the initiative in consulting indigenous workers on the principle that "Indigenous people's input and talent is vital to modernising the agricultural sector".¹¹⁴

As a result of its isolation, in 1788 the continent was a power vacuum, with a small population, no state-level political organisation, and hence no unified army or navy. Though familiar with their own local territories, the approximately 500 linguistic groups did not have a concept or name for the country as a whole. Aboriginal clan-based social organisation fitted the hunter-gatherer way of life. Due to the small population, the "big-man" tradition already practised by their cousins in Highland New Guinea had not developed, let alone the more advanced organisation structure called "tribes". Aborigines were not yet on a path to modernisation. Neither did they have tribal organisation, hereditary chiefdoms, and other stages in political evolution that presage state organisation.

¹¹⁰ Sutton, Peter, and Keryn Walshe (2021). *Farmers or hunter-gatherers? The Dark Emu debate*. Melbourne, Melbourne University Press.

¹¹¹ Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Trade, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, <https://kids.britannica.com/kids/article/Aboriginal-and-Torres-Strait-Islander-Trade/629048>, accessed 16.5.2023.

¹¹² Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics and Sciences (2023). Snapshot of Australian agriculture 2023, *Abares Insights*, March. https://daff.ent.sirsidynix.net.au/client/en_AU/search/asset/1034541/0, accessed 27 March.

¹¹³ Baxter, Jennifer (2011). *Families in regional, rural and remote Australia*, Australian Institute of Family Studies, March. <https://aifs.gov.au/research/research-reports/families-regional-rural-and-remote-australia>, accessed 16.5.2023.

¹¹⁴ Gilbert, Joshua, and James Pratley (2021). Australia's agriculture sector sorely needs more insights from First Nations people. Here's how we get there, *The Conversation*, 6 December, <https://theconversation.com/australias-agriculture-sector-sorely-needs-more-insights-from-first-nations-people-heres-how-we-get-there-173154>, accessed 27.3.2023.

Without external involvement, the territory that was to become Australia would have continued to remain defenceless for the foreseeable future. The realistic question in the late 18th century was not whether Australia would be colonised, but which culture or cultures would fill the vacuum?

Arguably, the indigenous population won the jackpot when, of all the circling powers, the continent was seized by Britain, a small cluster of islands on the other side of the world. Britain was special. Few other powers were in the process of limiting their own aggression, whether by outlawing slavery or developing liberal democratic politics. And no other power, not even Britain's European competitors, offered such profound cultural capital, a vast leap up from the Stone Age tool kit.

About 6,000 years before the First Fleet, farming entered what would become known as the British Isles. The transition happened in the usual manner, through the wholesale replacement or absorption of the original hunter-gatherer population by farmers migrating from the mainland. The change in economy therefore came with a substantial change in genetic identity. Analysis of DNA in ancient skeletons shows that the farmers who migrated across the Channel were racially different from the indigenous hunters. More than half their genes came from the Aegean Sea area.¹¹⁵

A population's adoption of agriculture reduces its equilibrium with the environment. Equilibrium is reduced because farmers and herders change their environments more than do hunters and gatherers, accelerating the feedback between genes and culture. This changes the direction and intensity of Darwinian selection pressure on the digestive tract and cultural selection on economic and political traditions.¹¹⁶ In the case of the British Isles, selection during and after the Neolithic came to operate on mutations and innovations that occurred across the European continent. The Neolithic farmers were the first to build a monument at Stone Henge, a project that was predicated on the population growing by two orders of magnitude and on extensive cooperation and organisation. That population was largely replaced by immigrants from the continent, the Bell Beaker culture. This new people, with distinctive genetic makeup, made copper utensils, and subsequently discovered bronze. Metallurgical and other technical developments continued in Europe. In their turn, this population would be culturally transformed and genetically admixed by the Anglo Saxon migrations in the fifth century AD, giving rise to England. By the mid 1700s the

¹¹⁵ Davis, Josh (2019). Neolithic Britain: where did the first farmers come from? *Science News*, Natural History Museum [London], 15 April, <https://www.nhm.ac.uk/discover/news/2019/april/neolithic-britain-where-did-the-first-farmers-come-from.html>, accessed 19 April 2023.

¹¹⁶ Cochran, G. and H. Harpending (2009). *The 10,000 year explosion: How civilization accelerated human evolution*. New York, Basic Books..

