



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance —*

Registered By Australia Post — Publication No. VBH 0999

Vol.29, No.23

June 18th, 1993

## THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:

"What's in a name? That which we call a rose  
By any other name would smell as sweet."

- William Shakespeare

## LESSONS FROM SOUTH AFRICA by Eric D. Butler:

The stage is being set for a major tragedy in South Africa, one which will dwarf the tide of violence and bloodshed which has already taken place. European South Africans are becoming increasingly militant with former leaders of the South African armed forces now openly declaring that there will be military resistance to the type of programme proposed by African National Congress leaders, these directly or indirectly under the control of hard core Communists, although these Communists now call themselves Socialists. The student of the Marxist-Leninist movement recalls how from the beginning Karl Marx and Frederick Engels regarded the terms, Communism and Socialism, as almost synonymous. They originally considered calling the famous "Communist Manifesto", "The Socialist Manifesto".

Former dedicated Communists throughout the former Soviet Empire, now describe themselves as Socialists. But as the editors of the Russian Independent paper, *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, have warned, the Communist philosophy has not completely gone in Russia and that while like a cancer, it may be in remission, it has by no means been completely eliminated, and may return in a new and more dangerous form.

South African Communists have not only transformed themselves into Socialists, but are being presented as Christians by South African Christian leaders. South African anti-Communist Christians were shocked when the two leading Communist strategists in South Africa, Mr. Chris Hani, who had been General-Secretary of the South African Communist Party, and Mr. Oliver Tambo, the Communist who for many years had been the driving force behind the African National Congress,

were hailed as Christians and given high-profile Christian burials. Many churches held memorial services. Oliver Tambo's body lay in state in St. Mary's Anglican Cathedral, Johannesburg, for two days following the requiem mass in his honour. On prime TV news on the evening of Hani's death, another top Communist, Joe Slova, a Lithuanian Jew, appealed for Hani to be mentioned in all church services on the following day. Here was a life-long Communist, a professing atheist, calling on Christians to honour his fellow Communist and atheists on Easter Sunday, one of the most sacred days in the Christian calendar.

But Archbishop Desmond Tutu went even further, using the funeral to equate Hani with the death and resurrection of Christ. Tutu claimed that out of Hani's death at Easter time would come a great victory for the forces of "liberation". According to a report from appalled South African Christians, Tutu turned the funeral of the Communist Hani into a feverish political rally, inviting those present to chant with him, "We will be free; we will be free."

At the funeral of Oliver Tambo, the Rev. Frank Chikane, General Secretary of the South African Council of Churches, compared Tambo with Moses. Nelson Mandela said, "While the ANC lives, Oliver Tambo cannot die ... Oliver Tambo cannot die while his allies in the South African Communist Party and Congress of South African Trade Unions remain loyal to the common purpose."

Christian leaders in South Africa, as elsewhere, have played a major role in betraying the South African people to growing violence and bloodshed. They will be the first in calling for the United Nations to send a "peacekeeping force", one which will prove even more futile than what is being attempted in Yugoslavia, where at long last it is being increasingly admitted that the only hope for peace in the Balkans is for the major ethnic groups to be assured of self determination in separate areas. This is the type of policy which was attempted in South Africa, but vilified by the swear word, "apartheid". How ironic that the UN may be forced to attempt policing a policy of "apartheid" - separate development - in Yugoslavia while eventually being called upon to try policing the bloody results of destruction of this policy in South Africa!

But any attempt to use the UN in South Africa must end in a major disaster, one with profound international effects.

#### **HOW MABO ESTABLISHES AUSTRALIAN "APARTHEID":**

The wild, ideologically-driven claims to more huge areas of land for Aborigines as a result of the Mabo case, and the political posturing attending the attempts to resolve the implications of Mabo, make a mockery of the Prime Minister's ham-fisted attempts at reconciliation

between Aborigines and other Australians. The Court's establishment of a form of native title previously unknown in this country has further encouraged the revolutionary forces who have long used the interests of the Aborigines to shatter Australia into two separate nations. Historian Professor Geoffrey Blainey notes that while Aboriginal health, housing and employment is largely ignored, "the ever-increasing grants of land to Aborigines is probably a step towards two peoples and two nations or, worst of all, two half-nations".

