



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.8

March 7th, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *".....British institutions, torn out of their living historic framework and dumped in the jungle could provide no safeguard against every sort of exploitation of the primitives by the Intelligentsia."*

– Sir David Kelly in **The Hungry Sheep** (1955)

THE BOUGAINVILLE TIME BOMB IN AUSTRALIA'S NORTH by Eric D. Butler:

Although generally little known, Sir David Kelly's work, *The Hungry Sheep*, is one of the most important books of the post Second World War period. One of the United Kingdom's most distinguished Ambassadors, Sir David Kelly was one of the first to discern the real nature of the Soviet Union. Based upon his first hand observations of the Soviet as British Ambassador in Moscow, Sir David observed that it was impossible to understand the Communist question without an understanding of the undergirding Marxist philosophy. This was extremely difficult in a Western world which had been progressively torn from its own traditional Christian roots. Kelly was a dedicated Christian.

One of the most perceptive chapters in *The Hungry Sheep* is entitled "Colonial Policy Takes The Wrong Turning". This was written before Harold Macmillan's famous "Winds of Change" speech concerning Africa. The rapid collapse into Charnel house conditions throughout Africa is a bloody testimony to the reality of the warning of Kelly and other realists. As Kelly observed the massive international campaign against European, particularly British, colonialism had the complete backing of the Marxist-Leninists everywhere. The Bougainville problem, exploding on Australia's front doorstep, is the result of the same liberal thinking which has progressively undermined Western Civilisation. No sooner had the Second World War finished than the liberal intelligentsia were pressing for Australia to grant "independence" to Papua-New Guinea as quickly as possible. Unless Australia did this, it would be condemned by "world opinion". Realists with practical knowledge of Papua-New Guinea, authorities like Sir Raphael Cilento, warned of the dangerous absurdity of the proposal. Even at the time of the formal granting of independence by Australia in 1975, previously unknown tribes were still being discovered. But the great liberal myth was advanced that if the hundreds of different tribes throughout Papua-New Guinea would enjoy democracy and nationhood if they had imposed upon them the political vote. It is estimated that apart from a number of different ethnic groups, there was at the time of independence some 4,000 different languages and dialects. When the Whitlam Government pushed ahead with a premature independence programme, there was not only no pressure inside Papua-New Guinea for such a programme, but there was active opposition from significant groups such as the highlanders and outer islanders like the people of Bougainville. But the Fabian zealots dominating the

Whitlam Government were determined that people of Papua-New Guinea were going to have "independence" and "democracy" irrespective of widespread opposition. The new "nation" was left with first class Australian administrators, most of whom were dedicated to trying to make work a programme in which they had little faith.

Anyone with even the most elementary knowledge of Papua-New Guinea knows that the people of Bougainville are of a completely different ethnic and cultural background to, for example, the highlanders. From the very beginning they were opposed to being under a central government in Port Moresby. There was friction between Port Moresby and Bougainville from the beginning. The friction was intensified with the development of the huge copper mine on Bougainville which at one time was producing approximately 25 percent of the Papua-New Guinean national income. The Bougainvillian people saw no benefits from this operation, which was upsetting their traditional way of life. Many of the workers were brought in from the highlands or elsewhere. The seeds of revolution eventually grew into an open revolt during which the copper mine was forced to cease operating. In spite of loans from the International Monetary Fund, the economy of Papua-New Guinea has declined, with Australia reducing its financial contributions.

Any attempt to resolve the present explosive situation, with the central government resorting to recruiting the support of professional mercenaries, which does not take heed of the desire by the people of Bougainville to enjoy a greater degree of self government, is doomed to failure. All Governments at Canberra have failed to heed the reality of the situation. The long term strategic interests of Australia demand stability among its northern neighbours. With the break down of Dutch colonial rule in the series of islands known today as Indonesia, Indonesia moved into West New Guinea, known now as West Irian. When the Portuguese Colonial system broke down, the Indonesians moved into East Timor, creating a growing problem which must be of the greatest concern to Australia. Australia's foreign policy must also take notice of the internal friction in Indonesia, with ethnic and cultural differences making it possible that eventually there will be a major internal explosion. Governments faced with internal conflict often resort to external expansion. Any major break down in Papua-New Guinea would be an invitation for Indonesian expansion. Washington policy makers closed their eyes to Indonesian expansion into New Guinea and East Timor. Australia should face the reality that they cannot rely upon American support. Even former Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser has discovered that in the mounting international trade war, Australia is not regarded as an American ally, but is expendable.

Having helped to create the problems afflicting the Papua-New Guinea Government, Canberra would be well advised to stop lecturing Sir Julian Chan and use whatever influence it may still have, to urging that the situation in Bougainville can only be resolved by heeding the wishes of those described as "rebels". But the major factor now clearly emerging to Australia's north is that Australia must take immediate and urgent steps to increase its own military defence capacity. Without increased defence capacity, Australia can exercise no effective bearing on events. But at the very time it should be increasing its military defence capacity, the Howard-Costello Government is attempting to **reduce** defence spending in a futile attempt to fill a "black hole" which the financial experts claim appears to be getting bigger. If ever there was a time for an Australia First programme to boost both Australia's military and economic defences, it is **now**. Graeme Campbell and his colleagues would be well advised to give a major lead while there is still time for effective action. Unless this action is taken Australia is doomed to collapse into a black hole of real national disaster.

BLAINEY FLOGS MABO JUDGES by David Thompson:

National Party leader Tim Fischer has been strongly critical of the High Court decision on the Wik case, and although Chief Justice Brennan has taken Fischer to task, Prime Minister Howard has refused to criticise him. With the role of the High Court now a matter of national controversy, a mild-mannered historian, Professor Geoffrey Blainey, has delivered a stinging attack on the Court in north Queensland on Friday, February 28th.