Salter, F. K. (1995). *Emotions in command. A naturalistic study of institutional dominance*. Oxford, Oxford University Press Science Publications.

English people were pioneering the Industrial Revolution, which was set to create a cornucopia of material wealth.

Meanwhile, the Australian population was almost in equilibrium with its environment, isolated from trade and migration routes for at least 30,000 years. The resulting cultural gulf is difficult to comprehend. As historian Geoffrey Blainey put it, when the British arrived in Australia, “[t]he people who had just invented the steam engine were face-to-face with people who, though rich in many branches of knowledge, could not boil water.”¹¹⁷ The contrast in cultural and political cultures was equally profound.

These characteristics of British economics and political culture softened, though did not eliminate, the harsh colonial experience of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. There were aggressive actions against them, such as occupation of traditional lands, removals, and the inevitable frontier conflicts with settlers who had a technological advantage. At the same time, despite the impracticality of making treaties with the hundreds of small indigenous clans, there was no genocide, the colonial authorities provided legal protection, and indigenous men could vote in the colonies of South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales, and Tasmania well before most British men received the franchise in 1918. The indigenous population has recovered overall and might now exceeds its pre-1788 dimension.

When the British claimed, named, and settled Australia they broke no laws or moral standards of the time. In the late eighteenth century international law permitted annexation and conquest and even slavery. European powers were taking the lead in developing international law and would become morally critical of conquest and colonisation. But for the time being, and still today to a degree, states operated within an anarchic world (dis)order.

If the colonisation of Australia from 1788 is viewed from the British perspective, it appears less as a questionable annexation or outright invasion and more as an inevitable race against time and distance. For the indigenous population, their inevitable colonisation happened as humanely as could be expected.

This historical context invalidates much of the blame being heaped on white Australia’s colonial ancestors. At the same time, it reinforces Anglos’ motivation to do everything in their power to keep the positive interpretation true, by ensuring that indigenous peoples continue to benefit from a secure and prosperous Anglo-core nation. It is also relevant that the six colonies and the federal Commonwealth have gone a long way to fulfilling that obligation. However, the commitment to treat indigenous fellow citizens with dignity and respect does not oblige Australia to disable its system of representative government in the

¹¹⁷ Blainey, G. (2018). Australia Day doubters misread our past. *The Australian*. Sydney, 25 January, <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/commentary/opinion/australia-day-doubters-misreadour-past/news-story/a4ffd4e490743a7c24fb1eb120e127>, accessed 29.11.2021.

effort. On the contrary, Anglos have a duty to all citizens to preserve a secure, united, and prosperous Australia.

Also relevant to reciprocal reconciliation is what both sides contributed to the other. Both contributed to Australian identity.

Indigenous peoples' main contribution was to share their land. Though the sharing was usually involuntary, it nevertheless makes ATSI people foundational for the nation. Moreover, that contribution was value-added. Down the millennia Aborigines had shaped the distribution of plant species, especially through frequent controlled burning. They assisted colonists, guiding them to resources and pathways using their superior local knowledge. Later, some participated in the rural economy, for example as stockmen. Elements of their culture were often adopted by the settlers. Like ancient Celtic place names found throughout England, the large number of Aboriginal names for places and features across Australia signals their prior habitation and language. The same applies to names for implements – boomerang, didgeridoo, woomera – and flora and fauna – waratah, mulga, kookaburra, kangaroo, emu, dingo, brolga, budgerigar, and galah. By sharing the heritage of deep familiarity with country, indigenous culture helped those who came afterwards develop a sense of place. Indigenous peoples – mainly Aborigines – contributed to Australia's identity.

Anglo colonists brought vast cultural capital, millennia worth of invention and accumulation across Europe and beyond in the realms of agriculture, science, medicine, industry, religion, law, politics, philosophy, the arts, and literature. The First Fleet brought Western civilisation, and with it the white race's extended phenotype, to the Great South Land. This included social capital distinctive to Europe – relatively high individualism combined with relatively low ethnocentrism and collectivism. Western Europe was on track to develop a tolerant cosmopolitanism that eased the life of minorities.¹¹⁸ At the time of the First Fleet, the English were still robustly patriotic with a keen sense of historical identity. They were capable of engaging in ethnic conflict. But they were also relatively individualistic and amenable to rule-of-law and empathy for foreigners.

