

Foreword – Second Print - *Updated*

Scott Balson's involvement with the One Nation party resulted in him being named in both the Upper and Lower Houses of Federal Parliament in just one week in July 1998 - shortly after the Queensland State Elections.

In the House of Representatives Liberal MP Tony Abbott referred to him as One Nation's "*constitutional officer*"¹ and in the Senate it was Senator Ron Boswell who made much of his on-line support for the monthly broadsheet "*The Strategy*". Before this Federal Treasurer Peter Costello had referred to him in Parliament as a "*shadowy character*" because of his work in exposing the MAI².

In October 1995 Balson started recording issues that he discovered were of common concern to himself and to other Internet users around the world. He did this by establishing a daily on-line newspaper "*The Australian National News of the Day*" and by keeping a comprehensive reference archive.

A few months before Balson launched this paper, in March 1995, Cr Pauline Hanson, an elected member of the Ipswich City Council, lost re-election by a handful of votes. The loss inspired her to make a move into Federal politics with the Liberal Party. Incredibly, on the 2nd March 1996 Ms Pauline Hanson secured the seat of Oxley as an independent in a massive 19.3% backlash³ against sitting Labor member Les Scott. The new MP won because of her determination to raise issues before the election, issues that concerned people in her electorate. It was this same determination which saw her being disendorsed by the Liberal Party.

Pauline Hanson was no ordinary MP. After being elected she continued to speak out on issues that people had privately discussed in the privacy of their homes or at a friend's bar-b-que. She had let the genie out of the bottle giving the mainstream Australian population a voice - the controlling media did not like it.

When Balson covered the launch of Pauline Hanson's One Nation in April 1997 he signed up as a party member after having heard the MP speak. He realised that he, like many, shared her views. Her speech can be seen in full in **Appendix B**.

Soon after the launch Balson volunteered to become the party's Internet web master. Over the next eighteen months he was in a unique position to be able to record what happened, the real issues that One Nation stood for and how the party's stance was distorted by a hostile mainstream media. Most of the research and reference materials have been sourced from the Internet – the most powerful information tool in the world today. There are about 400 optional reference links to the Internet for readers interested in further research on issues raised.

This book is a record of just some issues that expose media distortions and blatant bias. It looks behind the agenda, power and corruption which is taking place at the highest levels – causing the death of democracy in Australia.

It is intended to release an annual update of this book until such time as the people of Australia enjoy a truly free press. The first print of this book was withdrawn from Dymocks bookstores weeks after the launch – see **Appendix F**.

This second print includes several updates during the six months between December 1998 and June 1999 as well as reports covering reaction to the first print of this book.

¹ This is a lie - See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/photo98a/parl1.gif>

² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai>

³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/onenation/hanson/vote.html>

Quotes:

The *Courier-Mail* Editorial, 2nd December 1998:

Representative democracy should be as Abraham Lincoln said at Gettysburg in 1863, “of the people, by the people, for the people”.

Terry Lane, Free Speech Committee speaking on ABC's 7.30 Report 9th April 1999:

“If you are rich you can say what you like and what's more, you can stop anyone else saying what you don't want heard... it's the triumph of the raw power of money”.

“Squalling of the Obs-Elites” by Graham Strachan⁴

For more than a year, Mrs. Hanson had been the subject of the most disgraceful display of media bias, hysteria, spite, and outright dishonesty in history. Routinely dubbing her ‘the fish and chip lady from Ipswich’, they misrepresented what she said in parliament to make her out to be a ‘racist’, made fun of her limited education and personal mannerisms, accused her of being a bad mother, attempted repeatedly to ambush and humiliate her on national television, ignored her altogether in the hope she might disappear, and ultimately lied outright about connections between her party and foreign ‘right wing extremists’. The ‘gay mardi gras’ and left-leaning programs like ‘Fast Forward’ lampooned her, busloads of paid riff-raff were hired to abuse, spit on, and throw urine-filled condoms at people going to her meetings. She received death threats and required bodyguards. In the final weeks before the election Prime Minister Howard called her ‘deranged’.

What the Australian people had been witnessing with increasing disbelief were the squallings of this country’s entrenched ruling elites in a combined and frantic effort to protect their position of privilege and power against a challenge from the ‘mass’, the non-elite voters, led by Mrs. Hanson. So confident had those elites become of their monopoly of power and policy, that they believed they had what they accused Menzies-style conservatives of believing they had after 23 years in office: a god-given right to rule.

Extract from Dymocks fax dated 12th February 1999 advising withdrawal of the first print of this book from bookshelves⁵ (See Appendix F):

“I put you on notice that any statement which you make which suggests that Dymocks' decision resulted in any way from an attempt to censor your book and the views expressed in it from being circulated, will result in the commencement of legal proceedings against you without notice.”

ISSN 1441-6476

⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/economic/170698.html>

⁵ See: <http://members.tripod.com/balson/dymocks.htm> - for scan of fax

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the support of several people who have helped me compile this book from the unique on-line library developed over the last three years.

In particular I would like to thank Antonia Feitz for her constructive criticism.

Bob Djurdjevic for contributing "*The American Chapter*". Djurdjevic is the editor of the on-line "*Truth in media*".⁶

Graham Strachan and Alan Doak for approaching me with the idea of producing a book on this subject – a book which was cast over a bar-b-que and a bottle of good red wine. You can order Graham's book "*Globalisation: Demise of the Australian nation*" on-line.⁷

Pauline Hanson for the unique opportunity to get in behind the scenes at One Nation. Without this hands-on involvement much of the analysis and comment would not have been possible.

JG Estiot, the editor of *Media Watch* Interactive, who's vigilance in reporting on the tricks of the media provided a sound basis behind many of the revelations in this book.

The many contributors to the on-line *Australian National News of the Day* over the years who have provided me with countless useful links, reports and feedback.

Global Web Builders for the use of the photographs in the centre of this book.

There are a number of cross-references to the on-line archives of the *Australian National News of the Day* within this book. They can be recognised by the following file structure: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/296/...> (*Where 296 represents the second quarter of 1996 etc*)... To access these archives you will need to subscribe. **Go to:** <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/howto.htm> **to subscribe.**

All other Internet references are freely accessible.

Scott Balson

January 1999

First published in Australia by Interactive Presentations Pty Ltd

All images and content Copyright Scott Balson, 1999

First Print: January 1999

Second Print: Release 1.2 – April 1999

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

⁶ See: <http://www.truthinmedia.org>

⁷ See: <http://www.overflow.net.au/~bizbrief>

John Alexander (*until recently editor-in-chief and publisher of Fairfax's the Sydney Morning Herald*) speaking at the Andrew Olle memorial lecture 5/11/98:
"There is arrogance without qualification, an ongoing confusion of comment with reporting, and above all, an obsession with writing about one's peers, ignoring the interests and demands of readership.
"There is a disturbing trend: The medium as (journalists as) a participant.
"It is not surprising then that politicians become deeply cynical, even vengeful... I don't suspect – I know – that we've overstepped the mark."

Pauline Hanson's personal reflection on the Australian media:

12th December 1998

We never really know what life has in store for us so most of us take it a day at a time.

I never dreamed that my life would change to the extent that it has – from a small businesswoman to a national identity. I was reared by my parents with the greatest focus on honesty, truth and the work ethic.

I have always been proud to have these most important qualities and I also believe others would have them also.

Over the past two and a half years my faith and trust in a lot of people has diminished. Trust is a quality that must be earned and I have found a vast majority of the Australian media have not earned my trust but destroyed and embedded in me a hate for journalists.

There have been many instances that have caused this. One that comes immediately to mind is a journalist who came to my office to report on the support that I had. The next day I read her article in which she mentioned that "I had a price on my head" and showed pictures of my children whom I have tried to protect from the public eye. The story was not what I had agreed to talk to the reporter about.

In another case a journalist stated that I said I would not represent the Aboriginal race knowing that I was being misquoted. It was only after eighteen months of being forced to defend myself against this lie that the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission found me not guilty⁸.

Life was not meant to be easy but when a journalist or an editor with his or her own biased views can make or break or even destroy one's life their power is quite frightening.

All that I have asked for is a "fair go".

I ask all journalists to stop being judge and jury. Report the facts and let the people judge those you report on. That's all I ask. Our lives are in your hands.

Pauline Hanson

Pauline Hanson's One Nation: <http://www.onenation.com.au>

⁸ See chapter headed "Political Correctness"

Murder by Media – Death of Democracy in Australia

	Page i
Foreword	
Chapter 1: Introduction (Murder by Media)	1
 The Politics of Power:	
Chapter 2: Media Barons and Media Ownership	7
Chapter 3: The Four Corners of Australia’s Trojan Horse	19
Chapter 4: Media’s Double Standards	35
Chapter 5: Winners and Losers in Today’s Media	40
 Just some of many Issues:	
Chapter 6: Political Correctness	63
Chapter 7: Lawyers, Native Title & Secret Women’s Business	80
Chapter 8: Labelling and “Racism”	100
 Media Lies and Distortions:	
Chapter 9: <i>60 Minutes</i> Credibility Gap	109
Chapter 10: Censoring the Truth	118
Chapter 11: Mainstream Media Censoring Others	140
Chapter 12: Just who are the Extremists?	148
Chapter 13: The anti-One Nation Extremists	168
Chapter 14: Media reports half told	
Part 1 – Dissension in the One Nation Ranks and One Nation factions	185
Part 2 – Dissenting Voices	198
 Chapter 15: The Solution	 208
 Overseas Case Studies:	
Chapter 16: The American Chapter	211
 Appendices and References:	
Appendix A: Pauline Hanson’s speech at the federal launch	227
Appendix B: Pauline Hanson’s speech at One Nation launch	232
Appendix C: The New World Order (NWO) “Liberal”	237
Appendix D: Who’s who in the Chinese wing of the NWO	239
Appendix E: Scott Balson’s unpublished right of reply	242
Appendix F: Dymocks: Don’t dare call it “ <i>Censorship</i> ” in Australia	245
Appendix G: Interesting Internet Links and Bibliography	247
Reference list of Reporters and Media under the microscope	248

Chapter 1
Introduction

But has the reporting been venomous? Murray (Australian poet Les Murray) thinks the media edits Hanson's message even as it promotes her image, keen to corral this lone woman hoofing around out of the main paddock. Not just for her views, he says, but because she refuses to quiver.

Kate Legge, "Witch-Hunt", Focus, p27, The Weekend Australian, Sep 13-14)⁹.

In the October 3rd 1998 Australian federal election the new seat of Blair was the focus of national attention because it was the seat being contested by Pauline Hanson, the leader of the One Nation party. There had been a re-drawing of the electoral boundaries in late 1997 resulting in Ms Hanson's seat of Oxley being divided into two: Oxley and the new seat of Blair. Ms Hanson chose to contest Blair.

As a result of Australia's complicated compulsory preferential system of voting, it took nearly four weeks for the final results for the House of Representatives to be published. Though it was clear on election night that Ms Hanson had lost Blair, the final results for Blair make for sobering reading: Ms Hanson polled 24,532 primary votes; her nearest ALP rival polled 17,235 primary votes; and the Liberal candidate who won the seat polled 14,787 primary votes.

SEAT OF BLAIR:

	Votes in 1998:	% of total:	Change from '96 election:
Democrat	2,480	3.64%	-2.13%
National	6,990	10.25	-6.91%
CEC	199	.29%	+.29%
ALP	17,235	25.28%	-.19%
Green	1,233	1.81%	-.43%
One Nation	24,532	35.98%	+35.98%
Liberal	14,787	21.69%	-24.20%
Ind.	554	.81%	+.81%
ACS	169	.25%	+.25%

Though nationally One Nation polled 936,296 primary votes, about 8.5% of the vote, it failed to win a single seat in the House of Representatives¹⁰. Its primary vote made it the third most favoured party in the country after Labor and the Liberals – well ahead of the Nationals and the Democrats. Yet the National Party with just 588,088 primary votes (5.3%) secured 14 House of Representatives seats¹¹.

The senate results were just as disturbing; the figures speak for themselves¹². With 820,306 primary votes the Democrats won four seats. With 930,781 votes

⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/news.html>

¹⁰ See: <http://election.aec.gov.au/natresults.htm>

¹¹ See: <http://election.aec.gov.au/natstat1.htm>

¹² See: <http://election.aec.gov.au/senate.htm>

Chapter 1 – Introduction to Murder by Media

One Nation won only one seat, in Queensland and that seat is currently being challenged in the High Court by a Chinese-Australian, Chuck Hong¹³

Most fair-minded people would have to agree that an electoral system which produced such results is deeply flawed. Why did the Australian electoral system produce these results?

Firstly the law was changed. Many Australians who voted for minority parties were increasingly irritated knowing that their vote would help elect candidates they detested. A man called Albert Langer found a legitimate method to circumvent the compulsory preferential system of voting. Instead of following party tickets and voting 1, 2, 3, 4, in an election with four candidates, Langer advised voters who did not want their vote to flow to the major parties to cut them out by voting 1, 2, 2, 2. But on the 17th of July 1998, less than three months before the federal election, the Electoral Act was amended to close this loophole. Whether they liked it or not, voters for One Nation and all the other minority parties were forced to vote *for* the major parties.

Secondly, the major parties conspired to eliminate One Nation. Until the rise of One Nation, the minor parties were not much of a threat to the established parties, but when One Nation polled 24% of the primary votes in the Queensland state election winning 11 seats, the major parties reacted decisively. Traditionally they had always placed each other last on their how-to-vote cards. For example former Labor prime minister Gough Whitlam once put the Nazi party above the Liberal party on his ticket (*Alan Jones, 17/9/98*).

But faced with the threat of a genuine grassroots opposition, former Liberal Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser and even the Zurich based David Hale called for bi-partisanship on the issue of putting One Nation last. The major parties, supposedly rivals, agreed to starve One Nation of preferences. To win a seat, One Nation had to virtually win it outright i.e. with 50% +1 primary votes, an impossible task, especially for a new party.

The how-to-vote cards for the major parties in Blair showed the effectiveness of the strategy. Non-Australian readers must realise two things about Australia's electoral system: firstly voting is compulsory; and secondly, while voters do have the choice to allocate their own preferences as they see fit, party scrutineers will vouch for the fact that most people follow the party ticket. This is what happened not only in Blair, but across the nation.

Below are the preference voting recommendations of the major parties in Blair:

Prefer:	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Labor	GRN	DEM	NAT	LIB	CEC	ACS	IND	PHON
Liberal	NAT	DEM	GRN	IND	ACS	ALP	CEC	PHON
National	LIB	IND	ACS	DEM	CEC	ALP	GRN	PHON
Dem'rat	GRN	LIB	NAT	ALP	IND	ACS	CEC	PHON
PHON	CEC	ACS	NAT	LIB	ALP	IND	GRN	DEM
or (split ticket):								
PHON	CEC	ACS	ALP	LIB	NAT	IND	GRN	DEM

GRN=Green; DEM=Democrats; NAT=National; LIB=Liberal; CEC=Citizens Electoral Council; ACS=Abolish Child Support; IND=Independent; PHON=Pauline Hanson's One Nation

¹³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/498/0212.html>

Chapter 1 – Introduction to Murder by Media

How did the major parties manage to convince their members and executives to do this? Many of the rank-and-file, particularly of the conservative National and Liberal parties were not comfortable with putting One Nation, a natural conservative ally, behind their traditional foe - the Labor Party.

This is where the media's power was demonstrated. It was done by intensifying a campaign of vilification of Pauline Hanson and her One Nation party that is unprecedented in Australia's history. What was Pauline Hanson's crime which brought such opprobrium upon her? The Land's John Carter has summed it up:

She made a maiden speech that included nine bipartisan issues not meant to be discussed in front of the people: economic rationalism, sale of public assets, tax-funded multiculturalism, the level of immigration, excessive handouts to Aborigines, youth unemployment, compulsory national service, the Family Law Act and treaties that bind our internal laws.

The establishment decided to remove the irritant. As a former head of a multi-national communications company wrote in the Sydney Morning Herald (May, 1997): Don't agree with any of the plausible things she says - just shout "racism" - and so it was.

(The Land 5/11/98)

According to the mainstream media the One Nation party is:

- ☐ “beyond the political pale and must be treated as a disease rather than as a political party” (*Sydney Morning Herald*)
- ☐ “shameless” (*Courier-Mail*)

Pauline Hanson herself is:

- ☐ “Home grown Scary Spice 'Evita of Ipswich’” (Australian)
- ☐ “almost painfully inarticulate” (Australian)
- ☐ “a mental Methuselah, seemingly progressing from primary school name calling and thuggery to feebleness without passing through an age of wisdom and grace” (*Sunday Mail*)
- ☐ “recalcitrant” (*Courier-Mail*)
- ☐ an “ignorant, illeducated person” (*Courier-Mail*)
- ☐ and has a “funny head” (*Courier-Mail*)
- ☐ shows “simplemindedness” (*Herald Sun*)
- ☐ “a two-faced manipulative politician” (Australian)
- ☐ “an anti-politician” (Australian)
- ☐ “a demagogue with her peculiar brand of neo-Fascism” (*The Age*)

Her supporters are:

- ☐ “not the classic Aussie battlers but the classic Aussie whinger” (*The Age*)
- ☐ “ugly” (*Sunday Mail*)
- ☐ “creaky, freaky” (*Sunday Mail*)
- ☐ “troglodytes” (*Courier-Mail*)
- ☐ “have a racist agenda” (*Sunday Mail*)
- ☐ “largely the least educated, worst paid and most resentful Australians” (*Herald Sun*)
- ☐ “losers” (Australian)
- ☐ “Simply not up to it” (*Herald Sun*)
- ☐ “hard-core bigots” (Australian)

Chapter 1 – Introduction to Murder by Media

- “village idiots” (Sun Herald)
- “a disorganised, ratbag, white supremacist, unarticulate and dumb mob of populists and opportunists” (*The Age*)

The party's policies¹⁴:

- are “based on prejudice, populism, ignorance and intolerance” (*Sydney Morning Herald*)
- “hate soaked rhetoric” (*Sydney Morning Herald*)
- “are shallow, ignorant and contrary to our national interest” (Australian)
- are “simplistic racism, nationalism and isolationism” (*Courier-Mail*)
- “xenophobic protectionism” (*Courier-Mail*)
- “morally repugnant and a danger to public order” (*Courier-Mail*)
- “appealed to racists and bigots” (Australian)
- a “crude mix of populism and simplistic opportunism” (*Courier-Mail*)
- “bizarre notions” (*Sydney Morning Herald*)
- “short-sighted and crude populism” (*Courier-Mail*)

Senator-Elect Heather Hill and the High Court challenge¹⁵:

One Nation had just one success at the 1998 Federal elections – the election of a Queensland Senator who attracted over 280,000 primary votes.

Within months of being announced as a successful representative in the Upper House One Nation's Heather Hill found herself being challenged in the High Court by a wealthy Chinese-Malay businessman based in Sydney. This followed an earlier report in the *Courier-Mail* on the 19th November 1998¹⁶ in which Queensland National Senator Bill O'Chee, who was ousted by Mrs Hill, queried Mrs Hill's citizenship – and thus her constitutional right to stand as a representative for the people in the Senate.

O'Chee said, “*Australian people deserve to be served by a Senator who is 100% committed to Australia and who is 100% dinki-di*”. He accused her of “masquerading as an Australian”.

When I spoke to Mrs Hill on that day regarding her current citizenship status she said that she was amazed “*at the lengths to which the major parties will go to prevent the representation of one million Australians in Federal Parliament*”.

“*My children are Australian born citizens and I have paid taxes all my life,*” she said. Mrs Hill was born in Britain but had come to Australia as a young child. Her “*predicament*” was shared by some forty Federal MPs who currently represent the people of Australia in both Houses of Parliament. However,

¹⁴ One Nation's Queensland State Policies were the basis for the new Parliament's first six Private Members Bills. These were: Community Initiated Referenda (introduced by an Independent); Truth in Sentencing (introduced by the National Party); Legislative Standards Amendment Bill; Queensland Building Services Amendment Authority Bill; Transplantation and Anatomy Bill and Weapons Amendment Bill. See: <http://www.legislation.qld.gov.au/Bills/Bills49.htm>.

March 1999 - Labor government adopted One Nation's policy of garnishing wages to get fine defaulters to repay fines – rather than sending them to jail.

¹⁵ See: <http://www.austlii.edu.au/do/form.pl> (search on “Heather Hill”)

¹⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/498/1911.html>

Chapter 1 – Introduction to Murder by Media

because they were current Members of Parliament they could not now be challenged.

The Chinese-Malay businessman had to be represented by someone in Queensland (where Mrs Hill's voter-support lay) so a Brisbane-based Chinese karate instructor, Henry Sue, served Mrs Hill the writ through Sydney-based Phillips Fox. Not to be outdone Terry Sharples, a penniless accountant joined Sue in the action and so did the Australian Government. Sharples, a failed One Nation Queensland state candidate, had earlier (on 4th November 1998¹⁷) demanded that Liberal MP Tony Abbott honour an undertaking to fund his legal costs against One Nation for earlier litigation taken against the party.

Heather Hill, on receiving the writs, established a fighting fund and called for donations. Her only other option was to withdraw from representing nearly 300,000 Queenslanders who had voted for her.

The High Court heard the case over three days with the government (represented by four solicitors), Sharples (personally) and Phillips Fox (for Sue) presenting their arguments as to why Mrs Hill should not be allowed to take up her position in the Senate.

The case opened a can of worms with the Australian Constitution itself being at the centre of legal argument¹⁸ – the High Court judges pondered over the question as to the legitimacy of Australian law after Section 59 was raised. This clause of the Constitution purports to give the Queen the power to disallow Australian legislation.

Heather Hill wrote to me after the case was heard that¹⁹, *“Clearly the Attorney Generals department believe that the meaning of the Constitution is at the beck and call of the politicians and the bureaucrats, it is refreshing to see the High Court judges standing firm to defend our constitution.”*

A decision on Mrs Hill eligibility to stand as a Senator had not been made by the High Court at the time of this book going to print.

As will be demonstrated in this book, not only the One Nation party, but Australian democracy itself suffered murder by media in the 1998 federal election. An American dissident has summed up the problem quite well:

Most people have a very limited range of real life experiences. Television and films and glossy magazine advertisements provide an enormous expansion of experience for the average person, by substituting artificial experiences for real experiences. On the television screen viewers experience artificial social relationships, artificial romances, artificial conflicts, artificial life. In advertisements they are given artificial ideals of beauty and fashion, artificial life-styles to which they can aspire. And in their newspapers and newsmagazines they are given a carefully filtered, a carefully slanted, view of what is happening in the world.

And unfortunately most people do not have sufficient powers of discrimination to distinguish the artificial world of the media from the real world of everyday experience. The two worlds merge in their minds, and they can't tell them apart. What people see on the television screen is not just entertainment; it is a collection of artificial experiences which merges with their collection of real

¹⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/99a/scasha.gif>

¹⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/hillhigh.htm>

¹⁹ See: <http://www.onenation.com.au/press/hillhigh.htm>

Chapter 1 – Introduction to Murder by Media

experiences and gives them a new and largely artificial basis for evaluating things and making decisions. Cleverly designed advertisements don't just show potential customers what is available and give them the information they need to choose what they want; clever advertising actually creates new wants, new desires, that didn't exist before. The advertisements manipulate people's desires and motivations. In a similar way television entertainment manipulates viewers psychologically. It changes their values and attitudes. It strongly affects the way they see things -- including political issues and political candidates.

Well, I hardly have to tell you that the modern mass media give enormous power, unprecedented power, to whoever controls them -- especially in a democracy. And really, no knowledgeable person who is honest will dispute my conclusion here. There are many people, who are not knowledgeable, who believe that they can watch television without being affected by it, who believe that they make up their minds independently without relying on the artificial reality supplied by television, but most of these people are mistaken, and the experts will agree with me on this. The mass media do shape public opinion, and in a democracy they do control the political process.

(Dr. William Pierce's American Dissident Voices broadcast, 12/12/98)

Statistics show clearly the biased reporting by Fairfax publishing group against Pauline Hanson and One Nation at politically critical times.

In the four months following her maiden speech to Parliament on 10th September 1996 *The Age* and the *Sydney Morning Herald* published 60 editorials, feature articles and cartoons critical of Ms Hanson.

Less than a month after the launch of One Nation in a 14 day period between the 2nd and 16th May 1997 *The Age* published 13 feature articles, editorials and cartoons critical of Ms Hanson and her party.

In a six week period from 31st May to 8th July 1998 before, during and after the Queensland state election on June 13th 1998 *The Age*

- published 60 anti-One Nation and just 12 pro-One Nation letters.
- published 6 anti-One Nation editorials.
- published 61 feature articles with 49 anti-One Nation and 12 neutral.

The Age and the *Sydney Morning Herald* refused to publish even one feature article supporting her or the party during these critical periods.

Media Barons And Media Ownership
Chapter 2
Media Barons and Media Ownership

People at the Base (the voter) never achieve or have impact on the power structure or on the direction of the Executive (senior bureaucrats and those who formulate policy) policy, unless they are aligned with a Central Oligarchic Groupings -COG - (such as oil cartels, wealthy (media) families etc...) and have higher support in the Executive arms. The media selects what causes to promote, the COGs choose their allies, and the Executive arms facilitate or disrupt those networks it chooses. The Base, which votes for the Parliaments (state and federal) has no power, little influence and is essentially an impotent shadow boxing forum. Voting is a circuit breaker directing potential insurrection into the manageable forum of Parliament.

Don Veitch, "Hansonism, Tricks or Treat"

The ABC fell foul of Kerry Packer in April 1997 after its *4 Corners* program ran an expose on some of his business dealings. Mr Packer objected to the ABC's comments about his dealings with the ANI²⁰ – a public company in Australia. The result of his displeasure was a defamation writ - a handy legal tool often used by those with money - which effectively stifled further discussion.

The *4 Corners* program revealed Mr Packer's close association with governments²¹. For example Senator Chris Schacht (Labor's Opposition Communications Spokesman) was reported as saying:

"He (Packer) and his organisation know how to play the political game, know how to lobby, know how to have influence and whenever there is something going that is in their interest, they, the Packer organisation, are pretty adept at making sure politicians of all sides know what the Packer interest is."

Bob Hawke, the then Prime Minister of Australia said on the 11th June 1987:

"It is ladies and gentlemen, a real pleasure for me as Prime Minister to be here and sit next to a person whom I am pleased, as Prime Minister of this country, to count as a close personal friend and to measure as a very great Australian, Kerry Packer."

Mr Packer's political influence has been the key which has turned his father's print media company into a giant entertainment/media empire. The empire has been built on businesses that rely on government licenses - primarily TV, telecommunications and gaming. The alliance with the Labor party in the 1980s made for a lucrative decade for the Packer family. Key policy decisions by the federal government helped transform his Nine Network into the leader in Australian TV, taking end products of the Packer empire into virtually every home in the country.

Tom Burton (journalist and former government adviser) has said²²: *"There was a joke within the Cabinet that Graham Richardson was called the Minister for Channel 9. And between him and Peter Baron who was Bob Hawke's former senior adviser, they were very effective lobbyists. I remember quite clearly one day getting this piece of paper delivered from the Prime Minister's office, Bob*

²⁰ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/packer7.htm>

²¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/packer/>

²² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/packer/packer1.html>

Media Barons And Media Ownership

Hawke's office, and we were told this is what Mr Hawke wants, well, and at the top of the page was a facsimile and it was from TCN9.

These two senior Labor figures, Richardson and Baron, later joined Packer's payroll. As noted, Peter Baron had been Bob Hawke's political adviser, and Graham Richardson, the Labor Communications Minister, was well known as the numbers man and 'king-maker' in the Labor party. Their role was to ensure on-going access for Packer to the inner sanctum of the Labor party both in Canberra and in New South Wales. Peter Baron later played a key role in the political intrigue surrounding the Sydney casino²³.

In 1995 when Bob Carr's Labor government was returned in New South Wales, Charles Shields was made Chief of Staff to the new Gaming Minister Richard Face. Shields wrote Labor's gaming policy while simultaneously being on Kerry Packer's payroll²⁴. He reported directly to Peter Baron at Packer headquarters in Sydney after he had spent some time "*digging up dirt*" on Packer's rival for the Sydney Casino - a contract originally awarded to the US based Showboat company - whose reputation was earlier tainted with unsubstantiated claims of links to the Mafia. Packer then used the courts for 2 years to stop Showboat from developing the casino. The company finally conceded, handing the project over. The *4 Corners* Report said that when Showboat conceded defeat that "*the (new) deal leaves 85% of the Casino's management contracts and 10% of its shares in the hands of the Packer's family majority owned public company PBL*".

The Sydney Casino at that time paid the Government 22% on tables and 24.5% on poker machines up to Au\$200 million in gross annual revenue, and a smaller percentage after that. This compared unfavourably with Queensland and Victoria where high-rollers were taxed at only 10%²⁵. Packer's influence changed this.

Just eighteen months later, in October 1998, Packer publicly demanded that Kennett's Victorian state government change its 'high' taxation on high roller gamblers to a rate lower "*than in Sydney*" before he proceeded with his bailout of Melbourne's Crown Casino. Liberal Premier Jeff Kennett said that the request "*made perfect sense*" and that it "*would be looked into*"²⁶.

Kennett's swift accommodation to Packer's demand demonstrates the man's power: just eighteen months previously, Packer had been considering buying the Sydney Casino where the state tax rate on "high rollers" was more than double that in Victoria home of Melbourne's Crown Casino.

Such was Packer's influence that other shareholders at Melbourne's Crown Casino realised that his revised '*government assisted*' changes to taxes on gaming in Victoria would result in the operation becoming quite profitable. Packer had effectively re-written the tax rules on gaming in Victoria through his political contacts. The shareholders in Crown pinched themselves realising that they no longer needed Packer to survive financially. In November 1998 Packer walked away from the proposed buy-out after they demanded to re-negotiate the bail out.

Packer would not let up and in December 1998 offered a share swap in his company Publishing and Broadcasting Limited to the Melbourne casino shareholders. Victoria's state premier Jeff Kennett publicly endorsed the move.

²³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/packer/packer1.html>

²⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/packer/packer1.html>

²⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/197/1401.html>

²⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/498/2210.html>

Media Barons And Media Ownership

This time Packer's bid was successful and his empire now effectively controlled the major gambling houses in both Sydney and Melbourne.

In this power play between Packer and the Victorian government no journalist remarked on the irony that the major losers in gambling at the Crown Casino were people from the ethnic communities. While Packer's Channel 9 is quick to hammer any suggestion of ethnic racism on programs like "A Current Affair", it overlooks the damage being done to those communities through the proliferation of gambling.

The Murdoch family plays exactly the same game.

"Recalling his first television licence application in Australia to a right-wing government to which his newspaper had been "pretty unfriendly", Murdoch is convinced that despite submitting a "perfect application", the licence was split in two, and he won only half.

"It was a harsh lesson, well learnt. "If I'd had a different editorial policy all the time, I'm sure we wouldn't have had that trouble, we would have had a monopoly for a few years." What he learnt was "not to go and suck up to politicians, but that you just had to cover your political bases"."

Simon Berthon, *The Real Rupert Murdoch* ²⁷

A widely publicised example of the media's recruitment of politicians was the appointment of John Howard's confidant of over 20 years, Grahame Morris. Morris was sacked over the travel rorts fiasco. He walked straight into a senior and highly qualified position in the Murdoch empire²⁸.

Regarding Morris' appointment Lachlan Murdoch said: *"Grahame's appointment to the senior management position will strengthen News Limited's policy team. He will assist us in developing strategic plans for the future of our business and will provide additional expertise in the handling of regulatory issues."*

Murdoch's approach seems to be bearing fruit because on the 20th November 1998 it was announced for the first time that News Limited were putting forward a proposal to establish a new free to air television station in Australia with new profitable digital technology implications.

It is only when the two big media players, Murdoch and Packer, fall out that the inner workings of the 'system' are revealed.

An example of this was in August/September 1997 after Packer had spent months lobbying heavily to have media ownership laws relaxed to allow him to acquire the Fairfax "rivers of gold".

At the height of discussion on changes to the media ownership laws in 1997, News Corporation chief Rupert Murdoch visited Australia and immediately secured a bedside interview with Prime Minister John Howard. Shortly after this meeting the Coalition put the proposed Packer changes aimed at the acquisition of Fairfax in the too hard basket. No public outcry could have had such an immediate impact as that one meeting between Murdoch and Howard.

²⁷ See: <http://www.theage.com.au/daily/981115/news/news24.html>

²⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/497/1610.html>

Media Barons And Media Ownership

After the meeting the Murdoch press turned on the government. On the 2nd September 1997 under the heading "Black Day for Kerry Packer" *The Australian* reported²⁹:

John Howard will be the other big loser.

Having frozen out the country's largest newspaper group, News Limited, (from owning Fairfax) he has now alienated Packer's interests, which include the country's biggest magazine publishing empire and its most powerful television network, Nine.

That night on the ABC's 7.30 Report, Fairfax journalist Peter Bowers said, "I think the last thing that made it too hard that Mr Howard realised he couldn't give the Fairfax papers to Mr Packer without incurring the extreme displeasure of Mr Murdoch and when Mr Murdoch gets angry with governments he turns his, his, his, umm... editors loose on the government and I think that was the last thing Mr Howard wanted in the run up to the next federal election."

Despite enormous pressure brought upon the party by well placed Packer lobbyists including Michael Kroger, the Coalition backed away from changing the media ownership laws. Kroger's merchant bank would have secured a financial windfall had the Coalition embraced the changes.

In *The Courier-Mail*'s lead feature story on the 3rd September, opinion writer Peter Charlton wrote³⁰:

...they (Richard Alston and Peter Costello) also are close to Victorian Liberal powerbroker Michael Kroger whose merchant bank was handling the Packer attempt to acquire the additional Fairfax shares.

Estimates of Kroger's potential fee went as high as Au\$7 million.... It is, however, fair to say that had the (Packer's) Fairfax stake been increased Kroger's merchant bank would have stood to gain handsomely.

And:

The reasons for Cabinet's decision to back away from the policy change that would have allowed the Packer companies to acquire a controlling interest in Fairfax have not been given. News of the decision was leaked to Channel 9's Laurie Oakes in the Canberra Press Gallery and quickly picked up by other gallery reporters.

Two days later on the 5th September in an editorial *The Courier-Mail* said³¹:

The inept attempt by John Howard to reshape media ownership policy deserved to fail and has been rightly consigned to the "after the next election" drawer. The bid by the Prime Minister and Communications Minister Senator Richard Alston to dump the cross media ownership restrictions failed the basic test the Government set for its changes: it was mogul specific.

Both Mr Howard and Senator Alston protested that, unlike former prime minister Paul Keating, they would not draw up media rules to suit any proprietor.

This was always tendentious nonsense. the driving force behind these mooted changes was to allow Kerry Packer's Publishing and Broadcasting Ltd to buy the Fairfax newspapers while maintaining its stake in the Nine television network.

²⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/four/home.html>

³⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/fairfax.html>

³¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/coredit1.html>

Media Barons And Media Ownership

The reason for Packer's surprising goodwill towards the Coalition after temporarily losing such a prize as Fairfax became obvious nine months later. The government rushed through a little known and even less publicised Bill which gave Packer's Channel 9 and Kerry Stokes' Channel 7 exclusive use of the lucrative new digital TV market for ten years (to 2008) – effectively cutting out all current potential competitors. "Packer's" digital TV Bill was given priority over a money Bill which had to be passed within days by the *Senate to ensure that public servants were paid*. The Opposition senators went on the traditional "spiked-gun" attack when the Government tried to push the billion dollar gift to Packer through in a three hour session.

With that pleasing result, it was not surprising that Packer publicly endorsed Howard's Coalition just a few days before the October 1998 federal election. Journalists and reporters took note. When asked about Packer at the same Sydney lunch, Howard referred to him as "*just another Australian voter*". When asked for his opinion of the government Packer said the "*Coalition deserved another term in office and that Labor needed a couple more years in the wilderness*". Consider these words in light of Packer's assault on ex-Prime Minister Keating and the Labor Party in March 1999 – as covered later in this chapter.

Just a week before the October federal election Peter Cox said in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 27th September 1998³²

Why do we accept that newspaper proprietors and radio talkback hosts can express their political support through such avenues as editorials, the choice and angles of stories, headings and photographs, but are aghast at the concept of television networks taking a political stance?

During the months before the election a topic of national public interest to Australians was off limits - the questionable appointment of Packer's executive chairman of Publishing and Broadcasting Limited (PBL), Brian Powers, as chairman at Fairfax on the same day that he resigned from PBL (May 18th 1998).

Reporter Errol Simper wrote in *The Australian* on the 1st December 1998³³:

That said, there are those who are beginning to wonder how much longer the (Australian Broadcasting Authority) authority will take before deciding whether the chairman of Fairfax publishing group, Brian Powers, has lingering connections with media entrepreneur Kerry Packer....

Fairfax's then chief executive, Bob Muscat, has been replaced by Fred Hilmer, John Alexander, formerly the influential editor-in-chief of Fairfax's flagship title the Sydney Morning Herald is now publisher of Packer's special mastheads. Fairfax actually threatened to sue Alexander after he recruited a prominent SMH columnist, Max Walsh. Dickens would have loved it. Those with an intemperate imagination might even suspect Dickens of crafting the script.

Naturally enough Powers, who resides in the US, claimed that Packer had absolutely no influence over his running of the independent Fairfax media empire. The sudden resignation of some senior editors and journalists immediately followed his appointment gave the lie to that.

In a segment of the April 1997 "4 Corners" program which had drawn Packer's ire a reporter had stated³⁴:

³² See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/smh2.html>

³³ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/aust1.html>

³⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/packer/packer9.html>

Media Barons And Media Ownership

“Jeff Kennett (the Victorian Premier and a close friend of Kerry Packer’s) said on the 20 February 1997: ‘The only thing that I get embarrassed about, is this patheticness (sic) of The Age and the ABC.’

“Mr Kennett is all for Fairfax changing hands. He despises the Melbourne Age. He has told friends that on the day Packer takes over, he will be at The Age handing out pink dismissal slips to journalists.”

As mentioned above, what the ABC had earlier reported started happening within days of Packer’s ex-PBL chairman taking over the reins.

On the 11th December 1998 New Zealand based Brierley Investments Limited (BIL), with debts of over \$2 billion, sold their major shareholding in John Fairfax.

As Terry McCrann wrote in The Courier-Mail (12/12/98): So there is nothing particularly significant in its (BIL) departure. Its absolute lack of influence in the Fairfax boardroom was well and truly confirmed when it ceded the chair to former Kerry Packer right-hand man Brian Powers. The sale and, more particularly the way some of the shares have been cancelled and the rest dispersed, fundamentally cements the Fairfax company within the Packer corporate orbit. Fairfax is now indisputably a Packer company.

But how can this be? There is a law which specifically prohibits one party controlling both a major media group and a television network?”...

When the buyback is completed, FFX’s (a Packer/Powers vehicle) shareholding in Fairfax will rise to 16.5%, breaching the 15% maximum allowed under cross-media rules.

In March 1999 a number of apparently unrelated but carefully orchestrated media-related events occurred.

The chain reaction started on the 8th March with the Australian Broadcasting Association’s (ABA) Chairman Prof. David Flint clearing Kerry Packer and Brian Powers of any breach of media ownership laws after the ABA board changed an earlier decision finding conflict.

The official press ABA press release read³⁵, *“The ABA is satisfied, after a thorough investigation of the circumstances, that no breach of the Act has occurred,” said Professor David Flint, ABA Chairman.*

The two main issues the ABA examined were the questions of whether Mr Brian Powers was an associate of Mr Kerry Packer, Mr James Packer and the Consolidated Press Holdings group of companies (the Packer interests) during the relevant period and whether Mr Powers was in a position to exercise control of Fairfax.

The ABA has found Mr Brian Powers was not in a position to exercise control of John Fairfax Publications Pty Ltd and David Syme and Co. Ltd in the period.

The change of view at the ABA occurred after Kerry Packer and Brian Power’s legal team sent “strong” letters to the ABA in December 1998. Still divided, the board backed down in the face of a promised lengthy and costly legal action if Packer and Powers were to be found “in breach”.

At this time Packer flippantly told the ABA, *“I’d love to control Fairfax. I’d love to run Fairfax. And at any point in time I may do it because, you know, I’m only responsible to you blokes while I have a television station and at any point I can sell the television station and do what I like.”*

³⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/packer/aba2.htm>

Media Barons And Media Ownership

The ABA's report concluded, *"To make a finding on this issue, in the absence of a finding that Mr Powers was in a position to exercise control of Fairfax, would serve no useful purpose in terms of this report."*

Communications Minister Senator Richard Alston, (merchant banker Michael Kroger's close ally) immediately declared that the ABA's ruling had "closed" the questions hanging over Packer's control of Fairfax.

"Of course media moguls and politics in Australia are inseparable. The moguls are looking to win political favours to change the rules so they can expand their empires in a mature market"... Peter Cox, Media Analyst
(Source: The Sun-Herald, 27th September 1998)

Meanwhile Labor Senator Chris Schacht had some years earlier hit the nail on the proverbial head³⁶: *"I suppose everyone is fearful that one day, if you told Kerry Packer to go jump, you might end up as a bad story in the newspapers. As a result, you might end up with an antagonistic story. That's a natural function of human nature, I suppose. And no politician wants to see a bad story written about themselves, or against their government or their party."*

Schacht's prophetic words came home to roost just days after the ABA ruling when Packer's *60 Minutes* entire programme, on the 21st March 1999, was dedicated to the bodgy piggery dealings³⁷ of ex-Labor Prime Minister Paul Keating. The allegations were quite stunning with his former business partner, Achilles Constantinidis, claiming that

- the ex PM made US\$6.3 million from a questionable piggery sale;
- Keating used his political position to make the sale to Danpork and Indonesian interests;
- Keating owned shares in the Brown and Hatton business while telling Parliament he did not;
- Keating's initial investment in the business was just Au\$430,000.