We quickly forget that Blainey has been highly critical of the Court now for a number of years. In June of 1993. Blainey noted that conditions then existed (produced by the Mabo judgement) for the establishment of **two systems of government**. In his newspaper column, Blainey wrote that *"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"*.

In November 1993 Blainey delivered a public lecture in Adelaide, in which he attacked the historical basis for Mabo, and stated that if the Chief Justice of the Court could not explain the historical basis of the decision, he should resign. The result was a political contratemps, in which then Prime Minister Keating described Blainey's comments as "fanatic right-wing views", and Blainey was abused by the press.

On Friday, February 28th, Professor Blainey addressed the Sir Arthur Fadden Memorial Dinner in Townsville, and again savaged the High Court. He charged two of the High Court judges who ruled in favour of the Mabo native title judgement with being irresponsible, **one of whom is now the Governor-General, Sir William Deane**.

Sydney's *Sun-Herald* (2/3/97) reported Blainey as saying that the Mabo judgement had been made to **seem** fair, but in fact had been based on simplistic historical views. The Mabo ruling, he said, was followed by Keating's Native Title Act, which was conceived in secrecy, and sprung on an unsuspecting Australia. While the Act pretended to attack racial discrimination, it **enshrined** it instead. *"It perpetuated a new form of racial discrimination, a nation-wide form of land tenure based on race,"* he said.

Blainey has attacked the historical basis for the Mabo decision previously. When the High Court delivered the Mabo decision, (then) Justices Deane (now Governor-General) and Gaudron, in their decision wrote that, in certain areas, *"The obliteration, or near-obliteration of the Aborigines, was the inevitable consequence of them being dispossessed of their traditional lands."*

Blainey, who is credited with coining the phrase "the black arm-band view of history", rejects such a contention. *"Disease, far more than bullets, was the killer of Aborigines. If the history of disease in Australia was outlined, it would greatly weaken the case laid by these two justices . . ."* In 1993 Blainey accused these two justices of *"expounding a crude form of racial prejudice against British settlers"*.

BLACK STATES OR INTERNATIONAL SANCTIONS? At present, it is almost universally regarded as "extreme" to suggest that unless Australia moves towards the establishment of sovereign black states within the country, we may be the subject to international economic sanctions, and ultimately even war. But for some time the nation has moved in this direction. Blainey's comment in 1993 that *"the ever-increasing grants of land to Aborigines is **probably a step towards two peoples and two nations** ..."* is nothing short of prophetic. Although it is too far off for the majority of Australians to observe, the nation is being positioned in a "pincer movement" of policy.

N 335.408 ONT

On the one hand, the establishment of native title, and the High Court's insistence that such title can co-exist with pastoral leases, has created enormous rural tension. If the Commonwealth legislates to alter this situation, which Prime Minister Keating claimed he had "fixed" with his Native Title Act 1993, they must also deal with the Racial Discrimination Act 1975. If the R.D.A. is altered, the "Aboriginal Industry" is threatening massive demonstrations to interrupt the Olympics. Mr. Sean Flood, a member of the National Native Title Tribunal, has predicted that "*countries which trade with us could impose sanctions*" (*Weekend Australian*, 1/3/97).

The other "arm" of this pincer is only now becoming visible. It consists of yet another United Nations "treaty", the **Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples**. If the Declaration is adopted, the assumption of Australia as one nation, populated by one people, would be entirely swept away. Such a Declaration would not only provide an international forum for the "grievances" of "indigenous" peoples, but would establish the **right to self-determination** of indigenous peoples, and the **right to establish indigenous states**.

As yet, the "official" Government position is that such a Declaration, even if adopted, would not be legally binding, and would only have a moral strength. This is not the case. At the very least, such a declaration would provide an activist High Court with yet further basis to continue to change the face of Australian legal, cultural and political structures.

The implications of this Draft Declaration for Australia are immense. The Aborigine "Industry" is anticipating that it can provide the means for a dramatic advance in their quest for "rights". So-called Social Justice Commissioner, Mr. Mick Dodson, is reported as declaring that the draft is merely the "floor", not the "ceiling" of the quest for black power. It is the starting-point of a renewed revolution that could sweep away the present concept of the Australian nation, undermining our ability to act in a concerted way in political, economic or constitutional matters. We can expect to hear a great deal more of this Draft Declaration on Indigenous Rights.

WHO ARE "INDIGENOUS" PEOPLE? In another statement, Social Justice Commissioner Mick Dodson has called for the Commonwealth to remove all tertiary fees for **indigenous** students, in order to give them greater access to higher education. Much is being claimed on behalf of "indigenous" people; indeed, the entire continent is claimed on their behalf as "the original Australians". But are the "original Australians" also the "indigenous" people by definition? We strongly suspect that the word "indigenous" is being used as a moral club with which to beat the descendants of immigrants, by implying that they have "stolen" the land, and owe the descendants of the original inhabitants material redress.

In fact, the correct meaning of the word "indigenous" is not the descendants of "original" inhabitants at all. According to Webster's English dictionary, an *indigene* is "an aborigine, a native plant or animal". Further, the adjective indigenous is defined "**born or originating in a country; native**". Native has clearly to do with birth, rather than descent, and technically, all those who were **born in Australia are "indigenous"**.

If the Aboriginal Industry intends that the **descendants** of the original inhabitants should receive material redress, then he should say so. This, however, rather weakens his argument. Who is an Aborigine? Only those of exclusive Aboriginal heritage, once described as "full-bloods"? Or are those who share both Aboriginal **and** European heritage to be considered as "Aborigines"? It is clear that continued loose use of the term "indigenous" will become increasingly divisive, leading rather to resentment than reconciliation.