Most of the cultural and social capital brought to Australia had universal value, because it was useful to people everywhere. This included a parochial cultural element, the English language, destined to become the global language of trade and science. As a result, the Aboriginal population, after its long period of isolation, was almost instantly transported millennia ahead of the trajectory of their unaided development. For all those gifts, indigenous people should feel gratitude, if not to the people who brought them, then to extraordinary good luck.

¹¹⁸ Triandis, H. C. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1989: Cross Cultural Perspectives*. Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press.
MacDonald, K. (2019). *Individualism and the Western liberal tradition: Evolutionary origins, history, and prospects for the future*, Kindle Direct Publishing.

Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders have added a local texture to national identity in a way special to Australia, making them a founding people alongside Anglos. Due to disparity of numbers and economy, the indigenous component was more significant qualitatively than quantitatively. The bulk of national identity markers came from Anglo pioneers and immigrants. If the continent had been devoid of people in 1788, Australia today would still be part of Western civilisation with British characteristics. The convict influence helped the new nation jettison the aristocratic baggage of the Old World. Evidence of the quantitative importance of Anglo identity in Australia and other colonies is their continuing familiarity across the English-speaking world despite some differences in cultural admixture. Country was the massive quantitative contribution made by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. Their contribution to Australia's cultural capital and thus to its identity was not special quantitatively; but qualitatively it was unique. No other national identity carries the golden Aboriginal threads of identity – folk ways, art, language, names, myths, connection with country, and race. Anglos should be grateful.

White settlers came to identity with the whole continent, a result of the charting that was substantial by 1770 and completed by the 1830s. The early explorers became part of Anglo national lore. In contrast, indigenous peoples' familiarity with country was ancient but also local. Aborigines did not know that they lived on a continent-sized island, because they did not possess maps. They had no name for the continent as a whole. It is true that Anglos settled on particular plots, which they named – Sydney, van Diemen's Land, and so on. But they were the first Australians to have an overview of their physical place in the world. Due to cartography, they knew they were settling a vast land, which they named. During that process they had a collective self-awareness, something at first not available to indigenous people due to limited communications. Aborigines did not have a collective vision of themselves. Anglos did possess a collective conception of themselves and of the territory they were occupying. In the long run, none of this matters very much. Everyone now has access to the same information. Nevertheless, it remains a matter of fact that the first Australia-wide nation was created and understood predominantly by people from the British Isles.

In 1901 the six self-governing colonies united to form the Commonwealth of Australia, a federal nation state. They did so explicitly as an Anglo nation, as repeatedly observed by political leaders during the constitutional conventions of the 1890s. The most famous example is the speech by Sir Henry Parkes, discussed earlier, in which he spoke of the "crimson thread of [Anglo] kinship". In the background to these developments, the content of Anglo identity was being modified by ever-accumulating historical experience of ATSI people. The thread

of kinship now ties more and more indigenous people and culture to the nation and vice versa.

For most people with indigenous heritage assimilation is well advanced. Most Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians have become or are becoming one with the Australian nation, undergoing change while causing change to the whole. Along with political enfranchisement (delayed in Queensland and Western Australia), indigenous men began to serve in the armed forces. They fought in the two World Wars, a fact known to their comrades and becoming more widely known today. Another example is Aboriginal art, which has become famous worldwide, but more importantly for Australia, has become part of our national culture. Its meaning rests on a foundation of Aboriginal community, remembered and lived.¹¹⁹

The indigenous component of Australians' ancestry, however it manifests or is recorded, will forever retain the unique status of first peoples.

Many in the indigenous rights movement claim that this is not enough. They want protection from a constitution that, while not completely indifferent, while raising no impediment to their full participation in politics or society, does not name them, does not recognise that they were here first, nor acknowledges their contribution to national culture and identity. Many indigenous-Australians think that the Constitution should include such recognition.

