



Andrew Bolt

Australia's most read columnist

I am, you are, we are Australian



ANDREW BOLT HERALD SUN JANUARY 29, 2014 8:43PM

Andrew Bolt writes that he considers himself an indigenous Australian. Picture: Carmelo Bazzano Source: Leader

I AM an indigenous Australian, like millions of other people here, black or white. Take note, Tony Abbott. Think again, you new dividers, before we are on the path to apartheid with your change to our Constitution.

I was born here, I live here and I call no other country home. I am therefore indigenous to this land and have as much right as anyone to it.

What's more, when I go before the courts I want to be judged as an individual. I do not want different rights according to my class, faith, ancestry, country of birth ... or "race".

I'm sure most Australians feel the same. We are Australians together, equal under the law and equal in our right as citizens to be here. That's how we've been for generations. It's why we've welcomed lawful immigrants and damned racists.

But this Australia is now under severe threat. Most incredibly, that threat is now led by Prime Minister Abbott, a Liberal. Abbott says he wants a "national crusade" to change the Constitution to recognise Aborigines as the "first Australians".

"If we had known in 1901 what we know now, if our hearts had been as big then as now, we would have acknowledged indigenous people in the

Headline

Author, source, date and time of publication

Image and caption included

Establishes authority for speaking on the issue
Grabs the reader's attention through the use of powerful language and establishes contention

Continues to build on argument by listing other dividers in society

Use of inclusive language

Use of quotation from key individual

<p>Constitution back then,” he said this week.</p> <p>This is nonsense. The writers of our Constitution no more lacked heart than do people today.</p> <p>The difference is they were inspired by the creed that all citizens — those, at least, we admitted — are as one before the law.</p> <p>True, they did not always live up to that ideal (although, contrary to popular myth, they granted Aborigines the vote in all states where they had the franchise).</p> <p>But even if we don’t always follow our moral compass, the answer never is to break it. Changing the Constitution to divide Australians between the “first” and the rest — on the basis of the “race” of our ancestors — is not just immoral and an insult to our individuality.</p> <p>Worse, it is socially dangerous. This will not “reconcile” us but permanently divide. It would do no good to a single Aboriginal in bush camps, but would concede a critical point: that Australians in our most fundamental legal document are now to be divided by “race”.</p> <p>Abbott insists he will not endorse any change that will have that practical effect in the courts. He means to treat the Constitution in this matter as if it were just a history book, not the foundation of our law.</p> <p>But once he concedes the principle he concedes everything.</p> <p>He will not get the “reconciliation” he imagines, some shiny day when we all hug each other in happy tears.</p> <p>He will instead license demands from people, particularly race industry professionals, who will in some cases be satisfied with nothing less than apartheid.</p> <p>Consider the history of this disastrous “reconciliation” movement. First, we were told we simply needed to say sorry to be reconciled.</p> <p>As Aboriginal activist Professor Mick Dodson claimed: “The apology has the potential to transform Australia and, once and for all, to put black and white relationships in this country on a proper footing.”</p> <p>Prime minister Kevin Rudd duly said sorry in 2008, but then another step was needed, after all — a law to recognise Aborigines as the First Australians.</p> <p>As Ballarat elder “Uncle” Murray Harrison put it: “As far as I’m concerned this is what it’s all about, just being recognised would put the icing on the cake, mate.”</p> <p>So last year Parliament passed an “act of recognition”, but that wasn’t enough, either. Now the Constitution itself must change, and already we’re told even that won’t do.</p>	<p>Refutes claims made</p> <p>Use of informal language</p> <p>Use of inclusive language</p> <p>Use of key term in the debate (‘reconciliation’) and introduces this idea which is expanded upon later</p> <p>Use of transition words such as ‘then’ and ‘so’ to show the evolution of the steps in the ‘reconciliation movement’</p>
---	--

<p>Abbott’s chief adviser on Aboriginal issues, Warren Mundine, this week said we must then negotiate treaties with each of Australia’s hundreds of tribal “nations” to “acknowledge Australia’s right to exist”.</p> <p>Pardon? Argue with hundreds of Aboriginal “leaders” over whether our nation actually is entitled to exist? Have the incendiary debate Israel has with its Muslim enemies?</p> <p>What next? Well, Aboriginal leader Sol Bellear, chairman of the Aboriginal Medical Service, Redfern, spelled it out on the ABC: a future in which “no Australian court has the right to sit in judgment of my people.”</p> <p>Indeed, we already have an “Aboriginal Provisional Government”, led by Michael Mansell, with such a separatist agenda. So when exactly will we be “reconciled”? When our country is torn apart on ethnic lines, with more recently arrived groups demanding their own customary laws, too?</p> <p>Stop now. Say no to racism. Say no to racial division. Say no to changing our Constitution.</p>	<p>Use of comparisons</p> <p>Transition word ‘next</p> <p>Use of rhetorical questions</p> <p>Use of short simple sentences that gradually increase in length and repetition to create a sharp, pointed conclusion to the article</p>
<p>From: http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/opinion/i-am-you-are-we-are-australian/story-fni0ffxg-1226813342744 Retrieved 7/02/2014</p>	