

Canadian Heritage Alliance :: Articles :: Erik the Norseman :: What? Is an Aboriginal?

Thursday, February 24, 2005

GET INVOLVED

SITE MAP

RESOURCES & MORE

MESSAGE BOARD

Search the Site

Email Newsletter

HTML Text

Articles: Erik the Norseman  
Staff Journalist - email - bio

What? Is an Aboriginal?  
Erik the Norseman [email] [bio]  
Read More by Erik the Norsemen - here

We keep hearing about Aboriginals, Aboriginal issues, and Aboriginal rights. How do we define an Aboriginal? What makes someone who claims to be an Aboriginal so special and therefore entitled to preferential treatment and rights not enjoyed by those who have to pay for them, the beleaguered taxpayer? How can we validate any claim to such status when so many claimants have less than fifty percent so called Native blood?

As I have pointed out before:

If you define Aboriginal People as someone who got there (wherever there is) first, without being shoved out by someone else, before the White Man got there, then there can be no such thing as Aboriginal People, with the possible exception of some remote (and I do mean remote) South Sea Islanders. This presumes, in regards to this exception, that the Polynesians now inhabiting these remote South Sea Islands are the direct descendants of the original Polynesian settlers and not that of succeeding waves of migrating

Polynesians, a presumption with no great degree of absolute certainty.

At this point, some are going to start indignantly screaming, "How about, for example, the Australian Aboriginals? Eh!" Well what about them? They started arriving in Australia, according to the latest scientific evidence, about fifty or even possibly as long as sixty thousand years ago. More kept arriving over a period of tens of thousands of years. When the last of these Aboriginals arrived in Australia is not known but there isn't a snowball's chance in hell that the Aboriginals now inhabiting so called traditional Tribal Lands are the direct descendants of the peoples who originally settled there or for that matter, that they are even of the same racial stock.

The Chinese are now, reluctantly, having to revise their history. It seems there was a race of blond equestrian peoples riding around their interior plains some thousands of years ago. Could these Caucasian people be considered Aboriginal? Of course, the Chinese and others, expert or just opinionated, are not going to so consider them. Whites can't be Aboriginal, can they?

From the preceding it becomes evident that there can be only two possible conclusions. Either there is no such thing as Aboriginal Peoples or such peoples are comprised solely of any group of uncivilized savages who, no matter how they came into possession of the territories they occupy, they got there before the White Man

did.

In any case, we are stuck with a problem that needs to be resolved. Perhaps we should give the Natives a choice. They may live (on their reserves) as did their ancestors, without the advantages of modern civilization, subject only to the limitations of Civilized Laws or they can live as Citizens and members of the greater society, thereby abandoning their special status and rights. The current state of affairs cannot continue. They (the Aboriginals) are not only, in effect, having their cake and eating it too, but we're also throwing in the bakery, the flour mill AND the farm, all to be paid for, in perpetuity, by the taxpayer. This is utterly untenable.