Anglo-Australians should sympathise with this complaint because the Constitution also barely mentions them. Since the 1970s that document has stood by, so to speak, while hostile elites attacked the country's founding assimilationist immigration policy. The resulting diversity has undermined civil liberties such as freedom of speech and of association, and it has set the country's founding Anglo people on track to become a minority within a few decades. Another cost has been to democracy. The transformation of national identity has been unpopular, and could only be achieved by avoiding democratic process. Indeed, Australian prime ministers such as Malcolm Fraser and Bob Hawke admitted that if the Australian people had been given a choice, they would have rejected massive indiscriminate immigration. Similar processes have been at work around the Anglosphere, causing the state to delicense the founding nation. Perhaps the Constitution should be amended to help prevent and redress elite predation against the founding peoples, indigenous and Anglo, just as the Magna Carta of 1215 pioneered rights against arbitrary rule?

Changing the Constitution to protect its founding peoples should be done in a manner compatible with good government, which practically rules out interfering with the legally-binding body of the document. Nevertheless, in

¹¹⁹ Rothwell, Nicolas (2016). Indigenous art's journey traced in three pivotal books, *The Australian*, 26 November. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/arts/review/indigenous-arts-journey-traced-in-three-pivotal-books/news-story/07b6ac108e3e73585d075c215a778d5e>, accessed 11.4.2023.

principle all founding peoples have an interest in amending their constitutions to protect them whenever the state apparatus – broadly defined to include cultural and administrative elites – turns rogue, as the Commonwealth has done for several decades against Anglo-Australia.

Shared interest is the axis around which reconciliation should turn. Both sides – the nation and its indigenous component – have an interest in good governance, as discussed at some length in Section 7 concerning stakeholders. Indigenous-Australians, like the rest of the population, have an interest in preserving the Commonwealth because they are citizens who share in the public goods flowing from the economy, society, and government. It would be imprudent to ally with those who would wreck the Commonwealth's constitutional structure.

Therefore, as proposed earlier, prudence indicates that any voice should be installed via conventional legislation or in a preamble to the Constitution, as proposed by former prime minister John Howard.

Within that frame of shared interests, the two parties should state their needs and what they are able to concede. Before discussing negotiable terms, it is important for the sides to understand one another's basic conditions. So far in the referendum process no one has been invited to speak for Anglo-Australians.

NON-NEGOTIABLE TERMS

Anglo-Australians' opposition to indigenous recognition would recede if the indigenous movement took the nation's interests into account. Australia has two historic peoples, indigenous and Anglos, both worthy of recognition, whether in the Constitution, legislation, or in educational curricula. If the Constitution is to be amended to afford recognition to Australia's founding peoples, it is appropriate that both indigenous- and Anglo-Australians be recognised. At present indigenous peoples are shown sympathy, while Anglo history and behaviour are often vilified.¹²⁰

If Australia's origins are to be recognised in the Constitution, the people who largely created the nation and the Commonwealth cannot be omitted. If, as prime minister Anthony Albanese put it, "the fullness of our history" is to be recognised, Anglos cannot be left out. Failing that basic standard of fairness and truth-telling, recognising indigenous people alone will divide our society. Recognition must be conferred on both or on neither.

At the minimum, any indigenous voice should be formulated in consultations with all major stakeholders, especially both of Australia's ancestral peoples.

¹²⁰ Richardson, H. and F. K. Salter (2023). *Anglophobia: The unrecognised hatred*. Sydney, Social Technologies, Create Space.

Consideration of the legitimate interests of Anglo-Australians recommends rejecting the proposal of a constitutional voice. The same considerations yield sympathy for indigenous aspirations for recognition.

Those positions can be described by four non-negotiable conditions.

FOUR NON-NEGOTIABLE TERMS

The first condition is that a voice will not compromise national security, national territory or cohesion. Therefore, a voice or other constitutional or legislative recognition must not empower the separatist revanchist nationalism advocated by Anglophobic elites. Secondly, a special case of the first condition is that recognition or autonomy must not result in independent policies concerning foreign affairs or immigration. Thirdly, recognition must not weaken the nation's influence on the Commonwealth, for example by impeding its efforts to eliminate Anglophobic policies. Finally, recognition must not compromise Australia's system of government. Let us consider these in turn.

For the sake of national security, whether one sees the First Fleet and subsequent British settlements as an invasion or annexation, it is now imperative for the nation and the state and their dependants that Australia remain whole and undivided. The nation can allow for symbolic access to land such as provided for by the High Court's Mabo decision. It can continue to allow for and contribute to the cost of preserving religious sites and other special needs – linguistic, cultural, medical, economic, educational, and social – to facilitate indigenous cultural continuity and ameliorate disability. However, no act of reconciliation should be allowed to threaten national continuity, unity or identity. Any attempt to split off territory or otherwise weaken or dispossess the nation is unacceptable. That includes attempts to vilify or diminish the demographic standing of Anglo-Australians.