The claims were nothing new. They had already largely been aired in Parliament in 1995, years earlier, but had been a subject of a convenient media cover-up by both Murdoch and Packer at that time³⁸.

Keating when asked about the *60 Minutes* report the following week said, *"I think that this is as much about demonstrating to the Prime Minister (John Howard) and his family where power resides, as it is about trying to damage me"*. Keating also confirmed that he had not been told of the allegations before they were aired to the Australian public. *"No evidence has been produced, because no evidence exists..."* he said. Haunting words when you consider the unethical practices of *60 Minutes* as covered in a later chapter dedicated to this programme.

The week following the Keating expose on *60 Minutes* both James and Kerry Packer went public about their requirements over media ownership changes in Australia at the *"re-launch of The Bulletin"*.

James Packer told the guests, *"In the past, of course, as some of you may have noticed, we have supported the removal of cross-media restrictions but*

³⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/packer/packer8.html>

³⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/199/2203.html>

³⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/keating/>

Media Barons And Media Ownership

opposed the lifting of any foreign ownership restrictions.

“The reason for our opposition to lifting foreign ownership rules has been our belief in the importance of Australians owning Australian media.

“It is now plain, however, that the pace of technological change has made this blanket aspiration impractical.

“The importance of global scale and the reality of the foreign competition that our media already faces now vastly outweighs the benefits of trying to protect our media from foreign ownership.

“So it is now clear, in our view, that both cross-media and foreign ownership restrictions need to be lifted in the national interest.

“What is of concern, is the effect that the Net is having on the economics of many businesses.”

The broadside across the bows of the politicians with Keating as the expendable sacrificial cow would not have gone unnoticed by the men and women who have the power to grant Packer's wishes. To make the point again *60 Minutes* ran another expose on Keating's business dealing the Sunday after the initial report (28th March) – the Packer father and son's demands for media ownership changes conveniently sandwiched between the reports. The shifting sands of media ownership in Australia as proposed by the Packers will allow them to takeover Fairfax and Murdoch Channel 7. If allowed the alliance between the media barons and their control of the Australian media will have reached a chilling conclusion.

This “*conspiracy theory*” can no longer be labelled as such, Labor backbencher Mark Latham attacked Packer in Parliament on 29th March 1999, saying³⁹,

“Mr Keating is now paying the public price for standing up to the Packer organisation about its ambition to take over Fairfax. No one in this Parliament, least of all those who truly value the principle of Parliamentary independence, should support his campaign.

“If anyone takes the same stand as Paul Keating, they will end up being subjected to the same treatment. This is the standard Packer treatment, the media politics of intimidation and vendettas.

“This is the reason why the Howard Government has had the cross media rules under a permanent state of review since March 1996 (Federal Election at which the Coalition were elected).

“None of us, at any time, under the circumstances, should ever cave into intimidation.”

Latham then warned the Howard government against changing the media ownership laws to meet Packer's demands.

“Let me tell you the word ‘competition’ does not warm the hearts of media barons,” Paul Keating speaking on the ABC's 7.30 Report 25th May 1999

Even professional journalists have expressed growing concern about the further concentration of Australia's media ownership. *Sydney Morning Herald* journalist Margo Kingston said on ABC national television⁴⁰ in 1998:

³⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/199/3003.html>

⁴⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/1606.html>

Media Barons And Media Ownership

"The problem with Kerry Packer is that he is so powerful, the politicians aren't game enough to cross him. Look at history.

"Go back to 1991 when he and Conrad Black through Toorang wanted to take over Fairfax. He said, because of the cross-media (rules) he could only have 15% in print, 1) he said I don't control it, I won't try to control it, 2) he said foreign ownership restrictions are ridiculous, let's blow them out of the water.

"Peter Costello, then on the print-media inquiry now Packer's chief urger with Richard Alston, said back then I haven't got a problem with foreign ownership, my problem is diversity, I really care about diversity therefore I'll let foreigners in provided they don't increase concentration.

"Now, Kerry Packer has changed his mind. Now he doesn't care about media diversity and he does care about foreign ownership. He doesn't care about media diversity because he wants to take over Fairfax and keep (Channel) Nine, but he does care about foreign ownership because, guess what, he doesn't want to have any competition to buy Fairfax. The only competition comes from foreigners. And now, the government has completely switched its rhetorical and logical position and is again arguing for Mr Packer.

"Now when you have a man so powerful that he can buy Graham Richardson to talk the Labor party around and Michael Kroger to talk the Liberal party around, and Howard and Costello and Alston jump to his every need no matter how irrational, no matter how transparently incoherent their arguments, we have a huge problem. And yes, personally I am very scared, personally, of Mr Packer taking over Fairfax."

Australian journalists should be afraid. With increased concentration of media ownership there are fewer remaining options for gaining employment for anybody who does not toe the Packer-Murdoch line.

Media ownership in Australia

The *Australian Press Council's* (APC) 1997 annual report no 21 lists all major media publications. The concentration of ownership is alarming.

A large number of popular magazines are owned exclusively by Australian Consolidated Press (ACP), Publishing Pty Ltd (Packer) and Murdoch Magazines. John Fairfax Holdings Ltd and Pacific Publications Pty Ltd also publish a small number of magazines. (Packer's Nine Limited (Network) are today the largest shareholder in Fairfax with about 15% of the shares).

Free, mainly suburban-based weekly papers, are largely controlled by a number of News Limited companies, *Cumberland* (NSW), *Leader* (Victoria), *Quest* (Queensland) and *Advertiser Newspapers Ltd* (South Australia) (about 80 in all).

All major newspapers excluding *The West Australian*, *The Herald and Weekly Times Ltd*, *The Canberra Times*, and John Fairfax Holdings' *The Age*, *Australian Financial Review* and the *Sydney Morning Herald* are effectively controlled by Murdoch interests. There are a few minor players like O'Reilly.

Queensland Press (publishers of *The Courier-Mail* and *The Sunday Mail* in Queensland) are majority owned by the private Murdoch company, Cruden Investments Pty Ltd (52%) with News Corporation Ltd owning the balance. Murdoch flagship and Australia's very dominant newspaper group, News Limited, had the following major shareholders listed in the APC's 1997 annual report:

Cruden and subsidiaries (Murdoch interests):	30.84%
Citicorp Nominees:	8.71%

Media Barons And Media Ownership

ANZ Nominees:	8.67%
Westpac Custodian Nominees:	8.33%
National Nominees Ltd:	6.01%
Chase Manhattan Nominees:	5.26%

David Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Nominees holds a strategic top five shareholding stake in News Limited as well as Australia's four biggest banks⁴¹, major mining operations and other financial interests in this country. Given these facts it is easy to see why international treaties, such as the MAI, and issues such as globalisation and economic rationalism receive such positive coverage from the Murdoch's media empire. Obviously these are hot topics of discussion by Murdoch and Rockefeller at the influential Cato Institute⁴² one of the most influential think tanks in Washington.

Tax avoidance

Under Australia's media duopoly Packer⁴³ and Murdoch are able to ensure that the common problem they have with the Australian Tax Office goes largely unreported in Australia.

The US Washington Post carries far more on this topic than can be found in Australia. In an article on the 7th December 1997 the Washington Post reported⁴⁴

News Corp. has mastered the use of the offshore tax haven. The company reduces its annual tax bill by channelling profits through dozens of subsidiaries in low-tax or no-tax places such as the Cayman Islands and Bermuda. The overseas profits from movies made by 20th Century Fox, for instance, flow into a News Corp.-controlled company in the Caymans, where they are not taxed, according to an executive familiar with the operation.

The (Fairfax) Australian Financial Review reported on the 5th February 1998 (pre-Powers) that⁴⁵:

The ATO has stepped up a secret two year national investigation into the offshore tax structures of Mr Rupert Murdoch's media group, News Corporation

The ATO launched the inquiry into the News group's use of offshore companies after an internal compliance study assessed News as a "high risk" taxpayer in its treatment of foreign sourced income.

A confidential Tax Office report obtained by the Australian Financial Review, describes the ATO analysis of Australian companies that were "thought to represent significant FSI (Foreign Sourced Income) risks".

The analysis that was done resulted in News Ltd being classified as high-risk, the memo of May 1996 said.

In a fresh development last night, The Independent newspaper in London reported that tax officials from four countries had joined to set up an unprecedented multinational investigation of News Corp's tax structures.

The Packer empire never reported or investigated such claims; the problem is a little too close to home. Similarly Murdoch's press did not report on Packer's tax avoidance.

⁴¹ See chapter headed "Winners and Losers in today's media"

⁴² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/multi/murd1.html>

⁴³ Packer's media empire today includes Fairfax

⁴⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/multi/newstax1.html>

⁴⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/multi/newstax2.html>

Media Barons And Media Ownership

It took Ray Reagan of the Tax Accountants Association⁴⁶ on the *ABC Radio* on 23rd November 1998 to reveal some new, hard facts about Packer and tax. Reagan said that *"despite Kerry Packer's private company, Consolidated Press earning about Au\$600 million profit over the last two years it will pay no tax". The tools of franked assets and non-accessible income lead his tax avoidance strategies"*.

Reagan said that his association was disgusted because only the rich can benefit from these strategies and therefore 7 million other battling Australians have to pay the tax burden to keep the country running while the rich get richer through avoidance.

"One metropolitan newspaper commented earlier this year foreign investors including the owners of the US based Craft and Campbells are paying on average 1.2% tax (in Australia)."

Alan Jones, 2UE Radio Personality (12/12/98)

Just weeks before Reagan's statement, Kerry Packer had used the country's best tax lawyers to successfully fight the Australian Tax Office (ATO) over earlier tax claims which included one of over Au\$200 million. The judge ruled that Australia's wealthiest man need only pay Au\$32.40 in personal income tax over a three year period.

"The distinction I make is this. A social problem is one that concerns the way in which people live together in one society. A racial problem is a problem which confronts two different races who live in two separate societies, even if those societies are side by side. We do not want a society in Australia in which one group enjoy one set of privileges and another group enjoy another set of privileges."

Paul Hasluck, quoted in Pauline Hanson's Maiden Speech to Parliament on Tuesday 10th September 1996.⁴⁷

The pagan's prayer to the media barons

Oh eminent ones, pray hear the plea of your unworthy subjects, for there is insurrection within your domain. There are those within our midst who would not only dare to question your divine supremacy, but even challenge the infallibility of the holy trinity of Murdoch, Packer and his Fairfax!

Have mercy on their simplistic souls, for they are guilty of crimes against the media, in both thought and speech. These pagans surely know not what they do, and are no doubt fully deserving of the bestowal of your most fearsome wrath. They have forgotten their place. The disobedient refuse to worship your duly ordained idols, and even have the audacity to seek their own alternate destiny, straying from the path that you have chosen for us all.

Take pity on us, for by definition we cannot all attain membership of your elite, and we lack your ability to be "just that little bit more superior". We do not share

⁴⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/498/2411.html>

⁴⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/photo/phtalk.html>

Media Barons And Media Ownership

your exceptional intelligence; on the contrary, we are afflicted with mere common sense, which makes us vulnerable to the ideas of the heretic.

The elitist bible tells us that a policy cannot be any good if just anybody can understand it, true wisdom can only be uncovered by the creative interpretation of authorised elites. This explains many esoteric fundamentals in contemporary Orwellia, such as:

- The granting of special privileges to the chosen ones of the appropriate race is a cornerstone of true racial equality, and any suggestion to treat all races the same is undeniable evidence of the most abhorrent racism. After all, there can be no doubt that some of us are more equal than others.
- Assets are bad, debts are good. Orwellia can show the world how smart we are by offloading our assets onto foreigners, and gaining valuable debt leveraging opportunities in return.

Yet still the heretic attracts us with her siren song! Oh defenders of the elitist faith, we beseech you to deem us worthy, and impart thy wisdom unto us! Please explain why you preach the sanctity of tolerance and diversity, but do not tolerate any diversity of political opinion.

Please practise your wizardry, your media magic, your polished presentations, and help us celebrate the triumph of image over substance, according to the rites of contemporary journalism. You generously provide our opiate, so necessary to overcome our daily hallucinations of decline, despair and decay. Please take our realities away eminent ones, cure and comfort us, tell us again how good we have got it and how lucky we really are.

We fear that the communication links from your ivory tower are damaged beyond repair, for you speak in unintelligible tongues and your listening devices were discarded long ago. In more enlightened times this did not matter, as you could dismiss our concerns without spilling a drop of Chardonnay. But now your edict to "Just shut up and pay your taxes, we will tell you what to think" just doesn't have the same appeal that it used to.

You promise to respond to the heresy and not continue to persecute the heretic, but we have waited in vain. The heretic speaks against foreign control, and you respond to foreign investment. The heretic talks of multiculturalism, yet you defend multiracialism. The heretic discusses Australian culture and a proud heritage, but you only hear "meat and two veg" and an inherited historical guilt. Despite your most almighty inquisitions, the heretic continues to confront you, and will not repent.

Our people are tasting the forbidden fruit of independent thought. They are not accepting their penance, and they now actually believe that their opinions matter. The daily two minute hate sessions against the heretic are not working. Instead of ridiculing the heretic as a populist (always pronounced with a sneer), the people are celebrating her as a representative with voices of relief. The sneers are now reserved for those few who are still heard to say: "It must be true, I read it in a newspaper".

The people don't fear change as much as more of the same. And as someone once said, "It's time".

Chapter 3

The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

“Kill the cow”⁴⁸

It is widely acknowledged amongst News Limited reporters that with those three words young Lachlan Murdoch instructed his senior editors in their duty a few weeks before the October 1998 federal election. With independent polls showing that 14% of the Australian electorate supported Pauline Hanson's One Nation, the party posed a threat to the de facto bi-partisan political system in Australia.

Queensland's major daily newspaper, The *Courier-Mail*, owned by Queensland Newspapers – a company in which the Murdoch family *personally own over 50% of the equity* - was definitely out to 'kill the cow'.

“for their own political health they (the Coalition) have got to get (media) proprietors on side”⁴⁹.

Chris Schacht, ALP opposition Communications spokesman, 21st August 1997

Preferences and the two party system

In the October Federal election both the Labor and the Coalition parties had put One Nation last on their how-to-vote cards. Though Ms Hanson won more than twice the primary votes (36%) of the Liberal's Cameron Thompson (17%) she failed to win the seat of Blair. Thompson's win was secured with National and Labor Party preferences⁵⁰.

After the election The *Courier-Mail* editorialised on the 9th October 1998⁵¹:

“One Nation's problem in the Federal Election was not that there was a preferential system of voting in operation, but that the party was unable to persuade any other party to allocate preferences to it.”

In fact One Nation had been the victim of a hostile Murdoch press which intimidated any party which even considered this option.

When the preference issue was being decided by the Federal Coalition The *Courier-Mail*⁵² wrote on the 11th September 1998:

The failure of the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister to insist that Liberal and National candidates must put One Nation last on their preference lists will increasingly haunt them over the next few weeks. Already it appears certain that several National MPs and candidates in Queensland and New South Wales will effectively give their preferences to One Nation, by putting One

⁴⁸ As told to me by John Pasquarelli, Pauline Hanson's political advisor for much of 1996, during an unsolicited phone conversation in early September 1998. The claimed Murdoch statement was subsequently verified to me by various News Limited journalists.

⁴⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/four>

⁵⁰ See: See: <http://election.aec.gov.au/qldblai.htm>

⁵¹ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/couroff1.html>

⁵² See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/coredit16.html>

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

Nation candidates above the ALP. They argue the ALP is the "enemy" not One Nation. They are wrong....

It was different in the Queensland election, where it [One Nation] benefited from National and Liberal preferences. It failed to attract official preferences from those parties federally because of its perceived extremism. Its policies were regarded as so far beyond the pale, that, as occurred in the Queensland election, the Liberals would have suffered primary losses if they or their Coalition partners had given their preferences to One Nation.

Just a few months earlier during the Queensland State election, *The Courier-Mail* ran three opinion pieces and an editorial in one week trying to shame the State Coalition to put One Nation after Labor. Had it succeeded One Nation would have had only one state MP in Queensland despite winning about 24% of the primary vote – as it was the party secured eleven seats.

1. Opinion piece by Terry Sweetman⁵³, *Courier-Mail*, Tuesday, May 5th 1998:

Any doubts that the Queensland Liberal Party was something of a curious misnomer appear to have been settled by its weekend decision to direct preferences to Pauline Hanson's One Nation ahead of the Labor Party. And its continued failure to carve out a separate and distinctive identity for itself eventually could consign it to the ranks of historical curiosity.

The decision to direct preferences to Hanson's troglodytes is another indication that the Liberals are in bad shape politically, intellectually and, now, morally. The lame justification from state president Bob Carroll was that his party was in the business of winning elections, not giving 'free kicks' to Labor.

2. Editorial, *Courier-Mail*⁵⁴, Wednesday, May 6th 1998:

For One Nation to hold or share the balance of power in a Queensland Parliament would be a victory for short-sighted and crude populism and an indictment of the major parties for allowing such a profound increase in public cynicism and disconnection with mainstream politics. This week's announcement by the Queensland Liberals that One Nation will receive preferences ahead of Labor will feed this disconnection. It is just the kind of political pragmatism over principle that drives voters to disillusionment."

3. Opinion piece by Wallace Brown⁵⁵, Friday May 8th 1998:

Yet any decision by the Liberals, and presumably the Nationals, to allocate preferences to One Nation candidates is bizarre. This conclusion may not be conventional wisdom but it is bizarre precisely because it is not pragmatic. And it is not pragmatic because to give Hanson preferences is to give her credibility.

Just as the opinion polls had her withering on the vine nationally; just as she was disappearing from our television screens; just as more voters were beginning to realise that she had no real answers to her rhetoric and simplistic questions; just as some of the beat-up merchants on radio talk-back shows were starting to forget her; just as Premier Rob Borbidge and Queensland Liberal leader Joan Sheldon were insisting that Hanson was no problem – what happens? The Liberals themselves give her this boost.

That night, Friday 8th May, the Liberal Party held a special meeting to discuss the preferences issue. Caving in to the intense media pressure it was intimidated

⁵³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/sweet1.html>

⁵⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/coredit3.html>

⁵⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/coredit4.html>

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

into changing its official position of putting last its traditional enemy – Labor. The Liberal Party released the following statement:

Traditionally the Labor Party has been placed last on Liberal Party "How to Vote" cards. At this election, the distribution of preferences will be undertaken on a seat-by-seat basis when all candidates are known. This will be done in consultation with local campaign committees.

On the next day, 9th May 1998, state political writer John Lehmann wrote⁵⁶:

Now, as the Liberals prepare for a difficult state election, they have effectively aligned themselves with their volatile creation in last-ditch bid to win back Hanson's followers and save their political hides.

Call it pragmatism, call it blatant hypocrisy - either way, Liberal state president Bob Carroll's push to deliver preferences to One Nation ahead of Labor will be perceived by many voters as a latent acceptance of Hanson's populism.

Whether this strategy will draw more voters back or push more away is debatable but the move is clear evidence the Coalition is fearful of One Nation's potential impact on its re-election bid.

Former Liberal Senator and Aboriginal elder Neville Bonner described it as repugnant; party stalwart Sir James Killen claimed an alien philosophy had evolved; state minister Bruce Davidson indicated a preference for Nazi party candidates over Labor; recently resigned Liberal MP John Bradford said the party was shamelessly adopting the Graham Richardson motto: "Whatever it takes".

After the election in an editorial⁵⁷ on the 9th October 1998 The *Courier-Mail* rejected the charge that the major parties had been influenced by Murdoch's self-interest in conspiring to put One Nation last:

The answer for One Nation rests not with railing against the system, but in becoming part of it. It will only attract preferences if it can demonstrate that it is not a racist and reactionary party. It needs to show that it has well-considered policies. While it will attract a significant number of primary votes by relying on prejudices and anti-establishment sentiments, it will only attract preferences if it can prove to one or more established parties that it is part of the mainstream of political life in Australia.

In other words One Nation should stop rocking the boat - the boat in which the major parties and the media barons run Australia aided by unelected, paid political powerbrokers like Graham Richardson, Grahame Morris and Michael Kroger.

2UE Radio personality Alan Jones summed up the situation on the 6th October 1998, just three days after the Federal Election,⁵⁸:

"Mr Beazley believes that because he outpolled the Liberals he has some sort of "mandate" to oppose even though he didn't win government. What mandate then does One Nation have? The Democrats are saying that they have a mandate to oppose a GST in the Senate and indeed they won on Saturday night at least three and perhaps four seats in the Senate, yet they again won fewer votes for the Senate than did One Nation.

⁵⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/coredit5.html>

⁵⁷ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/couroff1.html>

⁵⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/ajones9.html>

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

"At close of counting on Saturday night the Democrats had about 747,000 votes for the Senate across the country while One Nation had about 777,000.

"So if Mr Beazley's definition of mandate based on votes won as opposed to seats gained is to be valid across the board what mandate does One Nation have with more votes then both the National party and the Democrats.

"He (Packer) will emerge as Australia's most powerful media baron, running the nation's top-rating network, and some of its most influential newspapers in the Fairfax broadsheets.

*"And while Fairfax journalistic purists may resent Packer imposing his will on the editorial content of the papers, he will have the power to appoint the editors who will do his bidding."*⁵⁹

Joseph Dowling, News Limited's *Courier-Mail* business editor, 15th May

Political fortunes (or misfortune) in the hands of Packer and Murdoch⁶⁰

The partnership between the major political parties and the media has worked to the mutual advantage of both. While the mainstream politicians (representing the Labor factions⁶¹) are now subservient captives, the partnership itself has served the two party system well. A genuine political opposition - such as Pauline Hanson's One Nation - would threaten the arrangement.

"The media's role in undermining the function of true democracy, and especially at election time, cannot be overstated. The elite are not satisfied with infiltrating the nation's highest political offices, nor are they satisfied with negating the effects of democracy with special interest lobbying. No, that's not quite enough.

*"Before the bottom 90% of society are even allowed to approach the polling booth, the elite take the opportunity to subject the entire population to no less than six full months of intense political conditioning in which individuals and policies that pose a threat to their wealth and power, are systematically discredited. By praising their sympathisers and discrediting and smearing their opponents, the elite have consistently and successfully used the media, to elect enough political candidates to the White House and Congress to ensure success with their future lobbying."*⁶²
from "America's Top secrets"

One of the greatest Australian cover-ups of all times would have to be the squashing of the story behind the allegations made against Packer's political heavyweight, Labor's Graham Richardson. He was allegedly involved with prostitutes provided by Australian crime figures on the Gold Coast some years

⁵⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/0505.html>

⁶⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/four>

⁶¹ Laboral Factions: A term describing the major Australian parties (Labor, Liberal, Democrat and National) who are largely funded by and clearly represent the interests of big business over those of the Australian population who are expected to vote for them.

⁶¹ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/couroff5.htm>

⁶² See: <http://www.imag.net/~davidf/author.htm>

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

ago. The story surfaced and was then promptly killed. The media's failure to investigate it properly speaks volumes.

Charles Rappolt and the DVO

In contrast, The *Courier-Mail's* pursuit of the personal life of Queensland State MP Charles Rappolt demonstrated a blatant double standard. Richo was a powerful Labor mate allegedly caught out in unsavoury company; Rappolt was an insignificant MP with domestic problems whose crime was his association with One Nation. Rappolt resigned from the seat of Mulgrave in early November and subsequently tried to take his own life.

The media had a legitimate right to investigate whether Rappolt's secretary Sandra Higgins was his live-in partner because partners or family members are not supposed to be employed in such positions. But in early September, The *Courier-Mail* obtained, by questionable means, a confidential document – a domestic violence order (DVO) previously taken out by Sandra Higgins against Charles Rappolt. It was the same week that the media adviser for the Queensland state parliamentarians of One Nation, Debbie Beavan, had been fired and within 24 hours was employed by The *Courier-Mail*.

Lawyers for Charles Rappolt and Ms Higgins sought a Supreme Court injunction to prevent publication of the police report that had been allegedly taken from the offices of One Nation leader Bill Feldman. They claimed that publication of the document would breach the Domestic Violence Act. Despite Judge Martin Moynihan's ruling to restrain The *Courier-Mail* from publishing material which breached the Act, the newspaper ignored the order and published the article transcribing statements word for word from the original DVO complaint by Ms Higgins⁶³.

In subsequent television interviews Rappolt and Higgins both denied that Rappolt had physically assaulted Ms Higgins.

The article greatly impacted on the personal lives of Charles Rappolt and Sandra Higgins, who also cared for Rappolt's son. Her ex-husband tried to gain custody of the children of their earlier marriage using The *Courier-Mail* report and subsequent publicity as ammunition.

Higgins moved out to ensure that she did not lose custody of her children. Rappolt's son had to live with his grandparents. The child told his father that he wanted his life back the way it was before he had gone into politics. On Wednesday the 4th November Charles Rappolt resigned citing the press as being the main reason for the mental stress that had made his life as a politician unbearable.

A few days later Rappolt was admitted to hospital after trying to take his own life by cutting his wrists.

An official press release from the One Nation party in Queensland released on the 5th November 1998 said⁶⁴:

Naturally we are disappointed that Charlie Rappolt has seen the need to resign. The tragedy of it is that a concerted campaign by some sections of the media have deprived the electors of Mulgrave of a good representative in the Parliament - a representative that 54% of the people of Mulgrave wanted to represent them.

⁶³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/0309.html>

⁶⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/onenation/qldmp/press/051198.htm>

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

The Murdoch press have been absolutely ruthless in their vindictive campaign against Charlie. They have destroyed his family life in their biased and unswerving agenda to destroy Charlie and to denigrate One Nation.

The freedom of the press is a noble institution, but with that freedom comes a major responsibility, to remain independent and unbiased. Unfortunately, The Courier-Mail, and its northern subsidiary, the Cairns Post, through its links to, and dependence upon, its mates in big business and the longer established political parties has prostituted its independence and has pursued its vindictive and destructive agenda with relentless arrogance.

The Courier-Mail and the Cairns Post, are so paranoid about the enormous support for One Nation, that it was prepared to ignore a Supreme Court injunction, place itself in contempt of court, and be prepared to pay any fine which might be forthcoming, just to achieve their character assassination of this quiet and dedicated man. The Murdoch press have no regard for the law and will simply use their endless financial resources to overcome any court decision.

He was prepared to absorb the personal attacks, but he places a very high value on his family life, and ultimately, it has been this aspect of the vicious attacks which has led him to take this course of action.

If we needed confirmation of the real reason for Charlie's decision it has been provided in private correspondence to us containing a plaintive plea to "Please keep the media off my back" and a specific acknowledgment of the personal damage done by Murdoch press.

The next day The Courier-Mail responded to the One Nation press release⁶⁵:

In each case, the publicity was warranted because the person had been elected to represent the people and make laws for the order and good government of the country. Electors are entitled to know if MPs behave in a way which suggests they do not obey or believe in the laws for which they are ultimately responsible.".....

The second diversionary tactic by One Nation was to blame the media for Mr Rappolt's resignation. The Murdoch press (including The Courier-Mail) was accused of a "vindictive campaign", which had destroyed his family life "in their biased and unswerving agenda to destroy Charlie and denigrate One Nation". State Parliamentary leader Bill Feldman accused this newspaper of being "paranoid" about the enormous support for One Nation, of being in contempt of court and of character assassination of "this quiet and dedicated man".

What Mr Feldman's outburst was directed at was a report by The Courier-Mail that the "quiet and dedicated" Mr Rappolt had been the subject of a domestic violence order, taken out by the woman with whom he and their respective children shared a house, Sandra Higgins. Ms Higgins was not only his live in housekeeper, but had been listed on One Nation's Internet site⁶⁶ as Mr Rappolt's partner. That relationship was denied, however, and Mr Rappolt appointed Ms Higgins as his electorate secretary. Prior to the State Election, One Nation had criticised MPs who put members of their families on the public payroll and insisted it would adopt a more ethical approach to public life.

⁶⁵ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/couroff4.html>

⁶⁶ The web page referred to was not part of the "One Nation web site". It was simply a commentary by myself on a meeting of One Nation MPs. I changed the article when I realised my error. See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/qldmp/day1/>

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

David Oldfield was quoted at this time as saying⁶⁷ :

"They (the Murdoch media) went after him like a coyote goes after a bone. He wasn't a baby raper. He wasn't corrupt. It's because he was One Nation and they don't care who they hurt or destroy to get at One Nation."

None of The *Courier-Mail* reports on Rappolt's resignation revealed that the newspaper had ignored a court order when it published information gained from the confidential police report.

In the Perspectives section of The *Courier-Mail* Terry Sweetman wrote⁶⁸:

I would not dispute that the publicity - as much as the family tensions that led to the DVO - distressed Rappolt and all under his roof, but it is a lie for Feldman to claim that "The Courier-Mail ignored a Supreme Court injunction and published details of a domestic violence disorder".

Feldman, a former police prosecutor who has spent more time in courts than most, should know better. Without burdening the reader with the arcane legalities that surrounded the issue, The Courier-Mail gave an undertaking at a court hearing initiated by One Nation that it would not breach the Domestic Violence Act. It never intended to do so, nor did it. If it had, someone would now be getting a striped suntan.

At issue was the claim that Rappolt - later supported by One Nation officials that he and Higgins had only had a "professional" relationship, this in the face of evidence that included her own statutory declaration and a One Nation Internet listing of her as his partner⁶⁹.

In the same article, supposedly quoting Rappolt, Sweetman wrote: *"....the people...don't like Pauline Hanson's One Nation party, really, really, don't like Pauline Hanson's One Nation party".*

But what Rappolt had said on Cairns Radio was quite different:

"I seem to find that the people who don't like Pauline Hanson's one Nation party really, really, don't like Pauline Hanson's One Nation party."

By omitting the relative pronoun, 'who', Sweetman deliberately distorted Rappolt's meaning. It was a blatant act of distortion. Why did he do it? It certainly wasn't to save space. It is just another example of the malicious media bias against One Nation.

Oldfield had a crack at the media, because elements were "out to get" One Nation.

At the risk of agreeing with Oldfield he has a point.

Peter Charlton, "A victory of sorts", The *Courier-Mail*, 30th March 1999

"Shreddergate"

It is instructive to compare the Murdoch media's treatment of Rappolt with its treatment of a much more important ongoing issue involving the entire 1990 Goss Labor Cabinet in the debacle now known as "Shreddergate".

⁶⁷ See: <http://www.smh.com.au/news/9811/07/text/pageone6.html>

⁶⁸ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/couroff5.htm>

⁶⁹ What Sweetman fails to mention is that I removed this reference on the web page several weeks before after I had realised my mistake.

See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/qldmp/day1>

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

Shreddergate is the term used to describe the cover-up associated Wayne Goss' Labor State Government's illegal shredding of archived public records on the 23rd March 1990. It includes copies provided to then Queensland's Crown Solicitor, Ken O'Shea, on the 23rd May 1990. These documents were held by the Department of Family Services.

*"The public has a right to know the truth.
"Justice for Mr Coyne and myself, and our families, has been delayed for far,
far too long."
Kevin Lindeberg, "Shreddergate" whistleblower*

The documents in question were the Heiner Inquiry documents and tapes. Noel Heiner was a retired Stipendiary Magistrate who was appointed to investigate written complaints of child abuse made against certain staff at the John Oxley Youth Centre. The abuse allegedly included chaining young children, under 10 years of age, to grills in the floor overnight. The children were allegedly told that *"snakes come through the metal grills above the doors and in the floors at night"* by staff at the centre. Among the staff under investigation at John Oxley was a Mr Coyne. Here is a brief outline of the events leading up to the shredding:

- The investigation was already underway when the Goss government was elected on 2nd December 1989.

- Just six weeks later on the 19th January 1990, Ms Ruth Matchett as acting Director-General of the Department for Family Services sought an urgent meeting with Mr Lindeberg Queensland Professional Officers Association (QPOA) and Ms Janine Walker (QSSU Industrial Relations Director), to discuss the termination of the Heiner Inquiry. Ms Matchett informed the union officials that the Inquiry had been terminated and she was in possession of the sealed documents, but had not personally read them. The Department expressed concern over possible litigation (related to defamation). Mr Lindeberg said that he had been informed that his union member Mr Coyne wanted to see the complaints laid against him in accordance with his rights.

- On the 29th January 1990 Mr Don Martindale, then QPOA General Secretary lodged a breach of the Public Service Management and Employment (PSME) regulations complaining that Coyne had been denied natural justice.

- On the 8th February Mr Coyne's solicitor demanded, in writing, access to the original complaints against Mr Coyne which were the subject of Mr Heiner's inquiry from then Acting Director-General Ms Ruth Matchett. The demand also included other documents and evidence taken by Mr Heiner which referred to the complaints against Mr Coyne as per his rights under PSME Regulation 65. The Department/Government was given seven days to comply.

- On 14 February Mr Coyne's solicitors phoned the Department telling a senior official not to shred anything and that unless the material was provided under PSME Regulation 65 as the matter would be undoubtedly resolved in court. The conversation was recorded on a departmental memorandum of the same day which Ms Matchett later initialled as having read and understood.

- On the 16th February the Crown Solicitor advised the Goss Government that it would be shredding public records "which may be required in court proceedings because they could not attract "Crown Privilege status".

- On the 19th February Departmental Minister Ann Warner and Ms Matchett

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

officially received Mr Coyne's solicitor's letter, dated 15th February 1990, giving due notice of Mr Coyne's intention to commence court proceedings to gain access to the documents. The Goss Cabinet, with the Crown Solicitor's advice, decided to seek urgent advice on the disposal of the documents from the State Archivist, Ms Lee McGregor, on the stated reason that the documents "are no longer required or pertinent to the public record."

- On the 23rd February Ms Matchett assured Mr Lindeberg at a meeting that the documents were secure and that she was still waiting for Crown Law advice on the issue. She did not mention any plans to destroy the documents.
- On the 5th March Goss' Cabinet voted to shred the documents.
- On the 19th March the Queensland Teachers Union (QTU) sent a second letter to Ms Matchett seeking access to the Heiner documents, and informed the Department it would consider legal action. Ms Matchett wrote to Mr Coyne informing him that she was still waiting for the Crown Solicitor's advice. She mentioned nothing of the Government's plans to destroy the evidence.
- On the 22nd March Mr Stuart Tait, Secretary of Cabinet, wrote to the State Archivist Ms McGregor informing her that the Goss Cabinet had decided to proceed with the shredding. It did not tell her about the Government having been put on notice by Mr Coyne's solicitors.
- On the 23rd March Ms C McGuckin, Senior Archivist, collected the Heiner documents with Mr Ken Littleboy of the Cabinet Secretariat from the Executive Building and transported the box of records to the Family Services Building where she, together with Ms Matchett's Executive's Officer Mr Trevor Walsh, (the man who took the phone call and wrote the memorandum of 14th February), destroyed the documents in a shredding machine.
- On the 23rd May the copies which had been provided to Mr. O'Shea for his "perusal and consideration" on 19th March 1990 were shredded.

The government later in February 1991 made an irregular payment of A\$27,190.00 to Mr Coyne to allegedly buy his silence. This was included in the terms of his ex-gratia payment. A condition of the payment was that he sign a Deed of Settlement stipulating that he never speak publicly again about matters surrounding the Heiner Inquiry. (This document was only uncovered in 1996).

After years of controversy, on 3rd September 1994 The *Courier-Mail* assured its readers that the Government had followed the Crown Solicitor's advice of 23rd January 1990 in destroying the material. The Government refused to table this advice in Parliament at this time but showed it to a selected senior political journalist. The advice shown to the media was given before Mr Coyne's legal demands were made on the material, and when no foreshadowed legal action was notified on the Government. The *Courier-Mail* did not reveal that the Crown Solicitor's advices of 23rd Jan 1990 and 16th Feb 1990 were redundant when the documents were destroyed. The circumstances changed substantially when the Government learnt on 23rd February about their being required in a court case.

The whistleblower in the Shreddergate case was a former union official Kevin Lindeberg. As is usual with whistleblowers, his reward for attempting to draw attention to the irregular shredding was his dismissal. He was dismissed from the QPOA by General Secretary Don Martindale on the 30th May 1990 shortly after the shredding because of his persistence over the matter and a Labor Minister, Warner's, complaint against him. He had been the QPOA's Senior Organiser/ Media/ Publicity Officer for six years. Since the shredding in 1990, he has worked tirelessly to bring the matter to the attention of the mainstream media. In

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

some instances he has had to wait over two years for damning and incriminating evidence requested under Freedom of Information.

Following the recent appointment to the High Court of Ian Callinan QC the mainstream media wrote tens of thousands of words about the QC's controversial selection while failing to report on his unexpected and stunning representation of Kevin Lindeberg as his senior counsel before the Senate Select Committee on Unresolved Whistleblowers in 1995. Callinan's oral submission and written opinion regarding the legality of the shredding openly questioned the Labor Cabinet's action, yet the media refused to take up the issue. Callinan went so far as to suggest that it was open to conclude that the entire Goss Cabinet had committed serious offences when it ordered the shredding of the Heiner documents. He said that it was done to prevent their use in litigation after the Crown had been served with notice of impending court proceedings in which those records were known to be critically relevant⁷⁰.

Callinan suggested in 1995 that the case warranted serious re-examination and severely criticised the Criminal Justice Commission's handling of the Lindeberg allegations. The *Courier-Mail* largely ignored his findings. As a result there was no political pressure and this never happened.

When the Senate Whistleblowing Committee's Report was tabled in State Parliament⁷¹ it became the focus of considerable discussion and debate, much of it centred around the exact wording of the Crown Solicitor's advice and the date that it was provided (ie before or after the government being informed that the documents were required in a court case). As the media appeared to have little interest in challenging Goss about the document no pressure was brought to bear and his government refused to table the advice it allegedly followed back in 1990.

On the 8th December 1994 The *Courier-Mail*'s editorial described the establishment of the Senate Select Committee on Unresolved Whistleblower Cases as a "*Stunt Act*".

In 1996 a new Coalition government established a new inquiry to be conducted by barristers Tony Morris, QC and Eddie Howard. During all the inquiries a controversial memorandum had been concealed within the public service bureaucracy for six years. It was eventually obtained by Lindeberg after a two-and-a-half year battle to gain access to it in June 1994 through FOI. It shed some further light on events surrounding the shredding of the Heiner documents. Morris and Howard said the elusive memo tracked down by the whistleblower could be described as being an inducement to buy Coyne's silence. In their report to the State Government they said there were prima facie grounds for believing that the payment of a substantial sum of money following the negotiations may have constituted a serious breach of the law. In their report, tabled in Parliament in October 1996, they called for a immediate public inquiry into the affair describing matters found by them as being far more serious than the Police Union memorandum of understanding which brought about the Carruther's inquiry established by the CJC. The charge was as serious as matters that came before the infamous Fitzgerald inquiry.

Instead, the Borbidge Government sent the report to the DPP for consideration.

Months later in mid-1997 in an official press release, while overseas in

⁷⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/goss/whistle.html>

⁷¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/goss/whistle.html>

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

Indonesia, Queensland Premier Borbidge said that there would be no public inquiry. He said the Director had advised there was one matter relative to which a charge could, theoretically, be laid under section 92 of the Criminal Code which deals with abuse of office.

But, in his release, Mr Borbidge said that the DPP had purportedly concluded his advice by stating that: *"Very considerable time has been expended by a good many people in the pursuit of the truth regarding the Heiner matter."*

"One has to wonder whether the public interest requires further exploration or whether it is now time to put the matter to rest once and for all".

Mr Borbidge said the Government had accepted the Director's advice, and no prosecutions would be launched as a result of the Morris/Howard report.

Supporting the government, *The Courier-Mail* wrote on 12th June 1997: *"The marathon Heiner document shredding saga ended last night with the announcement that no one would be charged over the affair."*

But they were wrong.

The Coalition and the media omitted to comment on barristers Tony Morris' and Eddie Howard's finding in the report to the Attorney-General that serious breaches of the law may have been committed in relation to the Goss Cabinet's instructions and the department's handling of the documents. The barristers also revealed in their report that the documents had been copied before being handed over to the union and that the copies had later been shredded—in contravention of the Libraries and Archives Act. By now both sides of government and *The Courier-Mail* had contributed to the cover-up.

My on-line site⁷² managed to gain access to material on the public record given to the Australian Senate and State Parliament. The on-line Shreddergate files⁷³ were developed as a resource for investigation. The University of Queensland's *Weekend Independent* published the facts constantly for close on three years. Despite these efforts, the limited readership of these two media outlets has ensured Shreddergate has gone unreported to the great majority of Australians and has allowed Labor to ignore the charges it should have faced then, and still should face even now.

So serious are the Lindeberg allegations facing ex-premier Goss and his Labor party Cabinet of 1990 (several of whom are still in Queensland's Cabinet today) that Shreddergate was cited by The Alliance for Public Accountability (APA) as a prime case of government corruption at a conference on the 4th October 1997 in Ottawa, Canada.

The other case studied by the APA at the conference was the shredding of Red Cross/Blood Bank records in Canada by government officials. The officials knew that they were being sought under Freedom of Information (FOI) by people who had been contaminated with blood containing Hepatitis B and the AIDS virus.

The Canadian Krevers Commission of Inquiry⁷⁴ and the officials involved in the Canadian blood bank shredding are currently under official investigation by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) with charges expected to be laid as a result. There has not been the level of political interference or media blackout in the process of law there.

