

<h1>CONNECT</h1>	
<h2>For Your Own Protection</h2>	

1405 CE

Is it really about protection – or is it really about tyrannical control

1 It's time we all understood what "protection" means to the *state*. What better way to find out than looking at how they have "protected" people in the recent past – their own indigenous people? It appears the *state* committed atrocities under the banner of "protecting" the indigenous people.

2 I didn't learn about any of these atrocities at school. Finding out, now, about the Australian, Canadian and American governments' deletion of their indigenous people's human rights has been repulsive. But it shows what human beings are capable of when they have power over other people.

3 I won't go into too much detail about what happened in any of these countries, it's really important that people read about it for themselves. There are some starter links at the end of this article. I'll just summarise, briefly, some of the key points.

4 Firstly, Australia.

The [Stolen Generations, also known as Stolen Children](#), were children of Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander descent removed from their parents by Australian government agencies - including church missions - under an act of Parliament called the **Aborigines Protection Act 1869**.

The justification for this removal of children was the assumption that the Aboriginal population was doomed to extinction. The *state* policy was, initially, to remove all mixed-race Aboriginal children from their mothers, to keep the Aboriginal race pure.

For the Aborigines' protection, in other words?!?

The "Chief Protectors of Aborigines" along with many other white people, believed that, as they were then known, mixed-race or half-caste children could be trained to work and assimilated into white society. Children were taken between about 1905 and 1967, but in some parts of Australia [it was still happening in the 1970s](#).

Official government estimates are that, in some regions, between one in ten and one in three Indigenous Australian children were forcibly taken from their families and communities between 1910 and 1970.

- 5 The original version of the Aborigines Protection Act "*just*" gave the **state** the power to take mixed-race children. The Act was later expanded to mean that - by 1915 - the Australian government had [the power to remove any Indigenous child](#) from their parents - for *any* reason.

The Australian government has since [issued an apology](#), describing the Stolen Generations as a "blemished chapter in our nation's history." The government talked about "[righting the wrongs of the past](#) and so moving forward with confidence to the future", a "new page in the history of our great continent" and "the healing of the nation".

It strikes me that the government wanted to sweep what happened under the rug, perhaps in the hope that nobody would realise that what they had done was even worse than stealing people's children.

How can it be worse?

Believe me, it can - and it is.

The Australian government kept slaves. Child slaves; at least some of the stolen children were made to work and received no wages. Correction, they did receive wages - in a way - it's just that their wages were paid to the government. There were [tens of thousands of Indigenous workers](#) whose wages were sent to governments across Australia.

Perhaps the government looked after the children's wages "for their protection". To stop them from buying alcohol or illegal drugs, perhaps. Or food.

Or perhaps the removal of these children was nothing to do with protection and everything to do with making money for the government or sections thereof.

In any event, the government never gave them their own wages. Now, some of the surviving children who were kept as slaves are taking them to court over the money.

In any event, for the government to call this atrocity a "blemished chapter in our nation's history" says rather a lot about them. I'll just say, that if that was a blemish, I dread to think what, to the Australian government, a gaping wound looks like.

- 6 The Australian government has "resolved that the injustices of the past must never, never happen again."

They have talked about a "future where we embrace the possibility of new solutions to enduring problems where old approaches have failed" and a "future based on [mutual respect, mutual resolve and mutual responsibility](#)" - and a future where "all Australians, whatever their origins, are truly equal partners".

Right now in Australia, the way the state is treating its citizens under the guise of "protection" is not "shaping the next chapter in the history of this great country, Australia."

If a "great country" is only great at the expense of its individual citizens – their choices and their dignity – that country is NOT great. Saying sorry is not enough in this case, at last NOT in my view.

- 7 I have written about Thalidomide, in particular about how long it has taken – and is taking – for the people affected by this drug to be compensated. This abomination at the heart of Australia is afflicted by the same issue.

The Australian government set up the Stolen Generations Redress Scheme through which survivors, removed as children from their families, can apply for financial recompense and a personal apology from the government. They set this scheme up in 2021 – like Thalidomide, decades later.

Again, as with Thalidomide, many of the people affected will have passed on. But the real reason this offer of "make it all right money" – along with counselling and the chance to tell a government official your story – strikes me as repulsive, especially when considered alongside the lacklustre apology finally given by the government – is this...

- 8 The Australian government has not explained or given a shred of a reason to believe something equally vile will not happen again.

Which is no surprise. Because right now, something equally vile IS happening again in Australia and this time, it is not only the indigenous people who are being treated as the property of the **state** – it's everyone.

- 9 Next, Canada.