This principle applies to foreign affairs. Australia must settle indigenous grievance and minority assertiveness in general, or it will be less able to navigate the hazardous regional environment that is coming in the near future. Like America, Australia possesses the huge strategic advantage of being a coast-to-coast continental country with no adjacent threatening powers. Being unimpeded by a home front frees us to engage at will far from our shores. Both countries are in the process of neutralising that advantage through imprudent race relations compounded by indiscriminate mass immigration. In both cases the root cause is a political class whose immigration policies resemble those of a quisling regime more than of a loyal democratic leadership. The United States could very well withdraw from world engagement due to economic mismanagement and metastasising ethno-cultural diversity. With this in mind, Aus-

tralia needs to present China and India with a united posture, or we risk being absorbed into their strategic-demographic spheres.

Politicians on both sides of politics have been turning a blind eye to Aboriginal separatism. Anglo-Australians are unlikely to accept this forever, especially if their advocates gain representation in the political system. Criticisms of indigenous separatism are already being made by at least one minor party, led by Pauline Hanson. She asserts that the exponents of a voice “want an independent race-based black state”.¹²¹ This criticism was also enunciated by Keith Windschuttle in his 2016 book, *The Break-up of Australia: The Real Agenda Behind Aboriginal Recognition*. This reaction could grow to become a powerful force impeding reconciliation. If this is to be avoided, then individuals who affiliate with the Anglophobic multicultural establishment should be rejected as negotiation partners.

Also unacceptable on the part of an emerging indigenous state would be such an entity adopting its own foreign or immigration policies or asserting the degree of independence necessary to enact those policies. The states are already effectively prevented by Section 61 of the Constitution from conducting foreign policy.¹²² Neither may states raise armed forces without permission of the Commonwealth (Section 114). Collective agreement with these principles is therefore a necessary indigenous contribution to reconciliation. Anglo-Australians look to the indigenous rights movement to acknowledge that they are part of the Australian nation and that national sovereignty entails the Commonwealth’s monopoly of foreign affairs and military powers. The Commonwealth and its parliament must remain united and the supreme policy-making body.

Thirdly, no act of reconciliation should impede the nation from reclaiming democratic control of the institutions of government. Maintaining democratic control is important because common sense and events of recent decades reveal that a rogue Commonwealth can and has become the vehicle of those who are not attached to the nation’s identity or continuity. To reiterate from Section 3 on evaluative criteria, “state” refers to the governmental component of what is sometimes called the political establishment or deep state – the federal and state governments, including the senior bureaucracy, public broadcasting, universities and other senior sections of the educational system. Too often, elements of the state apparatus act against fundamental national interests. This is unacceptable. The Commonwealth must not attack the nation that created it. Anglophobia,

¹²¹ Hanson, Pauline (2023). Voice activists are a ‘bunch of hypocrites’: Hanson slams Minister for Indigenous Australians, *Bolt Report*, Sky News Australia, 6 March, 2:37 minutes. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SdPxuMOwZjU>, accessed 11.3.2023.

¹²² Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs. (Undated). *Trick or Treaty? Commonwealth Power to Make and Implement Treaties*, Chapter 4: Treaties and the Commonwealth Constitution, Parliament of Australia, https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Legal_and_Constitutional_Affairs/Completed_inquiries/pre1996/treaty/report/c04, accessed 16.5.2023.

like other forms of racism, is unpleasant and divisive. In an Anglo-core nation it is seditious. More broadly, a voice or other forms of recognition must not exploit or otherwise unfairly disadvantage non-indigenous citizens.

The fourth non-negotiable condition is that recognition should not degrade governance. It is tempting to argue that fairness requires equivalent recognition of Anglo-Australia. But fairness does not equate with feasibility. An Anglo voice fashioned along the lines proposed for indigenous-Australians would undermine our system of representative democracy. The imperatives of parliamentary supremacy and unity of government disallow a constitutionally mandated Anglo voice as much as they do an indigenous one.

If the referendum fails, that too can be attributed in part to the exclusion of Anglo advocates from the referendum process. If those advocates had been included, they might have pointed out some sensitivities of the large Anglo population, and helped make the proposition both feasible and acceptable.

