The decision as to whether tourists should be allowed to climb Uluru has been a controversial topic in recent years, with the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Board deciding that it would officially ban tourists from climbing core 2019. This sparked debate within the media, with a range of people expressing strong, conflicting opinions.

Marcus Hendry, a geologist, wrote an opinion piece in the Northern Territory Geological Survey, releasing an opinion piece in 'The Australian' in which he assertively argued that to truly experience Uluru and appreciate its level of beauty it had to offer, "you must climb" it. In complete contrast to this, Nikki Gemmell's opinion piece in 'The Age' passionately proposed that the ban "feels timely and strong and right", with reflecting the "overdue respect to indigenous culture and traditions" that has been evidently missing in the past. Victoria Smith also weighed in on the debate, offering a visual representation of tourists bluntly disrespecting the Aboriginal's plea not to climb. Through this image, she is able to reinforce the disrespect that is currently present and turn support for the park ban.

Hendry begins his piece with the firm, assertive statement proposal that "if you can't climb it, I don't believe it is worth going to see." He acknowledges the opposition's arguments by quoting a "well respected" source and, in doing so, adds an element of credibility to his own argument as he highlights to the audience he isn't completely blind-sided in this debate. Through the use of a personal anecdote and strong emotive language, Hendry begins to diminish opposition views, instead creating an enticing image of Uluru and an exciting prospect of climbing it. Through an appeal to emotion, by suggesting that he...
wants to "share this experience again with [him] family and friends," he appeals to the audience's own family values and invites them to imagine the joy and "sense of physical, emotional, and spiritual connection" this would bring. Hendry references his own work as a geologist, to make himself appear like a knowledgeable source in the eyes of his readers, as he seeks to describe that "to understand the science, you must climb." The repetition of words such as "only" and "must" helps to further reinforce the notion that Uluru can not be fully experienced if it is not climbed.

Hendry's appeal to patriotism as he describes the "great Australian tradition" creates a sense of pride within readers and positions them to feel as though they will be losing a "beautiful, natural wonder of [their] world" if once the ban is put in place. Hendry acknowledges that "36 deaths" have occurred at Uluru and empathetically agrees that it is "unfavourable" that indigenous custodians feel responsible for them; however, he bluntly shuts down the perceived idea that climbing the rock is not safe by crediting the deaths to heart attacks. He forces the audience to realize that the "arbitrary timing" of protocols are "out of proportion to the risks for fit responsible individuals." By suggesting that we should need to close many "natural wonders across the world," he "applied the same logic" he used in his argument for the audience.

Hendry concludes his piece with one final appeal to unity and the prosperity that would come from being able to "share Uluru with the world," revisiting the idea of climbing the rock with family and friends. This appeal positions the audience to feel a sense of pride for the natural beauty their land has, as well as urging readers to "find a way for all cultures to enjoy this natural wonder."
In complete contrast to Hendry, Gemmell contends that you do not need to climb the rock for it to become an undeniable part of you. She thereby highlights the ban is one of timeliness necessity. Gemmell begins by extracting the heavy repetition of “you” at the beginning of her article creates a sense of personal connection within the audience and in turn a feeling of responsibility to protect and respect this sacred land. Gemmell bluntly contrasts the indigenous light touch on the land with the tourist who simply “do not” have this same respect and appreciation of cultural significance. Through quoting the polite, aboriginal polite plea for tourists to “respect our law & culture” she demonstrates how she is able to appeal to the audiences sense of empathy and injustice as they are forced to acknowledge that tourists not only ignore this, but also leave “human faeces, litter and all kinds of other detritus” on Uluru. Gemmell is able to position visitors to appear pitiful and disrespectful as immensely disrespectful not even bothered to deal with “their own waste or rubbish”. This invites the audience to associate tourists with negative connotations of ignorance and ord, in doing so, justify the need for the ban. The use of statistics to suggest that visitors are “becoming more culturally aware” helps to devolve the opposition argument that the ban will lead to a sharp decrease in tourism numbers. In support of this, Gemmell alludes to the idea that visitors who display “such verbal ugliness and cultural disrespect” for Uluru that to believe that its a “waste of time” to visit if you can’t climb, are not the sort of visitors that we want anyway. In the opposite way that Hendry used a personal anecdote to suggest that the only way you can experience the magnificence of Uluru beauty is to climb it. Gemmell’s personal anecdote highlights that the “majestic and powerful” nature of the rock
can be felt from simply being around. However, in its presence, Gemmell concludes her piece with a final appeal to empathy as she forces her audience to realise the significance Uluru has to Aboriginal people, so much so that leaving the climb open feels like a "gun being put to their heads." She urges the audience to realise the significant difference that respect for Indigenous culture and tradition is "long overdue," but this will be achieved through the ban.

In accordance with Gemmell's view, Ter Smith argues that tourists currently blantly disregard Indigenous culture and the ban is a necessary step in amending the trail of ignorance and disrespect. The picture is a sign in the foreground which blantly states "please don't climb." This is contrasted against the numerous tourists walking up Uluru in the background, thereby illustrating the visitors' ignorance and unappreciative of Aboriginal culture. This positions the audience to feel a sense of frustration towards the tourists and prompts the reader to agree that something must be done to change this. The emotive phrase "this is our home," which is displayed on the centre of the sign draws on the audience sense of empathy as they are forced to consider that people are constantly trespassing on what is sacred land to many. The multiple language
As it stands, the ban remains in place however three texts provide opposing opinion on what still appears to be a controversial topic. Hendry assertively contends that by banning the climb you are robbing tourists of the opportunity to truly experience the landscape and its beauty. Conversely, both Gannell and Smith passionately argue that the ban instead helps to cure a lack "long overdue" respect for aboriginal tradition and culture.

Excellent!

An impressive analysis of both the arguments and the persuasive techniques