The [Indian Act](#), created in 1876, has [enabled trauma, human rights violations and social and cultural disruption](#) for generations of Indigenous peoples. The Act was founded on a number of colonial laws with one aim: to [eliminate First Nations culture](#) and force the First Nations people to be assimilated into Euro-Canadian society.

It was not until 1951 that the [First Nations people had any say](#) in the legislation that deleted their rights and controlled them like cattle. One of these colonial laws was the 1850 Act for the [better protection of the Lands and Property](#) of First Nations people. Although the First Nations people have now gained some power to govern themselves, the Indian Act is still in existence.

Protection?

The Indian Act forbade First Nations peoples and communities from expressing their cultural identity through festivals, religious ceremonies and cultural gatherings – even dancing was illegal.

The Act removed the traditional structures of governance and the tradition of

hereditary chiefs – they could no longer self-govern themselves. Instead, government officials had the power to allow, or withhold, Indigenous rights based on their assessment of “good moral character.”

The government also made it illegal for First Nations peoples and communities to hire lawyers or bring about land claims against the government without the government's consent.

How convenient for the government.

First Nations children were forced to attend industrial or residential schools. The dark legacy of these residential schools in Canada lives on today, with atrocities committed in the schools still coming to light today.

The Australian government, as I have said, stole children from their parents. And so did the Canadian government.

From 1951, the provinces had jurisdiction over Indigenous child welfare. This enabled the “Sixties Scoop” - provincial child welfare agencies [removed children from their homes](#) instead of providing community resources and support.

It has to be understood, the Sixties Scoop was not an isolated event resulting from inferior Indigenous parenting. It was, rather, [an extension of paternalistic policies](#) designed for the assimilation of Indigenous cultures and communities.

Protection, again!

Between the 1960s and the 1980s, provincial governments in Canada saw the removal of Indigenous children as the [fastest and easiest way](#) of addressing Indigenous child welfare issues.

Fastest and easiest, yes. The most important criteria for making decisions. The same criteria which lead to decisions such as shooting dead a rare white stag because it is in the way. [1395 BA]

Or installing cameras in school toilets to stop bullying [1375 AG].

The “child welfare” system did not even need to seek consent from the parents. They could just “scoop” newborn and young children from their parents, and they did. This “scooping” – look, why not just call it what it is – stealing children? - only stopped in 1980, when the law changed and government agencies could no longer “scoop” children.

These stolen children were usually “placed” – adopted, I assume - in non-Indigenous homes. Many children were sent abroad, some as far away as New Zealand. Many others were [adopted by American families](#).

Hmmm. I wonder how much money the Canadian government made from these “adoptions” given the adoptive parents were much wealthier than the original parents and keen to adopt.

I also wonder how widespread this practice of “commercial adoptions” is - and has been - worldwide. The film “Lion”, based on a true story, is about an Indian boy who was adopted by new parents in Australia. They also adopted a

second Indian boy. Both boys had lived in an "orphanage" in India before they were adopted.

Beginning in the 1990s, [lawsuits against provincial governments have been pursued](#) in relation to these child thefts in Ontario, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

It was only as recently as 2015, however, that the provincial governments of Canada began to [issue apologies](#) for the Sixties Scoop and include this history in school curricula.

10 Finally, the USA.

Like the Australian and Canadian governments, the American government has deleted the rights of their indigenous people – and often, the indigenous people themselves. And like the Australian and Canadian governments, the American government has justified doing so on the basis of "protection".

As in Australia and Canada, cultural assimilation was something the "natives" were expected to accept, along with being "civilised" by their betters. As part of this process, the US government [outlawed traditional religious ceremonies](#) and forced children to attend Native American boarding schools.. At these schools, they were forced to speak English, forbidden to speak their tribal language, forced to study standard subjects, attend church, and leave their tribal traditions behind. The children also had their names changed.

As Martin Luther King later described it:

"Our nation was born in genocide when it embraced the doctrine that the original American, the Indian, was an inferior race. Even before there were large numbers of Negroes on our shores, the scar of racial hatred had already disfigured colonial society. From the sixteenth century forward, blood flowed in battles over racial supremacy.

We are perhaps the only nation which tried as [a matter of national policy](#) to wipe out its Indigenous population. Moreover, we elevated that tragic experience into a noble crusade. Indeed, even today we have not permitted ourselves to reject or to feel remorse for this shameful episode. Our literature, our films, our drama, our folklore all exalt it."

Native Americans have been considered for a long time to be "[wards of the nation](#)."

Needing protection.

A [United States Supreme Court ruling](#) in 1886 led to the idea that the "protection" of Native Americans justified intrusion into intra-tribal affairs.