NEGOTIABLE TERMS

Agency.

The gap and reconciliation are often discussed together because it is assumed that indigenous disadvantage is caused wholly by white colonisation, for example by annexation of land and disruption of traditional social ways. Therefore, it is argued, the large gap between indigenous and non-indigenous health, criminality, and income can only be closed by initiatives coming from whites, meaning the nation – making reparations and otherwise undoing the harm their ancestors allegedly inflicted. (See Section 4.)

As noted earlier, such a narrative assumes that indigenous people have had no agency, that their actions have had and continue to have no effect on their current situation. It is assumed that from 1788 until today, indigenous people have been passive recipients of impacts coming from non-indigenous people, that they are always the innocent, ineffectual party and that the nation, especially Anglos, are the party bearing sole responsibility for present inequality, indeed for all negative indigenous behaviour.

Aborigines were faced with an overwhelming colonial force, but that does not mean they had no agency. This implied narrative is taken as an excuse to ignore causes of Aboriginal disability originating in that population. This might seem ridiculous but it has dominant status among the cultural elites. Soviet-style rejection of biology, including the sciences bearing on human nature, is still influential in the humanities and social sciences,¹²³

¹²³ Salter, F. K. (1996). Sociology as alchemy [review of *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Sociology*, 1994]. *Skeptic* 4(1): 50-59.

Indigenous-Australians could not resist British annexation, but they have always had agency. Accepting that a person or group has a degree of free action implies that they also have a degree of responsibility for their actions.

We have already mentioned negotiation partners. If indigenous people do in fact have agency then they should be expected to meet minimum standards of dealing and settlement. Reconciliation can only be achieved between fair-minded people on both sides. Anglo-Australians cannot afford to involve bad actors in the process of forging a national settlement. They need credible, fair-minded negotiation partners with whom to work out a genuine settlement. Otherwise, an agreement will be unacceptable in the long term.

The recognition of indigenous agency also prompts us to examine the two slogans – “reconciliation!” and “close the gap!”. These catchwords are almost equated in public pronouncements by the Yes campaign because both are touted as prime reasons for installing a constitutional voice.

These slogans are used to justify the transfer of power to a new regime of permanent joint sovereignty. It is incumbent on any serious participant in the voice discussion to analyse the Gap and its causes as a means of assessing how reconciliation might be achieved. We cannot avoid considering hypotheses of major causes, including group differences in historical, psychological, behavioural, and evolutionary factors.

Unfortunately, Australian universities are not prepared to deliver such information, because the humanities and social sciences are corrupted by intolerant utopian ideology and activism. Consequently, for many decades they ignored or repudiated the vast body of knowledge concerning human nature, including individual and group differences. As a result, such knowledge bearing on Australian society is not up to date, consolidated or readily accessible. That is a pity, because the available data indicate that some indigenous disadvantage in health is caused by different evolutionary histories.

The gap is not closing despite the generous funding of indigenous health and welfare programs over many years. The massive funding of indigenous welfare programs is sustainable, but only if indigenous peoples remain part of the nation. Australians understand that their indigenous fellow citizens have special needs due to economic isolation in rural communities, long-term disruption of their life ways by white settlement, and cultural differences. There is much goodwill among taxpayers, but their ability to pay is limited, practically and morally.

Expenditure on indigenous programs has blown-out due to lack of rational administration. Senator Jacinta Price points out that in 2016 only 8 percent of the 1,082 indigenous-specific programs had been evaluated. Of those that were eval-

uated, the methods used were anecdotal and did not measure effectiveness. Price concludes that the “close the gap” industry has failed.¹²⁴

Administrative irrationality begins with the failure to analyse the “gap”, meaning indigenous disability. Poor indigenous outcomes in education, income, child care, and criminality remain unexplained by government agencies. Instead they and their academic consultants operate on the assumption of absolute cross-ethnic equality in cultural and genetic potentiality, an ideological tenet that might have been drawn from Stalin’s Soviet Union. Indeed, as we have seen in Section 7, the Expert Panel appointed by prime minister Julia Gillard actually cited a pro-Soviet ideologue writing in the 1940s. It is assumed that differences in outcome must be due to externally-imposed unfair disadvantage. The evolutionary causes of Aboriginal disability should be an area of inquiry in Australian social sciences.¹²⁵ Instead, the topic is studiously ignored by university faculties to shield their students from the sciences of human nature. Consistent with Senator Price’s remarks, it appears that ideological blindness has allowed race-guilt hucksterism to run amok.