Observing that the granting of too much land to Aborigines will be extremely divisive, Blainey says that it is no longer true that Aborigines are "landless in their own land". Blainey writes: "The part of the nation now in the hands of Aboriginal groups and trusts is extensive. It probably covers about 15% of the continent. Aboriginal lands form almost a continuous corridor from the Aratura Sea to the Southern Ocean, with only tiny breaks in the continuity. One Aboriginal block is about as large as Portugal, another as large as the Netherlands. Most of the land in Aboriginal hands is arid, but some is rich in natural resources. One large Aboriginal area has the rainfall and general capacity to support a nation of many millions at East Asian standards ... The average Aborigine has about 12 times as much land as the average non-Aborigine ... we could well end up with two permanent systems of land tenures and the genesis of two systems of government." (The Age, 12/6/93)

WHO MAKES THE RULES? Throughout last week's conflict with the State premiers, Mr. Keating held to his position, summarised when he said "It's no point the premiers telling me their States don't accept the (Mabo) decision - it's a matter of law". It certainly is a matter of law - this much is correct, but who should decide what is the law? The press has muddied the waters by making similar assertions to Mr. Keating's, one journalist writing disparagingly of the premiers "blindly refusing to acknowledge the fact that the activist High Court had made a new form of Aboriginal land title a legal reality which Parliaments cannot alter".

At least the Premier of Western Australia, Mr. Richard Court, does not accept this position. Court argues, "It is the elected members of Parliament who make laws in this country and I can't believe that they continue to say that the High Court can make the laws and we must accept them ...". The constitutional position supports Mr. Court.

Of the few journalists who have even taken the trouble to read the High Court judgement, Alan Jones makes sense. In an article last weekend (Sunday Telegraph, 13/6/93), Jones quotes from the decision which establishes that while Mabo's people should enjoy title to their land, this is "subject to the power of the Parliament of Queensland and the power of the Governor-in-Council of Queensland to extinguish that title by valid exercise of their respective powers...". Jones notes that "Federal Parliament has no power to legislate in relation to land title. That is a State Parliament prerogative. So it is the States which must legislate to extinguish native title...."

THE "EXTERNAL AFFAIRS" POWER: While it is certainly true that each State can resolve the Mabo problem by legislating, the Commonwealth still holds the "ace in the pack" - the Racial Discrimination Act of 1975. Any legislation which may be construed to discriminate against Aborigines, either in extinguishing native title, or compensating "inadequately" for doing so, could be disallowed under the Racial Discrimination Act. Where did this come from? Almost directly from the United Nations Convention on Civil and Political Rights, through the loophole of the "external affairs power" (Section 51 xxix) of the Constitution. How did this happen? An "activist" High Court ruled in the Tasmanian Dam case of 1983 that the Commonwealth had the power, under the above "external affairs" power, to impose the terms of any foreign "treaty" on the States. Power was effectively centralised further, and the key figure involved was Justice Lionel Murphy, former Attorney-General in the Whitlam Government, and strong supporter of radical Aboriginal land claims.

THE NEW INCREDIBLE LAND CLAIMS: Once again, the interests of the genuine Aborigines are being submerged in the ideological claims of the radicals. Claims for huge areas of land that not even the Mabo decision can justify, further aggravate potential conflicts. For example, Mr. Michael Mansell, Secretary of his Aboriginal Provisional Government, is claiming 20% of Tasmania for Aborigines. For many years European Australians have been accused of the genocide of Tasmanian Aborigines to the point of extinction. How amazing that so many of these unfortunate people can now be found to sustain a claim to unbroken habitation of parts of Tasmania!

The only long-term solution to the Mabo problem, is to re-state the constitutional powers of the States, and their relationship to the Commonwealth. This involves challenging the High Court's revolutionary decision in the Tasmanian Dams case, that the "external affairs" power can be used as an excuse by the Commonwealth to override the States on any issue. Keating is quite incorrect when he claims that the Mabo decision can never be changed. He could pave the way himself by agreeing to modify the Racial Discrimination Act to accommodate new State laws to deal with Mabo fairly. But he will never do so, as this acknowledges State powers that he and his colleagues have worked hard to eliminate. Keating's concern for the Aborigines is not genuine; his real concern is for power. As has been the case for the last 20 years, the genuine interest of the real Aborigines are submerged by the power-mongers.

ESSENTIAL READING: Land Rights Birth-Rights by Peter B. English. \$12.00, or \$14.50 posted - see "On Target" Bulletin.

---

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Subscription \$30 p.a.  
Telephone: (03) 650 9749 Fax: (03) 650 9368