The APA assisted the RCMP by giving it a copy of the 1996/97 Queensland

⁷² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/daily.html>

⁷³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/goss/>

⁷⁴ See: <http://www.uq.oz.au/jrn/twi/shrd21.htm>

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

Morris Howard report⁷⁵ into Shreddergate, because of the similarities between the shredding cases as well as the two countries criminal codes.

None of the information on the Krevers Commission has ever been mentioned in *The Courier-Mail*. This led the *Weekend Independent* to report:

"Prominent legal academics and some accountability pressure groups in the United States, Canada and Great Britain are monitoring developments in the Heiner document shredding saga via the Weekend Independent's electronic edition on the Internet."

One Nation forces Beattie's hand

Only the persistence of the One Nation MPs on the first night of the new Parliament, 30th July 1998 forced Labor leader Peter Beattie to release the party's cabinet documents at which Goss and his ministry took the extraordinary decision to shred the Heiner documents back in 1990. One Nation leader Bill Feldman challenged Beattie's claim of accountability in Parliament by demanding the release of the documents.

Beattie's hand was forced because he was trying to form a fragile minority government with the assistance of key independent MLA Peter Wellington who had promised that he would only support "*an accountable government*".

Wellington, who was fully briefed by the One Nation MPs only supported the Labor party, allowing them to form a minority government in Queensland, after they reluctantly agreed to release the 1990 Goss cabinet documents.

The Coalition somehow failed to achieve this result over the preceding eight years while in opposition and in government. The end result of One Nation's move over Shreddergate on the first day of Parliament, ironically, was a bi-partisan cover-up called the Forde Inquiry established by the major parties with its terms of reference *excluding the shredding*.

And the media.

Apart from Drena Parrington and The Gold Coast Bulletin, the Maryborough Chronicle and at earlier times Chris Griffith of the Sunday Mail, where have the media been?

The answer to that question is quite disturbing.

The University of Queensland's *Weekend Independent*, produced by the Department of Journalism, 1997

Channel 9's Sunday programme

On 21st February 1999 Channel 9's *Sunday programme* ran a cover story on Shreddergate. The *Courier-Mail* went into damage control as soon as word of the expose leaked out. On Saturday the 20th February, the day before the *Sunday Programme*, the paper carried an editorial⁷⁶ headed: "*Forde inquiry revelations are not new*"... here is an extract:

The allegations of abuse were then buried along with the shredded documents. According to one former Labor minister, former premier Wayne Goss and members of his cabinet were made aware of the nature of evidence presented to the inquiry. But the allegations were taken no further.

⁷⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/goss/libs.html>

⁷⁶ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/couroff17.htm>

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

The day after the *Sunday programme* went to air the *Courier-Mail* reported⁷⁷ on 1st March 1999:

If the Heiner affair is to be put to rest, a fully independent and thorough investigation into the processes that allowed - and may still permit - such an extraordinary series of events needs to be conducted.

The very next day the *Courier-Mail* followed up this report with coverage of state Labor leader, Peter Beattie's, comments in Parliament⁷⁸ that Shreddergate was "dead and buried" and that "Not one cent more of taxpayers' money will be spent on the Heiner nonsense.... There's been more inquiries into the Heiner nonsense than I've had hot dinners, and that's it."

The *Courier-Mail* reported the Premier's comments without questioning why the claims over the shredding would not now be investigated. Once again the Murdoch press had been an active partner in deceiving the people of Australia. No attempt to investigate the Channel 9 allegations was made by the paper.

A month later on the 28th March 1999 further evidence was produced by Channel 9's *Sunday programme* that an Aboriginal teenager, Bobby Yarre, had committed suicide on December 28th 1998 after being orally raped by other boys in the John Oxley Centre. He had used the grills referred to and complained about in the ill-fated Heiner report to tie the sheet to when committing suicide by hanging. Yarre had become a de-facto victim to both the deception of the Labor Party and the ongoing cover-up by The *Courier-Mail*.

When confronted by the *Sunday programme* Premier Peter Beattie made this most astonishing assumption after it was made quite clear that the shredding had been kept outside the brief given to the Forde inquiry.

Reporter, "Why don't you get to the truth of what happened though?"

Beattie, "Because..."

Reporter, "Shouldn't we go right back and find out?"

Beattie, "Yes, yes, you're dead right, you bet"

Reporter, "Well set up an inquiry and find out, what, why and when..."

Beattie, "Yes, you're dead right..."

Reporter, "Set up an inquiry and ask your ministers what they knew... and why they shredded..."

Beattie, "You're dead right and that's why I established the Forde inquiry."

Reporter, "But that's not going to explain why those documents were shredded."

Beattie, "Yeah, but it's going to get to the heart of this."

Reporter, "But it's not going to explain if any of your Ministers broke the law"

Beattie, "Well, you see, what's important here."

Reporter, "Accountability, Honesty... Truth"

Beattie, "No, you know what's important here? Children. The abuse of children. Not some theatrical game that is played by the media or someone who wants to run a personality game. What's important here is the children."

No mention of the *Sunday Programme's* allegations were raised the next day in the *Courier-Mail* and no discussion about them allowed through opinion pieces.

Had Murdoch's *Courier-Mail* pursued the story with a fraction of the commitment it had devoted to pursuing Rappolt, Shreddergate would have sunk the new Labor Government within months of the shredding back in 1990 and

⁷⁷ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/couroff18.htm>

⁷⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/199/0303.html>

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

young Bobby Yarre's life would probably have been saved.

But it never did.

The *Courier-Mail's* ethics are further brought into question through its decision not to subsequently report on matters involving the factors allowing the Aboriginal boy to commit suicide in detention – despite Channel 9's allegations of a link to Shreddergate. It raises some very serious questions about the ability of the Murdoch empire to represent the public interests of Australians fairly.

Beattie misleads Parliament over Shreddergate:

On Thursday 10 June 1999 Premier Peter Beattie used his numbers in a most extraordinary manner to defeat one of the most serious allegations that can be brought against any Member of Parliament, let alone a Premier of Queensland. The allegation that he deliberately provided false and misleading statement to Parliament to cover up serious impropriety within his Government.

The alleged contempt occurred on 4 March 1999 and Mr Beattie has compounded it since. His statement was designed to convince Parliament not to establish a commission of inquiry to thoroughly investigate allegations of criminal conduct involving five Ministers in his Government involving the shredding and subsequent cover up for nine years of serious incidents of child abuse. The debate occurred in the wake of the sensational revelations of the *Sunday programme*. It was a debate that the Government had to win.

The attempt to make Mr Beattie accountable was defeated 43-42. Mr Wellington, who promised to hold the Beattie Government accountable, voted with the Government despite having first hand knowledge of the significant evidence lined up against Mr Beattie.

An astounding bundle of evidence was tabled. It reveals that Mr Beattie wilfully misled Parliament on 4 March 1999 when he claimed that Lindeberg's allegations had been the subject of ten inquiries. Nothing could be further from the truth. The evidence shows up the lies⁷⁹. It makes extraordinary reading - and one can understand why the Beattie Government was so desperate to prevent it going forward for impartial examination, because if he were to be found in contempt, Beattie's resignation would have to follow.

In misleading Parliament on 4 March 1999, Premier Beattie carefully amended an Opposition motion⁸⁰ to establish a commission of inquiry by declaring, in effect, that it wasn't necessary because the allegations had already been the subject of 10 inquiries. A quick search of the public record would show anyone, let alone a Premier with the entire resources of Government behind him, that his claim was false. In giving those false assurances to Parliament the Beattie Government won the vote 44-40 (*with the support of the five ex-One Nation MPs*). In doing so, it obstructed justice and permitted those responsible for deliberately destroying public records to remain above lawful scrutiny.

This unacceptable abuse of the parliamentary process occurred in the same week that the Forde Commission of Inquiry into the Abuse of Children in Queensland Institutions conclusively established that evidence of child abuse at the John Oxley Youth Detention Centre had been covered up for years. The

⁷⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/goss>

⁸⁰ See: <http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au:81/hansard.htm> search on Heiner AND shredding (select 4th March 1999 and view pages 284 and 285 for Beattie's lies)

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

ongoing cover up of the shredding has now lasted over nine years - avoiding possible criminal charges being laid against Labor MPs.

The tabled documents reveal that the Speaker of the Queensland Parliament *held the Lindeberg contempt complaint up for 60 days* only to inform Mr Lindeberg that he would not consider any matter of privilege/contempt being brought to his attention from anyone other than a Member of Parliament. In making the ruling, he breached the Parliament's Standing Orders as other Speakers have always accepted those types of grievances from the public and referred them onto the Members' Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee providing they had substance.

The documents contain hitherto "*unknown*" correspondence between Mr Lindeberg and the Forde Inquiry. The letters are explosive. They show the true nature of the Inquiry and how it was politicised from the very outset by the Beattie Government itself when its Terms of Reference were deliberately restricted to only permit the incidents of child abuse to be investigated but not the shredding of the evidence to cover up that abuse.

In this case concerning whether the complaint to the Speaker had substance, the material tabled by Mr Allan Grice, Member for Broadwater, **included as examples (in part):**

- Independent supporting evidence from a former EARC Commissioner categorically rejecting Mr Beattie's claim that EARC had investigated the shredding;
- Evidence from the CJC quoting Assistant Police Commissioner Graham Williams that the police had not investigated the shredding when Mr Beattie claimed otherwise;
- Evidence showing that Mr Beattie in citing findings of two Senate Privilege Committee was citing totally irrelevant findings;
- Evidence showing that Connolly/Ryan Inquiry never made any findings of "*no criminality or official misconduct*" while Mr Beattie suggested otherwise.

The Beattie Government openly abused the parliamentary process to cover up the criminality associated with the Heiner shredding yet *The Courier-Mail* censored this fact by refusing to question Labor over these issues.

Meanwhile, the whistleblower, Kevin Lindeberg, remains unemployed and in limbo. The Australian people are the losers when both sides of government and the mainstream media are allowed to deny the democratic right of people to be fully informed about this serious issue.

There is no comparison in the Murdoch media's meticulous investigations of the insignificant Rappolt DVO case and the glossing over and censorship of serious issues relating to Shreddergate which is an important political and legal story.

It clearly exposes real concerns about journalistic ethics at *The Courier-Mail* and exposes the political advantages of the close ties between the major parties and senior journalists.

The difference in the treatment of Rappolt and the entire Goss cabinet by the Murdoch media can only come down to one thing: backroom deals being done

Chapter 3 - The Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse

between the Four Corners of Australia's Trojan horse⁸¹ - Packer, Murdoch and the main Laboral political factions.

When Goss lost power in 1996 following the Mundingburra by-election, a swag of Labor media advisers walked into jobs at the *Courier-Mail*. They had their work cut out getting their party back in - Shreddergate was just one of many ways in which they achieved this goal.

Graham Richardson has escaped media investigation because of his privileged position on Packer's payroll and through his political contacts in the Labor party.

The Shreddergate example above demonstrates how Murdoch's *Courier-Mail* regulates and controls the political agenda in Queensland. The rest of Australia would be no different. There is no objective reporting when it comes to politics.

In the case of Rappolt, opinion pieces, editorials and news stories with the Murdoch spin presented only one side of the story for weeks.

In the case of Shreddergate the *Courier-Mail* has pussyfooted for years and continues to do so. Any reporting has been largely based on verbatim extracts from Labor and Coalition press releases. Very few opinion pieces have been presented despite the enormous amount of work done on the subject by the *Weekend Independent*, the whistleblower (Kevin Lindeberg) and I.

With this in mind the *Courier-Mail*'s Terry Sweetman could probably not see the irony of a comment he made on the 12th of November 1998:⁸²

And, as he himself (One Nation party leader Bill Feldman) has been the subject of Freedom of Information inquiries from this paper in pursuit of what it believes to be its proper role in the community, we couldn't realistically expect him to be pleased with the Courier-Mail.

The hypocrisy is stunning: if the *Courier-Mail* bothers to use FOI to discredit a minnow like Charles Rappolt, why could it not use this option to catch the much bigger fish behind Shreddergate and to clear the stench around it?

I will leave you to make your own assumptions.

⁸¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/four>

⁸² See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/couroff5.htm>

Chapter 4 - Media's Double Standards
Chapter 4
Media's Double Standards –
the real dividing force in Australia

What we do have, is a group of leading Australians who, thanks to Hanson, have demonstrated that they regard the rest of us with contempt and fear. It is disturbing to realise that this is the same group that will be making much of the running on the republic during the next 12 months.
Michael Duffy⁸³, the *Courier-Mail*, 19/10/98

Pauline Hanson's rise was a fluke of history. As the Liberal candidate for the seat of Oxley in Queensland she wrote a letter to her local newspaper, the *Queensland Times*, calling for welfare to be based on need rather than race. (6/1/98).⁸⁴

Her letter drew immediate protests and politically motivated accusations of racism particularly from Labor in her home-town of Ipswich. Leading the attack was a Labor-leaning Councillor, Paul Tully⁸⁵. Despite being called a racist, Ms Hanson refused to apologise for her remarks. Caving in to political correctness the Liberal Party disendorsed her. Undeterred she ran as an independent and won what was formerly a safe Labor seat with the biggest swing in the country.

The size of the swing demonstrated that many ordinary people agreed with Ms Hanson's sentiments. Less than eighteen months after the controversial letter was published, Coalition Prime Minister John Howard expressed identical sentiments in a televised speech to the farming community in the small town of Longreach.

The hypocrisy of the established political parties and the mainstream media is clearly demonstrated by a comparison of Ms Hanson's comments in the letter, with the public statements made by Howard⁸⁶.

Pauline Hanson letter: *I would be the first to admit that many years ago the Aborigines were treated wrongly but in trying to correct this they have gone too far...*

John Howard at Longreach: *"I think that what has happened in this country is that we had a pendulum of Aboriginal affairs that was over here and I think that it has swung too far over in this direction particularly because of the Wik decision and what I am trying to do is to bring it back into the middle and I think that that is where it ought to be."*

Pauline Hanson letter: *I don't feel responsible for the treatment of Aboriginal people in the past because I had no say but my concern is for their future."*

John Howard at Longreach: *"I do not believe in intergenerational guilt when it comes to Aboriginal affairs. I am aware of the history of this country. I am aware of the fact that the indigenous people were here first. I do not exhibit a sense of shame for what our forebears did."*

⁸³ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/couroff3.html>

⁸⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/qtfirst.html>

⁸⁵ See colour plates for picture of Cr Paul Tully demonstrating with his dog at the Gold Coast launch of One Nation.

⁸⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/1706.html>

Chapter 4 - Media's Double Standards

Pauline Hanson letter: *How can we expect this race to help themselves when government showers them with money, facilities and opportunities that only these people can obtain no matter how minute the indigenous blood that flows through their veins and that is what causes racism.*

John Howard at Longreach: *"I understand the resentment that the rest of Australia feel when social security services are made available to minorities that are not available to them."*

Neither the Murdoch nor the Packer media ever suggested that John Howard was a racist let alone called for his disendorsement after his Longreach comments. Yet Pauline Hanson was labelled a racist because of this letter and subsequently disendorsed because of her racism. Why the double standard?

What goes on behind the scenes

*"What happened in Hobart is more proof for Pauline (Hanson) of that great conspiracy – she talks about it all the time. If its not the media its the politicians."*⁸⁷

Jeff McMullen, Channel 9's 60 Minutes, 18/5/97

The Australian media duopoly of the Murdoch and Packer (including Fairfax) empires now effectively manage the major parties' power brokers. The Labor Party and Coalition are increasingly being referred to as 'Laboral factions' because they primarily represent big business interests and not those of the average Australian.

In *"Hansonism, Tricks or Treat"*, Don Veitch shows just how insignificant people are to modern politicians:

The Executive networks despise the persistent way in which grassroots voices are always asking for schools, hospitals, full employment, tariffs, quality education and the like. Especially in the 1990s, the role of Executive government is to deflect such "unwarranted" demands. The aim of welfare in the contemporary world, according to Executive priorities, is to deflect rebellion and discontent, and to take the steam out of the system. Desperate people might do desperate things.

The second layer of attack against populist forces (such as One Nation) are the soft arms of Executive. These are the networks that formulate policy such as the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs; the old Industry Assistance Commission (which actually destroyed manufacturing). From here has emerged multiculturalism, land rights, de-industrialisation, more wilderness areas, and so on. The Executive arms are well funded, unaccountable and prolific. While schools and hospitals might close, these networks continue.

Political correctness⁸⁸ (PC) has been the tool by which the media and the government have suppressed the expression of mainstream Australian views. The establishment of bureaucracies such as those promoting multiculturalism and indigenous separatism, has promoted divisions in society, and the anti-

⁸⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/1905.html>
(See also chapter headed "60 Minutes credibility gap")

⁸⁸ See chapter headed "Political Correctness"

Chapter 4 - Media's Double Standards

discrimination tribunals set up to enforce PC have blighted the country's proud record of freedom of speech⁸⁹.

Australian society has slowly been fractured into competing groups. In fearlessly challenging this fragmentation and institutionalised apartheid, Ms Hanson threatened the prevailing PC ideologies. The most effective way to neutralise her was to label her racist. In contemporary Australia, a racist is more morally reprehensible than a murderer.

As 2UE's radio personality Alan Jones said on 14th October 1998: *"There wouldn't be one Australian who did not believe in improving the living standards of Aboriginal Australians, improving their standard of health longevity and education. The question is do we try to achieve those goals by bringing indigenous Australians forward as part of Australia or pushing them out on their own?"*⁹⁰

Peter Howson, who was Liberal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs 1971-72, wrote in the *Herald Sun* on Friday 20th November 1998⁹¹

Is their future to be one of separation from the rest of Australia forever, or as part of the mainstream?

A powerful federal bureaucrat of the 1960s, Nugget Coombs, had a fundamental idea that Aborigines were irrevocably different from the rest of Australians.

Because of this difference, and because of the sufferings and difficulties many Aborigines had endured since European settlement, they had to be set apart from other Australians with a different legal status and with special entitlements, he believed.

In *"Hansonism, tricks or treat"* Don Veitch outlines how these powerful bureaucrats work in with the COGs⁹² (pg 207).

Popular forces, One Nation included, have not yet devised strategies to deal with and control the Executive forces of government (such as Coombs). Executive forces of government have a hostile attitude towards "The People".

(and pg 208): The main objective of COGs (such as oil cartels, wealthy media families etc...) is to keep control of what they have, and get more. Essentially it is a "Venetian" ethic. Making money is the end product of oligarchical activity. Suppressing democratic demands for equal access to wealth is a vital part of that strategy. The Sydney Institute's Dr Gerard Henderson, an old political hand from way back, is the most useful of PIG (permanent informal government) assets. In the 1950s and 1960s his former inspiration, B A Santamaria, was a PIG asset helping to stymie trade unions and Labor Party activities.

Well paid bureaucrats stand to lose from a genuine grassroots party whose central ethos is the promotion of a sense of common nationhood. Currently such bureaucrats have a major influence on Australian policy directions. Furthermore, they work behind the scenes with COGs and the power-players like Richardson,

⁸⁹ See chapter headed "Political Correctness – Diversity and Multiculturalism – the new unreported racism.

⁹⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/ajones10.html>

⁹¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/twotribes.html>

⁹² Central Oligarchic Groups – see chapter headed "Media barons and media ownership"

Chapter 4 - Media's Double Standards

Morris and Kroger while the media report chaos and misleading stories as a diversion from the real games being played out in the committee rooms in Canberra.

Divided we fall, and divided we are. Ms Hanson, who objected to divisive race-based bureaucracies, was the “*fall guy*” for the media. Ironically, she was found guilty of being 'divisive' in a trial by media reported day after day in News Limited newspapers across the country.

Simply put, Ms Hanson and Mr Howard were treated differently by the mainstream media in the Longreach/letter comparison because the *populist* 'Hanson phenomenon' threatened the power relationship between the media barons and the Laboral factions. She threatened the influence they exert through powerful bureaucracies and the paid lobbyists such as the likes of Graham Richardson, Grahame Morris and Michael Kroger,

*Hi I'm a big fan of One Nation,
Pauline Hanson has made me so politically aware. I was wondering what went wrong in the federal election. To me she wasn't getting the publicity that she needed. How will the campaigns be done in the future. Will they be done differently.
Best wishes
Mitchell*

Fighting the voice of the people by tackling the “messenger”

When Ms Hanson won the seat of Oxley as an independent on a rush of “*populist*” support the alarm bells started ringing in the corridors of power at Murdoch's News Ltd and Packer's Publishing and Broadcasting Limited (PBL).

At first the mainstream media resorted to personal denigration. For example, soon after Ms Hanson was elected, the *Courier-Mail* ran an article quoting her ex-husband making unconfirmed and highly defamatory allegations.

Just days after her election another independent (Kalgoorlie), Graeme Campbell leader of Australia First said: “*There is a disproportionate allocation of resources to Aborigines, which is not benefiting them*”. He said that Ms Hanson had been attacked remorselessly by the “*Aboriginal industry and the media*”.

While vilifying Ms Hanson, the mainstream media simultaneously promoted the politically correct lines on multiculturalism and immigration. Their most outrageous claims against One Nation were strongly supported by bureaucracies and political parties. For many they became fact and were the basis for violent demonstrations at One Nation meetings a year later.

Later chapters document how any issues affecting Australia negatively in 1996 to 1998, such as a decline in Asian tourism, were attributed to the ‘racist’ Ms Hanson and her One Nation party⁹³.

How the news is distorted

Throughout this book there are numerous examples of how the chiefs-of-staff of News Limited, Fairfax as well as Packer publishing interests around Australia, have distorted the truth to suit their own interests⁹⁴.

⁹³ See: Chapter headed “Media reports half told”

Chapter 4 - Media's Double Standards

The mainstream media increasingly use freelance journalists who contribute regular political opinion pieces. Opinion pieces are supposedly the opinions of the commissioned writers.

A phone call to the Media, Entertainment and the Arts Alliance (MEAA) or Australian Journalists Association (AJA) will reveal that many journalists who regularly contribute opinion pieces to the papers are not members of the MEAA or AJA. (See example of Peter Charlton – chapter “Censoring the truth” – *The MAI*). As such these writers are not bound by the recognised journalistic code of ethics although the *Australian Press Council* can be used as an arbitrator. It is surely of concern that while most trades and professions have acceptable qualifications and codes of ethics many journalists do not.

When Lachlan Murdoch says “*Kill the cow*” he is, in effect, ordering his chiefs-of-staff and editors to be selective about whose political opinion pieces are carried in the papers, how the news is reported, and what the chiefs-of-staff will treat as newsworthy.

The ex-Labor media advisers who walked into jobs at the *Courier-Mail* after Goss lost power were the reporters and opinion writers behind many of the articles and stories that damned One Nation in the lead up to the Queensland State Election. When Beattie’s government regained power the ‘soft shoe shuffle’ went the other way as the reporters again became media advisers.

Finally, many news stories in the mainstream media are accompanied by comments expressing the views of the reporter. The disregard for objectivity has facilitated the labelling of Pauline Hanson and One Nation as ‘racist’⁹⁵.

The greatest white collar “moral” crime in Australia is the shifting of the tax burden from the rich and well-connected to the poor. Where taxes are cut or avoided in one area new taxes have to be generated in another. It is a simple accounting requirement in balancing the books.

Packer and Murdoch are not alone in using their contacts to avoid or reduce their tax liabilities. Most multinationals in Australia use our tax laws to avoid paying their fair share.

The result is easy to predict, more tax being paid by those who cannot afford it, and when they have been “bled dry” an erosion in government services along with job shedding. This is taking place in Australia now.

Scott Balson, 25th November 1998

⁹⁴ See: Chapter headed “Media reports half told”

⁹⁵ See chapter headed “Labelling and Racism”

Chapter 5

Winners and Losers in today's Media

"What I was actually doing, shock horror, was observational reporting. That's all."

Interviewer: "As distinct from?"

Kingston: "As distinct from finding the chink and making that the story. For example the Courier-Mail followed her once after they tried to ignore her. They followed her up to north Queensland where every single small town came out to see her. There were mob scenes, interesting, weird, mind-blowing phenomenon."

"The Courier-Mail ran four paragraphs on how she nearly got killed on the road when her driver tried to overtake. That was it."

"One obvious example of the media's calculated bias against Hanson was the photos of her that it (The Courier-Mail) used..."

"You look at the mainstream media's use of pictures before the Queensland election they were all of her thin lipped, scouring, glaring, every single one of them."

Margot Kingston, Channel 9's Sunday programme, 12/6/98 ⁹⁶

There are clear winners and losers in today's world of news dissemination.

The winners are the media barons who further their own and their largely overseas-based financial backers' interests by the manipulation of issues presented as news. The losers are the Australian public, few of whom are aware that most news is not news, but opinion. Other losers are those who dare to question the one-sided opinions that the mainstream media present. Pauline Hanson has been the most spectacular example of what happens to those who dissent.

Individual journalists' work is censored by the chiefs-of-staff before publication. In turn, the chiefs-of-staff are answerable to the editorial staff. The higher up the 'journalistic tree' they go, the more journalists are influenced by the views of the proprietor. Proof of these assertions?

When asked to give a toast before the New York Press Club in 1953, John Swinton, the former Chief of Staff of the New York Times, called by his peers, "The Dean of his Profession" replied:

"There is no such thing, at this date of the world's history, in America, as an independent press. You know it and I know it. There is not one of you who dare to write your honest opinions, and if you did you know beforehand that it would never appear in print. I am paid weekly for keeping my honest opinions out of the paper I am connected with. Others of you are paid similar salaries for similar things, and any of you who would be so foolish as to write honest opinions would be out on the streets looking for another job. If I allowed my honest opinions to appear in one issue of my paper, before twenty-four hours my occupation would be gone."

"The business of the journalists is to destroy the truth; to lie outright; to pervert; to vilify; to fawn at the feet of mammon, and to sell his country and his race for his daily bread. You know it and I know it, and what folly is this toasting

⁹⁶ See colour plates for photo of Margo Kingston celebrating with Pauline Hanson on the night of the Queensland State Elections.

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

to an independent press? We are the tools and vassals for rich men behind the scenes. We are the jumping jacks; they pull the strings and we dance. Our talents, our possibilities and our lives are all the property of other men. We are intellectual prostitutes."

Nothing has changed. Media magnates, their financial backers, and the intellectual prostitutes of the media world are the winners. They stand to benefit financially by championing issues such as globalisation.

The media have developed two strategies for dealing with anyone who dissents. The first is to ignore them. If that does not work - as in the case of Pauline Hanson - the media can and will run a massive campaign, co-ordinated across the different media, of labelling and vilification - the sharpest tools of political correctness.

In that respect, you (Roberta Sykes) are little different from Streten Bozic, Elizabeth Durack and Leon Carmen - people whose work would never have received the acclaim it did were it not falsely presented as "Aboriginal" - such is the depth and complexity of racism in Australia.
Pat O'Shane, The Weekend Australian, 8/11/98

Political correctness

According to the mainstream media, racism is always a white crime. The media never report on the racism practised in Australia's neighbouring Asian countries. Dr Richard Basham has said: *"In contrast to Australia, no Asian society genuinely prohibits racial discrimination in immigration or before the law. Indeed racial discrimination is so deeply imbedded in the moral premise of Asian societies that it often goes unnoticed."*⁹⁷

On the morning of 31st October 1998 a gang of Middle Eastern youths fired over a dozen bullets from a high powered semi-automatic gun through the windows of the Lakemba police station in a drive-by shooting. One police officer was lucky not to be killed and another was injured by flying glass. The shooting was allegedly in response to a police crack-down on ethnic-based crime in south-western Sydney.

The next day on Channel 9's *Today Program* the NSW police commissioner, Peter Ryan was careful not to offend against political correctness by rocking the multicultural boat. When asked whether it was an ethnic problem because some migrants came from places where life is cheap and the law is not enforced, he answered:

"I think it can be and I think it's quite often the case of cultural issues across a whole range of problems where trying to settle down in a new country - almost being dislocated from your previous family and culture - trying to live in a new culture which isn't all that sympathetic in some respects can cause difficulties and can cause gangs to get together of young people who feel as I have said dislocated a little bit."

The NSW Police Commissioner's squirming was the result of a savaging he had suffered from the multicultural Thought Police for his plain-speaking on a previous occasion. Paul Sheehan has described an interview Ryan had with a British police magazine in which he said: *"Here [in Australia] the crime is*

⁹⁷ "Among the Barbarians" (pg 182) Paul Sheehan – publishers Random House

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

partly Lebanese-based, partly from the Soviet Union, Hong Kong, Vietnam and China." (Amongst the Barbarians, Sheehan, pg. 180)

For these remarks he was publicly and viciously berated by multicultural zealots including Helen Sham-Ho (Liberal NSW Upper House), Franca Arena (Labor, Upper House), Angela Chan (Federation of Ethnic Community Councils of Australia), and Joe Wakim (Australian Arabic Council). (Sheehan, pg. 181)

Though the membership of many criminal gangs is indeed ethnically based, ethnic sensitivities must be respected, and the media play along. Most reports involving Aboriginal crime and rioting is in code with the perpetrators referred to as 'rioters' and 'drinkers'. Though crime in New South Wales is disproportionately ethnically-based, and the supply and distribution of over 80% of heroin coming into Australia is controlled by Asian gangs⁹⁸ (National Crime Authority report in 1995), the police commissioner was not allowed to say it.

Dr Richard Basham, an authority on the links between crime and culture said:

The comfort level of Asian criminals in Australia is now very high. It is almost as if they have political protection. This imposed silence is one of the reasons Australia now has Pauline Hanson. (Sheehan, pg. 182)

He is right.

From the day that she was disendorsed by the Liberal party in January 1996 Pauline Hanson suffered a media campaign of vilification of unprecedented ferocity. More than her 'racism' her rejection of multiculturalism in particular struck at the heart of political correctness. Defending multiculturalism inexorably led to RaceWatch.

RaceWatch

*RaceWatch*⁹⁹

This is my first E-mail to GWB. Thank you for all the info you are supplying us with. I am in a way surprised by the methods minority groups are using to attack Pauline Hanson's One Nation. Now this "RaceWatch" committee. You must really be worrying them but it also shows who are the real enemies of our way of life. But to me there is also a disturbing sign in all this. I grew up in Nazi occupied Holland and have seen from close by what has been done to the Jews.

I remember the Nazi propaganda where Adolf Hitler said something like "the Jews are poisoning our society and we have to get rid of them". What disturbs me now is that I start thinking "is there any truth in this". I never thought to reach this state of mind. In 1953, at the invitation of the Australian Government, I came here as a 26 year old migrant and was offered a future in a multi racial society, with a European culture. The first 25 years, when something like 2 million people came here from all over Europe, we "Assimilated" (am I now a racist) very well. I was proud when I became an Australian, but now I am very disappointed. Why did all this have to change. Where in the world is multiculturalism a success.? Sorry Scott for this lengthy epistle.

Best wishes,

Kees Viset.

⁹⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/ncareprt.html>

⁹⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/2008.html>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

On the 2nd August, just two months before the Federal election, RaceWatch received nationwide publicity with the following press release headed, "*Pre Election campaign launched to expose racist candidates*":

Poll shows 72% think One Nation dividing the country, 70% embarrassed by One Nation

In a bold move to combat political candidates playing the race card in the run up to the election, Community Aid Abroad and B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission are together launching a new campaign called Racewatch.

The campaign asks the Australian public to stand up and confront the destructive brand of racism that most Australians feel is dividing the nation.

Racewatch campaigners will monitor the use of the 'race card' by candidates or parties and refer them to Community Aid Abroad. The reports will then be verified by the B'nai B'rith Anti Defamation Commission and passed to a panel of distinguished Australians who will then determine whether the statements can be legitimately judged as racially inflammatory.

The panel will then issue a report publicly which will expose those resorting to racism with the aim of convincing other politicians not to use the "race card". The panel consists of Justiceinfeld AO QC, former Tax Commissioner: Trevor Boucher AO LLB FACPA, and former Race Discrimination Commissioner: Irene Moss AO.

In a nation-wide poll conducted last week by Community Aid Abroad 62 per cent felt that people are freer to state racist views now than they were two years ago. Seventy two per cent felt One Nation was dividing the country and more than 70 per cent per cent felt One Nation to be an embarrassment to the country. Less than nine percent believed One Nation to be a credit to Australia. The total number of people polled was 535.

Executive Director of Community Aid Abroad, Jeremy Hobbs, says: "Racewatch is aimed at all political candidates who think they have something to gain by resorting to racism. Our survey shows the majority of Australians abhor racism. This campaign gives those people the opportunity to challenge racist candidates and policies in every electorate and show them that racism has no place in Australia."

Danny Ben Moshe Executive Director of B'nai B'rith Anti Defamation Commission says: "The aim of Racewatch is to ensure that political candidates are less likely to engage in racist rhetoric. No longer will they be able to use the race card with impunity."

Becoming a RaceWatcher was a simple procedure: aspiring RaceWatchers simply made a phone call to receive a "RaceWatcher's kit"¹⁰⁰. Just as in the Leibler's list outrage, the media again failed to report on the hypocrisy of such vigilanteism and the frightening parallels with the excesses of Nazi Germany.

Though re-defining words is a common tool of political correctness, it was nevertheless surprising when RaceWatch unilaterally re-defined the word 'racist' to include "*those who believe that immigrants to Australia should assimilate with the mainstream population*". For publicly holding that legitimate point of view, a person was a 'racist' according to RaceWatch and could be 'outed' to the media if judged so by the kangaroo court of distinguished Australians.

None of the mainstream media questioned RaceWatch's re-definition of the word 'racist'. It took the plain-speaking Peter Walsh, a Finance Minister in the

¹⁰⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/watch/kit.htm>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

Labor Hawke government, to ridicule the notion and the organisation itself in the *Courier-Mail*:

The definition of racist policy (by RaceWatch), though somewhat fuzzy and subjective, seems focussed on immigration and specifically includes "policies which are assimilationist, that is expecting one cultural group to suborn their interests to a dominant group..... The political cleansing is jointly sponsored by Community Aid Abroad and the multinational Jewish organisation B'nai B'rith. Could one be forgiven for suggesting the latter's attention might be more appropriately directed to the Israeli Government's immigration policy and practice? Community Aid Abroad seeks, and gets, funds from the Australian Government and from the private citizens who, like AM interviewer Camille Fannel, "always thought (CAA) was about raising money for communities abroad. ("Odd partners in the fight against racism", 10/9/98)

When CAA's chief executive was contacted after the election and asked how many racists had been outed, the answer was quite extraordinary. "None", he said. Despite individuals publicly challenging RaceWatch to out them, RaceWatch did not do so¹⁰¹.

Date: Tue, 18 Aug 1998 09:32:41 +1000 (EST)

Subject: outed by Racewatch?

In an interview with Scott Balson, Vicki Horne said: 'Community Aid Abroad are of the view that "assimilation is racist". If someone says that they could be referred to RaceWatch and outed'.

I can't wait to be outed. I would regard it as an honour bestowed in recognition of my humble attempts to restore Australia to its true character of the land of the 'fair go'.

Calling all Racewatchers! I believe that the policy of assimilation produces far better outcomes in terms of social harmony and cohesion than does the policy of multiculturalism which has led to corruption and division. Poll after poll shows that the un-euphonious, polysyllabic monstrosity of a word itself - 'multiculturalism' - is on the nose for most Australians. And that's apart from its meaning.

Owzat? Good enough for a mention?

Antonia Feitz

The whole RaceWatch affair had been nothing more than a hideous racism-spotlighting marketing exercise capitalising on the politically correct frothing frenzy about the issue. Less than a week after the federal election, CAA started sending out requests for donations to the 500 new RaceWatch names on their database. The stunt had set the fund raiser back Au\$10,000 or about Au\$20 for each RaceWatcher added to their mailing database. Hobbs confirmed the costs of the project, justifying the outrageous expense by saying that donations received had made it "just about break even".

As far as CAA was concerned the initial media coverage of such a very politically correct cause justified the ends. It now enjoys a larger fund-raising mailing list even though the primary aim of outing racists proved to be a dismal failure. It could reasonably be argued that perhaps such a failure gave the lie to

¹⁰¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/watch/z.htm>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

the perception that Australia was now a racist country because of Pauline Hanson's One Nation.

Even though RaceWatch failed to even 'out' one racist, Hobbs wrote the following to his undoubtedly disappointed RaceWatchers on 21st October 1998:

We were very pleased with RaceWatch's success, as not only did over 500 people join up to keep an eye on racist campaign tactics but the 1998 election campaign was relatively free of racist sentiment.

Despite the initial blaze of publicity given to RaceWatch, the mainstream media totally ignored RaceWatch's failure. Nor was it widely reported that Community Aid Abroad receives Au\$13 million per year from federal revenues – and spends Au\$9 million a year on administration and marketing, including stunts like RaceWatch.

Racial prejudice in reporting (See also "Just who are the extremists?"):

In early April 1999 an elderly Maori, Hoera Te Kooti, was killed late at night in an unprovoked attack on a main Ipswich street by a gang of young feral Aboriginal thugs. This same gang had beaten up countless whites of all ages over many months yet the police were powerless to act because they know that arrests would be followed by intimidation through the Aboriginal industry represented by organisations like the Aboriginal Legal Service and ATSIC. No reports had been carried by the local Queensland Times on the gang or its victims.

It was only seven days after the murder that the papers came clean about the race of the "dark skinned" offenders. Police were too scared to apprehend the Aboriginal youths because of the legal and career implications. Two years before, at 2.30 am on March the 22nd 1997 outside the Volt, an Ipswich nightclub, a group of young Aborigines launched an unprovoked attack on visiting American soldiers and young (white) party goers. Several police were called to sort out the problem.

Several of the police who came to the aid of those being attacked have had their careers placed in limbo for the two years following the incident. Despite being cleared of any unwarranted physical force by the Magistrate following an official complaint by the Aboriginal Legal Service on behalf of the arrested Aborigines four policemen are still waiting to face Queensland's Criminal Justice Commission. The complaint? "Excessive physical force" during the arrest lodged by ATSIC. The impact on these police and their families and the detrimental effect on the moral of staff at the local police station has been profound.

No paper has ever questioned how our system can allow such blatant race-based bias and intervention by intimidation to impact on the performance of Australia's police force in fulfilling their duty. No paper has dared called the attacks on innocent white people by Aborigines as "racist".

Yet in early June 1999 when it was revealed that a One Nation member had established a branch of the Ku Klux Klan in Sydney the media went into overdrive. The fact that the One Nation member was expelled as soon as his extremist views were exposed was lost on the cartoonists, satire writers, editorials and opinion pieces that flowed with words filled with hate and distortion from the pens of the politically correct reporters. A cartoon in the Queensland Times¹⁰²

¹⁰² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/99a/qt0306.jpg>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

depicted Pauline Hanson as a member of the Ku Klux Klan grimacing while she tried to stem the flow of blood coming from one arm with a sanitary pad.

The next day on the 4th June 1999 the editor of the paper, Mark Hinchliffe, wrote: *"Play with fire and you will get burnt. One Nation is finding out the meaning of the adage with the no-so startling discovery that they have been infiltrated by white supremacists trying to start an Australian chapter of the infamous Ku Klux Klan in Australia."*

The frenzy of rating-based reporting was only topped by Channel 10 on their 5 o'clock news (3rd June 1999). They displayed the Internet address of the Ku Klux Klan in large letters on the screen for several seconds.

The hypocrisy of sensationalised reporting was complete – Channel 10 had, to all intents and purposes, handed out an electronic brochure to 10% of Australia's population on how to join the Ku Klux Klan while tut-tutting that such a thing could be allowed to happen here.

When one compares the infatuation that the media had in denigrating the One Nation party by making much of an expelled member's association with the Ku Klux Klan to the manner in which they had skirted around the facts facing the police in Ipswich on an issue which was having a real long-term social impact on the community their bias and politically correct reporting speaks for itself.

FSIA

In 1995, an Australian Labor government signed a World Trade Organisation's (WTO) international treaty called the Financial Services Industry Agreement (or FSIA).

Through this treaty, which few Australians outside the banking industry have ever heard of, foreign investors like Chase Manhattan Nominees have gained their major stake and control in Australia's banking industry. One of News Corporation's chief backers, Chase Manhattan Nominees is among the top ten shareholders of all Australia's major banks and many of its largest companies. It is the largest shareholder in the ANZ Bank and the fifth largest in News Ltd.

These are the major Australian companies embracing economic rationalism.

On the 28th July 1995 the then Labor Minister for Trade, Senator Bob McMullan, said of the FSIA, *"The financial services agreement will directly benefit Australian banks, insurance companies and securities traders."* He spoke the truth: the proliferation of international treaties such as the FSIA is aimed at undermining national sovereignty and promoting the globalisation of the world economy. While this is in the interests of the international banking industry, it is not in the interests of Australians: in the banking industry alone some 40,000 full time bank staff have been cut, while in 1996/97 more than one bank branch a day was closed in Australia.

With the 1996 change of government the foreign bankers seized the opportunity to gain control of the recently privatised Commonwealth Bank of Australia. When privatising the "people's bank" the Labor government had promised that it would remain in Australian hands.

The FSIA amendments, signed in December 1997 under the Coalition were testimony to a radical change in Australian banking.