When universities’ ideological corruption is overcome and the Gap is subjected to serious analysis, it might be possible to make progress while reducing expenditure to a more sustainable level.

Reconciliation should be a two-way process. Unfortunately, those indigenous leaders who seek redress for past harms typically are not equally prominent in reciprocating the nation’s generosity and fairness. If concord were the goal, demands for redress would be accompanied by expressions of loyalty to the Commonwealth. There would be no hint of breaking up the country or criticising national interests. They would attempt to heal or at least apologise when indigenous people have placed unfair burdens on taxpayers, as discussed below. These burdens include high welfare and medical costs, the diminution of trust and safety in local communities and schools due to disorderly and offensive public behaviour, harm to property and persons due to extraordinarily high rates of crime, psychological harm against onlookers within Australia, and reputational harm to the nation in the form of embarrassment on the international stage.

Aboriginal leader Nyunggai Warren Mundine lists dysfunctions of many Aboriginal communities such as in Alice Springs. These include violence, especially rape and battery against women. They include theft, alcohol abuse, petrol

¹²⁴ Price, Jacinta Nampuinpa (2023). Voice risks perpetuating a long history of failure, *The Weekend Australian*, 4 March, p. 21. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/indigenous-voice-risks-perpetuating-a-long-history-of-failure/news-story/fcb5ed9afa39ea5b5a825e9e4802f70d>, accessed 12.3.2023.

¹²⁵ Richardson, H. and F. K. Salter (2023). *Anglophobia: The unrecognised hatred*, Sydney, Social Technologies, Create Space, Chapter 7, section D-3.
Salter, F. K. (2016/2014). *The war on human nature in Australia's political culture: Collected essays*. Sydney, Social Technologies.

sniffing, and drugs. These social dysfunctions cause people to stay indoors to avoid the mayhem. Children need to be hidden from predatory males.¹²⁶ Mundine pointed out that every government, both state and federal, as well as many media channels, have ignored the desperate reality of Aboriginal dysfunction.

Truth-telling should also involve indigenous leaders. They should cease blaming Anglo-Australia for all their ills and stop supporting those who cast that slur or who belittle the nation. In general, the ill will expressed by some indigenous people needs to be opposed by any party seeking negotiations. They should not allow themselves to be used as battering rams by Anglophobes and others who would harm the Australian nation.

Only when these attacks on the nation are brought within tolerable limits, at least by the negotiating parties, can the reconciliation process move forward. How can an agreement be negotiated with a people claiming collective rights when they refuse to demonstrate collective responsibility? A ceasefire in the culture wars is an absolute precondition for peace talks to begin.

Financial reciprocity.

This paper has been arguing that any form of recognition, including a voice, should be designed and enacted equitably. That includes financial contributions. If indigenous people have agency, should not those who participate in a voice pay some of its cost? After all, the proposed voice is designed to be a private ethnic good. None of its advocates have provided justification for having non-indigenous citizens provide all the funding. What could be such a reason?

Ian Callinan notes that the proposed voice would be paid for with non-indigenous taxes. It will not be self funding and it will offer no direct accountability to the taxpayers who fund it.¹²⁷ Callinan also asked whether participation in the voice will be voluntary and whether voting for voice office-holders will be compulsory? Callinan's questions raise issues of fairness.

It would be degrading for non-indigenous citizens alone to fund what is meant to be a sectional lobby. The beneficiaries should provide a share, with a generous means-tested subsidy from the Commonwealth government. Not doing so would be tantamount to treating indigenous-Australians as exploitative aristocrats or as child-like wards of the state.

Making participation compulsory would also be improper, because it would remove free choice. How can self-determination have any meaning if it is made compulsory or is paid for by others? By enabling democratic choice – of joining or not joining – the voice would rise or fall in legitimacy and influence depend-

¹²⁶ We were 'picking kids up on the street' and taking them home: Nyunggai Warren Mundine, *Sky News* interview, 27 January 2023. <https://www.skynews.com.au/opinion/rita-panahi/we-were-picking-kids-up-on-the-street-and-taking-them-home-warren-mundine/video/2e17837e0513c5c4c8de1e137ec5bdce>, accessed 31.1.2023.