The Supreme Court and Congress were given unlimited authority with which to force assimilation and acculturation of Native Americans into American society.

"For their protection",

By this time, the judge in the case was able to accurately give reference to

the “remnants of a race once powerful, now weak and diminished in numbers”.

The judge appointed as a protector, [the very institutions which had caused that reduction](#) in numbers and strength,

Another court case resulted in [a prohibition on the sale of alcohol](#) to Native Americans.

This ruling suggested that they needed protection.

The wounds inflicted on the indigenous people, of course, still affect people today. As the [Wikipedia article](#) says,

“Many current Native American issues in the United States stem from the subjugation of Native Americans in society, including societal discrimination, racism, cultural appropriation through sports mascots, and depictions in art. Native Americans have also been subject to substantial historical and intergenerational trauma that has resulted in significant public health issues like alcohol use disorder and risk of suicide.”

This terrible legacy must apply equally in Australia and Canada – and in any country, including my own country the UK, which has violated people’s rights – wherever those violations took place.

11 This article is intended to be a “whistle-stop” look at some of the issues. The point I want to make is this.

The **state** has interfered with people’s lives in the past, using the justification of “protection”.

It has made acceptance and full participation in society dependent upon certain conditions.

These conditions have involved giving up freedoms and behaviours which connect people in their communities.

The **state** has deleted people’s rights, using the justification of “protection”.

It has weakened cultures, in a deliberate attempt to destroy them.

It has made traditions illegal.

It has even banned dancing.

The **state** has removed children from their parents, using the justification of “protection”.

It has awarded itself the power to do so without permission from the parents.

It has broken the ties between parent and child, and between children and their heritage.

It has given – or sold, perhaps – children to other people in “adoption” processes.

The **state** has treated people as **state**-owned chattels.

It has treated our children like **state**-owned chattels.

It has treated adults like children who are in need of protection.

The **state** has kept slaves - child slaves.

It has put children to work and not even paid them.

It has allocated wages to child workers, but taken that money for itself.

But the worst thing of all - the thing that should make all of us say NO to the **state's** offer to "protect" is that the **state** believes that doing all these things is OK.

The **state** sees nothing wrong with doing these things.

It is only when, eventually, people get angry, the law is forced to change, or too many people have found out, they stop doing these things.

Or do they? Perhaps being found out simply drives these activities underground.

When the **state** says sorry, it is a case of doing so eventually and then doing so poorly, weakly and badly.

The **state** says:

"Nothing to see here".

"Let's move on and build a better country".

In fact, the buzz phrase today is "Build Back Better".

Ans that phrase has been adopted by the **states** all around the world.

I say, NO.

You, the **state**, are not to be trusted.

You are not building anything.

I do not trust the **state**.

I will not again trust the **state**.

Trust is like virginity – Once it's lost – it is LOST!

This is a time for us people to reorganise.

We don't need the **state** to look after us – to protect us.

We surely can organise ourselves to handle the job differently.

We need a New World Alignment - where people are front and centre.

PS

Taking this look at how the states in the world have looked after their own people, it pricks a chord in me. All this protection stuff that **states** talk about - we are seeing again, but this time on the world stage. This time it relates to the rights and freedoms of people relative to the plandemic.

It gives me more to think about – and even more to question.

CONNECT'S Maxim and Oath

Connect is only interested in finding and sharing the TRUTH.

In search of that TRUTH, we only pose questions – we have no answers.

By: Helen King

Source: Tetbury CONNECT: [Magazine](#)

[LINK](#): Wikipedia: Stolen Generations [Australia]

[LINK](#): Class action launched against WA govn. over Indigenous stolen wages

[LINK](#): Canadian Encyclopedia: Indian Act – article about the Act

[LINK](#): Canadian Encyclopedia: Indian Act – Plain English summary

[LINK](#): Cultural assimilation of Native Americans

[LINK](#): Native Americans in the United States

[LINK](#): Rare White Stag Shot Dead – by police [1395 BA]

[LINK](#): Who's Filming Our Children [1375 AG]

FURTHER READING

[LINK](#): Australian gov.: Apology to Australia's Indigenous peoples

[LINK](#): Australian gov.: Territories Stolen Generations Redress Scheme

[LINK](#): Nat. Indigenous Australians Agency: Territories Stolen Generations Redress Scheme

[LINK](#): National Museum Australia : Aborigines Protection Act

[LINK](#): Canadian Encyclopedia – Sixties Scoop

[LINK](#): American Indian boarding schools

[LINK](#): Contemporary Native American issues in the United States



Opportunity to join the CONNECT [team and network](#)

END