They undertook to¹⁰³:

¹⁰³ See: <http://www.wto.org/wto/new/sumfin.htm>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

- *Eliminate a Most favoured Nation exemption based on reciprocity requirements for membership in the Australian Stock Exchange;*
- *Eliminate a prohibition on the acquisition of control of any of Australia's four main banks. Also eliminates a measure which prohibits banks (resident or non-resident) from holding shares in the Commonwealth Bank of Australia and other entities from holding more than five percent of its issued share capital;*
- *Eliminates restrictions placed on share ownership of authorised money market dealers by foreign and domestic banks, and restrictions imposed on relationships and dealings between authorised dealers and related banks;*
- *Relaxes the prohibition on foreign banks located overseas from raising funds in Australia, and allows such banks to raise funds in Australia through the issue of debt securities, subject to conditions*
- *Removes an entry relating to the reservations by State and Territory governments of the right to prohibit foreign control of State-owned or controlled banks.*

The Commonwealth Bank of Australia, following the signing embarked on a series of branch closures and staff retrenchments.

A Canadian, Bob Olsen, wrote on the Internet about the FSIA at this time:

Why have the media not reported that the World Trade Organisation Financial Services Agreement, which was signed on December 12, 1997, has still not been seen by legislators, the media or the public?

The signing of the agreement was well reported. 70 countries signed this thing five weeks ago.

Canadian Members of Parliament, including government MPs, have not been allowed to see it. They apparently have been given a variety of excuses.

- ☐ *What has this "agreement" committed us to?*
- ☐ *Why won't they tell us?*
- ☐ *What are these 70 governments hiding?*
- ☐ *Where the hell is the media?*
- ☐ *Have all reporters, journalists etc been bought?*
- ☐ *Why are they not asking questions?*
- ☐ *Is the media part of the tyranny of silence?*

Though they would have a huge impact on Australia, the 1997 amendments to the FSIA were similarly unreported in the mainstream media. In many of these international treaties the governments' own ministers often seem to be totally uninformed about the ramifications of what they are approving or signing. This was most obvious in the MAI debacle. The politicians depended on the advice of senior departmental bureaucrats who can make or break their political careers.

For example, in Queensland the minority Labor Beattie government came to power in June 1998 partly on the promise that *it would not allow* the privatisation of the state owned Suncorp/Metway financial institution. Within weeks of forming a minority government it decided to follow the former Coalition government's plan to do so. The media never questioned why the Labor government changed its mind so quickly (*on a deal worth nearly Au\$1.5 billion*).

Just four months after the Labor party gained power, The *Courier-Mail* reported in its Business section on the 15th November 1998 that the Suncorp/Metway note issue "had been oversubscribed 2.5 times." The State Treasurer David Hamill said the allocation process was in line with the Government's aim of enabling as many "*mum and dad investors as possible to participate in the offer and share in the future of Queensland's largest financial*

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

institution". His words parroted those of Labor's Paul Keating when the now, increasingly foreign controlled, Commonwealth Bank was sold.

Hamill failed to say that 40% of the float was allocated to institutional investors like Chase Manhattan Nominees and the Bank of Queensland's major shareholder the Bank of Hawaii. The shares of the now private banking institution rose 40% within 24 hours of the float realising an immediate loss of about Au\$600 million to the state revenue coffers through gross under-valuation.

The money lost would have been better spent on improving the social infrastructure which increasingly is not meeting the needs of Queenslanders as shown in hospital waiting lists, the lack of police, and under-funded schools. The *Courier-Mail* took the line that the 'mum and dad' shareholders in Suncorp/Metway had made a financial bonanza with their 300 shares.

When the state owned Bank of Queensland was privatised the year before, the Bank of Hawaii became the major shareholder with 10%¹⁰⁴. Shortly after privatisation the bank retrenched staff, increased fees and reduced branches as well as the hours in which it was open. Similarly the R&I Bank in Western Australia had a name change to BankWest before being sold to the Bank of Scotland¹⁰⁵. Few Australians are aware of this level of foreign ownership.

When reporting on bank closures and staff reductions the mainstream non-specialist press have consistently failed to report on the causes of the closures or what is behind the economic rationalism of a traditional service industry.

National Australia Bank's Don Argus is on the record, in 1998, as saying that it was an "emotional issue"¹⁰⁶ when announcing the culling of 4,000 jobs and the closure of scores of the bank's branches. This arrogant statement was reported on as a statement of fact by the media with no question about the social impact. Their focus remained on Hanson and her alleged racism.

In May 1998¹⁰⁷ I predicted that the National Australia Bank would spearhead the drive to challenge the government's four pillars policy in the banking industry after the next federal election.

In November 1998, just one month after the October federal election, Don Argus warned the government that if they did not remove the four pillars policy NAB would consider moving its head office off shore. The media did not even take the bank to task for its blunt threat.

It is worth noting that the top four 'Australian' banks contracted none other than Liberal powerbroker Michael Kroger and his merchant bank in November 1998¹⁰⁸ to present their case for removing the four pillar banking policy to allow major banks like National Australia Bank and Westpac to merge.

While Kroger, if successful, will earn millions of dollars for his work based largely on his privileged political contacts, tens of thousands of ordinary Australians will be retrenched as the banking industry rationalises itself further.

The true winners of the FSIA agreement, foreign bankers, are on the point of achieving their aim of bank mergers through the help of Kroger and contacts. *The Australian* reported Don Argus on its front page on 8th December 1998 as saying,

¹⁰⁴ See: <http://www.boh.com/new/980430.asp>

¹⁰⁵ See: <http://www.bankofscotland.co.uk/overseas.html>

¹⁰⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/298/0404.html>

¹⁰⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/298/2005.html>

¹⁰⁸ As reported on ABC Radio

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

"The past few weeks have been highly instructive and rewarding. We've managed to have four pillars and merger issues placed on the government agenda and we've also been given an outline, albeit in very general and ambiguous terms, of the conditions under which four pillars will be removed" ("Four pillars will crumble: Argus").

On the 17th December 1998 NAB chief Don Argus added this little quote to his earlier repertoire when questioned about job cuts resulting from bank mergers: *"union blurb (is) just emotional nonsense"*.

In May 1999 the Coalition government confirmed the sell-off of the Commonwealth and state banks through the signing of the *"Fifth Protocol"*¹⁰⁹. The nobly worded Joint Standing Committee on Treaties never questioned how such a document could be signed after the Australian government had promised to keep the Commonwealth Bank in the hands of Australians shareholders. There was no debate no media coverage – Deputy Prime Minister Tim Fischer signing the document six weeks before the expiry date (15th June) requested by the World Trade Organisation. This early signing prevented any debate by Australians.

Fischer claimed that¹¹⁰ *"For Australia, acceptance of the Protocol does not require any new legislative action"*, giving the impression little will change. Prior to signing Treasury had issued reassurances that the Fifth Protocol would not automatically allow foreign takeovers of the *"big four"* banks, the Commonwealth, ANZ, NAB and Westpac and that the four pillar policy would stay. In light of Treasury's track record the reverse is a sure thing.

MAI

In 1995, at the same time as the signing of the FSIA, The Australian Labor government involved Australia in negotiations with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) over a treaty aimed at advantaging multinational companies. The treaty was called the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI).

In the words of Renato Ruggerio, Director General of the World Trade Organisation, *"we are writing the constitution of a single global economy (through the MAI)."*

For over two years this international treaty, which had significant long term impacts on the Australian people and on Australian sovereignty, was negotiated behind closed doors by senior Treasury bureaucrats in Paris.

There was no openness about the negotiations, nor any exposes in the media. A blanket of silence was thrown over the reporting of the global restructuring of world investment. News Corporation played a pivotal role in the censorship – a fact which became apparent to concerned men and women using the Internet.

A small Canada-based Internet newsgroup monitored the treaty's progress. People from around the world, including Australia, discussed its implications. In Canada the MAI opponents were supported by a small contingent of National Democratic Party MPs who used the floor of their parliament to question Canada's involvement.

In late November 1997 the *Australian Broadcasting Corporation's* (ABC) *Background Briefing* program ran an expose on the treaty. On the 30th December 1997 I was invited to attend a One Nation policy making conference at the

¹⁰⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/fifthp.htm>

¹¹⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/fifthp3.htm>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

residence of Paul Trewartha inland from the Gold Coast. There were six people, including political adviser David Oldfield and Pauline Hanson at the meeting¹¹¹.

During the lunch break I handed a transcript of the ABC's Background Briefing report¹¹² to Ms Hanson. Half way through reading it she said, "They can't do this." "But they are," I replied.

It was the forerunner of Pauline Hanson's now historic press conference on the MAI on 21st January 1998. Previously the (O'Reilly owned) *Queensland Times* had published a series of my letters outlining the damage to Australia's sovereignty that would result from the signing of the MAI.

In the official One Nation press release on the MAI Pauline Hanson said¹¹³:

"Ladies and gentlemen of the press,

"Today's press conference is more than just a matter of news, it is a very serious matter of national interest and it is only through yourselves that Australians can be effectively informed of the treacherous nature of their government's intentions to sign away the future of Australia by selling us out completely.

"The Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) is the brainchild of the OECD and is an attack on everything Australian. In fact it poses the same threat to many countries and various groups around the world are conducting their own fight just as we must.

"Currently, the government is negotiating the treaty in secret and it is expected to be ready for signature in April or May this year. Once we are bound by this agreement its terms will trap us for 20 years with no facility for changes.

"The purpose of this agreement is to transfer power and control away from citizens and their democratically elected representatives to the world's largest multinationals with no strings attached.

"The effect of this agreement as they are known to us at present include:

"Australian governments, whether federal, state or local, will not be able to favour local business over foreigners.

"Any performance requirements for multinationals, such as creating jobs for Australians, using local components, or loyalty to Australia, will not be allowed.

"Australia will not be able to stop multinationals from importing foreign workers and their families into our country.

"Multinationals will be able to sue all three levels of Australian government for any infringements of the rights given to them by the agreement - it will be the Australian taxpayers who will pay the legal costs and damages compensation.

"It is important to understand this is not about trade, it is all about power and control.

"This is the multinationals shifting production and workforces without impediment from country to country to minimise costs and maximise profits. Giving them unrestricted rights and freedom to buy, sell and move their operations whenever and wherever they want around the world.

"The agreement is designed to impose tight restrictions on what National governments can do in regulating their own economies.

¹¹¹ See colour plates in centre of the book

¹¹² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/maiabc.html>

¹¹³ See: <http://www.onenation.com.au/onenation/press/210198.html>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

"We will no longer be able to attach conditions to, or limit the extent of foreign investment and many of our decisions will be made by international bureaucrats.

"It will be impossible for Australians to run our country for our own interests. Our government will in many respects be reduced to simple managers and caretakers for foreigners.

"In the words of Renato Ruggerio, Director General of the World Trade Organisation, "We are writing the constitution of a single Global Economy."

"The negotiation of the agreement commenced under Labor in 1995, and has continued under the current Coalition government - Liberal, National and Labor must shoulder the responsibility and wear the blame.

"While it has been reported Australian negotiators have submitted 29 reservations to the agreement, we have no idea what those reservations are and it must be acknowledged that Canada has asked for 48 exemptions.

"The secret negotiations must stop and the government must come clean immediately. In particular the government must disclose forthwith the 29 areas they have already raised as issues.

"Australians must be given details of this agreement.

"They must issue a draft of the agreement to any interested community groups for full and frank public scrutiny as well as opening up the issue for parliamentary debate.

"It will effect everyone from workers to owners of Australian businesses, their families, their futures, everything.

"Ladies and Gentlemen of the press, I believe you have a professional and patriotic responsibility to do all you can to alert Australians to the dangers of this agreement and the need for the government to be more open and accountable for their intended actions with relation to the MAI."

It is revealing that after Pauline Hanson's press conference exposing the MAI, big business in Australia confirmed that they were entirely happy with the MAI and had been kept fully informed of all developments during the negotiations, even though no word of the negotiations had ever made it to the popular press.

As Pauline Hanson's press conference was widely reported on television, the print media were finally forced into covering the MAI. The *Courier-Mail* wrote the next day¹¹⁴:

However a spokeswoman for Assistant Treasurer Rod Kemp yesterday accused Ms Hanson of "scare-mongering based on ignorance.

She denied there was any secrecy surrounding Australia's involvement in the agreement.

The *Queensland Times* wrote 22nd January 1998:

A spokesman for Mr Fischer yesterday said, "If Ms Hanson's request is genuine and she is truly seeking information, we will respond and give her information she desires as a representative of the Australian people."

He said the details of Australia's objections to the MAI document were not yet public as negotiations were continuing.

Days after the bombshell press conference on the MAI the *Courier-Mail* reported:

¹¹⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/198/2201.html>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

Peak industry groups support the proposed agreement arguing that it will remove restraints on international capital flows and make the process more open.

Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry chief executive Mark Patterson said yesterday that industry had been consulted extensively on the agreement.

He said Ms Hanson's concerns were unfounded.

In England, Australia's Foreign Minister Alexander Downer, speaking to a group of businessmen at a luncheon on the 29th January 1998, dismissed Hanson's comments. His own ridiculous comments indicated he didn't know much about the treaty or even what Ms. Hanson had said¹¹⁵:

"I have noticed in Australia the sort of campaign that people like Pauline Hanson at the moment are running, saying that by going along with MAI, that means Australia is going to be swamped by a lot of terrible foreigners and the whole of Australia is going to be sold off.

"I think that, first of all, it needs to be understood that this agreement isn't going to lead to any changes in Australia's foreign investment policy.

"But secondly Australia has an interest in seeing a more liberal global investment regime.

"And the MAI also will lead to a more liberal global investment regime, although we will still be able to have the restrictions on the sensitive sectors that we currently have in Australia."

At this time the Australian Labor Party were holding their annual conference in Hobart. Richard Sanders, an ecological economist reported to a STOP-MAI meeting held in Brisbane some ten days after the Hanson press conference¹¹⁶:

Representatives from ACE-J said that a survey late last year had shown that most of our Federal MPs and Senators either knew nothing about or cared to know nothing about the MAI. Somebody noted that the recent ALP Conference in Tasmania had declared they were against MAI with "certain reservations".

(Richard had spoken personally with Opposition Leader Kim Beazley last year and noted his support for the MAI. Ironically a similar conversation with Federal Industrial Relations Minister Peter Reith had revealed a negative response!)

The media attention that Pauline Hanson's One Nation Party had lately received with respect to this issue was dealt with by the re-affirmation that in fighting MAI we are caring not only for our own country but also for the whole world - especially the poor majority. It was noted that Australian Democrats and Australian Greens Senators were now very aware of the issue and were preparing themselves for a public and parliamentary campaign.

The movers and shakers of an Australian major political party were at the Hobart conference. The delegates should have known the intimate details of the MAI – but most of them had never heard of it.

While public concern grew and spread throughout Australia on the Internet, the mainstream media maintained their blackout on the MAI because it was a very hot topic that went against the interests of the multinational media barons. One of the cornerstones of the MAI was 'the level playing field' policy which meant that over time any short term exclusions to this aspect of the treaty would be wound

¹¹⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/down1.html>

¹¹⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/stop1.html>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

back and eventually removed. One of the exclusions under the draft MAI related to media ownership. If the MAI had proceeded Murdoch and others could have used the international courts to overrule any complaints or legal challenges on future take-overs of Australian media interests – like Channel 7 television.

There were on-line petitions to MPs as a growing body of concerned Australians heard about the treaty. By March, determined opposition had forced the establishment of a Joint Standing Committee on Treaties to look at the MAI. Yet still the papers carried no information for the general public on the MAI.

It took the following statements by the former Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia, Sir Anthony Mason, on the 2nd March 1998 at the opening of the Melbourne Convention to get the Fairfax press to take a lead on the issue¹¹⁷:

“In the far-off days of my youth, as a matter of every day life, it was very much State rather than Commonwealth law and regulation that affected our lives.. Today, it is a different scene. Privatisation of utilities is transforming the States into regulators rather than service providers and the Commonwealth law and regulation reach into many aspects of our lives. The steady accretion in the exercise of Commonwealth power has been matched, if not surpassed, at the international level by the exercise of power and influence by international and transnational corporations. Of even greater importance, perhaps, has been the technological revolution which, along with the rise of economic rationalism, has resulted in the emergence of a world economy and a world market in which the provision of financial and other services transcends national boundaries.”...

“Another avenue is to encourage an input from sectional interests at the international level. The Internet and other communication services enable sectional interests in different countries to mobilise their viewpoint internationally in a way not before possible. So it is conceivable that, in future, international decisions could be taken in the light of viewpoints expressed by sectional interests on an international basis. If the prophets of the demise of the nation state be right, we should be thinking about making international decision making itself more democratic, open and transparent. International negotiation and decision making has traditionally been less open and transparent than the democratic process.

“The problems are considerable. Take the current negotiation in OECD over the Multilateral Agreement on Investment, an agreement that could have a great impact on Australia if we ratify it. The negotiation, so far as Australia is concerned, is in the hands of Treasury. The negotiation is not an open process; it is being conducted in secret. There are no doubt reasons that can be advanced to support the veil of secrecy. But at the end of the day it is possible that the terms will be set in concrete leaving Australia with very limited choices to make, the effective choices having been made by Treasury and Federal Cabinet during the course of the unpublished negotiations.

A follow-up press release by Pauline Hanson on the 5th March on the MAI went totally unreported by the media¹¹⁸:

Secondly, it was Labor's own Senator Cook, then Minister for Trade, who represented Australia at the OECD Ministers' conference in May 1995 when it was decided to commence MAI negotiations, and it was Labor who oversaw

¹¹⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/melb1.html>

¹¹⁸ See: <http://www.onenation.com.au/onenation/press/050398.html>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

those negotiations between May 1995 and Labor's devastating defeat in March 1996.

The fullness of the destructive nature of the Multilateral Agreement on Investment is yet to be determined, however, Labor's involvement and obvious support for the MAI must not be allowed to go without condemnation because just like the Coalition,

Labor's burglars have their fingerprints all over it.

On the 7th March the *Sydney Morning Herald's* Economic Correspondent Paul Cleary, responding to Mason's statements re-wrote the history of the MAI's exposure in Australia when he totally ignored Ms Hanson's role in drawing attention to the treaty and Labor's role in involving Australia in it.

Under the heading "Treaty Xenophobia" he wrote¹¹⁹:

The Opposition and Democrats responded with a call for a parliamentary inquiry. On Thursday, the Foreign Minister, Alexander Downer, gave a guarantee in Parliament that the MAI would be reviewed by the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties.

Downer said Australia's handling of the negotiations "has been completely transparent". However, while talks have been under way since May 1995, the 124-page draft negotiating text was made public only last month.

"The fact is that we are very happy to be transparent in these negotiations. As far as we are concerned, these negotiations can go before the treaties committee today or tomorrow." he said.

At the time Deputy Prime Minister Tim Fischer told ABC Radio:

"Let me give you an absolute assurance that this process involving the multilateral agreement on investment will be subject to the new treaty process established by the Coalition government.

"In other words nothing will be signed, nothing will be bound in any way, shape or form until it is tabled on the floor of the Australian Parliament, made public and then maybe, after that, those steps will be taken."

The *Courier-Mail's* National Affairs Editor, Peter Charlton derided Hanson for her opposition to the MAI¹²⁰):

As any user knows, the Internet is a wonderful research tool. A local phone call, a few clicks of the mouse and the Net user is in the resources of, say, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development with its vast array of reports, statistics and other useful data. A few more clicks of the mouse and the Net user is deep inside a world of conspiracy theories and of global take-overs. Fruit loop territory.

And so it is with the information on the MAI. Take, for example, The MAI, a web page prepared by Global Web Builders¹²¹ on behalf of Pauline Hanson MP which makes the following claim, "The MAI is the international linchpin of what is, in the end, a totalitarian project for world rule". Hanson's page builders quote, with obvious approval, Malaysia Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad: 'The traders apparently make billions with each transaction. But when the funds at their disposal are huge and they are in a position to influence the values of the currencies with their investments and divestments, then the currency markets become cash cows to them.'

¹¹⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/austmar.html>

¹²⁰ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/cour2.html>

¹²¹ My company "GWB" or Global Web Builders

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

Other links shown include 'The enemy - MAI negotiators', including the OECD home page. Frequently the critics of the MAI claim the negotiations are being carried out in secret, yet their own web pages show how the reports can be obtained and downloaded from the Internet. Hanson told Parliament on March 9: "I must state that that as it is not possible to download the text of the agreement of the Treasury Internet site on a computer disc, it is very difficult and expensive to distribute the text of the treaty.".....

Her (Hanson's) objections - ill-informed, illogical, not based on fact and hysterically outlandish - are typical of other MAI critics, most notably in Canada, which has long had an ambivalent attitude towards foreign direct investment, particularly from big-brother United States. Groups in Canada opposed the North American Free Trade Agreement or NAFTA; MAI's critics claim it is 'NAFTA on steroids'.

Hanson's criticisms can be dismissed as those of an ignorant, illeducated person with a political barrow to push....

Charlton's dismissal of legitimate criticism was disingenuous to say the least. He failed to acknowledge that the mainstream media had not even reported on the existence of let alone the progress of the MAI. It was typical of his bias that while Pauline Hanson was singled out for ridicule for challenging the MAI, the Labor party, the Democrats and even Sir Anthony Mason escaped similar treatment.

A week later Charlton took the issue one stage further with another one-sided article on the MAI in the *Courier-Mail*, but his views were contradicted in a *Sydney Morning Herald* Editorial(8/6/98)¹²² :

WHEN a treaty like the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) is opposed by the hard Right, the hard Left, the soft Right and the soft Left and by distinguished former judges it is clearly under considerable pressure. Given the range of this opposition, it is incumbent on the Federal Government to present the community with strong and convincing arguments for the MAI. But according to the Federal Parliament's joint standing committee on treaties, to which the MAI was referred by the Foreign Minister, Mr Downer, this has not been done. The consequence of this is that a treaty that has the potential to help the Australian economy might be lost through the lack of proper and adequate explanation.....

The fact that these serious problems with the MAI are being aired publicly before the treaty is signed indicates the success of the joint standing committee on treaties process. Secret treaty-making, like the Keating Government's treaty with Indonesia, is not in the public interest. Neither is the silence of the bureaucrats on proposed treaties. The Reserve Bank Governor, Mr Ian Macfarlane, has issued a timely reminder of the challenge posed to the economy by the Asian financial meltdown. If only indirectly, this should underscore the fact that more needs to be done to sell the benefits of the MAI.

It is undeniable that the Internet played a major role in exposing the MAI as a treaty favouring the interests of the global bankers and multinationals. It is also undeniable that the media failed to report honestly or openly on it because there was a conflict of interests. As reported above, some of the big winners in Australia would have been the media barons.

¹²² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/smh.html>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

Just as the unreported amendments to the FSIA had devastating effects on the banking industry in Australia, the roll-back provisions of the MAI could have devastated small business, the major employer in this country.

Even the Federal Government's Joint Standing Committee on Treaties (JSCT) found great difficulty in getting press coverage. To its credit the ABC stood out alone as a voice for the people on this issue.

In a letter to the *Courier-Mail* (27/3/98) the JSCT chairman Liberal MP, Bill Taylor wrote¹²³: *The Federal Government has not signed anything yet; there is no secret government deal done with shadowy United Nations figures in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development in Paris; the matter has been referred to the joint standing committee on treaties (which I chair) by the Minister for Foreign Affairs for review; and public views were invited in all capital city newspapers on March 14.*

A few months later the committee's own findings contradicted Taylor's claims saying there were some "serious and legitimate concerns" being raised about Australia's involvement in this "secretive and undemocratic treaty aimed at opening our doors to big business".

The contradiction became irrelevant when the Coalition Government called a federal election for 3rd October 1998. The JSCT, like all federally appointed committees, was stood down after the announcement. Less than three weeks after the federal election senior bureaucrats from Treasury were back in Paris working for the MAI to go ahead.

It was only the dissent of France and the US just days before the critical October 22nd meeting that stopped the MAI being ratified. France objected on the grounds of protecting her culture and the US contingent argued that the now watered down MAI did not provide enough incentive for their big banks. As reported on the OECD website on the Internet¹²⁴, Australia was ready to sign the MAI – despite the concerns raised by the Joint Standing Committee on treaties.

No Australian paper questioned Australia's decision to let the treaty proceed after the committee's findings against participation had been published. In a front page article on the 3rd of November 1998 *The Australian* said¹²⁵:

A global treaty that would have eased controls on foreign investment has collapsed handing the Howard Government a fillip in its bid to soften its economic rationalist image and neutralise the One Nation threat.

Assistant treasurer Rod Kemp said yesterday the three-year long negotiations on a Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) broke down under the weight of concerns among some industrialised nations, including Australia.

One Nation had been able to exploit nationalist sentiments by staunchly opposing the agreement in line with its anti-foreign investment stance.

The article and Rod Kemp's comments are lies. The OECD's web site reveals the truth – only the US and France took a stand against the MAI. Except for the independent Hanson and the Democrats who had an anti-MAI petition, Australia actively supported it.

On the 6th November 1998 One Nation's new Senator-elect Heather Hill released the following press release to the media. Once again, despite the party's

¹²³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/jstc1.html>

¹²⁴ See: <http://www.oecd.org/daf/cmismai/mainindex.htm>

¹²⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/498/0311.html>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

intimate association in exposing the MAI in Australia the information was disregarded by the mainstream media:

*One Nation welcomes collapse of big business treaty*¹²⁶:

One Nation senator-elect Heather Hill has welcomed the collapse of the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) but warned that the Howard-Beazley club at Canberra had not changed its internationalist spots and would continue to support globalist policies like the MAI.

Mrs Hill said the Howard Liberal-National government was just as committed to economic rationalist schemes as before and no way would the external collapse of the MAI soften the government's attitude to selling out Australia's national sovereignty to the international robber barons of big business.

"What has really worried Mr Howard and his mates was the almost universal condemnation of the treaty by the Australian people and the equally universal support of the treaty by Howard interests. Howard has difficulty accommodating these diverse positions," Mrs Hill said.

"Howard and Tim Fischer have been momentarily rescued by the collapse of overseas support for this notorious treaty that would have held Australia to ransom. This means they now have no treaty to endorse or support and force upon the Australian people to help out their big business supporters," she said.

"But the important issue that should worry Australians is that the Howard Government was aggressively supportive of this treaty, and as such, hasn't changed its spots.

"Tim Fischer speaks in code language and claims he supports 'sensible foreign investment' but he really means he endorses the horrific principles underlying the MAI - the selloff of Australia's independence, the censoring of Australia before international tribunals and the prohibition of local support for local industry and interests.

"Even the government's own parliamentary committee in June this year urged that the government not sign the MAI unless it could be shown to be in the national interest.

"It would take a slicker and more slippery salesman than Howard to prove the MAI was in the national interest, but this is exactly what key coalition ministers have been trying to do," Mrs Hill stated.

Mrs Hill demanded that the treaty-making procedures needed to be changed to ensure proper public and parliamentary scrutiny before any decisions were taken by government on international agreements that could seriously impact on the Australian people.

"The people of Australia should join me in thanking Pauline Hanson for bringing this treaty out from under the covers and ensure that the public were aware of its potential damage," she said. "One Nation will continue to oppose economic rationalism as a major policy thrust to ensure we put Australia first."

In late March 1999 the new JSCT released its final report into the MAI¹²⁷. Its Conclusions and Recommendations included the following comment, While Treasury may have accelerated its consultative and briefing process 'quite significantly in the last few months' leading up to May 1998, by then it was reacting too late to a situation which was already out of control. Moreover, it

¹²⁶ See: <http://www.onenation.com.au/onenation/press/071198.html>

¹²⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/jsct.htm>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

advocated the draft Agreement in such a way that the underlying point of preserving the national interest was often lost.

Hanson's concerns about the MAI had been vindicated and her knockers ridiculed in a report whose findings remain unreported in the mainstream media despite the JSCT resulting from an outcry by the Australian people.

How close to the brink we came – or how far have we gone under the major parties? Consider the future of your children under the MAI when trying to find employment under the new “*constitution of a single global economy*”.

As lawyers Phillips Fox advised me in response to an inquiry about moving my hypothetical Australian business to Vietnam:

*Dear Mr Scott Balson*¹²⁸,

Doing Business in Vietnam

I am sorry for not being able to reply to you earlier. Following is a brief outline on some Vietnamese labour issues you queried in your e-mail message of 2 November 1998.

1. Costs of labour: Vietnam has a low minimum wage and a young, eager-to-learn workforce. However, foreign businesses are finding some of the labour compliance requirements restrictive, onerous and confusing.

The salary of an employee must be specified in his/her labour contract. It should be noted that salaries of Vietnamese employees must be expressed (in their labour contracts) in United States Dollars (US\$). However, payments of such salaries must be made in Vietnamese Dong (VND) at the average exchange rate between the actual selling and purchase rates of the foreign currency inter-bank market published by the State Bank at the time of payment. At present, US\$1 is approximately equal to VND14,000.

Minimum wages for several different categories of employment are published by the Ministry of Labour, War Invalids and Social Affairs. At present, the minimum wage for unskilled employees is US\$45 per month in Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City and US\$30 - 40 elsewhere.

2. Ages of labour: So far, an employee must be a person of at least fifteen (15) years of age who is able to work and has entered into a labour contract.

I hope our answers satisfy your queries. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can be of any further assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Truong Bich Lien, Legal Assistant, Phillips Fox, Hanoi Branch

The real impact of globalisation is summed up Alan Jones who said on the 16th December 1998¹²⁹:

“All too simple of course for bureaucrats and politicians to even contemplate but just by way of interest I had a letter bloke who runs a ribbon company. They manufacture ribbons. These sorts of companies are being run out of town by imports often the product of labour which is paid for in some foreign country at the rate of 25 cents an hour.

“This bloke told me that imported ready to use ribbons to the year June 30 totalled 3.2 million. Their value? Au\$26.5 million. My correspondent made the sensible point that that translated into about 100 direct jobs for Australians.”

The sad reality is that today, June 1999, the principles of the MAI are still being progressed behind closed doors. It has now been referred back to the big

¹²⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/498/0512.html>

¹²⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/ajones13.html>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

business end of town through the World Trade Organisation – the global body which brought our community all the delights of a restructured banking industry under foreign control.

It is again Deputy Prime Minister Tim Fischer's Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade which is driving Australia's participation in the new WTO-based MAI. A long Adobe Acrobat report can be viewed on-line¹³⁰.

The little known MIGA and dealing in "water commodities"

There are two other international treaties (amongst literally thousands) that Australians have not been informed about or been allowed to have a say on. Both have been enacted by the current Coalition government in the last 18 months and will have major impacts on our future.

MIGA (Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency Bill) was signed by the current Federal Treasurer, Peter Costello,¹³¹ in Washington in September 1997.

In that financial year the Australian taxpayer contributed Au\$2,446,000 from the Commonwealth Public Account, (Paper 4 under Table 6) for an upfront 10% payment of an initial 1,713 shares or SDRs (Special Drawing Rights) under this Bill. This was paid on the expectation of the MAI going ahead.

The primary purpose of MIGA is a 'single global currency'. The MIGA document states¹³²:

(e) A "freely useable currency" means (i) any currency designated as such by the International Monetary Fund from time to time and (ii) any other freely available and effectively suable currency which the Board of Directors referred to in Article 30 (hereinafter called the Board) may designate for the purposes of this Convention after consultation with the International Monetary Fund and with the approval of the country of such currency.....

Currency Transfer

...any introduction attributable to the host government of restrictions on the transfer outside the host country of its currency into a freely useable currency or another currency acceptable to the holder of the guarantee, including a failure of the host government to act within a reasonable period of time on an application by such holder for such transfer;

Unlike the MAI, very little is known about the MIGA yet the government repeatedly tells Australians that it stands for open and accountable government.

If this is true it is somewhat surprising then that neither the government nor the media has informed Australians that it has allowed the United Nations to unilaterally change the status of the fresh water that runs in our rivers and is stored in our dams. It is no longer recognised as an 'essential staple' but is today a commodity which can be traded and speculated on. The negative impact of hedging funds on the currency commodity of many countries gives citizens an idea on what is in store for our free water in the future.

The change in status of drinking water took place on the 21st March 1998. In a press release which only appeared on the Internet and was never questioned by the mainstream media Reuters reported¹³³:

¹³⁰ See: http://www.dfat.gov.au/trade/negotiations/gtr_2000.pdf

¹³¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/miga1.html>

¹³² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/miga.html>

¹³³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/water1.html>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

A United Nations conference on managing the world's limited fresh water supplies agreed on Saturday that water should be paid for as a commodity rather than be treated as an essential staple to be supplied free of cost.

The three-day conference, attended by environment ministers and officials from 84 countries, said costs should remain low and the poor must be assured of access to fresh water.

The conference's cautious appeal for more market forces in managing the world's water supplies prompted a note of caution from France's socialist Prime Minister Lionel Jospin, who addressed the meeting on its final day.

The conference's final declaration said the problem of water shortages was so important that governments would have to mobilise private funds for the vast investments needed for networks and treatment plants to assure future supplies.

The *Courier-Mail* never reported on the UN agreement but in an article¹³⁴ 'Satellite sinks illegal dams' on the 4th April 1998 it revealed that satellite technology was being used by the government to 'catch up' with illegal dams on farming properties in Queensland along the Cooper Creek catchment area. Offending farmers were being sent threatening letters: licence the illegal dams, or face stiff penalties.

In another apparently unrelated development just days after the agreement was signed the then Coalition State Government ratified a project under "*special circumstances*": multinationals operating under the collective name of Sudaw Developments Ltd were given the contract to develop the massive Nathan Gorge Dam in northern Queensland¹³⁵ on the Dawson river and to 'own' the water held in it (once developed it will hold twice as much water as Sydney Harbour).

Consultants working for the multinationals were paid Au\$2 million (taxpayers money) to guide the Government through "*a minefield of negotiations*".

About 300 groups which expressed interest were narrowed down to 25. The select group's plans were presented while the tendering process was bypassed.

Economic and Trade Minister, Doug Slack, dismissed criticisms at the time saying, "*This was a uniquely Queensland approach which the Federal Government has endorsed. It was really left up to the private sector's creativity and ingenuity to determine how to proceed.*"

"We raised issues about what it was they really wanted to do, what sort of backing they had, what would happen under certain circumstances. The major concern of the team was that there was no revelation of information between each consortium."

Damn, dam, damn, bureaucracy gone mad:

Meanwhile, matters over fresh water are apparently no better in the US¹³⁶:

Dear Mr. DeVries:

SUBJECT: DEQ No. 97-59-0023-1 T11N, R10W, Sec. 20, Montcalm County

It has come to the attention of the Department of Environmental Quality that there has been recent unauthorized activity on the above referenced parcel of property. You have been certified as the legal landowner and/or contractor who did the following unauthorized activity: Construction and maintenance of two wood debris dams across the outlet stream of Spring Pond.

¹³⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/economic/060598.html>

¹³⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/198/3103.html>

¹³⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/water7.html>

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

A permit must be issued prior to the start of this type of activity. A review of the Department's files shows that no permits have been issued. Therefore, the Department has determined that this activity is in violation of Part 301, Inland Lakes and Streams, of the Natural Resource and Environmental Protection Act, Act 451 of the Public Acts of 1994, being sections 324.30101 to 324.30113 of the Michigan Compiled Laws, annotated.

We anticipate and would appreciate your full cooperation in this matter. Please feel free to contact me at this office if you have any questions.

Sincerely, David L. Price District Representative Land and Water Management Division

Mr De Vries' cynical response to the bureaucrats:

Dear Mr. Price:

Re: DEQ File No. 97-59-0023; T11N, R10W, Sec 20; Montcalm County

Your certified letter dated 12/17/97 has been handed to me to respond to. You sent out a great deal of carbon copies to a lot of people, but you neglected to include their addresses. You will, therefore, have to send them a copy of my response.

First of all, Mr. Ryan DeVries is not the legal landowner and/or contractor at 2088 Dagget, Pierson, Michigan - I am the legal owner and a couple of beavers are in the (State unauthorized) process of constructing and maintaining two wood "debris" dams across the outlet stream of my Spring Pond. While I did not pay for, nor authorize their dam project, I think they would be highly offended you call their skilful use of natural building materials "debris." I would like to challenge you to attempt to emulate their dam project any dam time and/or any dam place you choose. I believe I can safely state there is no dam way you could ever match their dam skills, their dam resourcefulness, their dam ingenuity, their dam persistence, their dam determination and/or their dam work ethic.

As to your dam request the beavers first must fill out a dam permit prior to the start of this type of dam activity, my first dam question to you is: are you trying to discriminate against my Spring Pond Beavers or do you require all dam beavers throughout this State to conform to said dam request?

If you are not discriminating against these particular beavers, please send me completed copies of all those other applicable beaver dam permits. Perhaps we will see if there really is a dam violation of Part 301, Inland Lakes and Streams, of the Natural Resource and Environmental Protection Act, Act 451 of the Public Acts of 1994, being sections 324.30101 to 324.30113 of the Michigan Compiled Laws annotated.

My first concern is - aren't the dam beavers entitled to dam legal representation? The Spring Pond Beavers are financially destitute and are unable to pay for said dam representation - so the State will have to provide them with a dam lawyer. The Department's dam concern that either one or both of the dams failed during a recent rain event causing dam flooding is proof we should leave the dam Spring Pond Beavers alone rather than harassing them and calling their dam names.

If you want the dam stream "restored" to a dam free-flow condition - contact the dam beavers - but if you are going to arrest them (they obviously did not pay any dam attention to your dam letter-being unable to read English) - be sure you read them their dam Miranda rights first. As for me, I am not going to cause more dam flooding or dam debris jams by interfering with these dam builders.

If you want to hurt these dam beavers - be aware I am sending a copy of your

Chapter 5 - Winners and Losers in today's Media

dam letter and this response to PETA. If your dam Department seriously finds all dams of this nature inherently hazardous and truly will not permit their existence in this dam State - I seriously hope you are not selectively enforcing this dam policy - or once again both I and the Spring Pond Beavers will scream prejudice!

In my humble opinion, the Spring Pond Beavers have a right to build their dam unauthorized dams as long as the sky is blue, the grass is green and water flows downstream. They have more dam right than I to live and enjoy Spring Pond. So, as far as the beavers and I are concerned, this dam case can be referred for more dam elevated enforcement action now. Why wait until 1/31/98? The Spring Pond Beavers may be under the dam ice then and there will be no dam way for you or your dam staff to contact/harass them then.

In conclusion, I would like to bring to your attention a real environmental quality (health) problem; bears are actually defecating in our woods. I definitely believe you should be persecuting the defecating bears and leave the dam beavers alone. If you are going to investigate the beaver dam, watch your step! (The bears are not careful where they dump!) Being unable to comply with your dam request, and being unable to contact you on your dam answering machine, I am sending this response to your dam office.

Sincerely,

Stephen L. Tvedten

By now it's easy to see who the winners are - the multinationals, politicians and the politically correct bureaucrats. The losers under the current media duopoly are ordinary Australians, irrespective of race, creed, colour or religion. They have joined the race to the bottom of the global social ladder.

Chapter 6

Political Correctness (PC)

Diversity and Multiculturalism – the new unreported Racism

"Both Wark and Lasch (in Australia and America respectively) identify a sharp social divide between "elite" and "populist" opinion on multiculturalism and economic issues. This is best exemplified by the mainstream media's mud-slinging treatment of Hanson and her simultaneous surge in popularity. Clearly, a large number of people (according to polls something in the order of 25% of the Australian population) believe nothing of what they read or see concerning her in the media."

Helen Darville, Australia your elites are revolting¹³⁷

Multiculturalism:

Multiculturalism is one of the major battlegrounds of political correctness. It is championed by the media simply because it is good for business. With regard to Murdoch's interests and their reliance on the new age politically correct Ken Silverstein has reported in MoJo Wire Magazine, October 1998¹³⁸:

Media baron Rupert Murdoch appears close to striking a deal with a coalition of minority leaders in which he will donate at least \$100 million to help increase the number of minority-owned U.S. broadcast stations. But a source familiar with the negotiations describes the investment fund as part of "a package deal" orchestrated by Murdoch to expand his media empire. According to sources familiar with the negotiations, Murdoch will provide the funding under the condition that, in return, members of the coalition agree to endorse a waiver Murdoch plans to request from the Federal Communications Commission that would allow him to buy more TV stations in the United States. Under current FCC regulations, further acquisition by Murdoch's News Corp., which includes the Fox network, would constitute an illegal monopoly.

And multiculturalism is good for politicians, Sheehan wrote: *"Multiculturalism was a core policy of the Labor party which spent over Au\$1 billion in the 1980s 'locking up' the ethnic vote"*¹³⁹.

The Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission:

The public enforcer of political correctness in Australia is the laughable Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission or HREOC, and ordinary citizens are its victims. The Sun Herald's Andrew Bolt is not alone in observing that¹⁴⁰:

In fact, it seems the people getting most harassed now are the defendants (in HREOC cases).

The case of Dr Whittaker illustrates Bolt's observation about HREOC's victims. The *Sunday Mail* (02/11/97) reported¹⁴¹ on the front page, lead story, that an Aboriginal mother, Lisa Moffatt, took a Brisbane doctor to HREOC for

¹³⁷ See: <http://www.uq.net.au/~enhdemid/Hanson.html>

¹³⁸ See <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/multi.html>

¹³⁹ "Among the Barbarians" (pg 112) by Paul Sheehan

¹⁴⁰ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/smh3.html>

¹⁴¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/497/0211.html>

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

comments that she considered to be “patronising, condescending and deeply offensive”.

Moffatt was told by the doctor that a bump on her baby's head would not be damaging because Aborigines had “thicker skulls”. He said that their skulls were thicker through evolution because of the tradition weapons that they used. (Dr Anne Kemp at the University of Queensland confirmed that Aborigines do have slightly thicker skulls than Caucasians but not because of the weapons they used. The fact itself was indisputable.)