¹²⁷ Callinan, Ian (2022). Examining the case for the voice.

ing on its acceptance among indigenous people. This seems to answer part of commentator Henry Ergas's criticism of the proposed voice. Ergas maintains that creating a racially-defined body is necessarily divisive.¹²⁸ He has a point, but any divisiveness would be softened if indigenous people were given the option of choosing to belong to the voice or other bodies and categories. While someone should only be able to claim indigeneity if they can identify some threshold degree of ancestry, they should also be able to opt out of the indigenous category due to self-identity or preference.

Reciprocity should also apply to group apologies. In 2008 prime minister Kevin Rudd apologised on behalf of the Commonwealth for the removal of many children from Aboriginal families. He said "sorry" to the "Stolen Generation". In order to establish trust, Aborigines should apologise to Anglo-Australians, when appropriate, for transgressions committed by members of their communities (described above). An Aboriginal apology would not at all excuse instances of bad behaviour towards indigenous people or nullify prime minister Rudd's apology. But it is surely reasonable that indigenous leaders should apologise for patterns of bad behaviour shown by their own local communities.

The principle of taking responsibility fits English philosopher John Stuart Mill's criteria for participation in liberal democratic liberties. Mill wrote in 1861 that: "... a people must be considered unfit for more than a limited and qualified freedom who will not co-operate actively with the law and the public authorities in the repression of evildoers".¹²⁹

Furthermore, if Aborigines are to be treated as a nation-wide collective interest group, then apologies are also warranted at that scale, by their national leaders. If community leaders refuse to apologise for patterns of exceptional bad behaviour that occur in places across the country, then how can they consistently demand to be treated as indigenous representatives of good will?

If the answer to that question is that a collective apology is impossible for organisational reasons, then it must also be impossible to organise meaningful consent to a treaty, voice, or recognition. If indigenous leaders will not or cannot apologise when their people behave badly, then let us call the whole reconciliation thing off. Negotiations should be conducted only with indigenous leaders who are credible negotiation partners. We should only negotiate with those willing to say take responsibility where appropriate.

Furthermore, indigenous leaders must deliver, at least to some degree. Saying "sorry" is nice, but non-indigenous-Australians primarily want the bad behaviour to end or at least decline to an acceptable level. The rest of the nation

¹²⁸ Ergas, Henry (2023). There is no question the voice is racially discriminatory, *The Weekend Australian*, 22 April, p. 15. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/there-is-no-question-the-indigenous-voice-to-parliament-is-racially-discriminatory/news-story/84699d959bde2e5c4cd6d92f60f35cd0>

¹²⁹ Mill, J. S. (1972/1861). *Considerations on representative government*. South Bend, Ind., Gateway Editions, p. 7.

will provide support, but indigenous communities must solve this horrendous problem themselves. There are no excuses. If they request help from local, state and federal governments, the nation will answer Yes. Community governance? Yes. Alcohol bans? Yes. Demands for sovereignty? No. Acceptance of attacks on the nation? No!

Responsible negotiation partners should also show consideration for the interests of all major stakeholders, which means citizens as a whole, including the Anglo-core nation. And that will entail rejecting the anti-white component of the multicultural industry. Independently-minded and responsible spokesmen should step forward. Unity between the nation and its indigenous members should help, as would governments taking a stand and actively supporting patriotic indigenous leaders. The combination would be powerful.

At the same time, Anglos should demand inclusion in the referendum process and cessation of systemic Anglophobic exclusion and vilification. They should advocate for their own as well as for national interests.

Only through full consultation can indigenous recognition be conducted in a legitimate manner. The goal should be reconciliation through finding a settlement consisting of respectful mutual recognition. An example will close this statement. It is a revision of the well-known Acknowledgment of Country to include both Anglo- and indigenous-Australians.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE HISTORIC AUSTRALIAN NATION

We acknowledge the Anglo explorers,
pioneers and their descendants
who planted the British flag and
Western Civilisation on this continent,
creating the Australian nation.

We acknowledge the Aboriginal and
Torres Strait Islander peoples
who have lived here since the Dreamtime.

And we acknowledge the
Federal Commonwealth of Australia,
created by the nation under the Crown
to guard the nation and
the liberty of all citizens.