Dr Whittaker had treated Ms Moffatt's daughter in a family clinic in November 1995. He did not deny making the remarks but said that he had made them to reassure the mother that her daughter would not have any permanent damage from the bump. He waited nearly two years for the case to come before HREOC, and was eventually found not guilty of racism.

Dr Whittaker was a hard working doctor who had done voluntary work for Aborigines in north Queensland. His reputation and business were undoubtedly damaged by the charges made against him. HREOC harasses such good people.

HREOC¹⁴² is publicly funded to the tune of nearly Au\$20 million a year. It has been spectacularly unsuccessful in its task of finding racists with just two dubious cases of racism being proven in the last two years. Many of the cases are so trivial it is a scandal that public money has been wasted on them.

For example Andrew Bolt has reported on one of the cases where racism was proven by HREOC¹⁴³:

It (Defence Department) cited three bits of evidence: Mr Kummle's application contained bad grammar; he was long-winded and unclear; and he had a strong accent that several people had found hard to understand.

Oh dear! Racism!

Commissioner Graeme Innes agreed Mr Kummle's communication skills weren't up to the job.

But how dare the panel quibble about his accent! Mr Innes thought he understood Mr Kummle fine.

So he gave him Au\$1,000 for his “hurt and humiliation”.

Another child of political correctness is the infamous RaceWatch which is covered in the chapter “Winners and Losers in today's Media” (RaceWatch's three person tribunal members included former Federal Race Discrimination Commissioner Irene Moss, the Commissioner for the HREOC and now New South Wales Ombudsman¹⁴⁴.)

“Where are they going to take the action you are talking about? Every international forum you can think of. Political Correctness poppycock. Firstly this issue should be decided here in Australia, not elsewhere.”

Tim Fischer, Channel 10's Meet the Press 6/12/98

¹⁴² HREOC Web Site at: <http://www.hreoc.gov.au/>

¹⁴³ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/smh3.html>

¹⁴⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/watch/index.htm>

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

Hanson

A few days after her election win in 1996 Pauline Hanson was charged with racism. One of the complainants was Ms Patricia Thompson from the Ipswich Aboriginal Legal Service.

The complaint arose after *The Australian's* Nigel Wilson reported (on the 4th March 1996): *Pauline Hanson claimed victory yesterday for the "white community" white community meaning immigrants, Italians, Greeks whoever it really doesn't matter – anyone apart from the Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders.*

Ms Hanson refused to appear before HREOC calling it a kangaroo court. Over 12 months later the charge was dismissed. Sir Ronald Wilson found her not guilty on the 24th October 1997 – some eighteen months after the charge had been laid¹⁴⁵.

As late as the 8th September 1997 the *Courier-Mail* still misrepresented the controversial statement which led to the charge¹⁴⁶ quoting the interview:

Reporter: *"So you're fighting for all the white community generally?"*

Hanson: *"Yeah, look the white community, the immigrants, the Italians, Greeks, whoever, it really doesn't matter you know, anyone apart from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. I just want everyone to be equal and... I think there's a racial discrimination out in the community and we might start to get on to work together as one."*

The *Courier-Mail* omitted to report Ms Hanson's preceding comment – *"The indigenous people of Australia already receive social services that no one else does but should"* and that the reporter then interrupted her with the *"So you're fighting (on this issue) for all the white community generally?"* question.

On the 1st November 1997, a week after the charge against Pauline Hanson was dismissed, HREOC's Race Discrimination Commissioner Zita Antonios blamed Ms Hanson personally for an alleged 90% increase in race complaints¹⁴⁷ during that year. HREOC said that there had been 397 complaints of racial discrimination during that year - or an additional 189 claims of racial discrimination.

Her complaint against Ms Hanson was somewhat misplaced as the Sun Herald's Andrew Bolt subsequently reported on the 11th of November 1998:

Pssst! Wanna hear a secret? Australians aren't racist after all.

But don't try telling race discrimination commissioner Zita Antonios. She doesn't seem to want to know.

Ms Antonios this month admitted complaints under the Racial Discrimination Act had fallen by more than a third over the past year.

But Ms Antonios won't accept the glad tidings.

In the annual report of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission (HREOC), she says the figures are "incongruent with anecdotal evidence", and "feelings of race issues have seemed more heated than ever".

For ideologues, truth is always secondary.

The Spindler Sexuality Bill

¹⁴⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/497/2510.html>

¹⁴⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/397/0809.html>

¹⁴⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/497/0211.html>

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

Because of its assault on traditional morality, the Spindler Sexuality Bill¹⁴⁸ should have been a major issue for discussion by the Australian population before the October 1998 elections. The Democrats will join the Labor Party with their increased numbers to push it through in 1999.

In 1994 *News Weekly* had reported on Cheryl Kernot's views¹⁴⁹:

Senator Kernot supported the Gay and Lesbian Legal Rights Coalition's contention that the claim ought to be extended to homosexual couples and extended the concept to an adult who took in a child boarded (presumably paid or unpaid).

The Australian Family Association opposed the Kernot application and was represented by Mr Joseph Santamaria of the Victorian Bar.

The homosexual lobby was supported by the Federal Government's Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission (HREOC) who argued that homosexuals ought to be allowed leave to care for any other homosexual. The HREOC argues that 'Because of the responsibility attitude the gay and lesbian community has taken to HIV/AIDS, many in the community are involved with caring for those who are ill, but may not necessarily be their partner'.

The Senate's McKiernan report endorses a draconian ban on free speech about homosexuality in Clause 26 of the Bill, which prohibits expressing "severe ridicule" about homosexuals or transsexuals. It also prohibits "harassment", defined to include anything likely to offend or insult a homosexual and by making it unlawful to refuse to acknowledge the preferred gender of a transsexual. If a bloke says he's a sheila, then you break the law if you say he is a bloke!

"Harassment" is also defined to include a refusal to "accept bisexuality as a distinct sexuality". This recommendation mandates the acceptance of an ideological position on bisexuality. It not only violates the beliefs of religious people of all faiths who regard 'bisexuality' as a fancy word for 'depravity', but also shows the extent to which the McKiernan report is an exercise in sexual engineering and thought control.

The report also endorses the legal recognition of male homosexual and lesbian couples, as well as couples where one or both persons are transgender, as equal to male-female couples. While recognising that the Marriage Act may be temporarily exempt from this requirement, other Commonwealth laws would have to be amended or interpreted to reflect this profound change. Through the provisions of the Sexual Discrimination Act 1984 which deal with marital status this new recognition of homosexual couples would give them full access to IVF and to adoption.

Intent is held by the McKiernan report to be irrelevant in an allegation of discrimination which, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder. Or complainant.

Similarly, the report recommends a prohibition, when making employment decisions, on taking into account any manner of dress which may be suggestive of a particular sexuality. So employers will just have to hire a bloke who turns up for work in drag or in full leathers and chains with exposed buttocks.

Religious Freedom Act

¹⁴⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/homo1.html>

¹⁴⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/kernot.html>

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

In mid-November 1998 HREOC recommended that a Religious Freedom Act¹⁵⁰ should be enacted which would include provisions to ensure religious beliefs were protected, particularly in relation to autopsies and other medical procedures. *“The proposed Act would protect the freedom of religion and belief and make discrimination on the ground of religion or belief and certain public acts of religious vilification unlawful,”* the report says. It says such an act is necessary because there is limited but not guaranteed, protection for freedom of religion in the Constitution.

Several State laws regarding autopsies would need to be repealed to ensure the beliefs of some religious groups are not violated. This was of particular concern to Buddhists who require a body should be left for three days after death to allow the soul to make a peaceful transition, and to Jehovah’s Witnesses regarding medical procedures when blood transfusions are forcibly given.

The HREOC committee also received submissions from pagans and witches concerned that they were not able to perform their ceremonies. It recommended that Queensland and Victoria should repeal laws that criminalise witchcraft, fortune-telling, sorcery and enchantment. There would be no danger in doing this it said because *“any practice associated with witchcraft which might result in physical or mental injury to other individuals ... can be dealt with under general criminal and civil laws.”* This position is inconsistent with the establishment of special tribunals to deal with offences against political correctness.

Fightback in the USA through Proposition 209:

The move to entrench special privileges for minority groups and races through such bodies as HREOC is encountering substantial set-backs in the USA. Such policies are increasingly being regarded as divisive.

Though the matter received very little, if any coverage in the Australian media, Californian voters passed Proposition 209 which bans preferential treatment based on race or gender in public employment, education and contracting in that state. It effectively eliminates most California affirmative action programs designed to create opportunities for women and racial minorities.

In October 1998 Washington State passed Initiative 200 prohibiting the use of race and gender preferences in government contracting, hiring and admissions. Other states are planning similar actions.

The Washington Post Staff Writer, William Claiborne wrote on the 28th of August 1997¹⁵¹

LOS ANGELES — After nearly a year-long battle in the courts, California can now begin implementing a controversial new law that eliminates race and sex as factors in a variety of state programs, from hiring to education and contracting.

The measure makes this state the first in the country to abolish affirmative action programs, a move that has captured the interest of public officials nationwide in the face of growing pressure to scrap or limit racial preferences. Campaigns for similar bans are underway in several other states.

A coalition of civil rights groups fought the initiative in various federal courts, arguing that the law abolished only programs that benefited women and minorities while keeping preferences for those who sought them on such grounds as age, disability or veteran status.

¹⁵⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/498/1211.html>

¹⁵¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/affirm1.html>

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

But on Tuesday, the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals denied the groups' latest attempt to prevent the law from going into effect, clearing the way for it to take effect Thursday.

On the 12th of September 1997 the Washington Times' Paul Roberts showed the irony of the politically correct guardians of equal rights arguing for the maintenance of racial discrimination¹⁵²:

Bureaucrats and judges ruled that protected minorities are entitled to their fair share of the slots, and fair share came to be defined as race and gender proportion. Anything less was proof of discrimination. To avoid costly discrimination suits, employers and universities adopted a system of quotas that hired, promoted and admitted "protected minorities" independently of the evidence of merit to which white males were held. After a couple of decades of quotas, equality in the law - the original civil rights goal - has been replaced by privilege in the law. The ultimate irony was the American Civil Liberty Union's lawsuit to have Proposition 209 ruled unconstitutional because it prohibited racial discrimination.

The ACLU were finally defeated in the courts in November 1997¹⁵³:

In rejecting the (American Civil Liberties Union) ACLU's challenge to Prop. 209, without a dissenting vote, the justices let stand the Ninth Circuit's ruling recognising that the U.S. Constitution is not violated by a law requiring the government to treat all people equally, regardless of race or gender.

The ruling marks a major victory for those who support a race-neutral, colorblind standard for government. Prop. 209 prohibits governmental racial and gender preferences, and insists on equality of rights for all, regardless of color or sex.

Because the case involved appeals from Judge Thelton Henderson's preliminary injunction restraining enforcement of Prop. 209, the focus now returns to the District Court until a final judgment, which complies with the Ninth Circuit ruling, is rendered by Judge Henderson.

Now that the major legal challenge to Prop. 209 has been resolved, it is likely that further litigation will be brought to clarify its scope, and challenging whether Prop. 209 bans outreach efforts which target minorities or women by governmental employers or schools.

In commenting on the Supreme Court action, Governor Pete Wilson said, "It is time for those who have resisted Prop. 209 to acknowledge that equal rights under law, not special preferences, is the law of the land." He further noted that a measure that eliminates any form of discrimination based on race and gender violates no one's constitutional rights.

ACLU chief lawyer, Mark Rosenbaum, called the Supreme Court's one-line order rejecting their appeal "a severe and painful disappointment". Again displaying that he is no master of understatement, Rosenbaum asserted that Proposition 209 is "mean-spirited and unjust", and "its enforcement ushers in the resegregation of California".

On behalf of Prop. 209 proponents, I have asked that the ACLU join with Prop. 209 supporters in supporting equal treatment of people by government, regardless of color. The ACLU once was on record in favor of this concept, and we ask that they rediscover that ideal and again work to achieve equality of

¹⁵² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/quota.html>

¹⁵³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/497/1911.html>

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

rights. In particular, we ask that Prop. 209 opponents reassess -- and de-escalate -- the shrill tone of their opposition, and work for racial healing and conciliation, rather than hostility and divisiveness.

21st April 1997

Redundant journalists

Dear Editor

It was reported in *The Australian* (21/04/97) that tax agents may soon be redundant because clients will be able to deal with the ATO directly via the Internet. I'd like to suggest that journalists have already been made redundant. Why else would newspapers be so full of opinion, as opposed to reporting?

It's all very well for those with access to the Internet to be able to find their own news, but what about those people with no such access? For example I have seen no reporting of the fact that a three-judge panel of the 9th US Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco upheld California's Proposition 209, which bars preferential treatment based on race or gender in public employment, education and contracting in California. It will eliminate most California affirmative action programs designed to create opportunities for women and racial minorities.

In this changing social climate, a federal appeals court has ordered the University of Texas Law School to stop taking the race of its applicants into account, and fearing a legal challenge, the University of Colorado has stopped awarding black-only financial aid.

As Australia has travelled down this same ideological path of affirmative action, even though there has always been considerable opposition to it, it seems strange that there has not been widespread reporting and commentary on these momentous changes in public policy.

Perhaps the old adage, that Australia = California minus 10 years, is true. Perhaps Mrs Hanson, rather than being some sort of embarrassing throwback, is actually at the vanguard of public opinion.

Antonia Feitz

Diversity and multiculturalism:

In the article "*Diversity and Multiculturalism: The New Racism*" Michael S. Berliner, Ph.D., and Gary Hull, Ph.D. wrote:

Is ethnic diversity an "absolute essential" of a college education? UCLA's Chancellor Charles Young thinks so. Ethnic diversity is clearly the purpose of affirmative action, which Young is defending against a long-overdue assault. But far from being essential to a college education, such diversity is a sure road to its destruction. "Ethnic diversity" is merely racism in a politically correct disguise.

Many people have a very superficial view of racism. They see it as merely the belief that one race is superior to another. It is much more than that. It is a fundamental (and fundamentally wrong) view of human nature. Racism is the notion that one's race determines one's identity. It is the belief that one's convictions, values and character are determined not by the judgment of one's mind but by one's anatomy or "blood."

This view causes people to be condemned (or praised) based on their racial membership. In turn, it leads them to condemn or praise others on the same

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

basis. In fact, one can gain an authentic sense of pride only from one's own achievements, not from inherited characteristics.

The spread of racism requires the destruction of an individual's confidence in his own mind. Such an individual then anxiously seeks a sense of identity by clinging to some group, abandoning his autonomy and his rights, allowing his ethnic group to tell him what to believe. Because he thinks of himself as a racial entity, he feels "himself" only among others of the same race. He becomes a separatist, choosing his friends — and enemies — based on ethnicity. This separatism has resulted in the spectacle of student-segregated dormitories and segregated graduations.

The diversity movement claims that its goal is to extinguish racism and build tolerance of differences. This is a complete sham. One cannot teach students that their identity is determined by skin colour and expect them to become colorblind. One cannot espouse multiculturalism and expect students to see each other as individual human beings. One cannot preach the need for self-esteem while destroying the faculty which makes it possible: reason. One cannot teach collective identity and expect students to have self-esteem.

Advocates of "diversity" are true racists in the basic meaning of that term: they see the world through coloured lenses, coloured by race and gender. To the multiculturalist, race is what counts — for values, for thinking, for human identity in general. No wonder racism is increasing: colourblindness is now considered evil, if not impossible. No wonder people don't treat each other as individuals: to the multiculturalist, they aren't.

Advocates of "diversity" claim it will teach students to tolerate and celebrate their differences. But the "differences" they have in mind are racial differences, which means we're being urged to glorify race, which means we're being asked to institutionalise separatism. "Racial identity" erects an unbridgeable gulf between people, as though they were different species, with nothing fundamental in common. If that were true — if "racial identity" determined one's values and thinking methods — there would be no possibility for understanding or cooperation among people of different races.

Advocates of 'diversity' claim that because the real world is diverse, the campus should reflect that fact. But why should a campus population "reflect" the general population (particularly the ethnic population)? No answer. In fact, the purpose of a university is to impart knowledge and develop reasoning, not to be a demographic mirror of society.

Racism, not any meaningful sense of diversity, guides today's intellectuals. The educationally significant diversity that exists in "the real world" is intellectual diversity, i.e., the diversity of ideas. But such diversity — far from being sought after — is virtually forbidden on campus. The existence of "political correctness" blasts the academics' pretence at valuing real diversity. What they want is abject conformity.

The only way to eradicate racism on campus is to scrap racist programs and the philosophic ideas that feed racism. Racism will become an ugly memory only when universities teach a valid concept of human nature: one based on the tenets that the individual's mind is competent, that the human intellect is efficacious, that we possess free will, that individuals are to be judged as individuals — and that deriving one's identity from one's race is a corruption — a corruption appropriate to Nazi Germany, not to a nation based on freedom and independence.

"The few politicians who care enough to recognise the situation will not speak out, because the politically correct multiculturalists, and sections of the media will call them names, their colleagues will distance themselves, and their party will destroy them.

"In my own case, when I said what we all know to be the truth, the Liberal Party disendorsed me, and used me as an example to others of what will happen if you break ranks and speak the truth."

Pauline Hanson, April 1997¹⁵⁴:

Banning Santa

Multiculturalism is producing the same divisiveness in Australia, as the banning of Santa Claus at kindergartens shows.¹⁵⁵

In December 1997 it was reported that kindergartens in Adelaide had banned visits from Father Christmas for fear of offending the cultural sensitivities of non-Christian children. Kindergartens across the "*City of Churches*" decided not to have Father Christmas visit. One kindergarten even refused a free offer from a child's relative to play Santa. The state's Education and Children's Services Department officials said at the time that the decision was left to each kindergarten, and that they were unable to say how many had said no to visits by Santa.

Kindergartens which decided against a visit from Santa included Hackham East and Woodville Gardens, where directors declined to comment about the decision. Officials at Woodville Gardens decided against a visit by Father Christmas because of the "*cultural sensitivity*" of its mix of children.

The Playgroup Association took up their cause and cautioned about visits by Father Christmas on cultural grounds. Yet the same association had urged groups to make children celebrate other religious events, including the births of Muhammad, Buddha and Krishna.

The ban was welcomed by the Islamic Society of SA, with spokesman, Mr Wali Hanifi, saying multicultural Australia should celebrate all religious festivals equally or have none.

"While we respect the right of others to celebrate Christmas, in a multicultural society you cannot have it one-sided where one festival is celebrated, but not Muslim festivals," he said.

A senior Jewish religious leader, Rabbi Kanterovitz, also backed the ban, saying Father Christmas was not part of Jewish custom.

The ban angered many people, who said it was reverse discrimination. Bio-ethicist, Father John Fleming, said it was "*a case of PC smothering children's enjoyment. I believe there is a hidden agenda to remove any reference to the principal religious festivals Australia celebrates as a nation.*

"It is like saying we should cancel Anzac Day because there are two pacifists in a class."

To put it into context, the Bureau of Statistics figures for 1997 showed that the state's population was 70.3 per cent Christian, 1.3 per cent non-Christian, and

¹⁵⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/speech.html>

¹⁵⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/497/2212.html>

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

28.4 per cent "other", including atheists. In other words a 1.3% non-Christian minority dictated to the majority.

Anti-globalisation parties are often racist because one of the things they hate about the global economy is that it is full of foreigners

Greg Sheridan, Australian, 9/19/98¹⁵⁶

Awards

Out of deference to political correctness Australian awards are almost routinely won by members of ethnic groups or of the indigenous community. Pauline Hanson was derided by the mainstream media for stating the obvious – that the selection process appeared to be slanted towards minority groups.

For example, in the thirty years between 1968-1998, 6 Australians of the year (as chosen by the National Australia Day Council) have been indigenous Australians: L Rose, E Cawley, G Yunupingu, L O'Donoghue, M Yunupingu, C Freeman. (ie 20% of the winners).

This is about 10 times what one would expect based on the percentage of indigenous people in the Australian population. Can anyone suggest an explanation for this remarkable phenomenon? Can this be anything but a classic example of political correctness in action?

In 1998 the "Australian of the Year" was Kathy Freeman, an Aboriginal; the "Young Australian of the Year" was Asian Tan Li; the Australian Film Industry selected another Aboriginal Deborah Mailman as "Best Actress".

Shortly after her selection, on the 25th July 1998, Ray Martin interviewed "Young Australian of the Year", Tan Li¹⁵⁷.

She talked about being Australian, wanting to be part of this country, her love for Australia. She expressed the identical unselfconsciously patriotic sentiments for which One Nation supporters are derided by the media. She even made the politically incorrect observation that it was important to assimilate into the Australian way of life. Her views were the opposite of the multiculturalists, and identical to those of One Nation.

The make-up of the judging panels for these awards are very PC. For example the Manager at Foundation Law (*an initiative of the Law Foundation*). is a member of a number of panels involved in judging key awards in areas like the Australian Internet Awards¹⁵⁸.

On her 'work play' page on the Internet she has written¹⁵⁹:

This is my "when I'm not at work play page". It provides an environment for me to share with you the tacky, crappy and the really amazing things I'm interested in. It also provides me with an opportunity to get on my soap-box and have a go about issues that bug me. I currently have a problem with:

The racist One Nation party. Most Australians hate this party. There's an on-line protest site setup to register disgust. Do this now.

The major beneficiaries of Foundation Law are largely PC organisations like the HREOC. The Foundation Law web site states¹⁶⁰:

¹⁵⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/498/0910.html>

¹⁵⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/2607.html>

¹⁵⁸ See: <http://www.webawards.info.au/webawards/judges.htm>

¹⁵⁹ See: <http://www.fl.asn.au/lf/sandplay.html>

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

The Law Foundation gave a small grant to the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission to enhance a video and training package called "Tracking Your Rights". The video is a national project aimed at Aboriginal communities and in a drama format shows the different alternatives in pursuing a common consumer complaint (including non-legal methods).

These opinion makers are influential when they gain positions in areas such as the *Australian Broadcasting Corporation, SBS* and the other media. The ABC, for example, appear to have a particular interest in promoting gay and lesbian issues.

The *News Weekly* article, "*The barbarians at the gates... or inside them*" states¹⁶¹:

The ALP nomenclature is comprised of the ABC, the multicultural and ethnic industry, large sections of the media and the universities, the cultural elites, federal and state bureaucracies, the welfare sector and progressive churches. Their message is clear: Australia is a violent, racist society which lacks political legitimacy.....

Using this technique the ALP nomenclature has stigmatised its critics and opponents as "racists", "fascists" and "sexists". By this technique , controversial issues are unexamined and shielded from public scrutiny.

The politics of embarrassment aims "to soften up your opponents by making them feel bad about themselves or their ancestors. This puts them in a mood to make concessions.

An inverted technique is the "politics of victimology". The aim here is to gain sympathy by claiming to be a victim of sexism, racism or alleged discrimination. This technique has marked operational advantages for criminals, particularly members of ethnic groups engaged in crime. If you are the subject of police enquiries or investigations, or indeed, any kind of official enquiry, you can claim to be the subject of racism, sexism or some other form of discrimination and thereby avoid detection.

It is not surprising that welfare fraud, major crime, tax evasion and drug dealing have developed into billion dollar industries in ethnic communities. This is a statistical and verifiable fact disclosed in this book. It may make some people uncomfortable. It is still, however, true.

Universities:

Universities are supposedly the bastions of freedom of speech, but the University of Southern Queensland banned Pauline Hanson's One Nation party from holding meetings on campus. In Canada, the student council of Queen's University prevented the setting up of a students Reform association because the party was "*sexist, racist and homophobic*". (Alberta Report, 11/2/91). Reform is now the Canadian opposition party.

The university tried to justify itself by taking the high moral ground, but its decision was a blow to tolerance, freedom of speech and a very bad example to the students¹⁶²:

"Ms Hanson's views are just wrong," Professor Swannell said. "There is no place for her philosophy in a modern, caring university. Australia is a model of

¹⁶⁰ See: <http://www.fl.asn.au/lf2/fltext/news/apr97.html>

¹⁶¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/santa2.html>

¹⁶² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/frontpge.html>

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

multiculturalism in the Asia-Pacific rim and we have an obligation to protect the interests of our international and indigenous students.” Following a call by a group of students for their Association President Paul Barnes to declare the Toowoomba campus a ‘Hanson-free’ zone and support student protests against the One Nation party, both management and the student association have indicated facilities on campus will not be used for any One Nation meetings.

“It is extremely undesirable to have any meeting of that group at this university,” they said. Mr Tanzer said although universities are supposed to provide a forum for public debate, USQ is a living example that what Ms Hanson is saying is wrong. With a combined on and off campus international student population of nearly 4000 and a 198 percent increase in overseas enrolments since 1991, USQ anticipates a 1998 income of more than \$13 million for the delivery of programs to overseas students. Those who study in Toowoomba spend an average \$10,000 per year in the local community.

Reverse racism:

In her maiden speech to parliament in 1996 Pauline Hanson spoke strongly against multiculturalism, correctly realising who were its main beneficiaries - bureaucrats¹⁶³:

“We now have a situation where a type of reverse racism is applied to mainstream Australians by those who promote political correctness and those who control the various taxpayer funded “industries” that flourish in our society servicing Aboriginals, multiculturalists and a host of other minority groups. In response to my call for equality for all Australians, the most noisy criticism came from the fat cats, bureaucrats and the do-gooders. They screamed the loudest because they stand to lose the most - their power, money and position, all funded by ordinary Australian taxpayers.

“Present governments are encouraging separatism in Australia by providing opportunities, land, moneys and facilities available only to Aboriginals. Along with millions of Australians, I am fed up to the back teeth with the inequalities that are being promoted by the government and paid for by the taxpayer under the assumption that Aboriginals are the most disadvantaged people in Australia. I do not believe that the colour of one's skin determines whether you are disadvantaged.”

In “It’s smart to be left, dumb to be right” Dale Heslin has also analysed the multicultural obsession with the rights of minorities¹⁶⁴:

Social issues are now routinely portrayed as some kind of “debate”. After Pauline Hanson’s maiden speech we were informed that there was a race “debate” in progress. Now we are told that there is a “multiculturalism” debate going on. In both cases I ask, what exactly are we “debating”? This is right versus wrong, smart versus dumb, intellectuality gone crazy. The multiculturalism debate is an ideology being foisted upon us. As far as the “race debate” is concerned, racial differences are a fact of life beyond rational analysis. There is nothing to “debate”. Different races and groups in society are naturally going to feel alien to one another. This is in itself neither a good nor a bad thing, but for those campaigning against “racism” it is an issue which must be put under intellectual control. Intellectual effort did not create these

¹⁶³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/photo/phtalk.html>

¹⁶⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/article1.html>

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

differences, but they must be made to appear to have this character so that an adversarial ideology can be raised to counter it.

It is said that if you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem. Today, we have a situation where "problems" are dreamt up to match the "solution". The solution has already been worked out – it's politically correct thinking. The problems aren't important, whether it's Aborigines, women, homosexuals, you name it. They merely exist to reinforce an ideology of social justice activism. There is a neverending search for victim groups in society to match the ideology. Certain issues are constantly in the public eye because they suit this style of thinking. Homosexuals make up only tiny part of the population and yet their "rights" and their concerns are constantly shoved in our collective face. They practically dominate the deliberations of mainstream churches, even though they are only a minuscule presence in our society. When Bill Clinton came to power, almost his first executive act was to push for the acceptance of homosexuals in the military. Was this really one of the more pressing affairs of state facing the U.S. in 1992? I think not. Then there is the environment. It has been observed that the last thing environmentalists actually want is a solution to environmental problems. This would deprive them of an issue to agitate about.

JG Estiot summed up the critical role of the media in the maintenance of political correctness¹⁶⁵:

The media should plead guilty to attempting to gag Pauline Hanson. There has been no effort by the servants of political correctness to give any kind of exposure to the facts and figures over which Miss Hanson has based her views on immigration, multiculturalism and Aboriginal Affairs funding. It seems obvious, at least to me, that the refutation of her views, if any, should be done by way of exposing policy flaws or inaccuracies in facts or base data. Instead, the media has largely allowed character assassination to replace this process. This is especially true of newspapers who are usually so prompt in flooding us with facts, graphs, surveys and tables.

Negative stereotyping is a weapon commonly used against anyone raising questions on immigration and multiculturalism. A few years ago, Professor Geoffrey Blainey was at the receiving end. Today, it is Pauline Hanson. Representatives of minority lobby groups have free access to the Australian media. Some sections of the news media (I didn't say SBS) are closer to being an advocacy group than an impartial news service. Journalism has become a bureaucracy made of lack of resources, laziness and questionable professional standards. The scribes who call themselves journalists are office workers who swallow the propaganda which drips down their fax machine. Investigative journalism no longer exists. The number of news reports using another media report as its primary source is alarming. Is this the media we had to have?

The immigration policies of the Asian countries reportedly offended by Pauline Hanson are kept under wrap. Applying current media standards, the immigration policies of Indonesia, Malaysia, Japan and China would be considered racist. These are facts far more relevant to the issue at hand than the biased and ill-informed opinion of Kathy Freeman on Pauline Hanson. For many years now, there appears to have been a consistent 75% support for a review of immigration policies in Australia. Either we put all these people on

¹⁶⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/media/0511.html>

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

little boats and send them out to sea, or we start talking. The role of the media in promoting a fair debate is essential. So far, we have been short-changed.

The Courts:

Political correctness has entered in the area of the courts and crime. True victims are ignored while criminals' rights are paramount. Australians heard on the 10th November 1998 that a gang of criminal Asian drug dealers who were caught red-handed trying to smuggle about Au\$400 million in heroin into the country had been granted Au\$1 million in legal aid to fight the case. The funding coming from the cash-strapped family court system.

In contrast, it is not considered newsworthy when Australian tax payers who cannot afford a lawyer are left to themselves. The letter below which appeared in the *Queensland Times* on the 6th of March 1997 says it all about the double standards of political correctness¹⁶⁶:

Racism in Reverse

Ipswich's weekend rally against racism was hailed as a singular success. It was well co-ordinated and well publicised.

A Karumba pensioner, John Weider, would endorse the thrust of the rally, however John can't attend.

He is serving 21 days imprisonment in Townsville jail. As an approved carer for native birds, John used an air-rifle to harvest three "pop eyed mullet" to feed his injured sea birds.

A brother Australian, Jason Yanner of Burketown, was also charged; he killed crocodiles with a high-powered hunting rifle.

He is free and "good luck to him". As an Aborigine he qualified for legal aid. A barrister, solicitor and an expert witness were flown to Mt Isa.

John is not an Aborigine. Consequently no legal aid of any type for Australian John.

Is it really difficult to understand why John and thousands like him have had enough of racism in reverse being directed towards non-Aboriginal Australians by politicians and government lackeys who thrive on the Aboriginal gravy train, that only stop at cities and towns that host the Aboriginal aristocrats?

No time and no funds for the most needy Aboriginal Australians and their disadvantaged white brothers and sisters.

Let's get fair dinkum.

Tom King, Bray Park.

That 'song' and the ABC

In 1997 a Sydney transgender arts lecturer, Pauline Pantsdown (aka Simon Hunt) launched his much publicised "*Backdoor Man*" song. The highly offensive song was played by the *Australian Broadcasting Corporation's* (ABC) "*Triple J*" station which is targeted at Australia's youth.

The media supported *Triple J's* playing of the song which clearly slandered Ms Hanson. Her voice had been cut and pasted and used in a manner that suggested that she supported paedophilia and was a lesbian.

The ABC's hypocrisy was shown in their double standards. On the grounds of free speech they fought, and lost a subsequent defamation case taken out by Ms

¹⁶⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/197/0703.html>

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

Hanson to stop them playing the song. Yet they demanded a book distributor withdraw *"Your Rights 1998"* because it carried an article which criticised them. (See the chapter *"The Mainstream Media Censoring Others"*)

In September 1997 The Supreme Court in Brisbane banned the ABC from playing the song. The ABC appealed against the court's decision arguing that they were protecting freedom of speech. On 28th September 1998, just days before the October Federal Election the Supreme Court upheld its earlier decision to ban the song.¹⁶⁷

Shortly after the decision was made in her favour Pauline Hanson was scheduled to talk at a private lunch for One Nation members¹⁶⁸. She kept the engagement but broke down and wept during the lunch. This is the only time that Ms Hanson has publicly shown the stress that she had been placed under by the PC elites and the media.

As she was leaving the court she said to the media: *"What the message is is that freedom of speech does not extend to allowing people the right to defame others and to tell lies."*

Singer Simon Hunt a la Pauline Pantsdown said after the court decision, *"I regret the grief she has caused to many thousands of Australian people who are divided by her views."*

"It is a satire. If people are hurt by satire, then they should get out of the political game and leave it to people who can actually justify their and their words and their policies."

In an interview shortly after the election I interviewed One Nation's Senator-elect Heather Hill¹⁶⁹ in which she said: *"It was the complete unfairness of the political system that hit me at that moment. The vilification of Pauline Hanson by the media empires who were paying people to run her down."*

"Despite all this Pauline did not dummy spit like Cheryl Kernot."

"I could feel everything that she had gone through - from the payment by New Idea of thousands of dollars to her son Stephen to bag her just days before the election to the Pauline Pantsdown banned song issue."

The ABC are now challenging the Supreme Court decision in the High Court.

The federal government's LOUD initiative and the pornographic image.

In January 1998, as One Nation's webmaster I was alerted to an offensive postcard of Ms Hanson which had been shortlisted as a finalist by the LOUD judging panel in a competition on the Internet.

The image had Ms Hanson's head superimposed onto the body of a naked white woman crouched legs apart, front on, giving birth to a smiling black baby. The postcard was called *"The Issue"*.

The LOUD Media Festival of Youth, Culture and the Arts website is described thus on its homepage¹⁷⁰: *"pixel for pixel, the LOUD site is as good as anything that has been achieved on the Web in Australia, and probably better. It crackles with life, showering sparks of creativity in all directions."* - Jon Casimir, *The Sydney Morning Herald*.

¹⁶⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/2909.html>

¹⁶⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/federal/28sept/>

¹⁶⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/498/2610.html>

¹⁷⁰ See: <http://www.loud.net.au/>

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

Unsurprisingly, LOUD is also associated with the ABC's "Triple J" radio station.

More than 100 hours after the Department of Communications and the Arts were advised that LOUD was displaying a pornographic image of a Member of Parliament, Pauline Hanson, on their web site it was removed, but not because of their action. In fact, they refused to become involved. Calls and e-mails by many readers of the *Australian National News of the Day*¹⁷¹ complaining about the image to Senator Alston, the Minister for Communications, were ignored.

On Monday 2nd February 1998, after I had alerted the *Courier-Mail's* Jeff Sommerfeld to the pornographic image, a spokesman for Senator Alston was reported as defending LOUD's right to carry the image¹⁷²:

The Federal Government yesterday defended funding of the Internet site targeted at youth which contained manufactured pornographic images of independent MP Pauline Hanson.

A spokesman for Communication Minister Senator Richard Alston said the Loud Festival was partly funded by the government "deliberately so as to allow Australian youth to express their views".

"We are not trying to censor their artistic expression," the spokesman said.

"If people believe this picture is offensive, and if this picture was published in a magazine and would require some 'M' or 'R' rating, then they should contact the Loud organisers and request it be classified by the Office of Film and Literature classification.

"Obviously the community has certain standards and those standards are expected to be upheld."

Just days before, on the 19th January 1998, Senator Alston had spoken very differently:

"The Government has a clear duty, recognised by the Internet industry, to protect Australian children and other citizens from illegal material on the Net such as child pornography," the Minister for Communications, the Information Economy and the Arts, Senator Richard Alston, said.

It was only after I contacted a member of the Australian Council for the Arts, Deborah Klika, late on Tuesday that action was taken. Klika was outraged that such an image had been placed on LOUD's web and was able to get it removed. It was finally removed at 5.35pm on Wednesday the 4th February 1998¹⁷³.

On Thursday afternoon the General Manager of The Australian Council for the Arts, Michael Lynch phoned informing me that he had removed the image on "Monday". He promised to send a written apology to Pauline Hanson. Only after some on-line pressure was co-ordinated did the Lynch apology dated 4th February arrived - two weeks later¹⁷⁴ on the 16th February¹⁷⁵.

In the letter Lynch wrote: *I hope that you will accept my sincere apology on behalf of the Council and the LOUD organisers and my regret at any distress caused by the appearance of this image to you and others who may have viewed it.*

¹⁷¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/daily.html>

¹⁷² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/198/0202.html>

¹⁷³ See: <http://www.loud.net.au/cards/issue.jpg>

¹⁷⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/198/1602.html>

¹⁷⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/photo98/arts.gif>

Chapter 6 - Political Correctness

Apart from the comment by Sommerfeld in the *Courier-Mail* the LOUD incident was ignored and unreported in the mainstream media.

For the record, Alston was to say a year later on 18th March 1999 when calling for the *Australian Broadcasting Authority* to be given the power to monitor the Internet, “*We don’t allow our kids to see “X” or “R-Rated material on free to air or pay television. Why should we allow them to do it on the Internet?”*”

The sudden change of direction by Alston came after Senator Brian Harradine, an Independent Senator from Tasmania, had warned that he would refuse to support the sale of Telstra because of the government’s lack of control over the falling moral standards in Australia.

As John Pasquarelli said recently, “*now that the politicians have screwed up the word ‘racism’ they are working hard at doing the same to ‘ethics’ and ‘credibility’*”.

Chapter 7

Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

Behind the native title debate

"What concerns me is Hanson mentioned the United Nations Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Does it exist, why hasn't it been debated? Is it to be signed as she says by the year 2004?..."

"Does this thing exist? Why hasn't it been debated? Is it to be signed? It is no good dealing with Pauline Hanson in the language of abuse. If she has alerted the country about yet another international treaty that we know nothing about then she has done the public a service."

Alan Jones, 5th June 1998¹⁷⁶

The UN Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples¹⁷⁷ is another taboo subject for the mainstream Australian media.

Like the MAI this international treaty has been negotiated in secrecy, this time not by big business but by indigenous groups such as the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission and the New South Wales Indigenous Land Commission at the United Nations¹⁷⁸.

The media, although fully aware of the ramifications of the treaty, have totally overlooked it, despite the major trauma being faced right now by many pastoralists through a native title claim or multiple native title claims over their property.

Aboriginal Social Justice Commissioner Mick Dodson, one of the Aborigines involved in negotiations on the treaty, has declared this draft treaty is¹⁷⁹ *"The floor not the ceiling. We are still on the plains but hope to climb the foothills and then the mountains in terms of our rights."*

Right at the bottom of the 'plains' lies the High Court's Wik decision made on the 27th December 1996¹⁸⁰. The clear intent under the agreement signed between the Labor government and Aboriginal elders following the earlier Mabo decision was to secure the legitimacy of the pastoral leases held by farming and mining companies. The 3-2 High Court Wik decision forever changed these rules¹⁸¹.

A few days after Wik deputy Prime Minister Tim Fischer told *ABC Radio's Country Hour*¹⁸²:

"I support the provision of absolute certainty for pastoral leaseholders, and the best way that might be effected could well be by some sort of legislation."

"But we cannot, in 48 hours, produce a legal magic wand to fix the uncertainty which the High Court has created progressively over a period of 48 months."

¹⁷⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/298/0506.html>

¹⁷⁷ See ATSIC web site: <http://www.atsic.gov.au/iiissues/charter.htm>

¹⁷⁸ See: <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu4/chrrep/10297.htm>

¹⁷⁹ Piers Ackerman in The Daily Telegraph: 1997

¹⁸⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/496/2812.html>

¹⁸¹ See chapter headed "Native title and secret women's business"

¹⁸² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/496/3112.html>

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

"We had thought the High Court would clarify the situation, it has not done so. The Parliament has a role and a responsibility. The Government has a role and a responsibility. We're getting on with it."

Meanwhile the Queen's Council representing an Aboriginal tribe had already started placing advertisements in *The Australian* newspaper warning that any attempt to overturn the decision "would be seen as a racist act" and that it would do irreparable damage to our image "in the eyes of our Asian neighbours"

The Chief Minister for the Northern Territory, Shane Stone, warned that same day that the lawyers were already preparing claims against owners of pastoral properties for 'royalties', compensation and other payments... in the event that native title is secured over the property.

Immediately following the decision by the High Court on Wik, developers on major mining projects like the Au\$200 million Stuart oil shale project near Gladstone confirmed that they were seeking legal advice before proceeding. And Placer Pacific Ltd confirmed that the Au\$220 mining project at Osborne near Mount Isa was affected by the Wik decision.

Several other mines under development or being considered for development around Australia were affected by the Wik decision with, perhaps, the biggest being the drubbing of the billion dollar Century Zinc project in northern Queensland. Murrandoo Yanner, a locally influential Cape York Aboriginal activist was well known for his intimidatory tactics. He almost single-handedly saw this massive employment-generating project shelved for nearly two years. Here is a brief background on Yanner's taxpayer funded rout of Century Zinc.

Yanner wanted the ATSIC auditors to back off from the Carpentaria Land Council¹⁸³ (CLC), which he chaired, in return for his support for the project. He made it clear to ATSIC that his agenda and the future of Century Zinc were linked. His influence amongst the Gulf Aborigines was enough to get them to agree to see him at the eleventh hour and then to change the native title compensation package that they had already agreed on with negotiators from Century Zinc and ATSIC.

Yanner was not one of the negotiators involved in the process; he was in fact an interfering outsider when he arrived at that meeting on the 14th February 1997. At 7pm after Yanner had finished his fireside chat with another key negotiator, the chairman of ATSIC Gatjil Djerrkura, he disappeared with a group of the native title claimants - never to be seen again that evening. This left the compensation package unsigned and the Au\$1.1 billion Century Zinc mine project hanging in the balance.

A few months earlier in August 1996 it had become public knowledge that 17.1% of the CLC's budget of more than Au\$1.6 million (or \$260,000) went to miscellaneous and unexplained charter flights in 1995¹⁸⁴. Yanner had used a chartered plane to go to the Old Parliament House in Canberra where he burnt the Australian flag on 20th August 1996.... this was done especially for the benefit of the evening television news¹⁸⁵.

¹⁸³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/197/1502.html>

¹⁸⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/396/0809.html>

¹⁸⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/396/2108.html>

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

On August 4th 1997 Yanner was found guilty of unlawful assembly¹⁸⁶ and was placed on a three year good behaviour bond. Yanner appealed taking up two days of the court's busy time in November 1997, using a tax-payer funded Queen's Council, Angelo Vasta, to defend him on such a minor issue!

As recently as December 1998 Yanner was in the news when he called for one million indigenous people to hold a conference in Sydney with the primary aim of disrupting the Sydney 2000 Olympics while attending a global indigenous conference in Toowoomba, in south-west Queensland.

Yanner has somehow escaped any form of media labelling despite his very chequered history. His style of negotiation at the massive Century Zinc project revolved around intimidation, yet it has never been criticised or been the subject of a serious opinion piece in, for example, the *Courier-Mail*.

While the disadvantaged indigenous population represented by the extremely well-advantaged ATSIC bureaucracy knew little or nothing of the antics of the likes of Yanner, the Australian banks were ready to make their move on the rural sector. The banks, which have embraced economic rationalism and foreign ownership, were closing 'unprofitable' branches in the small towns around Australia. (For example over one bank branch a day was closed¹⁸⁷ in mainly rural Australia in the financial year 1996-97). The banks warned pastoralists that they might call up their loans because of the High Court Wik decision. Any negative reporting on the entire native title debacle is off-limits to the journalists. It is a divisive issue tearing at the heart of Australia – but it is of no consequence to the Murdoch/Packer empires who had far bigger game in politics, like Pauline Hanson's One Nation, to pursue.

The earlier assurance by Prime Minister John Howard and Deputy Prime Minister Tim Fischer that the government would immediately act to clarify the position of pastoral lease holders under Wik resulted in a watered down ten point plan¹⁸⁸. The plan has done little or nothing to ease the plight of those most affected – the farmer. The subject is made, quite simply, too hot to handle because of the media.

The native title issue is one affecting most large landholders around Australia today with the complexity of *multiple separate native title claims over the same property* just adding to the confusion. The entire legal farce also exposes another great unpublished flaw in our justice system. While the Aboriginal claimants, irrespective of how weak their claim might be, get their legal expenses paid for by tax payer funds the respondents, often battling farmers, are expected to meet their own legal expenses. Despite assurances from political leaders to the contrary Aborigines have already secured title over freehold property using other Acts¹⁸⁹.

The native title issue is an extremely complex one which has padded the bank balances of a growing number of professionals in the legal industry. It has become an exciting new cash cow to them. For example there are large law firms like Phillips Fox who publicise their relationship with high profile Aboriginal lawyers Noel Pearson, Geoff Clark and Michael Neal in native title claims on the

¹⁸⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/497/2211.html>

¹⁸⁷ 386 bank branches were closed in this period

¹⁸⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/photo/wik.html>

¹⁸⁹ See chapter headed "Censoring the Truth" or:
<http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/title/>

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

Internet¹⁹⁰. Phillips Fox webpage states that they have been advised by these lawyers on:

- ☐ Barron George National Park by the Djabugay Traditional Owners;
- ☐ the "*Wet Tropics Management Plan JRA action*" by Noel Pearson, Cape York Land Council, North Queensland Land Council, Central Queensland Land Council;
- ☐ the Hopevale Native Title Claim – the first permanent determination of native title under Native Title Act 1993 by "*The Traditional Owners*";
- ☐ and a Federal Court hearing by the Western Yalanji people.

Phillips Fox state on the Internet that¹⁹¹:

We advise both indigenous groups and organisations, and non-indigenous parties, such as mining and pastoral companies and major infrastructure providers.

Our decision to offer this broad spectrum representation in the native title area required significant cultural changes to take place within Phillips Fox. Native title is an area which demands a particularly sensitive approach which takes account of radical cultural differences.

And "*the ways in which Phillips Fox can help you*" include:

- ☐ *preparing, negotiating or litigating native title and*
- ☐ *compensation claims*
- ☐ *drafting and negotiating regional and land use agreements between indigenous, government and private interests*
- ☐ *providing mediation or alternative dispute resolution services*
- ☐ *native title due diligence inquiries*
- ☐ *advice on cultural heritage issues*
- ☐ *advice regarding future act proposals*
- ☐ *conducting tenure history investigations*
- ☐ *offering a full range of native title consultancy services for government and indigenous bodies, representative bodies, and industry groups.*

Phillips Fox has also contracted at least one staff member who was involved as an adviser in the farcical Hindmarsh Island claims¹⁹². George Williams, a constitutional expert was appointed to the firm's Canberra based team in April 1998. Through Phillips Fox he is now involved in the legal constitutional challenge against One Nation's only federal representative, Senator-elect Heather Hill, over allegations of dual nationality. The challenge was initiated by a Chinese-Australian businessman Chuck Hong¹⁹³.

In Australia, it is quite clear that large legal firms are amassing financial fortunes from the ongoing native title fiasco. White Australians are unaware of the millions of tax payer dollars that are being 'invested' into driving the divisive and legalistic post-Mabo/Wik claims into new legal waters. It has nothing to do with reconciliation; it has everything to do with lining pockets.

This "*ripping apart*" of Australia will become a formality when the "*UN Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*"¹⁹⁴ is ratified by the UN. The

¹⁹⁰ See: <http://www.phillipsfox.com.au/general/Ndxnative.htm>

¹⁹¹ See: <http://www.phillipsfox.com.au/general/i00000003.htm>

¹⁹² See: <http://www.phillipsfox.com.au/general/n00000040.htm>

¹⁹³ See: <http://www.phillipsfox.com.au/general/N00000067.htm>

¹⁹⁴ See ATSIC web site: <http://www.atsic.gov.au/iiiissues/charter.htm>

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

Australian people will be the last to know because the media has never covered it.

When Pauline Hanson tried to warn Australians she was ridiculed.

Canada has created a new state called Nunavut¹⁹⁵ which comprises 20% of Canada's landmass. It will be funded by the Canadian taxpayers for the next twenty years to ensure that it can finance infrastructures yet to be established.

There are some disconcerting and unreported issues relating to both native title claims currently before the Australian courts, and to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. For instance Aboriginal leaders speak openly of 'self determination'.

Under the UN Declaration some Aboriginals will demand independent "statehood" of the lands successfully claimed under native title. While Howard has ruled this out, the media is remiss in not opening up a public debate so that the issue is discussed before Aboriginal expectations get too high.

However, claims are not restricted to Aborigines. The Indonesians on Timor are currently making claims over Australia's territorial waters and their resources through article 35 of the Draft United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples which states¹⁹⁶:

Indigenous peoples, in particular those divided by international borders, have the right to maintain and develop contacts, relations and cooperation, including activities for spiritual, cultural, political, economic and social purposes, with other peoples across borders.

States shall take effective measures to ensure the exercise and implementation of this right.

The Indonesian claim on Australian waters is colloquially referred to as the "Banjo Shark Fisherman Claim". Again it is interesting to note the very active role that Australian legal firms are playing in feeding financially off the advice they give to get the Timorese people making these claims lodged in Australian courts. This whole area is like a taxpayer-funded money tree. But it is taboo territory in the mainstream media.

In a letter to the Editor of the *Queensland Times* I wrote on 2nd October 1997¹⁹⁷:

Dear Sir,

There are two paths that Australia can take. Unfortunately like blind fools, because of the callous attitudes of the major parties, we don't even know that we stand at the cross-roads.

Pauline Hanson has espoused her thoughts in the name of her party 'One Nation'... we can go forth as one nation. This is one of the paths open to Australia. For presenting this she has been vilified by an antagonistic media protecting their privileged status quo with the Liberal and Labor elite. She has been labelled divisive and racist by this media for suggesting that all people should be treated equally.

The other path is one that Canada is currently progressing along. It is no fairytale to suggest that a new nation called Nunavut taking up 20% of Canada becomes reality in 1999. Nunavut will be governed by the indigenous Inuit commonly known as the Eskimos. The architect of Nunavut now lives in Brisbane

¹⁹⁵ See: <http://npc.nunavut.ca/>

¹⁹⁶ See: <http://www.atsic.gov.au/iiissues/charter.htm#VII>

¹⁹⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/qt8.html>

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business
and advises the Central Land Council on the development of an Australian equivalent which will be funded by the Australian tax payer.

Here in Australia things will not be as easy as there are hundreds of Aboriginal tribes who will all want independence. Financial feasibility is just one consideration.

Can you imagine an Australia partitioned by states? Can you imagine an Australia partitioned by culture (this move has now been approved in Quebec where local councils are being planned specifically for Chinese and other communities)? In thirty years time if we don't get off our backsides our kids will grow up in a country which will resemble the mess that was once Europe - and the reason why Europe is unifying under one union.

There is an old saying 'United we stand, divided we fall'.... the Labor and Liberal Parties have divisive policies which embrace the role of the United Nations over the rights of Australian voters. The divvying up of Australia is on the drawing board, and like my other unanswered challenge to the ALP to allow me to prove that they are promoting a boycott to the Sydney 2000 Olympics I can say without hesitation that the most destructive element in our nation today are the invisible committees of political powerbrokers with hidden agendas who steer our nation blindly into the future.

Scott Balson

The Laboral factions never took up the challenge. In the letter I refer to Peter Jull. In the Northern Review in 1994 Jull wrote¹⁹⁸:

Australia's Northern Territory (NT) government is preparing a constitutional smash-and-grab when a gullible Thatcherite Right government takes office in Canberra later this year or early next. While national Right leaders are impeccable on matters of the visible minorities from Asia or Black America, some travel North to sit at the feet of an indigenous-unfriendly Territory government to imbibe techniques of aboriginal relations. Their gullibility—to use a polite term—will cost them dearly if they take office and their actions lead to an immediate world perception of a return to the white Australia policy.

Specifically, the NT government hopes to take over the federal aboriginal rights law and gain statehood by a package of measures that appear to give favourable consideration to aboriginal rights. The reality of course is that the white authorities want the same sort of regional control on their own terms that Canada rejected when white-run Northwest Territories and Yukon governments tried a similar move in the 1970s and 1980s.

Australia's "other" indigenous people, the Torres Strait Islanders, feel much like Inuit—too often forgotten and relegated to second place. They know, however, that Inuit and Scandinavia's Sami are also concerned with and taking action on similar marine issues and seeking more regional power.

In early 1993 a visit to Central Australia by Inuit (Nunavut) national and international head, Rosemarie Kuptana, left local politicians quoting her admiringly and eager to follow up some of her insights from Canada's northern and national indigenous experience. But until recently Australia lacked the habit of international co-operation and comparative study in indigenous policy and politics. Now its national ombudsman for indigenous peoples, Mick Dodson, may be changing that. In two reports published in early 1995 he outlined a philosophy, an approach, and some start-up subjects for work that notably

¹⁹⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/jull3.html>

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

included issues that have occupied northern Canada peoples and governments for the past 30 years. (Dodson, M., 1995, "International Perspectives," Second Report, 1994, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Social Justice Commissioner, Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission, Commonwealth of Australia, Sydney, pp. 203-218; and "International Connections," Indigenous Social Justice, Vol. 1, Strategies and Recommendations, Submission to the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia on the Social Justice Package, pp. 41-48.)

Jull, an Australian by birth, returned to Australian shores recently. Flushed with the success in his role of establishing the new Inuit state of Nunavut in Canada he now heads up the Centre for Democracy in the Department of Government at the University of Queensland in Brisbane. From this official position he advises the Aboriginal Northern Land Council as it moves towards a Nunavut type-claim.

It was the Centre for Democracy which presented papers by nine academics, including one by Peter Jull on "*One Nation's Future*" at a public forum following the October Federal elections. The forum was staged in Brisbane on 15th November 1998¹⁹⁹ in front of an audience of over 200. The unappreciative audience heard first hand the politically correct prejudices of the academic elite. The public forum was advertised in the *Courier-Mail* on the 8th November 1998:

"THE ONE NATION PARTY: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE"

The One Nation Party received significant voter support in recent state and federal elections. Its rhetoric and policies have provoked discord within Australian politics and invited international scrutiny. Leading political scientists from the Department of Government will examine a range of critical issues surrounding One Nation, such as its political ideology, its relationship with other political groups, electoral support and public policies.

The forum will provide an opportunity for anyone interested in Australian politics to review questions such as:

- ☐ *What is the ideological character of One Nation?*
- ☐ *How has the One Nation Party sustained its political momentum?*
- ☐ *What are its policies and their impact on Australia's place in the world?*

The Venue is: Customs House, 399 Queen Street, Brisbane

Date: Tuesday 17th November 1998

Time: 6pm to 9pm

Registration fee: \$10 (which includes light refreshment)

Spaces are limited. Prior registration is essential.

Contact is Sue Lochran,

Department of Government,

The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072

The ill-named Centre for Democracy refused a request by One Nation to have a nominated member of the party speak that day despite the presence of the party's state parliamentary leader Bill Feldman MP. The forum was launched by avowed One Nation-hater, Labor's Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Jim Soorley²⁰⁰.

There was certainly no balance presented by the Centre for Democracy that night and the large number of One Nation supporters attending made their views

¹⁹⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/uqforum/>

²⁰⁰ See colour plates in centre of the book.

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

felt to a number of politically correct academics who found the unfriendly response to the pre-conceived view points they presented most disconcerting.

Pauline Hanson was unafraid to take on the Aboriginal industry after she was elected to federal parliament. In a press release on 30th October 1997 she said²⁰¹:

"Once again we see the treachery of our parliamentarians as they uphold the absurd claims of a minority that seeks to place a stranglehold on as much as 80% of Australia. It is a sorry state of affairs that there were only five sensible representatives of the people of this country who had the honesty and guts to stand in the way of those who continue to divide Australia."

"With less than 2% of the population considered to be qualified to make native title claims, it is racial discrimination, indeed an act of apartheid, to alienate the other 98% of the population. I have said from the very start that I want all Australians to be treated equally and not on the basis of race but the government and opposition have worked tirelessly to entrench division in Australian and it is these policies I will continue to fight."

The next day, 31st October, the *Courier-Mail* published an opinion piece by Peter Jull who was referred to as the Adjunct Associate Professor, Centre of Democracy, University of Queensland Inter alia he wrote²⁰²:

The 'underlying blueprint and inspiration' of native title in Australia is an indigenous land and sea claims agreement in Canada's Arctic, according to Pauline Hanson.

Nunavut, the Inuit peopled region in question, is slightly larger than Queensland and is counting down to the election of its first "parliament" in 1999. Like Canada's existing territory governments, the Yukon and Northwest Territories, Nunavut will be self-governing and closely resemble Canadian provinces or Australian states.

About 90% of Nunavut's population are Inuit, the so-called Eskimos, who retain their own language (as well as English) and live in 30 villages with no connecting roads. The National Geographic magazine, now in newsagents, has a wall map, history, article and photos of Nunavut.....

Nunavut is not the "separate country" or "separate indigenous nation" as Hanson imagines. Inuit are "joining" Canada, not separating. Long isolated and powerless, ruled by white officials, Inuit are gaining rights as Canadians including the right to govern their region.....

Nunavut will be a startlingly different member of the Canadian federation when seated around the conference table with Prime Minister and premiers at the first ministers' meetings where so much Canadian policy is decided. With unique outlooks on indigenous needs, ecologically sustainable development and the perils of resource extraction, the Inuit will have much to offer Canada's jaded southern leaders.

As for my role, years before I ever imagined living here, Australian diplomats in Canada sent visiting ministers and officials to me for briefings. I slowly was 'discovered' by those, including Coombs, looking for someone who knew about Northern Hemisphere indigenous politics and policies.

Aborigines already own land covering approximately 20% of Australia's landmass. It stretches down from the north coast of Australia covering about 80%

²⁰¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/onenation/press/301097.html>

²⁰² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/497/3110.html>

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

of the Northern Territory extending west through Western Australia's eastern boundaries and south into South Australia stopping just short of the great bite.

This land is not overlooked by Jull. In another article to *The Northern Review* in 1994 he wrote²⁰³:

In this sense, the whole effort is reminiscent of the mid-1980s in Canada when political will and vision had failed in respect of northern policy (Jull 1989; Robertson 1988). However, in Canada that epoch represented a lapse, a period in which northern policy was by no means the only public policy left adrift, but fortunately, there were already positive elements well-established. For instance, there were de facto and de jure constitutional processes underway with regard to the North, e.g., the northern claims negotiations and the national constitutional review; well-established wholly-elected territorial government responsible for that 40 percent of the national land that was the federal North; ample funding under the direct control of northern residents; the long-standing existence of a national Northern Affairs department in Ottawa and a clear sense that Northern Policies were 'a good thing'; a visibly proceeding reduction in the extreme inter-regional and inter-ethnic social disparities in the North; the rights of indigenous peoples recognised in law in a general way by Calder and much in evidence in federal and territorial government programming; strong indigenous political associations recognised by governments as authoritative interlocutors in political debate, in addition to indigenous members and ministers in the territorial legislatures; an acceptance of comprehensive policy planning in respect of Northern lands, seas, and development activity; and national media and other institutions accustomed to including Northern indigenous and non-indigenous agendas and participation in their work. In Australia today the only one of those factors apparent is the 1992 Mabo decision that recognises that native title may continue to exist in parts of North Australia, a court ruling and policy framework resisted by all three sub-national jurisdictions for North Australia, e.g., Western Australia, Northern Territory, and Queensland in descending order of vehemence.

On the 2nd June 1998 Pauline Hanson raised the issue of the UN Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Nunavut in the²⁰⁴ federal parliament.

Here are extracts from her speech²⁰⁵:

"I rise today to speak on a matter that has grave and wide-ranging consequences for all Australians. The matter is the ominous document entitled the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This treaty is due to be signed by 2004. The complicity or, at the very least, the lack of will on the part of the federal government to encourage public examination and discussion on this threat to the Australian people is very similar to their reluctance to debate that other attack on Australians also sponsored by Labor and the coalition, the MAI.

"Both of these treaties will take power and choice from the majority of our own people and place that power and freedom of choice firmly in the hands of foreigners and self-seeking minorities. Both of these treaties diminish Australia's sovereignty and in the case of the so-called rights of the indigenous people could

²⁰³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/jull1.html>

²⁰⁴ See full transcript at: <http://www.gwb.com.au/onenation/press/landtitle.html>

²⁰⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/un.html>

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

ultimately result in the disintegration of our nation. With the MAI now largely exposed and on hold, the time has come to concentrate on the dangerously and inappropriately named rights of the indigenous people. When signed, this treaty will be a permanent fixture of division. It will divide us not just racially but geographically. This treaty is a treacherous sell-out of the Australian people. It is a document of such social impact it would be unimaginable to most Australians. It will tear the heart out of our country and deliver that heart to one of our very smallest minority groups.....

"The architect of Nunavut, Peter Jull, is in Brisbane and has advised the North Australia Research Unit on how to establish independent race based states in Australia. All they need is the trigger, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

"Article 27 speaks of the rights to restitution of lands, territories and other resources and affirms rights to just and fair compensation for lands and resources confiscated or used without consent. The potential for significant claims to be made against landowners past, present and future is a certainty given our experience with native title. Any individual or company forced to pay compensation may not be able to sue the government to cover the loss.

"Article 30 specifically requires countries to obtain a free and informed consent from indigenous people before approving projects that affect their land, particularly in connection with the utilisation or exploitation of minerals or other natural resources.

"Taken literally, this amounts to a veto right over future land use and resource utilisation. This will result in far more problems than we are currently experiencing with native title. Indeed, this could override Howard's 10 point plan as United Nations treaties override our domestic laws.".....

"It is time Australians became aware and studied the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the massive and irreversible effects it will have on this country if implemented. We must teach the government the powerful lesson that we will not let them give our country, part of our country or our sovereignty to anyone without our knowledge and clear approval. Governments and the internationalists who fill their ranks must not be left unchecked.

"With further regard to native title, taxpayers will already have committed to the indigenous land fund \$1.4 billion by the year 2004. Australians must understand that up to 79 per cent of Australia is under the threat of native title by less than two per cent of the population. The taxpayers of Australia have sunk over \$210 million so far into the native title process only to arrive at the untenable situation today with massive delays and the lack of proper outcomes.

"The Racial Discrimination Act 1975 is supposed to guarantee that no-one will be disadvantaged on the basis of race. Unfortunately, the loophole in the act is the provision to discriminate positively.

"Having this loophole and using it to discriminate positively for one group results in negative discrimination against others. Whereas pastoralists are only compensated for lost production from mining on their leases, Aboriginals are tremendously advantaged by having the right to negotiate with miners for a share of the profits. This creates insurmountable barriers to investment, jobs and family financial security unless you are an Aboriginal."

Ms Hanson's speech drew this response from Prime Minister John Howard on Radio National the next day:

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

"Well I read the speech that she made last night and I've got to say that it is not only an inaccurate dishonest speech but it verges on the deranged in various places..."

"What she said in this statement is appealing to irresponsible, racist sentiment in the community."

Howard's comments were hypocritical to say the least. In 1988 he sang a very different tune. A media liaison member of Howard's staff wrote at this time²⁰⁶ :

When the proposal of a (Aboriginal) treaty was put forward by the Prime Minister (Bob Hawke), Mr Howard rejected it out of hand, arguing that a treaty could only divide, not unite black and white Australians.

The Liberal and National Parties remain committed to achieving policies which bring Aboriginal people into the mainstream of Australian society and give them equal opportunity to share fully in a common future with all other Australians.

Consequently, we are utterly opposed to the idea of an Aboriginal treaty, partly because it will do nothing to assist these aims. It is an absurd proposition that a nation should make a treaty with some of its own citizens. It also denies the fact that Aboriginal people have full citizenship rights now.

The whole idea of a treaty makes nonsense of the statement by the Prime Minister on Australia Day that there can be no hierarchy of descent in Australia and that commitment to Australia is everything. The Prime Minister at that time rejected any policy based on racial difference, and we do the same.

In proposing a treaty the Hawke Government has set itself on a path of creating expectations amongst Aborigines that such a treaty would facilitate the provision of national land rights and enable claims to be made for monetary compensation based on prior ownership of land and past injustices.

This has certainly been the experience overseas.

Howard's response to Ms Hanson's comments in parliament drew this response from Labor's great globalist²⁰⁷, Gareth Evans, "What we are hearing now from Mr Howard is a panicky reaction, a fear that One Nation is cutting into and dividing his own political base."

On the night after her speech to parliament, the 3rd June 1998, Pauline Hanson was interviewed live by Ray Martin on Channel 9's "A Current Affair". Earlier that day I had been contacted by the programme as they "could not find any references to Nunavut on the Internet"²⁰⁸. The interview with Hanson was supposed to be a discussion on her comments to parliament about the indigenous treaty and the ramifications that it had for Australia.

The interview broke up into high farce after Martin produced a fax purported to be from the Canadian High Commission which claimed that Nunavut was "not a race based state".

Instead of interviewing Ms Hanson about her concerns for Australia the entire interview degenerated into Martin challenging her claims about Nunavut using the basis of his attacks the Canadian High Commission's fax – which was never shown to Ms Hanson or viewers before, during or after the program.

²⁰⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/treaty.html>

²⁰⁷ Gareth Evans is on the record as saying that his main goal in life was to be the President of the United Nations.

²⁰⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/298/0306.html>

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

On the 4th of June *The Age* reported Ms Hanson's comments in parliament²⁰⁹:

Mrs Hanson claimed people were identifying themselves as Aboriginal to win the 'booty' of native title claims. "At both state and federal levels we will fight the opportunistic nonsense and dishonesty of native title and work to dismantle every form of discrimination including that which assists native title claims," she said. "The paralysing effect of native title and other issues will see Queenslanders deserting those who have deserted them."

She also described the United Nations draft declaration on the rights of indigenous people as a "treacherous selling out of the Australian people" that would result in the disintegration of the nation.

"Queenslanders will be the first Australians in living memory to have the chance to elect a real alternative to the multicultural and politically correct Labor and Coalition parties," she said.

A spokesman for the Aboriginal Affairs Minister, Senator John Herron, said the Minister was mystified by the outburst and Mrs Hanson was talking about a UN declaration that, if ever adopted, would never bind Australia.

While the Australian population remains largely in the dark over the UN Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples²¹⁰ the treaty moves on.

As a compromise on native title Prime Minister John Howard offered an amended "ten point plan"²¹¹ on Native Title for the states to consider. The plan did nothing to resolve the real short term issue of native title, and nobody is addressing the potentially explosive draft indigenous treaty currently being negotiated at the UN.

Things are hotting up. *News Weekly* (12/12/98) has commented on the latest native title determination:

The Miriuwong-Gajerrong native title claim, lodged with the National Native Title Tribunal in April 1994 has now been decided, some four and a half years later, leaving the people of Kununurra and the east Kimberley more confused than ever about what native title means in practice.

In the Federal Court on November 24, 1998, Justice Lee found that the Miriuwong-Gajerrong people have communal native title rights over more than 7,000 square kilometres – including Lake Argyle and the Ord River.

According to the judgement, native title rights include the right to possess, occupy, use and enjoy the land; the right to make decisions about the use and enjoyment of the land; the right of access and to control the access of others; and the right to use, enjoy and control the use resources.

It also includes the right to trade in resources and to receive a portion of any resources taken by others; the right to maintain and protect places of importance under traditional laws, customs and practices and to maintain, protect and prevent the misuse of cultural knowledge associated with the land.

While the mainstream media have glossed over the implications *News Weekly* continues, *At times evidence was only allowed to be heard by, and distributed to, either (Aboriginal) men or women, with the exception of Justice Lee himself.*

Father Brenden Walters, based at the Sacred Heart Monastery, Kensington, is both a priest and a lawyer. He has studied the native title issue and has come up

²⁰⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/298/0406.html>

²¹⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/unatsic.html>

²¹¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/photo/wik.html>

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business
with the following conclusions²¹² about native title claims. If he is correct thousands of native title claims would be declared null and void:

The High Court in Mabo recognised native title according to 'their' tribal law and custom. By allowing mixed race aborigines as native title claimants, native title is recognised according to 'our' law in the Native Title Act. The distinction is important. Some difficulties may arise with references to persons as being of 'mixed race' or of 'mixed aboriginal descent' but these problems are to be expected when laws from traditional cultures are introduced into our modern system of law. Traditional aboriginal culture was not the cradle of democracy but we are nevertheless obliged to adopt their law with respect to people of mixed aboriginal descent because it is part of the customary traditional law of native title. This topic may be a sensitive one but I would argue the cause of right is served by raising it. No offence is intended to any aboriginal person but if the topic is not up for discussion then we are indeed diminished as a nation. Here follows some of my views in relation to eligible native title claimants.

What the High Court did in Mabo was to uncover in Australian common law some traditional native law. Native Title is part of the general law of the tribe and certain members of the tribe are designated tribal law men. Native Title gives the members of the tribe certain rights with respect to tribal land. It does not give those rights to people of mixed aboriginal descent. A potted version of the story goes something like this.

Prior to 1788 this continent was inhabited by a people who were said to have been here some 40,000 years. Then came the Europeans. So at that stage there were two groups on the island: the tribal aborigines and the Europeans. Then a third group began to appear. These were the result of the intermingling of Europeans and tribal people; they were mixed race. The mixed race people did not fully belong to either of the first two groups. Prior to the 1967 referendum, mixed race people and the tribal people were under the authority of the Protector of Aborigines and neither group enjoyed the rights of Australian citizens. But all this changed with the referendum of 1967. The referendum removed the section in bold type seen here:

S51 The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to.... (xxvi) The people of any race, other than the aboriginal race in any State, for whom it is deemed necessary to make special laws²¹³.

And so the mixed race people have become citizens of this country. Unfortunately for the tribal people, they too became Australian citizens and subject to our laws, they lost their sovereignty. What the 1967 referendum gave to the mixed-race people it took from the tribal people. The mixed-race people got lumped in with the tribal people and they all became aborigines. This 'aborigine' was defined such by our law that now the mixed race aborigines are given the same traditional rights as tribal people. These rights tribal people will not, and cannot by tribal law, ever give them. Now the mixed race aborigine was given the same.

Tribal people may consent to give a mixed-race aboriginal person some rights or communal recognition but never the right of ownership to land. Their land is

²¹² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/title/priest.html>

²¹³ Download interactive copy of the Australian constitution:
<http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/austcon.exe>

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

their life source and their identity. It is the defining principle of their existence and is at the heart of their law. There are other people who have very strong attachments to the land going back many generations but a tribal man's relationship with the land is unique. Thus, by definition, it is impossible for a mixed-race aborigine, or any other person in Australia for that matter, to have an affinity with the land which is the same as that of a tribal aborigine.

The tribal people may not give the person of mixed aboriginal descent Native Title rights because it is against customary tribal law. So whose law is the Native Title Act purporting to give effect to when it allows a mixed-race aboriginal as a native title claimant?

The answer is our law.

It is clear that the Native Title Act goes well beyond customary tribal law, and therefore, well beyond the common law, when it allows a mixed-race aboriginal person as a native title claimant. A person with some aboriginal heritage who has aboriginal community recognition may well be classified as an aboriginal person for certain purposes but that's 'our' law. Mabo recognised in our legal system traditional native land title which has been interpreted according to traditional tribal law.

Traditional tribal law does not apply to people of mixed aboriginal descent. Under the present Native Title Act, people of mixed aboriginal descent are being given grant rights to which they are not entitled. There is no basis in Mabo for the granting of such rights.

Fr Cyril Connolly MSC, informed by tribal elders from the Top End (tribal law elders being the only appropriate source of information of this nature) offers the following principles of customary tribal law with respect to succession to tribal land:

- ☐ *Tribal customary law recognises native title rights to reside only in those persons who are aboriginal by their law. This means that a person must be born of a tribally initiated father and mother and no one else.*
- ☐ *Native Title rights are vested only in the male person. His authority over his land or 'country' increases as he progresses through the levels of ceremonial law. Here again no one is admitted to the process of ceremonial law and its rituals unless he qualifies by being born of a tribal father and mother.*
- ☐ *Native Title to land does not reside in the woman, nor does it descend, in tribal customary law, through the female line.*
- ☐ *There is no provision in customary tribal law for making someone into an aboriginal by defining them to be one.*
- ☐ *A person who has a non-custodial father and a tribal mother has visiting rights to his mother's country and can stay there. He may also take part in some of the discussions but he has no land 'ownership' rights; no native title rights.*

By allowing mixed-race aborigines as native title claimants, the Native Title Act adapts its own version of tribal customary law and, in so doing, strays from the test of the High Court in Mabo that native title must be ascertained in accordance with 'their' laws and customs. Mixed-race aborigines are not legitimate native title claimants and the Native Title Act should be amended to reflect that. On the above analysis, any successful native title claim by mixed-race aborigines is inherently unjust.

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

Thus, whilst the High Court has said that native title still exists in Australia, there will be no existing eligible native title claimant unless traditional native law with respect to such claimant is satisfied.

The provision of social justice for mixed-race aborigines will not be satisfied by continuing to transfer to them interests in property to which they have no common law entitlement. Thus, native title is not a human rights issue nor can it be a factor in the so called process of 'Reconciliation'. To have linked these issues is misleading and adds to the confusion. Native Title is a legal issue. By promoting native title for mixed-race aborigines, the Catholic Church has involved itself in a cause which is basically unjust. The Church should now take responsibility to set the record straight. The problem might be finding someone in the Church willing to break the news to the people of mixed aboriginal descent. It would be easier to dismiss what I have said as being... whatever.... and avoid the issue but I doubt the Master would approve of that.

The native title issue has become a minefield of legal argument and quick money. It rarely if ever has anything to do with reconciliation. Aboriginal leaders and large legal firms with vested interests are promoting it.

In the *Herald Sun* on the 20th November 1998 Peter Howson, a former Liberal Aboriginal Minister wrote²¹⁴:

More recently he (Fred Chaney) has, as a member of the Native Title Tribunal, played an active role in administering one of the most divisive pieces of law passed by the Commonwealth Parliament - the 1993 Native Title Act. This Act took the High Court's Mabo decision as its starting point, then prescribed a new system of property law quickly seen to be unworkable.

Last July, the Howard Government finally got Senate approval to its Wik Bill and next year we will find out whether this new legislation resolves the problems which caused so much bad feeling under the 1993 Native Title Act.

We have now experimented with separatist policies for more than 25 years. It is now widely accepted that the quality of life for Aboriginal Australians has seriously declined in this period, and this despite the very large sums of money spent by Governments of both sides of politics seeking remedies.

Extracts from negotiations taking place at the UN on the draft declaration on indigenous rights²¹⁵:

262. The observer for the New South Wales Aboriginal Land Council, in a joint statement with several other Aboriginal organizations, said that the articles under consideration should be analysed within the context of the draft declaration as a whole. The draft contained aspirations and should not be the lowest common denominator. In light of this, he called for the adoption of the articles as drafted.

²¹⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/twotribes.html>

²¹⁵ See: <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu4/chrrep/10297.htm>

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

263. The observer for the Central Land Council stated that articles 25 and 26 were essential to the draft²¹⁶ as a whole considering that the absence of indigenous control over their lands was the cause of the situation they were in. She supported the assertion that national law was not relevant in this respect. The phrase "other resources" as found in both articles was very important considering that indigenous peoples' knowledge was under threat from multinational companies. Indigenous peoples should be recognized as guardians of their lands.

326. The observer for the New South Wales Aboriginal Land Council presented a joint statement on behalf of some of the indigenous organizations of Australia. He stated that indigenous peoples, like all other peoples, possessed the right to self-determination and that to assert otherwise would be untenable, discriminatory and racist. He stressed that article 3 was one of the cornerstones of the declaration and that it must be retained unaltered or the declaration would be worse than meaningless. He also stated that article 31 appeared to be a compromise as it only referred to some of the options open to people under international law, but that they reluctantly accepted it as part of the whole package of the text as presently drafted.

The Hindmarsh Island Bridge Fiasco

The Hindmarsh Island bridge fiasco has been, and still is, one of the major battlegrounds in the great cultural wars of the late 20th century. It epitomises all that is wrong with political correctness, and what happens when it gets out of hand.

The yet-to-be-built bridge became a cultural battleground between the forces of Good - a PC alliance of Greens, feminists, hand-wringing apologising churchpersons of both sexes, genders and sexual orientations, indigenes, muddle-headed clerics, activist anthropologists, craven politicians, biased media and your run-of-the-mill protestors - and Evil: Tom and Wendy Chapman, developers.

For his book "It would be nice if there was some secret women's business" (Duffy & Snellgrove, 1996) Chris Kenny used the evidence and findings of the 1995 Hindmarsh Island Bridge Royal Commission, and personal interviews. From that source a brief chronology of events can be established.

The development had been approved by the South Australian State Government and had gone through all the correct approvals and channels, including EIS statements and archaeological surveys. (Kenny, pg32)

After a campaign by some affected locals with the assistance of the CMEFU and Greenpeace failed to halt the bridge it was decided to enlist the help of local Aborigines. ATSIC wrote to the Ngarrindjeri Aborigines expressing fears that archaeological evidence might not be enough to halt the bridge, and that evidence of 'special' cultural or spiritual significance would strengthen the case to stop it. 68. An anthropologist, Dr Lindy Warrel casually remarked to protestors that, "it would be nice if there was some women's business".

Unfortunately for the bridge opponents, anthropologists had long documented that the Ngarrindjeri were unusual in not having the rigid sexual segregation typical of most Aboriginal tribes. (Kenny pgs: 45-47; 68; 71; 112)

²¹⁶ See: <http://www.atsic.gov.au/iiissues/charter.htm>

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

Yet secret women's business swiftly emerged in the form of the sole custodian of the secrets, one Doreen Kartinyeri. At a meeting of Ngarrindjeri women on 9th May 1994 she explained the significance of Hindmarsh claiming that it was sacred for women because it was where Ngarrindjeri women had aborted their children fathered by whitemen. The women drafted a letter objecting to the bridge. They showed it to an Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement (ALRM) lawyer who said it wasn't enough. While wondering what else to put in, Doug Milera, a senior Ngarrindjeri man pointed to an aerial map of the Murray mouth and remarked that it reminded him of a woman's private parts. He later recanted. The expanded letter was faxed to the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Robert Tickner.

After violent demonstrations at the site and with the mainstream media firmly behind the protestors, on the 10th July 1994, in the final decade of the 20th century an Australian government Minister, Robert Tickner, accepted the Saunders report recommending the bridge not be built without even reading the contents of the sealed envelopes which was the basis of it - because it was "*secret women's business*". He signed an order to protect the Hindmarsh bridge area for 25 years.

Tickner called the decision to halt the development "*a victory for the Aborigines and their rights*". The Chapmans demanded a Federal Court review, and in February 1995 Justice O'Loughlin overturned Minister Tickner's order, saying that the Chapmans had been denied natural justice. In May 1995 seven senior Ngarrindjeri women broke ranks claiming that the so-called secret women's business had been concocted as a last resort to stop the bridge.

To bring some credibility back into Aboriginal affairs the SA government established a Royal Commission and in December 1995 the Royal Commissioner, Mrs Iris Stevens found, "*that the whole claim of women's business from its inception was a fabrication*". In September 1996 a second Federal inquiry headed by Justice Jane Matthews "*found insufficient grounds to conclude that a bridge to the island would desecrate the area*".

The new leader of the defeated Labor opposition conceded that: "*There is now no reason why the Hindmarsh Island bridge should not go ahead.*" Yet in June 1997, lawyer Stephen Kenny representing the Ngarrindjeri anti-bridge group presented the case to the International Indigenous People's Tribunal. To the minds of most Australians the purpose of this exercise is clearly to embarrass the Australian government and to bring Aboriginal grievances before an ignorant but sympathetic international community.

Though the new federal government passed an Act allowing the bridgework to proceed, it was challenged on the constitutional grounds that the government is only allowed to make race-based laws for the benefit of, not to the detriment of Aborigines. Obviously having learned nothing, journalists of the mainstream press referred to the case as being between the 'Ngarrindjeri people' and the government. In ignoring the fact that the so-called dissident women were in fact the elders of the Ngarrindjeri people, the media unintentionally displayed their prejudices for all to see. The same bias was demonstrated by the ABC. When the story broke the ABC shamelessly referred to Dorothy and Dulcie Wilson as women who "*claimed to be Ngarrindjeri*" though they were the aunts of their activist nieces.

On 1st April the 1998 the High Court yet again cleared the way for the construction of the bridge. Revealingly ATSIC's regional chairman said, "*The*

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business
key issue isn't the bridge anymore, it's the concept of English common law not recognising indigenous common law".

Pauline also had some aboriginal supporters in the audience, who backed her call for the abolition of ATSIC. In particular, Amelia Campbell (a Ngarrindjeri woman who had the courage to dispute the "secret women's business" at Hindmarsh Island), stated that most Aborigines received little or no benefit from the billions of dollars given to ATSIC. An aboriginal elite controlled the money, and they needed to keep other aborigines living in poverty to maintain the white guilt and the continuous flow of money to the aboriginal industry....

"It shouldn't really come as any surprise that the majority of Aboriginal people despise their ATSIC politicians just as much as white Australians despise most of their politicians. The Ngarrindjeri Aborigines received generous applause from the audience in appreciation of their courage and integrity."

Pauline Hanson²¹⁷, Adelaide, 13/2/98

Dulcie Wilson, one of the leading dissident Ngarrindjeri women wrote a book called: *"The Cost of Crossing Bridges"*²¹⁸. It is controversial because it challenges the media image of Aborigines as a group whose traditions were under threat. It details how Dulcie and the other courageous Ngarrindjeri women originally stood up to say that the "secret women's business" - which halted the Hindmarsh Bridge development - was not part of their culture and never was.

According to the publishers, the mainstream media have effectively censored the book by refusing to publicise it or report on any points raised by Ms Wilson. This is remarkable considering the passionate interest anything indigenous normally arouses.

But Ms Wilson is not politically correct. She wrote:

I was appalled and disgusted with the claims that were being made (over Hindmarsh Island). It's ludicrous to think up such an idea, which they said their ancestors told them, that the shape of the island, when viewed from the air resembled a part of a woman's anatomy.

Aeroplanes were not in existence when primitive man roamed the country. Such distasteful remarks were demeaning and derogatory to most Ngarrindjeri women and showed that these types of people were willing to distort and exploit their own culture to serve their own purposes. To this day I am not sure what those purposes were.

The Chapmans have continued to for redress in the courts, as Michael Duffy has reported in the Daily Telegraph on the 5th of December 1998:

The Hindmarsh Island bridge developers, Tom and Wendy Chapman, were last week awarded \$110,000 after a libel case judgement which found they had been grossly defamed by anti-bridge anthropologist Dr Neale Draper and Green Left Weekly magazine.

This follows the finding of the Royal Commission that the 'secret women's business' was fabricated and is the Chapman's fifth defamation case

²¹⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/adel98.html>

²¹⁸ The Cost of Crossing Bridges by Dulcie Wilson published by Small Poppies publishing, P.O. Box 123, Mitcham, Victoria (ph: 03.9874 2719)
Email: small_poppies@bigpond.com

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

win (*The Australian, The Bulletin, The Canberra Times and Channel 10* were the other 4), with another 7 cases are in the pipeline.

It is deeply disturbing,..., that these people (the Chapmans) should have been vilified so casually and brutally, not for doing anything wrong, but simply because they were judged to be politically incorrect.

What we saw here was an example of how many whites are only interested in Aborigines if they fit their preconceptions. The only acceptable blacks are the whingers and those with major problems - even if they happen to be lying. No other Aborigines need apply.

It is amusing just how accurately those observations apply to so many of the limp-minded Lefties that inhabit this group. Under the guise of self-righteous 'moral concern', these delusional prats seek not to support what is right, just or even sensible, but merely to punish others for their own inadequacies.

The mainstream media failed spectacularly with Hindmarsh. The so-called dissident women were never interviewed, and there was no critical appraisal of any of the main players such as Doreen Kartinyeri. To his credit Geoffrey Partington brought some critical faculties into use, even as far back as 1996 when he wrote in the decidedly non-mainstream *News Weekly* on the 24th February:

Doreen Kartinyeri ... alleged she was the sole custodian among relatively young women of this knowledge.

This was difficult to reconcile with other claims she made, such as, that these beliefs had been passed down to women, from mother to daughter, for the last 40,000 years. The three women she claimed had imparted knowledge to her of 'women's business' were her grandmother, Sally Kartinyeri, her aunt, Rose Cropinyery, and Laura Kartinyeri, the daughter of Pinkie Mack, a midwife of the interwar years looked upon with veneration by all present Ngarrindjeri women.

Of these three, only Laura Kartinyeri was still alive in June 1994. The other two women had died some years earlier.

After Laura Kartinyeri, by then 89 years-old and the "eldest woman of the Ngarrindjeri nation", learned of Doreen Kartinyeri's claims, she wrote a letter to Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Mr Tickner, on March 17, 1995, stating that she knew nothing of any 'women's business' and had not passed it on to Doreen Kartinyeri.....

All the other Ngarrindjeri women who appeared before the Royal Commission confirmed that in their knowledge over many years of the three women named by Doreen Kartinyeri as her informants, no mention was made of any 'women's business'.

The native title debate is further complicated to the benefit of the legal profession by the most recent Federal Court ruling outlined below. Despite the important ramifications to the Australian pastoralists the mainstream media have glossed over and ignored the findings in the Yorta Yorta case.

4. It follows from the above that a claim to native title necessarily involves a number of distinct avenues of inquiry. First, it is necessary to prove that the members of the claimant group (whether it be described as a clan, a community or otherwise) are descendants of the indigenous people who occupied (in the relevant sense) the claimed area prior to the assertion of Crown sovereignty; second, the nature and content of the traditional laws acknowledged, and the traditional customs observed by the indigenous people, in relation to their traditional land must be established; third, it must be demonstrated that the traditional connexion (sic) with the land of the ancestors of the claimant group

Chapter 7 - Lawyers, Native Title and Secret Women's Business

has been substantially maintained since the time sovereignty was asserted; and the claimed rights and interests must be rights and interests recognised by the common law of Australia. Leaving aside for the moment any question of extinguishment, it is not until each of these elements has been proved that it will be possible to determine whether the laws acknowledged and the customs observed by a contemporary clan, group or community should be afforded the protection of Australian law...

134. For the reasons expressed above the Court determines that native title does not exist in relation to the claimed land and waters...

Solicitors for the applicants: Arnold Bloch Leibler.

Extracts from High Court Judge Olney's ruling over the native title claim by the Yorta Yorta people vs the State of Victoria²¹⁹ 18th December 1998

A search of "Arnold Bloch Leibler" (ABL) on the Australasian Legal Information Institute website²²⁰ provides a revealing insight on the dealing of the two Leibler brothers, Mark and Isi, and why they are so paranoid about the "populist" policies of Pauline Hanson and One Nation. The over 1,000 cases traced through a simple search on ABL. (For Leibler see also the chapter on: "The anti-One Nation extremists")

ABL's listed cases include: tax avoidance, trusts, alleged income tax fraud, native title claims, foreign takeovers and withholding documents sought by the tax office. Quote from ATO defence in one of the ABL cases: *The conduct of investigations, in a climate of persistent evasion of income tax and non compliance with the income tax law at almost every level of the income earning community, must be regarded as a crucial weapon against such evasion and non compliance.*

Aboriginal activist/lawyer Noel Pearson is also noted as "joining ABL staff" in 1996. (Pearson specialises in native title claims).

²¹⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/native/yorta.html>

²²⁰ See: <http://www.austlii.edu.au/>

What British people are being asked to do is utterly unnatural. They are being asked to devote themselves to the interests of other races and to ignore the interests of their own. This is like asking a man to forsake his own children and love the children of his neighbours, since to do otherwise would be 'racist'.

"What then, is 'racism'? It is considerably more than any dictionary is likely to say. It is any opposition by whites to official policies of racial preference for non-whites. It is any preference by whites for their own people and culture. It is any resistance by whites to the idea of becoming a minority people. It is any unwillingness to be pushed aside. It is, in short, any of the normal aspirations of people-hood that have defined nations since the beginning of history - but only so long as the aspirations are those of whites."

What is racism? – British National Party's view²²¹

Labelling is probably the most effective propaganda tool used by the media. It is such a simple technique: instead of debating issues abuse your opponents. Among a range of other derogatory terms Pauline Hanson has been labelled racist, simplistic, bigoted, uninformed and divisive by the media. The labelling progressed through degrees as the editor of *Media Watch* Interactive, J G Estiot showed on 12th November 1996²²²:

Pauline Hanson cannot win. On Monday (11th November 1996), she produced facts to answer the allegations that she was to blame for inciting racial incidents in Queensland. Her action was described as "broadsides at Aborigines".

It seems new standards are created every day. It is not an incitement to racial hatred to claim Pauline Hanson is to blame for an incident she has no relation to. But for her to answer such swipes is an attack on aborigines.

When the smoke cleared, the farcical attempts to keep her into the news continued. On Seven, a speech by the Governor General (with no mention of Pauline Hanson) was described as "a thinly veiled attack on Pauline Hanson" by Glen Milne. On the ABC, whenever the topic is immigration, multiculturalism, Aboriginal or racial matters, Pauline Hanson is associated with the story, one way or another. Even if it is to inform us that "Pauline Hanson was not mentioned" (7/11/96). The following day, Craig McMurtrie continued to put fuel on the fire and once again brought Pauline Hanson into the picture: "despite his (John Howard) best effort, the Hanson debate lingers still". No wonder, with McMurtrie, it'll never stop.

Observers would have noticed the progression in the way the news media has dealt with Mrs Hanson. About six weeks ago, she was routinely called "maverick MP Pauline Hanson". It then became "Anti-immigration MP" to be later upgraded to "Anti-Asian immigration MP". She is now routinely referred to as "Anti-Asian MP Pauline Hanson".

JG Estiot

Editor, *Media Watch Interactive*

²²¹ See: <http://www.bnp.to/what.htm>

²²² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/media/1211.html#four>

Chapter 8 - Labelling and racism

In *"The Ethics of Hate"*²²³ Graham Strachan has also described the process:

Thus they (the media) create a whole pantheon of villains: rednecks, homophobes, xenophobes, globaphobes, femophobes, neandathals, troglodytes, good ol' boys, sexists, male-chauvinists, neo-Nazis, people with 'links' to the Ku Klux Klan, anti-Semites, right-wing extremists, patriots, urban terrorists, and so on.

The greatest scapegoat of all is the 'racist'. To create 'racism', challenges to government policy concerning racially identifiable groups are induced by legislating those groups special privileges. When the enemy (ordinary people) inevitably question the privileges, the act of questioning is deliberately misconstrued by the media as a 'racist' attack on members of the racial minority. It is, of course, nothing of the sort.

The questioning of a policy is not a personal attack on the people the subject of that policy. But the purpose of the media in a State at war is not to tell the truth. It is to stir up hate for the enemy, and bolster the morale of the favoured side. The label 'racist' demonises the class 'enemy' and provides a moral justification for the class antagonism of the bourgeois-Left, who can then suppress challenges to their war agenda under the guise of 'fighting racism'.

Is Pauline Hanson a racist, or is the racist Hanson a media creation?

Ms Hanson was first referred to as a 'racist' by members of the Labor party followed the publication of her letter in the *Queensland Times*. (See chapter headed *"Media's Double Standards"*). The Labor Party wanted to discredit the Liberal party's candidate in the seat of Oxley.

The media ran hard with the 'racist' smear after Ms Hanson's maiden speech in which she expressed her fears of Australia becoming 'Asianised'²²⁴. Only a few reputable people have been brave enough to express similar sentiments after the disgraceful treatment meted out to the mild Professor Geoffrey Blainey. In 1988 none other than Prime Minister John Howard expressed similar concerns and was hounded by the media and the ethnocrats. Though poll after poll has demonstrated strong objections to high migration, especially from Asia, elite opinion has not only dismissed people's concerns, but also has intimidated critics by smearing and labelling them. The issue has been taboo.

Japan will have no part in multiculturalism. "They want a pure race".
Australian Financial Review

It is grossly hypocritical for Asian governments which themselves practise racist policies to express concern about the rise of racism in Australia, especially when One Nation's racism is nothing but a media beat-up to discredit a genuine grassroots party.

Malaysia discriminates against its large Chinese population. In Indonesia the ethnic Chinese have been scapegoated in the recent political turmoil resulting in them suffering rape, murder, arson and looting.

²²³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/economic/031198.html>

²²⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/photo/phtalk.html#note>

Chapter 8 - Labelling and racism

In many Asian nations foreigners are not allowed to buy or own land. (Compare their policies to the ITR policy on land ownership introduced by Labor under Paul Keating. This policy allows foreigners to buy and sell properties at will in small upmarket property developments²²⁵.) It is very difficult to migrate to many Asian countries, particularly Japan. In Australia courts are used by illegal immigrants seeking residency here. By Australian elites' standards the governments of these countries are racist, but they would maintain they are merely preserving their national and cultural identity. The media do not condemn these countries for their hypocrisy.

Australia is not a part of Asia as many like to believe. Asian leaders like Dr Mahathir have told us plainly enough that we are not. Lee Kuan Yew²²⁶ contemptuously referred to us as the “*new white trash of Asia*”. According to an Australian diplomat the Thais treat Australia's insistence it is Asian with ‘bemused tolerance’. Samuel Huntington rightly scorned Paul Keating's Asia push: *While arguing that Australia must be Asian, Keating regularly irritated, shocked, and antagonised Asian leaders by his brutal frankness. The gap between cultures was so large that it blinded the proponent of cultural convergence to the extent his own behaviour repelled those whom he claimed as cultural brethren.* (The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order, p. 153 by Samuel Huntington, Simon & Schuster, 1996)

Australia is part of Oceania, a unique region consisting of Australia, New Zealand, the Pacific Islands, and New Guinea. Huntington suggests Australia would form a more natural alliance with the Pacific nations including New Zealand, Canada and the US.

The double standard on racism is perfectly illustrated in a comparison of two opinions on the matter. In the *Herald Sun*, 11th April 1996 Bruce Ruxton, the Deputy President of the RSL pointed out the existence of Asian racism:

Bill Hayden is right because racism is practised throughout Asia. There would not be one country to our north that does not practise some sort of racism, and the greatest example is Japan. It is the most homogenous country in the world, and any non-Japanese would soon find out that he is a second-rate citizen. Even third generation Koreans living in Japan, who are descendants of the thousands of Koreans taken to Japan during the war as labour, are still not on the electoral roll, although they were born there. “The White Devils” policy is still maintained in China, and we have seen the attitude of other countries in South East Asia towards ethnic Chinese and Indians who form part of their population.

And Marion Lau, the Deputy Chairperson, Ethnic Communities Councils of Victoria defended it:

It depends on your definition of racist. The majority of Asian countries are very protective of their cultures and traditions, which they are proud of and are anxious to preserve. Most Asians are keen and happy to make friends with western world countries like Australia, but at the same time are concerned that the next generation are not over-influenced by Western culture and lose sight of their own.

Like parents wanting to ensure that their descendants carry with them not only their memories but also their values and beliefs of their forebears. I think that all

²²⁵ See: <http://www.hope-island.com.au/invest/itr.htm>

²²⁶ Lee Kuan Yew's family bought “Dreamworld” near the Gold Coast and later sold it for a large profit.

Chapter 8 - Labelling and racism

countries have a right to be selective of the relationship that they build with each other.

It seems that for the politically correct, it is perfectly acceptable for Asian countries to be “*very protective of their cultures and traditions*”, but Ms Hanson and One Nation supporters are labelled racists for holding the same sentiment. This is the great PC hypocrisy which the media persistently fails to expose.

When reviewing Paul Sheehan’s “*Among the Barbarians*” *News Weekly* wrote²²⁷:

For daring to criticise immigration policy, Blainey was stigmatised as a racist. This was to be the pattern for future critics of immigration policy.

It should be a sobering thought to all fair-minded people to realise that the following Financial Review article exactly articulated Pauline Hanson's concerns, yet the article inspired no media frenzy of abuse²²⁸:

...(there is) a conspiracy of silence on immigration matters. Certainly the government, of whichever party has not kept the public properly informed about changes in immigration policies, and the increasing percentage of immigrants from Asia. The media has censored arguments for a return to a predominantly European immigration policy and has either ignored or berated people seeking to express support for the views of Professor Geoffrey Blainey who has said the current level of Asian immigration is too high. Reports indicate that a majority of immigrants are now from Asia are given little prominence The failure of multi-racial and multi-cultural societies overseas is generally downplayed.

People who call for a reduction in Asian immigration are subjected to character assassination and are wilfully described as inciting racial hatred while the racist immigration policies of Asian countries such as Japan, China, Malaysia and Indonesia are accepted as normal.

Asia doesn't want whites. While Australia readily admits Asians, Asian countries such as China and Japan don't want whites as permanent settlers or citizens. While Chinese come in greater numbers into Australia it is all one way traffic. Both China and Japan have immigration policies designed to retain their racial homogeneity. An Asian immigrant to Australia (Miss G Lee) was recently reported in The Australian as stating, 'I am Asian and arrived in Australia in 1976. People like Al Grassby cause problems for us. I am very happy here, but I know I will never be accepted by real Australians. I do not blame them - after all their families pioneered and developed this country. They are not welcome in Asia either and cannot live there permanently.

Japan will have no part in multiculturalism. They want a pure race.

The chasm between truth and reality about One Nation’s ‘racism’ cannot be blamed on ignorant Asian reporters based in racist countries like Japan. The Laboral factions and the Murdoch/Packer media must be blamed for so maliciously and deliberately misrepresenting the real concerns of Pauline Hanson and her party.

The immigration issue has been largely ignored by the Murdoch/Packer media. As noted above, the political correct elite, particularly those in the Australian Labor Party, have made the subject taboo. It is easy to see why Paul Sheehan aroused such fury with his expose of the political manipulation of immigration in “*Among the Barbarians*”.

²²⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/santa2.html>

²²⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/0208.html>

Chapter 8 - Labelling and racism

Concerning labelling, racism and the Labor Party²²⁹, Sheehan wrote in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, (31/5/98):

The porous welfare and immigration systems were supplemented by direct payments to ethnic organisations. Des Moore, a former deputy secretary of the Treasury and now director of his own think-tank in Melbourne, the Institute of Private Enterprise, estimates that in Labor's last full year in office, the Federal Government spent at least \$143 million in direct grants to ethnic communities. Ninety-seven per cent of these grants went to organisations in Labor electorates.

To distract scrutiny from this, Labor has systematically played the race card. A classic example occurred this month when the Nine Network's Sunday program was about to expose ethnic branch stacking in Melbourne. Before the program went to air, Sunday received a warning from the ALP:

Based on the information we have received, your program . . . has created the impression within some branches of the ALP that it is acting in a politically biased, if not racist, way and the ALP State Office has been asked to consider whether there have been breaches of racial discrimination and privacy laws."

The letter was signed by John Landers, State secretary of the Victorian ALP. The threat was real enough. The ability to accuse people of racism was the final, crucial, element in Labor's race strategy. Under Australia's plethora of anti-discrimination laws, a large bureaucratic machinery exists to process accusations of racism.

The charge of racism levelled at One Nation is a smokescreen to divert attention away from One Nation's opposition to globalisation. In a piece full of bile directed at One Nation *The Australian's* Greg Sheridan acknowledged on the 9th October 1998 that the 1998 election had been about globalisation. To put it mildly, his language was intemperate - the hallmark of a bigot, not of a journalist. He wrote that Australia had spawned its own anti-globalisation party. That One Nation was a "*crude, racist, intellectually ludicrous outfit*". He compared the One Nation national vote to that of the recent German election where 10% of the vote was for the "*spiritual heirs of either the Stalinists or the Nazis*". He wrote sentences of such absurdity as: *Anti-globalisation parties are often racist because one of the things they hate about the global economy is that it is full of foreigners.*

His diatribe unwittingly exposed the real reason for the elites' hatred of One Nation. One Nation is the most significant threat to globalisation in Australian politics. And control of the media is the real power driving us towards the globalised world. It's not for nothing that the mainstream media champion globalisation, it's for profits.

In "*The Cancer Stage Of Capitalism*"²³⁰ John McMurtry paints a dismal picture of the evils unregulated globalisation has so far produced:

Our social immune system is being overwhelmed by growing, out-of-control money market cancer.

Unemployment rates continue to rise, and protective social sectors everywhere are suffering cutbacks. The unregulated cross-border movement of money capital for non-productive speculative seizures of social incomes is accelerating

²²⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/298/3105.html>

²³⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/nwo1.html>

Chapter 8 - Labelling and racism

in volume and velocity everywhere, reaching an estimated 30 to 40 times the size of the total dollar turnover for goods and services.

One-quarter of the world's people are now starving, and one-third of all children are malnourished--a pattern of deprivation of the most basic means of life. What is most alarming about this deepening, spreading deprivation of the basic requirements of life sustenance is the universality, rapidity, and apparent inexorability of its advance. A relatively small and increasingly walled-in proportion of social bodies is escalating its appropriation of world society's income, while access to vital life means is rapidly decreasing and becoming more insecure for a rising majority of the globe's population.

In the globalised world, economic rationalism reduces all human endeavour to efficiency and profit no matter what the social and even political costs. Greed is the new god. The vision of a fair and independent Australia is derided by the media as a simplistic, populist sentiment that cannot work. Globalisation is 'inevitable' so we are told. Many reputable economists are having a re-think about globalism today. Harvard economics professor Dani Rodrik has said the previously unsayable – “*that a world financial system is inherently impractical*”. Why? Because “*successful capitalist systems are, and will remain, a national phenomenon, each of which exists in a web of social and political institutions*”.

Elite opinion derides Pauline Hanson for expressing the same sentiment: that national sovereignty is still important economically as well as socially.

Rodrik is saying loud and clear to the governments of the world: *Go back, You are going the wrong way*, when addressing the move towards globalisation. Yet Murdoch and his cronies still push the line that globalisation is 'good for Australia' - a line obediently adopted by the Laboral factions. It is not difficult to see who the real racists are - the elites who use this smear to divide the nation and to discredit their opposition.

A sympathiser summed up the hypocrisy of the media's labelling of One Nation as “*racist*” and the effects of the intimidation on ordinary Australians:²³¹:

- (b) *Intimidation. I, like many have read Pauline Hanson's maiden speech, and it is not even remotely racist, yet the written word “hard copy” went out, verbalised by all the establishment. Racist.*
- (c) *This resulted in ordinary people like myself, who cannot afford to have our property savaged by people who believe this lie, having to vote truly in secret.*

No opinion poll will get any truthful answer from me. There is no way I will put a One Nation sticker on my car or front gate to place myself and family at the risk of violence and persecution, such as all have seen on TV. I have enlightened Asian and Aboriginal acquaintances who are in the One Nation camp.

The grapevine is more powerful than the newspaper. Many working-class people are hurting. There is no longer security of employment, and thus the home is at risk. The more the big lie is told on the major news, the more people flock to the one person who is prepared to listen and say the truth. This is the grapevine working not the Internet. The Internet is merely a tool where ordinary people like myself can access Hansard (among others) and get the truth, and spread it around for ordinary people to read. This then makes a mockery of the newspaper that tells the opposite.

²³¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/2509.html>

Chapter 8 - Labelling and racism

Finally, you are correct in that Balson and Australian National News of the Day²³² is biased towards One Nation, but this cannot even remotely balance the opposing bias by the big business Media. It is truly a David against Goliath scenario, where truth is bigger than muscle. Thank you for at least putting the @notd site address in your article.

Regards,

Philip Lester James.

One of the very few commentators independent of the Murdoch and Packer line on Pauline Hanson is 2UE Radio personality, Alan Jones. Naturally he is reviled by the elites as a 'shock-jock'. After a Rally against Racism which was planned by the Communist youth arm "Resistance" and openly promoted by the mainstream media, Jones said on the 3rd July 1998²³³:

"Some front pages of today's papers carry the story about a hundred and fifty school children between the ages of twelve and eighteen, do you mind, marching on John Howard's offices in Sydney in a protest over Pauline Hanson and they were quoted as saying 'I just want to protest about racism'.

"Who is responsible for this? Who has put this racism flag up the pole?

"Why is it that every time anyone has opposition to the migration policy, the epithet 'racist' is thrown at them.

"These kids are having their minds poisoned. I have every sympathy for them. They have been force fed this notion that because Pauline Hanson and others may have a view on migration that differs and because no-one has got the brains to intellectually argue against that notion, then just call her and others 'racist'."
..... "This behaviour is a disgraceful derivative of the disgraceful development within sections of the media and amongst some politicians to call everybody who they disagree with migration - call them 'racist'. The kids get the headlines and away they go and in parrot fashion all the slogans are trotted out. Well we've dwelt on the politics of personality, of vilification, of vindictiveness, spitefulness and sloganeering and now in some way the kids have picked up the slogans."
..... "The hidden face of racism in the country is shrouded in a cloak of political correctness. There are well researched allegations that those who shout the loudest about Pauline Hanson and One Nation being "racist" show these tendencies themselves. Of course the mainstream media are not concerned about reality – the racist slur placed on Pauline Hanson has been a well orchestrated campaign aimed at discrediting her and those associated with her party."

The Sydney Morning Herald reported²³⁴:

At the end of 18 months of massive scrutiny and an avalanche of scorn and derision, this one woman had become the most reviled figure in politics. She was also the most famous politician in Australia, the most well-known Australian politician abroad, had the largest personal following, and on the basis of her celebrity, her "martyrdom", was able to lead an inexperienced rag-tag party to the greatest first-up election performance in Australian political history.

²³² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/daily.html>

²³³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/ajones2.html>

²³⁴ Sydney Morning Herald "A daily diet of scorn and derision" Paul Sheehan 14/11/98

Chapter 8 - Labelling and racism

So much for the moral authority of the Australian media.

The lascivious extravagance of the media's coverage of Pauline Hanson was the most powerful single ingredient in the Hanson phenomenon. As a direct result of the scorn and derision pouring from the media, Hanson's policies ceased to matter to her supporters. What mattered was her courage in the face of hostility.

Finally it is instructive to see who are the real racists in Australia – and they are not the One Nation supporters:

Subject: Chinese racists²³⁵

Here is an actual case of two different types of Chinese immigrants, one of whom is a true Australian (and a Pauline Hanson One Nation (PHON) supporter), the other a racist.

Unfortunately I have been asked not to give too many details in case there are repercussions from certain intimidating members of the Chinese community against the PHON supporter.

An Australian of Chinese race was helping a local One Nation candidate in the electoral campaign. This person had immigrated many years ago and has embraced the Australian culture.

Unfortunately this PHON supporter received a phone call from a local Chinese friend who insisted that PHON was bad and that they should keep away from the PHON candidate. The PHON supporter refused, saying that they were Australian and they wanted what was good for Australia.

This friend then reminded the PHON supporter that they were of Chinese race, that they should be Chinese first and that they were born Chinese and they will die Chinese.

This anti-PHON Chinese person is sadly representative of many Chinese. In Sang-Ye's book "The Year the Dragon Came" (which is based on interviews with Chinese immigrants to Australia) it states that:

China is a country with a strong xenophobic, isolationist tradition; a place where deeply racist sentiments are not uncommon...Nearly all of the interviewees here referred to Australians as 'devils' (guizi) or foreign devils (yang guizi) or the slightly more polite 'foreigners' (laowai or waiguoren), apparently oblivious to the fact that in Australia, it's they who are the foreigners.

Somehow I think that Racewatch²³⁶ and the gestapo enforcing the Racial Discrimination Act and Racial Hatred Act would turn a blind eye to Chinese racists, all in the name of Multiculturalism and Political correctness. Naturally they also turn a blind eye to PHON's welcome to immigrants like the PHON supporter above who is a true Australian.

Hypocrisy at it's best. Peter W

Another e-mail correspondent gave her opinions on who the real racists are:

Comment on "Hypocrisy"²³⁷

²³⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/3008.html>

²³⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/watch>

²³⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/1308.html>

Chapter 8 - Labelling and racism

Yes, I too asked myself the same question. I am married to a Chinese Australian (happily) but it makes for some interesting and more than often frustrating debates. I forwarded yesterday's Indonesian story to his computer and when I raised the "Isn't that really the racism we should be fighting?" issue with him he said (to my disgust) "Oh, that's different" When I said "Why" he replied "They were 'rich' Chinese."

More hypocrisy? We visit Chinese friends in Malaysia quite often. If you ask their 2 year old what will happen if she is naughty she says "The Indian man will come and take me away". If you ask her "Why does the Indian man wear a turban?" She says, "Because he has dirty smelly hair". And the Chinese all laugh at this. If you ask them is their distaste of Indians not racist? They say, "Oh no, they are just Indian", so they don't count.

Hmmm.... apparently two sets of rules; rules for them and rules for us. Which probably accounts for the fact that as soon as times got economically tough in Malaysia, all the Bangladeshi and Indonesian workers got shipped straight home. No compassion that they might be much, much worse off at home and would no longer be able to provide for their starving families.

Until Australia learns to be proud of our country and believe in our own ability to make decisions to do what is best for Australia then we will continue to be the lapdog and the laughing stock of the world. "If you don't like it.... Tough" would be a good message to send then if only to show that we do have some backbone somewhere in our seemingly spineless political leadership .

And to all those (including my husband) who cry "Racism" and take such great offence at the mere mention of them being singled out as 'Asian' (or Indian, or aboriginal or anyone else in the world), and to all those who want a cushioned politically correct world, well my mother always taught me when kids at school used to call me names to stand proud and say "Sticks and stones will break my bones, but names will never hurt me". Perhaps we can all learn from that and the world would be a better place. A.R

Despite the revisionist claims of the multicultural brigades, Australia's national ethos has long been centred on the ideas of tolerance and a fair go. One Nation stands for those traditional Australian values. The party's name says it all.

60 minute's refusal of an opportunity for us to face their fairytale on their program this Sunday night (A Call to Arms), in itself, proves their intention to simply maliciously attack Pauline and One Nation by any means regardless of the total lack of truth. 60 minutes has no credibility and should be treated accordingly. Even their Internet story announcing their program is filled with lies when factual evidence is clearly available by speaking to us, something they chose not to do because the truth would ruin their dishonest and despicable claims.

Pauline Hanson's One Nation press release 6th June 1998²³⁸.

The story of Pauline Hanson and Australia's self-proclaimed leading current affairs program *60 Minutes* (Packer's Channel 9) presents several case studies of unethical reporting.

Getting the interview at any cost to credibility

In May 1997, *60 Minutes* secured an interview under false pretences²³⁹. In a letter addressed to David Ettridge, the National Director of Pauline Hanson's One Nation, the Executive Producer of *60 Minutes*, John Westacott requested an interview with Pauline Hanson. He gave an overview of what he had in mind:

Dear David,

Further to our telephone conversation this morning, here is an outline of our proposal to prepare a report on the development of One Nation as an emerging political force in Australia.

Ideally, we would have a reporter (Liz Hayes) and a crew follow Ms Hanson to a rally and later conduct a formal interview. We'd also like the opportunity for some behind-the-scenes filming of strategy discussions etc.. to develop the notion that we are seeing first hand, a new political party in the making.

The thrust of our report would suggest that initially Pauline Hanson was a phenomenon in Australian politics, today she is clearly a force to be reckoned with.

The major parties now have been required to take her and One Nation seriously and have begun their political counter attacks.

We consider it is time we look past the "Pauline Phenomenon" and report what she is saying and what direction she and the movement are heading.

On a personal level Pauline has gained a staggering following and I believe our viewers would be interested in hearing how she is coping with the challenge. A challenge that is turning out to be a major and historic task.

Yours sincerely

John Westacott, Executive Producer, Nine Network Australia Pty Ltd

As *60 Minutes* provided a large audience for Ms Hanson to speak on One Nation's vision for Australia, and as the letter promised a fair hearing, the proposal was accepted.

²³⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/onenation/press/060698.html>

²³⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/1905.html#sixty>

Chapter 9 - 60 Minutes credibility gap

To put it mildly the resulting program was far-removed from the spirit of the request. It was little more than an attack on Ms Hanson's credibility. Jeff McMullen persistently tried to get Ms Hanson to admit that she was responsible for the perceived growth in race-based hatred and violence, though un-biased examination of the evidence clearly shows the violence has been perpetrated against One Nation. So much for integrity of the agreement *"to look past the 'Pauline Phenomenon' and report what she is saying"*.

On claims of growing racial hatred in Australia, McMullen says to Ms Hanson, *"There seems to be a lot of hate in the air isn't that dangerous?"*

Ms Hanson, *"That's only happening out there because the true message is not getting across to the people. How could there possibly be hatred from anyone when you are calling for equality for all Australians?"*

McMullen continues, *"... latest poll suggests that 66% of Australians blame you for the racial intolerance that's around at the moment."*

Ms Hanson, *"The hate out there is from people who clearly concede they've got the most to lose and the majority of Australians have been forgotten..."*

McMullen later tries to ridicule Hanson by asking a loaded question: *"How much do you think we are losing in dividends (to foreigners)?"*

Ms Hanson, *"About Au\$200 billion a year."*

McMullen, *"The trouble is the figures Ms Hanson is using to scare people is the AusBuy guide."*

In that statement McMullen displayed his own ignorance: Ms Hanson had actually used the Austand figures.

Ms Hanson's comments on tax avoidance by multinationals, including Channel 9's boss Kerry Packer, have since been confirmed by no less an authority than the Australian Tax Office (ATO). Jim Killaly²⁴⁰ the Assistant Commissioner of the ATO claimed that multinationals pay little or no tax in Australia. On the 3rd April 1998 Killaly said on ABC Radio: *"There are 4,300 large foreign corporations that pay no tax in Australia, and there are another 4,000 or so foreign companies that pay little or no tax in Australia by means of transfer pricing and various tax havens"*.

The figures in the latest AusBuy bulletin showed Australians paying out more than \$15 billion to foreign investors and lenders in the second half of 1997, including dividends to the growing number of foreign-owned companies making everything Australian from Vegemite to Tim Tams. Since 1990-91, overseas interests with a stake in Australian businesses have earned \$180.6 billion in interest and dividends.

Claire Miller, *The Age*²⁴¹

Moreover at the time of the program *60 Minutes*' boss Kerry Packer was under investigation by the ATO over an outstanding tax bill of over Au\$143 million²⁴². Despite these facts, *60 Minutes* portrayed Ms Hanson as an ignorant woman out of her depth.

²⁴⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/austand.html>

²⁴¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/multi/selloff1.html>

²⁴² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/packer/tax.html>

Chapter 9 - 60 Minutes credibility gap

The day after the program David Ettridge responded saying,

"They will never get another interview with Pauline Hanson. They promised to do a soft, positive piece – that's why we agreed to the interview. What they produced was a betrayal of the agreement that they had with Pauline."

60 Minutes got another interview, but it was gained deceitfully.

One might well ask what happened to 60 Minutes commitment that, *The thrust of our report would suggest that initially Pauline Hanson was a phenomenon in Australian politics, today she is clearly a force to be reckoned with.*

Paul Keating commenting on the 60 Minutes expose of his piggery dealings, *"I think this is as much about demonstrating to the Prime Minister (John Howard) and his family where power resides as it is about trying to damage me."* Page 11, Weekend Australian, (27/3/99)

Call to Arms – six days before the Queensland State Election²⁴³:

The Call to Arms segment on 60 Minutes was another case of blatant media manipulation. The program's intent was to influence the upcoming Queensland State Election by damaging One Nation's reputation.

When alerted to the airing of a program aimed at linking One Nation directly with allegedly extremist militia groups in the US, the party faxed the following press release to the media. Not one media outlet covered One Nation's side of the story²⁴⁴:

This Sunday, 60 Minutes is airing a segment devoted to connecting Pauline Hanson with individuals or groups in the United States. While we don't know who these people are, what is certain is that Pauline Hanson is not in contact politically or organisationally with anyone in the United States - the 60 Minutes story is a fairytale.

After hearing of an advertisement for this Sunday's 60 Minutes, David Oldfield contacted the program to check its content. Despite making it clear there was absolutely no communication between Pauline Hanson, her advisers, or the organisation's heads and anyone in the United States, 60 Minutes refused to even consider they had manufactured the story. They also refused to allow One Nation an opportunity to rebut their fairytale until the program the following week. This is a nefariously timed lie.

This is deceptive and dishonest journalism at its worst and all credible journalists, whatever their personal feelings, should be appalled at 60 minutes' approach. Regardless of what evidence 60 Minutes produce or what they may state, the whole story is a fairytale fabricated without the slightest basis of truth. There is no connection or communication between the United States and Pauline Hanson or One Nation.

While we have no knowledge of such activities, it is possible some individual member may be in contact with people overseas but this, if it has happened, is a personal affair and unrelated to us as an organisation.

It should also be understood that One Nation letterhead and other documents have been forged on a number of occasions. Further to this, people have falsely claimed to be party officials and candidates as well as one incident where a

²⁴³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/60.html>

²⁴⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/onenation/press/060698.html>

Chapter 9 - 60 Minutes credibility gap

person in Western Australia claimed to be a close personal adviser to Pauline when in fact she had never even met him.

We are not sure what 60 Minutes will put to air, but having spoken to them twice, it is clear they will peddle the lie of links that simply do not exist. Perhaps they have cleverly manufactured a fairytale with the help of people either willing to perjure themselves or who are just not aware they are not really in contact with Pauline or One Nation, but whatever the case, their story is fiction in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd degree.

60 Minute's refusal of an opportunity for us to face their fairytale on their program this Sunday night, in itself, proves their intention to simply maliciously attack Pauline and One Nation by any means regardless of the total lack of truth. 60 Minutes has no credibility and should be treated accordingly. Even their Internet story announcing their program is filled with lies when factual evidence is clearly available by speaking to us, something they chose not to do because the truth would ruin their dishonest and despicable claims."

Pauline Hanson and One Nation is, and will always be, 100% Australian owned and 100% Australian influenced.

Jeff McMullen opened "A Call to Arms" saying:²⁴⁵, "According to most opinion polls Pauline Hanson's One Nation party will perform strongly at next week's Queensland state election, perhaps winning seats, maybe even holding the balance of power. But listen to her speeches, and delve into what her party stands for and you find, like we've done you find that One Nation has very little to do with our nation. From the theory of the United Nations new world order espoused in a speech by Pauline Hanson this week, to laxer gun laws to attacks on minorities and immigration. One Nation is taking its cue from America. From extremist groups and what a weird warped view of the world they have."

60 Minutes had recorded the segment of McMullen meeting with a number of militia leaders nearly a year before (late 1997), but had not used it. Now it was spliced into a fabricated 'angle' on One Nation in the politically critical period just days before an election. The only indication of a link between One Nation and the US militia organisations demonstrated in the program came from these exchanges:

McMullen: "McLamb visited Australia on the invitation of people who are now strong supporters of the Pauline Hanson movement."

McMullen: "Pauline Hanson has been talking about a civil war, do you expect a civil war?"

McLamb: "I think so. I do. And I think so in your country, because I have talked to people in your country and so we are hiding the guns, doing what we call in America midnight gardening. I understand from a lot of people in your country that the same thing is going on."

In another interview McMullen asked a different man:

McMullen: "Is Pauline Hanson your kind of gal?"

John Cochrane: "Yes I would say so, absolutely. I would to say those in Australia to make sure that they have got all the provisions that they need so that they can prevent tyranny and so that they can stand without support from outside."

The 60 Minutes program was unable to show any connection whatsoever between the One Nation party and the US militia organisations apart from such

²⁴⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/guns.html>

Chapter 9 - 60 Minutes credibility gap

contrived inferences. The deceitful editing, as described below by media analyst J G Estiot, would have worked for uncritical people²⁴⁶:

Last night's 60 Minutes story on Pauline Hanson and the US militiamen was brilliant. It wasn't brilliant journalism, it was a brilliant corporate hit, less than a week from the Queensland elections.

There were signs the Nine Network had pulled the big guns to shoot Hanson. In recent times, every single Channel 9 program, with possibly the exception of "Here's Humphrey" and "Catch Phrase", had a go at smearing Pauline Hanson and One Nation. The typical hit-men for the occasion were people like Laurie Oakes who masterfully fakes an impartial observer, and company-men like former Senator Graham Richardson who gives a bad name to prostitutes. I almost forgot Ray Martin, the man who used to be a journalist.

For the readers who may not be familiar with dishonesty, hypocrisy, double standards, propaganda and gutter journalism, I will outline here some of the tricks that 60 Minutes weekly passes off as investigative journalism.

First, the story has to be one-sided. No point in inviting One Nation to spoil the party by refuting the allegations. The wildest claims can be made to sound overwhelming when unchallenged.

Next, the starting point for some of the story usually based on wild assumptions which are usually groundless, but derive their perceived authority from the fact they have been repeated in the media for months, sometimes years. One such assumption that is regularly used in the Australian media as a basis for further smearing is the fact that One Nation is a "racist" party. Apply the same standards to any other political party in Australia and there would not be a non-racist party in the country. I dare say that, based on the media benchmark, most anti-racist organisations today behave like racists. Never will you see in the Australian media a reminder that the only time One Nation faced official scrutiny for being a racist organisation, it was cleared.

Naturally, there has to be a scare factor. The militia goons roaming in the snow firing indiscriminately did the trick. This would shake the daylight out of the Mums and Dads out there who were finishing their mashed potatoes. The tricksters who pass themselves off as journalists know the effect of such associations. The mud sticks and so do the shock pictures indirectly associated with One Nation.

As with every professional hit, the timing has to be perfect. If somehow 60 Minutes is forced into a retraction - as it should - the next opportunity is the day after the Queensland election. Top stuff!

Yesterday's 60 Minutes story did not demonstrate any links between the US militias and One Nation. however, clever editing and constant innuendo gave the viewer the impression that it was clearly established. It was interesting to see the story claim that One Nation's policies were borrowed from the US. The fact is that much of the One Nation policies are not new in Australia and have been debated before. So, why not run a story claiming One Nation borrows its policies from the Liberal or Labor Party? The real question is this: how would the other political parties fare if the same level of caustic scrutiny was applied to them?

Finally, I urge those who watched the show to write to Channel 9 asking them to explain how they could possibly associate One Nation and the US militia when they did not have a single piece of evidence. Should they fail to reply or if

²⁴⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/sixty98.html>

Chapter 9 - 60 Minutes credibility gap

they give you the standard cut-and-paste reply, take the matter further to the Australian Broadcasting Authority.

In his book *"The Captive Press"*, David Bowman raised questions about newspapers: "Do they publish the truth or do they stretch it until it is a lie? Do they seem to be fair or unfair in their treatment of people and issues? Do they victimise individuals? Do they help society by their example or set it back?" Today, 60 Minutes would have some trouble answering these questions.

Most intelligent people agree that programs like 60 Minutes are entertainment, not current affairs. But a true democracy requires an informed citizenry, and the media are not doing their job. Graham Strachan wrote about such programs and McMullen's interview with Ms Hanson in particular in the on-line article *Mankind in Amnesia*²⁴⁷:

The present generation of young Australians is about to repeat one of history's grimmest lessons: encouraging and submitting to tyranny, and they are being led to the slaughter by people in the media, particularly on programs like '60 Minutes'. During the '60 Minutes' disinformation piece on Pauline Hanson (8 June 1998), reporter Jeff McMullen repeated the now-familiar piece of propaganda: "The patriots here believe that their own government is selling them out. Like Pauline Hanson they believe that international treaties are undermining the power of national governments to make individual decisions.

It's a much derided global conspiracy theory."

In the immediate sense the implication is that because one Jeff McMullen of '60 Minutes' in Australia says something has been 'much derided', it could not possibly be true. That, of course, is a logical fallacy known as 'ad populum': something is false if somebody says lots of people believe it's false. According to McMullen's reasoning, the world was once flat because lots of people disbelieved that it was spherical.

Much derided by whom? Again McMullen didn't say. If he means by other high profile journalists like himself, then forget it.

Their credibility is history. Nor does he say what sort of things governments will be left to 'make individual decisions' about after all the treaties have been signed. They could for instance decide which street to sweep next, or which train to make run on time. By some stretch of the journalistic imagination this might still be construed as 'national autonomy'. But the significant thing that McMullen implies is that the government would never sign treaties handing over the people's sovereignty to international bodies.... mummy government could never be bad, in other words. This of course is nonsense. The lesson of history is that governments have rarely been good.

<p><i>"60 Minutes is the Rolls Royce of current affairs programs (in Australia)"</i> Ray Martin, 22nd November 1998</p>

60 Minutes established an on-line survey on the Internet for feedback on whether "there is any basis on these (One Nation's) fears of a UN led New World Order."

The survey was directly tied to the "A Call to Arms" program.

²⁴⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/economic/100698.html>

Chapter 9 - 60 Minutes credibility gap

Just a few hours before the show went to air the poll was rigged by someone associated with *60 Minutes*. There were more 'no' votes cast at this time in a twenty minute period than were cast in the ten hour period immediately following the program going to air.

What is the basis of the vote rigging allegation²⁴⁸?

- ☐ Someone associated with *60 Minutes* interfered directly in the survey sometime between 2.15 and 4.45pm Sunday afternoon.
- ☐ During this period about 3,500 votes were added to the survey by someone associated with *60 Minutes*
- ☐ This vote rigging continued until 4.15pm when it suddenly stopped at 3,240
- ☐ Between 4.20pm and 4.30 another 400 votes were added
- ☐ No votes were added for about 10 minutes after 4.30pm
- ☐ At between 4.40pm and 4.45pm another 350 votes were added
- ☐ In the next 90 minutes just 10 votes were added - probably the real thing
- ☐ This was all before the program went to air at 7.30pm at a time when Channel 9 was broadcasting a live rugby league match between the Brisbane Broncos and Parramatta
- ☐ Less than 1,000 votes were cast in the ten hours immediately AFTER the show was broadcast and the web site promoted by Sixty Minutes and only 1,500 votes were cast over a 60 hour period following the show and the web site being promoted.

What impact did the vote rigging have on the result?

- ☐ Before the voter rigging started after 2.15pm on Sunday 85% of voters had answered "yes" to the question, "Is there any basis for these fears of a UN-led new world order?"
- ☐ This "yes" vote dropped to just 11% in a two hour period during which about 3,500 were cast by someone associated with *60 Minutes*
- ☐ Over 9 hours after the program was broadcast the "yes" vote had risen to 25% while under 1,000 were cast
- ☐ In other words, of about 872 votes cast by "real people" after the show, 834 voted "yes" (lifting % to 26) *60 Minutes'* survey claims that 74% voted no
- ☐ The 1,500 votes cast after the show raised the "yes" vote to 32% from 11% after the numbers were rigged.

These poll rigging allegations have been previously put to *60 Minutes* for reply. None has ever been received.

27th July 1997, Hong Kong activist Emily Lau as a *60 Minutes* interviewer²⁴⁹:
Lau makes three attempts to speak to Pauline Hanson at the Geelong dinner after telling us that she had been refused an interview with her. Her attempts are rude.

Lau: (trying to speak to Hanson) *"I am Emily Lau from 60 Minutes..."*

Hanson: *"60 Minutes is a dirty word to me..."* breaks off conversation.

Later, Lau again confronts Ms Hanson asking her about her "racist policies", Pauline Hanson replies: *"I think that your countries are very discriminating, very racist. We are not."*

²⁴⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/packer/survey.html>

²⁴⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/397/2807.html>

Chapter 9 - 60 Minutes credibility gap

Later while Ms Hanson is autographing guests shirts, paper etc... Lau joins queue and says, "*Mrs Hanson it's me again.*" She then asks: "*You did not say the yellow race will one day rule the world? You said your mother said that.*" Ms Hanson immediately denied the statement saying, "*I have never said that.*"

60 Minutes and the interview gained through deception²⁵⁰:

Despite the declaration by David Ettridge that One Nation was finished with *60 Minutes*, the program did get another interview with Pauline Hanson, by deception.

On the 13th June Pauline Hanson's One Nation won eleven seats in the Queensland State Parliament. The night after the election *60 Minutes* used extensive footage from Channel 9's election interview between Paul Lyneham and Ms Hanson for a program *not associated with 60 Minutes*. They did this without Ms Hanson being aware that this footage would be later used by *60 Minutes*. They did this knowing that, in the days leading up to the state election, Ms Hanson had firmly declined the opportunity to be interviewed by *60 Minutes*.

Pauline Hanson told me the next day: "*There was no mention about my interview with Paul Lyneham being for 60 Minutes. The program approached me a couple of weeks ago and I turned them down. I feel deceived by 60 Minutes. I was shocked when I saw my interview with Lyneham appearing on 60 Minutes last night. 60 Minutes know that I do not want to appear on their program.*"

At this time I initiated an e-mail campaign to warn *60 Minutes*' major sponsor, Toyota, that damage could be being done to their good name because of the tactics being employed by the program. The e-mail included Ms Hanson's comments above.

This was Toyota's standard response by e-mail to me and many others:

Date: Tue, 16 Jun 98 17:18:46 +1000 Subject: 60 Minutes

Dear Scott

We wish to acknowledge receipt of your correspondence regarding the recently screened 60 Minutes program. Toyota Australia's association with the Channel 9 program is simply one of sponsorship and precludes our company from influencing editorial content in accordance with the right of free speech for all.

We are certain that as a responsible citizen you will appreciate that any attempt by a major sponsor to manipulate any form of media would be considered immediately as an attempt of unreasonable censorship which of course, would violate not only the law, but also inhibit an important part of our democracy.

We are not privy to the full content of each program prior to it going to air and seek your understanding in this matter.

We value your association with our company and trust that our explanation will permit you to continue this relationship.

Regards, Toyota Net Response Centre on behalf of Toyota Motor Corporation Australia Limited

The "Great 60 Minutes Debate" – 26th July 1998²⁵¹

²⁵⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/298/1506.html>

²⁵¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/60>

Chapter 9 - 60 Minutes credibility gap

In late July about 100 One Nation supporters were invited to question Labor's Graham Richardson and Liberal's Michael Kroger on any issue of their choosing. Key One Nation supporters were contacted "*to ensure that they could voice opinions when the relevant issue of interest was raised*".

A *60 Minutes* producer, "Steve" contacted me at about 4pm on Saturday to find out what line of questioning I would like to put to the Labor/ Liberal/ National party panel. I said the banks but did not tell him the Financial Services Industry Agreement (FSIA) would be the main thrust of my questioning.

About 20 key One Nation members were contacted in this manner by Steve to "*ensure that Richard Carlton knew where to direct his debate when issues were raised*". Those contacted subsequently discovered that they were the very people that interviewer Richard Carlton²⁵² would ignore after they had been identified by Steve before the program began! One Nation's Queensland state director, Peter James, normally a very reserved man, had a heated exchange with Carlton after he continuously refused to accept his question. I found the only way to get a question to Richardson on the FSIA²⁵³ was by just standing up and shouting it out. The whole 'debate' was a farce.

Needless to say the program was cut and edited to make the One Nation group look like a bunch of hooligans who had turned the interview on its head. The panel's patronising attitude was summed up by the National Party representative pointing at the One Nation supporters saying: "*.... the common Australian*". This comment was carefully edited out of the program which eventually went to air.

²⁵² See colour plates for picture of Carlton taken at the debate

²⁵³ Financial Services Industry Agreement.

See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/fsamain.html>

Chapter 10
Censoring the Truth

Demonising One Nation is increasingly proving to be a dangerous game for the media. A million Australians voted for One Nation; by now many of them have had first hand experience of media distortion.

FAIRA's One Nation "Nazi" party²⁵⁴:

In June 1998 the Foundation for Aboriginal and Islander Research Action (FAIRA) posted the following on-line press release calling One Nation Australia's Nazi Party. None of the media challenged this outrageous slur on a legitimate political party:

One Nation is Australia's Nazi Party²⁵⁵

The One Nation Party's policies could lead to the same racial hatred which became the basis for Nazi Germany and, in its extreme, lead to the extermination of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander races in Australia, says Les Malezer, General Manager of the Foundation for Aboriginal and Islander Research Action (FAIRA).

"Pauline Hanson has achieved her notoriety by attacking and accusing our people of exploiting the white people," he said.

Les Malezer says this propaganda campaign is the same type of militant campaign used by Adolf Hitler and the social democrats, the Nazi Party, of the 1930's.

"Pauline Hanson's One Nation Party is the 'Nazi Party of Australia' in the 1990's and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander races are the targets of race attacks, like the Jews were targeted in Europe.

"The Pauline Hanson One Nation Party is inciting cultural genocide by claiming that our culture is inferior and to be feared, and that we must be assimilated to be like white Europeans," he said.

"Pauline Hanson has claimed that Indigenous Australians eat babies, and that we should apologise to white Australians for the past 200 years.

"These sentiments are irrational and pure nonsense, but this type of hatred is highly contagious and dangerous to our people's lives.

"Pauline Hanson's One Nation Party is openly proud of its intention to extinguish our rights in Australian law to possess land.

"The Party uses race to distinguish us as land owners and makes outrageous claims that our legal rights are the cause of white misery in Australia. This is the same propaganda approach used by Adolf Hitler's Nazi Party to dispossess the Jews in Germany."

Les Malezer says the rise of Nazi-type sentiments, aimed at indigenous people in Queensland, should be loathed and avoided.

"The advance of a 'Nazi Party' in Queensland is an insult not only to our races but to the many Australians who fought against the Nazi Government of Germany in World War 2," he said.

²⁵⁴ The FAIRA Web Site: <http://www.faira.org.au/default.htm>

²⁵⁵ See chapter headed "Just who are the extremists?"

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

"We urge all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to campaign vigorously against the Pauline Hanson One Nation Party and its sympathisers, because the futures of our races, and our children are at stake.

"We urge the public to reject the propaganda and hatred of the Pauline Hanson One Nation Party."

It was FAIRA that used the threat of the courts and virtually unlimited taxpayer funding to gain title to a five acre freehold property in 1997/98. The case is typical of the media cover-ups in the whole native title debate. It has never been reported even though the media are fully informed of it²⁵⁶.

The Kippa Ring case demonstrates that freehold title is subject to Aboriginal land claims without recourse to native title²⁵⁷:

In this case, the Ningi people successfully acquired a 5 acre block of freehold land in a prime residential location in the Redcliffe Shire using section 9 of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984 (the Commonwealth Act).

The site, known as Lot 1 of RP 139809, was originally purchased in 1901 by the Clarke family. The present Clarke generation have confirmed that there is no positive evidence that a bora ring was situated on the site. (A "bora ring" is a location used by Aboriginal men in their initiation ceremony.) A bora ring was thought to have once existed in the vicinity before the turn of this century, but its location was understood to be on what is now Klingner Road near the five acre property.

Redcliffe Council (who have spent about Au\$10,000 in legal costs against the Indigenous Land Corporation²⁵⁸ or ILC) undertook an aerial survey of the land to try to substantiate the claims by FAIRA of a spiritual connection to the land.

²⁵⁶ Consideration should be given to the misinformation that emanates from the highest levels in Australian politics today. When Aboriginal leaders like Noel Pearson and politicians like Labor leader Kim Beazley claim that freehold land is safe in Australia they are being less than honest. They are deceiving an un-informed Australian population. Few people know that Noel Pearson was a signatory to the agreement signed following Mabo. The agreement, between indigenous Australians and the Australian government, confirmed that native title could not be claimed over pastoral leases *let alone freehold properties*. Kim Beazley was a member of Paul Keating's Cabinet which drew up and ratified that "agreement". Keating claimed the agreement *extinguished native title on pastoral leases*. But the High Court WIK decision re-wrote the rules on pastoral leases (See: http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/cases/cth/high_ct/unrep299.html) Today Noel Pearson acts for many Aboriginal claimants seeking native title claims over pastoral leases. He has a legal firm. Aboriginal legal expenses on native title claims are footed by the Australian taxpayer. Regarding freehold title current Labor leader Kim Beazley said in Parliament: "The Prime Minister wants to know what we think its (claim over free hold) chances of success are in the High Court - we think them nil."

²⁵⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/title/index.htm>

²⁵⁸ *Note:* The Indigenous Land Corporation (ILC) is another taxpayer funded body that no-one hears very much about but it has done very nicely since its establishment in 1995. The Land Fund (administered by the ILC) was allocated Au\$200 million in 1995 and thereafter an allocation of Au\$121 million per year

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

FAIRA states on their Internet web site²⁵⁹:

As Indigenous Peoples, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples enjoy physical and spiritual connections to their land, waters and environment which cannot be substituted, extinguished or altered without ending their essence as Indigenous Peoples. These physical and spiritual connections are necessary elements of their life energy.

The General Manager of FAIRA is Les Malezer. He is from Gubbi Gubbi country - north of Brisbane – land which includes the Shire of Redcliffe and the Sunshine coast. FAIRA called on the ILC to make an offer to buy out the freehold land owners using taxpayers money.

Despite the Redcliffe Council saying that there was no proof that a bora ring existed on the property the ILC was instructed by Senator Herron, the Coalition Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, to acquire the site. This move has cost the Redcliffe Shire an estimated Au\$30,000 pa in rates and the local economy over Au\$500,000 per annum (from new residents).

Problems arose when the ILC tried to acquire the freehold property. In response Herron ordered a 30 day injunction on the property which had just been purchased by Dellmere Pty Ltd for Au\$750,000 from the Roman Catholic Church trustees of the land. This stopped the developers' plans.

Regarding the ownership of freehold land the developers were given an ultimatum by FAIRA: accept the ILC offer or see us in court. Through the ILC, FAIRA paid the developers a more than generous \$1,127,000 returning a profit to Dellmere Pty Ltd of over 50% in just a few weeks. The Australian taxpayer footed the bill for this windfall.

The site is intended to be used for an Aboriginal Community Centre with accommodation to be built for aboriginal communities from the Peninsula taking part in Bora Ring initiation ceremonies. It is highly unlikely that this will ever happen.

The official Hanson biography no-one ever knew about

On the 21st November 1997 Helen Dodd launched Pauline Hanson's authorised biography "*Pauline, the Hanson Phenomenon*" at the Angus and Robertson bookstore in central Ipswich²⁶⁰.

Among the media throng present at the launch was reporter Jeff Sommerfeld²⁶¹ representing the *Courier-Mail*. He and the paper's photographer spent some time with Pauline Hanson and Helen Dodd. As he left he remarked *that "he had a great story"*. But his "*great story*" was never carried. Instead, the *Courier-Mail* ran an article on a book launch by Bryce Courtenay in Sydney.

until 2004 a total of Au\$1.289 Billion. The yearly allocation is indexed from 1996 to maintain the value in 1996 dollar terms. Of this Au\$121 million allocated each year, Au\$76 million is retained in the Land Fund, Au\$45 million goes to the ILC for land acquisition and management. The ILC is the largest single land owner in Australia.

²⁵⁹ The FAIRA Web Site: <http://www.faira.org.au/default.htm>

²⁶⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/book/>

²⁶¹ See colour plates in centre of the book for photo of Sommerfeld interviewing Ms Hanson and Mrs Dodd at the book launch.

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

Given the newsworthiness of Ms Hanson, a reasonable person can only conclude that Sommerfeld's positive story on her authorised biography was censored by the chiefs-of-staff.

News Ltd papers around the country ignored the book following its launch. In contrast the Murdoch media gave extensive coverage to John Pasquarelli's unauthorised and controversial biography "*The Pauline Hanson story by the man who knows*". A reference in the book led to Channel 9's Midday host, Kerri-Anne Kennerley, calling Pasquarelli a liar on national TV on the 16th February 1998²⁶².

The Rehame Report compared the reporting frequency of these two books and found that Mr Pasquarelli's book was significantly more reported on than Dr. Dodd's by a factor of ten. (Rehame Report - 1997-1998)

Following the release of "*Pauline - The Hanson Phenomenon*", a senior bureaucrat from the south-east Queensland branch of ATSIC publicly attacked Dr. Dodd's businesses and her professionalism and ethical standing as a pharmacist in the community. This personal and libellous attack was reported on Monday 24th November 1997 by the *Queensland Times*. The Aboriginal complainant admitted to not having read the biography. The *Courier-Mail* did not report on the verbal attack against Dr Dodd.

It was only when Dr Dodd was unceremoniously evicted from Pauline Hanson's office at the end of June 1998 that the *Courier-Mail* suddenly made mention of her book. Out of the blue she was referred to as the author of Ms Hanson's authorised biography, "Pauline, the Hanson phenomenon" - a book that most people had never heard of, a book that was not even stocked by the major book stores.

After her eviction Dr Dodd told me that she never gave the *Courier-Mail* an interview and refused to meet with their reporters. She told me that despite her refusal reporters turned up at her home demanding to speak with her. She still refused.

Yet two reporters from the *Courier-Mail*, Michael Madigan and Elizabeth Meryment, quoted her on the 1st July in a large front page article with accompanying file photograph as saying: "*They (the two Davids) are using her (Ms Hanson) for marketing purposes...*"

"*All I can say to Pauline is 'you need to get back in charge very quickly before your credibility gets hurt anymore'.*"

Dr Dodd asks a pertinent question: "*How could the press manufacture this information and run it as a front page story when she did not make these statements? This behaviour demonstrates the flagrant disregard by the press for accurate and truthful reporting*".

Following the launch of "*Pauline, the Hanson phenomenon*", News Limited owned book stores around Australia refused to carry the book – even on consignment. It was largely through the Internet and through the growing One Nation branch network that about 5,000 copies of the biography were eventually sold.

²⁶² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/pasquar.html>

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

The following e-mail was sent to several One Nation members on 29th November to test the availability, or lack of the book:

Subject: How to overcome the apparent media boycott of Pauline Hanson's new biography

Dear One Nation supporter,

It has come to our attention that the newly released authorised biography of "Pauline, the Hanson Phenomenon" is apparently not being stocked by major book sellers in most Australian states.

The big exception to the rule is Queensland where publicity and coverage (apart from Murdoch print media) was given to the book launch and resulting sales in pockets of this state have been excellent. This media coverage has simply not occurred in the other states.

Media monitor feedback to Dr Dodd showed that only "The West Australian" and "The Canberra Times" covered the book launch or any subsequent publicity of any note. (Neither of these papers being in the Murdoch stable).

Reading between the lines Murdoch's News Limited, who dominate the print press, has totally ignored the book.

We would ask you to contact your local major book seller to make a copy of the book available in their store, book details as follows: "Pauline, The Hanson Phenomenon" by Helen Dodd, publishers Boolarong Press, Queensland ISBN #0646332171.

This action will result in the book being ordered by your local book store who have the details on how to make orders for the book. If they say they do not wish to order or stock the book please contact GWB with the details of the book store.

It is important to note that the book store does not pay for the book as it is on consignment and anything that they do not sell is returned to the publisher so there is no financial cost to the book store.

We are confident that the book will be sold, based on extraordinary sales in Queensland, but without the publicity the general public will not be aware that the book is available. It appears that the mainstream media are attempting to prevent the book reaching its potential audience Australia wide.

Your assistance in overcoming this apparent act of censorship would be greatly appreciated.

GWB

Scott Balson.

The e-mail drew a number of replies. Those reproduced below were typical.

Dear Scott,

As requested in the above e-mail, I contacted three of the major book stores in Newcastle, the ABC book shop, Angus & Robertson and Dymocks.

- ☐ *Angus & Robertson said that it was not on their list of new releases, but that they would try and order it in for me. They also suggested that I try One Nation. Dymocks checked their listings of new releases and couldn't find it, but said that if it had only been out for a short time then I should try again in a week or two.*

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

- *The ABC book shop, - surprise, surprise-, said NO they did not have it and NO they were not going to get it in. When asked why, she did not know, she just knew they were not getting it.*
Regards Dave Bland.

And:

I discussed this with someone familiar with the book trade, who said “the big mainstream booksellers only stock books aimed at reinforcing the ‘desired consensus reality’, or deliberately changing this ‘reality’ towards meeting their newer objectives. Further, that you were fortunate to have enjoyed big sales in Queensland. That if sales only in Queensland were permitted, then this could be a tactic in another strategy, and you might well be advised to consider what alternative strategic scenarios would be served by this tactic”.

I contacted four bookstores:

- *Kmart at Campbellfield, Vic: “Not in stock. Don’t know whether we are getting it”*
- *Angus & Robertson, Swanston St: “Don’t have it, not on our CD Rom, try our Bourke St store.”*
- *Angus & Robertson, Bourke St: “I have heard of it, there are no plans to get it in, we don’t normally stock that kind of thing. We could order it in if you want it.”*
- *McGills, Elizabeth St: “We don’t have it on order.”*

My informant said, “such censorship” is not “apparent”, it is real. It has been in existence since the scribes of Sumeria 6000 years ago, and is a key component of the oligarchical systems of government that have been in control in all “civilised” cultures since then. As the French say “The more things change, the more they stay the same!” You could study the methods used by other groups, such as those in the alternative health field, to market their products and books, and adapt these techniques to suit your requirements.”

Bob

And:

Here in Melbourne , one of our major book stores called McGills in central city do not stock Helen Dodd’s new book .

They will only bring in a copy of the book following a deposit by the interested customer, otherwise they do not plan to have it stocked on the shelves.

regards

Greg

Despite the book being available on consignment to major book sellers around the country not one, even when approached, ordered it. The lack of media coverage given to the book would have been a contributing factor.

In contrast, the release of another Hanson book “The Truth”²⁶³ at the launch of Pauline Hanson’s One Nation party received extensive media coverage because it generated negative publicity.

The official One Nation launch – 11th April 1997²⁶⁴:

²⁶³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/onenation/truth/>

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

While the television stations²⁶⁵ showed graphic scenes of demonstrators harassing elderly supporters arriving at the launch and of Pauline Hanson running the gauntlet to get into the Ipswich Civic Centre, little or no coverage was given to her speech which raised concerns about the country's future²⁶⁶. What made the national news that night was footage of a broken window after a violent demonstrator had kicked-in a large plate of glass in the front door of the civic building.

The broken glass provided the Labor-dominated Ipswich City Council with an excuse to ban One Nation from holding any more functions on the council's property. The ban continued up to the October 1998 federal elections resulting in Ms Hanson being forced to speak to her Ipswich constituents at an open meeting in Nicholas Street²⁶⁷ outside the Civic Hall on the 4th August 1998²⁶⁸. At this meeting some 100 demonstrators tried to shout her down. And the TV coverage? That night the television stations broadcasted a small piece of footage of Pauline Hanson shouting back at the demonstrators.

This is how I summarised the April 1997 launch night of One Nation²⁶⁹:

It was wonderful to have enjoyed the companionship and the vision of all those who attended the launch. These were real Aussies who were sick and tired of the major parties lies.

They had run the gauntlet through a mob of undisciplined and abusive protestors and had not responded.

I was privileged to be there, to be among them - real Aussies, and it will be a day I will always recall as history moves on and what will be, will be.

When I left the Civic Centre at 11.30pm there was one solitary protestor standing outside holding up a placard.

While walking to my car about 100 metres away three teenage Aboriginal girls approached me and said "You fucking shit". This comment being made without provocation. I felt like responding but said nothing - like other Aussies I was scared because by doing so I would be misquoted and become the attack of some sensational reporting in the media. Where was the equality in our country I wondered.

Sadly we are not, at the moment, One Nation. The evening's events highlighted this. Here we had all the major television stations recording the event. Yet nothing negative was reported about the actions of the protestors and their unprovoked abuse.

The 'quality' Melbourne Age failed to even report on the launch of a new political party as J G Estiot, of Media Watch Interactive, wrote (14/4/97): "*Why then the silence from the Melbourne Age? The launch of the new political party took place on Friday evening and was reported that day on television on the late news (10:30pm). It did not feature in either the Saturday or the Sunday editions of "The Age".*

²⁶⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/launch.html>

²⁶⁵ See colour plates for photograph of television cameras recording the chaos at the launch.

²⁶⁶ See: Appendix "B" for full transcript of Hanson's One Nation launch speech in April 1997

²⁶⁷ See colour plate of media at Nicholas Street rally.

²⁶⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/nicholas/>

²⁶⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/onenat3.html>

The First Eleven:

Just two weeks before the October Federal Election, the *Sydney Morning Herald* featured a lengthy article by reporter Frank Robson headed “*The First Eleven*” in its “*Good Weekend*” magazine of the 19-20th September 1998. The article’s primary purpose was to denigrate the One Nation party – targeting the party’s Queensland State MPs.

Robson's article ridiculed the One Nation MP for Burdekin:

The new member for Burdekin considers himself an authority on Aboriginals, as he calls them, and hopes one day to become the State’s Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. If he does he’ll try to implement his plan to have rural Aborigines return to the old system of working, without pay, for white pastoralists. As Knuth sees it, this would eliminate Aboriginal land grabs (they would camp, as of old, beside station billabongs) as well as their problems with alcohol because, without pay, they couldn’t buy any.

Knuth not only justified himself at the interview but also demonstrated Robson's lack of ethics²⁷⁰:

The book “Raparapa” was the main emphasis of my comments made to a journalist (Robson) who has distorted the message I was trying to deliver. “Raparapa” is a book written by twelve Aboriginal stockmen who grew up and worked the large cattle properties of the Kimberleys. The main thrust of my comments was directed at the decision of the Government of the day in the early 1970s to force graziers to pay the hundreds of Aboriginal stockmen and their families the same wage as white stockmen. Their decision, at first glance, seemed fair but this is where the twelve stockmen give account of the tragedy that has befallen the Aboriginal people that were forced to leave their traditional way of hunting, culture and their union with white men’s horses and cattle.

As was falsely reported, I did not show any malice towards the Aboriginal people, my true statement reads that I thought the Aboriginal people were a wonderful carefree natured race and their simplistic way of talking had always appealed to me. My further comments about alcoholism was to point out what a tragedy has befallen this once proud people. The consequences of alcohol has caused so much self-destruction in the Aboriginal community, I also commented that alcohol should be taken away from Aboriginals, this decision should be left up to them, as has been done by some Aboriginal communities....

I did, however, admit that as an experiment if some Aboriginals would like to return to living on the land and working in with pastoralists this should be made available according to what the twelve elders in the book “Raparapa” are advocating.

In conclusion the journalist had quoted some truth in what I have stated but has twisted what I have said to show malice towards myself and One Nation and has personally branded me as a racist or as one with an ideology of returning to black slavery. This is far from the truth and has left my faith in interviews with journalists in mistrust.

If anyone is interested in more on this subject buy the book “Raparapa”.

The *Courier-Mail*'s Jeff Sommerfeld listened to and reported on the tape of the Robson interview with Knuth on Monday 21st September. The tape clearly showed the manner in which Knuth had been quoted out of context by Robson.

²⁷⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/knuth.html>

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

But Sommerfeld's story was not published by the *Courier-Mail* despite media interest in Robson's article which had been successful in generating negative reports about One Nation in newspapers and television stations around the country.

For example, on Sunday night, the 20th September it was reported nationally that Pauline Hanson labelled Knuth's *comments* 'stupid' after reading them. The *Sydney Morning Herald's* senior political reporter Margo Kingston was seen on national television showing Ms Hanson the distorted Knuth statement in the "Good Weekend" magazine.

Having rejected Sommerfeld's story, the *Courier-Mail* restricted their coverage of One Nation on Tuesday 22nd September to reporting on a New Idea article in which Mrs Hanson's son Steven was quoted as saying that he had no contact with his mother. Pauline Hanson - racist, Nazi and now 'bad mother' into the bargain.

The *Courier-Mail* showed no interest in redressing a blatant misrepresentation.

The entire context of Knuth's comments to Robson was based around the alcohol-related problems facing Aboriginal communities. The subsequent reporting on the same issue of alcohol abuse in Aboriginal communities by police commissioner O'Sullivan just six weeks later was very different.

On the 4th November 1998, the *Courier-Mail* carried a front page story which included the following statement²⁷¹:

Queensland's police commissioner Jim O'Sullivan yesterday called for an inquiry into alcoholism and violence on remote Aboriginal communities.

O'Sullivan said, "The women don't even have money for clothes or food, and the children live on Coke and chips.

"These women are the most vulnerable in Australia and are suffering because of the uncontrolled drinking that goes on (amongst Aboriginal men). I have seen it countless times and my officers have to deal with it.

"A whole lot of positive things would fall into place for Aboriginal people once the problem was addressed. The mortality rates, illness, crime, general health, education - everything would improve overnight if the drunkenness was addressed.

"What is needed is some sensible people, with indigenous input, to continue a proper inquiry and put a stop to this carnage once and for all."

The article noted that Murandoo Yanner, an outspoken Aboriginal activist, said, *"If you put the very worst abusers of women, the criminals on an outstation for two months, you would not believe that they are the same person."*

Then the *Courier-Mail* reported Cape York Land Council chairman Noel Pearson saying on the 29th April 1999 *"The most dangerous time in the life of an Aboriginal child is the Wednesday or Thursday when the welfare cheque arrives"*. In the interview with The *Courier-Mail*, Mr Pearson (a lawyer consulting to Arnold Bloch Leibler on Aboriginal issues) continued that the welfare system was a poison which left Aboriginal recipients dependent on government welfare payments they had not earned.

"The government is paying these people to sit around the canteen to drink and destroy the prospects of their children - destroy society.

"The madness of that system has to stop."

Pearson was immediately hailed the hero by gutless politicians like Queensland Premier Peter Beattie who had, until then, refused to be drawn into the argument.

²⁷¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/498/0411.html>

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

Where had Beattie been when Knuth made his stand on the same issue and how hypocritical of Jackie Huggins, a politically correct Aboriginal historian and director of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander studies unit at the University of Queensland, to say that the language used by Mr Pearson would play into the hands of “rednecks”.

Alcohol and substance abuse by Aborigines were issues of real concern but Mr Pearson's comments were unnecessarily inflammatory, she said.

“The way in which they are described leaves a lot to the imagination and will give fodder to the rednecks out there and the people who continue to stereotype and use Aboriginal people as scapegoats,” Ms Huggins said.

Now here is the great divide while Pearson can say the obvious and be applauded and cautioned because he *“had played into the hands of rednecks”*... his comment is not racist and was not taken out of context.

For expressing the same views for the same reason - the alcohol problem among Aborigines - Jeff Knuth was ridiculed by Robson. He was not the only loser – so were the Aboriginal people whose plight Robson so callously used to do his hatchet job on One Nation.

Not surprisingly for such a misguided reporter, Robson referred to me in the same article in *“The Good Weekend”* as *“their (One Nation’s) karaoke scribe”* after a forty five minute telephone interview during which I raised a number of concerns none of which were raised in the *“First Eleven”* article.

The MAI²⁷² Multilateral Agreement on Investment:

‘We are writing the constitution of a single global economy (through the MAI).’
Renato Ruggerio, Director General of the World Trade Organisation

It was Hanson who alerted the Australian nation to the existence of the MAI, a treaty so obnoxious it had been covered up by bureaucrats for several years²⁷³.

Through my association with Ms Hanson as the One Nation webmaster, I had my own taste of selective censorship by the *Courier-Mail* after I challenged the accuracy of an article, *“Conspiracy Theories”*, written by Peter Charlton and published on 21st March 1998²⁷⁴. The article presented the opinion that the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) was good for Australia.

In *“Conspiracy Theories”* Charlton referred to my company:

“And so it is with the information on the MAI. Take, for example, The MAI, a web page prepared by Global Web Builders on behalf of Pauline Hanson MP which makes the following claim, “The MAI is the international linchpin of what is, in the end, a totalitarian project for world rule”. Hanson’s page builders quote, with obvious approval, Malaysia Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad: “The traders apparently make billions with each transaction. But when the funds at their disposal are huge and they are in a position to influence the values of the currencies with their investments and divestments, then the currency markets become cash cows to them.”

²⁷² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai>

²⁷³ See chapter headed “Winners and losers in today’s media”

²⁷⁴ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/cour2.html>

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

Other links shown include 'The enemy - MAI negotiators', including the OECD home page. Frequently the critics of the MAI claim the negotiations are being carried out in secret, yet their own web pages show how the reports can be obtained and downloaded from the Internet. Hanson told Parliament on March 9: "I must state that that as it is not possible to download the text of the agreement of the Treasury Internet site on a computer disc, it is very difficult and expensive to distribute the text of the treaty."

I had been closely following the MAI for nearly a year and wrote a clearly marked "right of reply"²⁷⁵.

Despite not publishing either my reply or a requested abridged version of it, the *Courier-Mail* ran a follow up article by Charlton called "Gurus of Gloom". Without my permission he actually quoted from my right of reply. I later discovered through a phone call to Ms Fussell that she had noted with some surprise that extracts from my right of reply had been used. She said that the second Charlton article had been supervised by the *Courier-Mail*'s Editor-in-Chief, Chris Mitchell and that she could not do anything about it.

In "Gurus of Gloom" Charlton wrote²⁷⁶:

In a long response to last week's report on the MAI, Balson wrote, "The veil of secrecy that has been wrapped around this agreement should be of concern to all Australians as exclusions.... will be wound back or cancelled under the current MAI draft agreement while no new exclusions requested by a signatory country will be entertained. With the incredible changes taking place in technology today, how could we be so stupid to agree to this?"

Telstra will be in the midst of these technology changes and, like the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, will be a prime target for foreign takeover as the MAI, once signed, will sooner rather than later invalidate any government restrictions on foreign ownership in a valuable communications giant.

Furthermore, how can an Australian government sign a treaty which will allow multinationals like McDonalds (the fast-food chain) to take any level of government to an international court if they believe they are being discriminated against? In a recent pre-MAI example, McDonalds took the Port Douglas shire, with just 3,000 ratepayers, to an Australian court because the council would not allow Big Mac to breach its council regulations by erecting a large golden arches sign. How could the shire afford to defend itself in an international forum against this financial giant?"

Balson's arguments are similar to Martin's: excessively gloomy, with frequently asserted conclusions based on the most remote of circumstances. Yet Balson is right when he quotes Renato Ruggerio, director general of the World Trade Organisation, on the MAI: "We are writing the constitution of a single global economy."

As will be seen in Appendix "E" my letters were centred around a comparison of the detrimental impact on Australia of the signed Financial Services Industry Agreement (FSIA) and the potentially detrimental impact of the unsigned MAI. The FSIA was totally overlooked by Charlton in "Gurus of Gloom".

Charlton had suddenly become a world expert on the MAI to hundreds of thousands of Queenslanders. I took this matter up with the *Australian Press Council* (APC) after being told by the *Australian Journalists Association* that he

²⁷⁵ See Appendix "E"

²⁷⁶ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/cour3.html>

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

was not a member of and, therefore, not bound by their journalistic code of ethics.

(Earlier in my written complaint to the APC²⁷⁷ I had noted that, *"I contacted Chris Perkins of the Australian Journalist Association on Monday 30th March. He told me: 'We only have jurisdiction over AJA members who are bound by the code of ethics. None of those you mentioned are members so are not bound by the code of ethics. Your only recourse is the Australian Press Council'."*)

On 22nd May 1998, after a truly memorable day in Sydney²⁷⁸, Charlton admitted to me before the APC that he had presented, unedited, the OECD viewpoint on the MAI. As the OECD was *the negotiator behind*, and the proponents of the MAI, their view of the treaty is hardly disinterested. The alternative viewpoint, debated on the Internet by international lawyers, journalists, politicians and academics, was never presented even though Charlton would have had the opportunity to view their arguments. Balance, one would feel, demanded that the media consider the views of reputable people who had studied the MAI for months and who feared the impact of the treaty. This was not the case in either of his reports.

The APC rejected my complaint²⁷⁹.

Lorenzo Ervin and the Labor Party lead the Sydney Olympic Games boycott²⁸⁰:

When Lorenzo Ervin arrived on Australian shores in 1997 it was Pauline Hanson who protested about the failure of the immigration system to prevent his visit.

The media's immediate response was predictable: Ms Hanson was accused of racism because Ervin was a black American. Several weeks later when Ervin refused to leave the country after being ordered to do so, he was detained, then deported by the government.

Ervin was not just any black American as Coalition Minister Philip Ruddock later wrote in August 1997:

Mr Ervin's visa was cancelled because of his past criminal conduct. Mr Ervin is a convicted kidnapper and hijacker for which he received two terms of life imprisonment. Some years later Mr Ervin was convicted to a term of ten years in prison for an assault on a Corrections Officer. Despite his claims to the contrary, the United States Federal Parole Office has advised that he has never received executive clemency from the United States Government."

Prior to this on the 14th August 1997 Pauline Hanson's One Nation distributed the following press release to the media²⁸¹:

Ervin can't take the hint

Despite the Howard Government's bungling of the whole Ervin affair, in particular letting him enter Australia although they had two months warning of his arrival, it should have been clear to Ervin that Australia doesn't want him or the trouble he peddles.

²⁷⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/multi/courethc.html>

²⁷⁸ MD

²⁷⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/apc1.html>

²⁸⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/left/ervin4.html>

²⁸¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/onenation/press/140897b.html>

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

However, Lorenzo Komboa Ervin simply can't take a hint. not only is he planning to illegally return to Australia, but he is going to send more of his kind as well. All Australians, regardless of their birthplace or cultural origin, must be horrified by the prospect of Ervin's message of revolution.

Ervin is in contact with radicals in Australia through Left Link, the violent on-line underground arm of the ALP²⁸². Through this link he is leading the plan for an 'indigenous peoples' boycott of the Sydney Olympics which he describes as the, 'Bread and Circus Olympics on stolen land soaked with the blood of your ancestors.'

He describes the Australian government as, 'The Howard - Hanson racist government', and yet I am not in Government and my call for equality for all Australians with assistance provided on the basis of need not race is quite the opposite of the Government's racially based policies.

Ervin describes himself as, 'an emissary of black autonomy international', and our country as, 'the land the white man calls Australia'. He also makes the point that many will, 'join you to obtain the birthright to which you are entitled: land and independence'.

Ervin is an international terrorist, he preaches revolution and further describes himself as, 'a warrior'. He also states, no barrier or territorial border of the white man will prevent my return'. He is dangerous and will only incite racial hatred and violence. It is imperative that all Australians reject him and all he represents."

The press release followed extensive research on the moderated messages posted by Left Link, the radical left wing arm of the Australian Labor Party.

The incredible claim in this press release - that an activist group associated with The Australian Labor Party was actively supporting the boycott of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games - was totally ignored by the media. I demonstrated the association to Sid Maher, a political reporter for Murdoch's *Sunday Mail* in Brisbane²⁸³ on 5th September 1997. He said that he agreed and that the link would be exposed. It never was.

Ervin's initial press release followed closely on his deportation. It appeared on Left Link's moderated on-line message board after being forwarded on the 10th August 1997 by Jim and Yvonne Duffy. (The Duffy's Nyungah Aboriginal website proudly states, "The smell of the white man is killing us"²⁸⁴.)

Subject: Re: (Fwd) LL:Mr Lorenzo and his Deportation from Australia
Hello to the Elders of the Nyungah Tribe:

It is with great sadness that I must write you from across the waters, not having been able to enter your lands as an emissary of Black Autonomy International, and I was literally driven out of the country with the police standing two steps behind me, and then told that I was permanently barred from returning to the land the white man calls Australia. I am one person and with the power of the state, the Howard-Hanson racist government, it should have been no surprise that I was finally forced to leave at that time. I had resisted in the courts for sometime, and had even been offered by Indigenous people safety and seclusion in their lands outside of the cities. I chose at that time not to go underground, but I have been a warrior all my life, and swore that I would

²⁸² See chapter headed "The anti-One Nation extremists"

²⁸³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/sunmail.html#cover>

²⁸⁴ See: <http://www.omen.com.au/~staffy/index.htm>

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

return, and no barrier or territorial border of the Whiteman will prevent my return. Not only will I personally return, but I will send others from my organisation to investigate the condition of your/our people further, will conduct an international conference on the genocide and land theft of the tribes of your country (to which we are asking that you will send a Nyungah) next year, and as I promised you I would begin to conduct the international boycott against the white Australian government. This has begun even as we speak. I have set up the Boycott 2000 Coalition in those 17 countries which protested my false imprisonment in Australia, and I assure you that many others, white, Black, Asian, Native Americans, Mexican-Americans, and the whole of humankind will hear of your plight, and join you to obtain the birthright to which you are entitled: land and independence.

Your letter is so important because it not only makes your wishes known, but it confirms our statements that an international boycott of these bread and circus Olympic games, on stolen land soaked with the blood of your ancestors, is really the way forward to winning the human rights of the Indigenous people in the land known as Australia.

Lorenzo Komboa Ervin

The post was just the warm up for the main event, a subsequent letter by Ervin on Left Link which went so far as to give full banking account details of the “Boycott 2000 Coalition” and calling for donations. The post confirmed what Ms Hanson had claimed in her earlier press release. Sid Maher viewed the post below and the direct on-line links to the Australian Labor Party on Friday 5th September 1997. This was the story that never made The *Sunday Mail* (note I have censored information like the boycott bank account details):

Subject: LL:Olympic Boycott materials²⁸⁵

From: Lorenzo Komboa Ervin XXXXX@mindspring.com Date: Thu, 28 Aug 1997 23:19:26 -0400 (EDT) Message-ID: 1997 08291032.

UAA23344@yarra.vicnet.net.au Mailing List: LEFTLINK@vicnet.net.au

[Below is a posting from Lorenzo Ervin initiating an international campaign to boycott the Sydney 2000 Olympics. Although it has a number of factual errors and makes some unsubstantiated claims it has been posted to the list for the information of subscribers.]²⁸⁶

BOYCOTT RACIST AUSTRALIA!

(This section carrying the “factual errors” has been removed)

WHAT CAN YOU DO?

1. Do not attend the 2000 Olympic Games in Sydney, AUSTRALIA, and tell everyone you know not to attend. Call on them to begin a tourist and trade boycott of AUSTRALIA before and after the Olympics. In fact, advise your church, club, union, college and other community institution about the racist mistreatment of Australian Aborigines and get them to join the economic boycott campaign.

2. Write letters of protest to the Australian government about its racist and politically biased immigration policies, including the permanent banning order

²⁸⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/left/ervin4.html> for unedited version

²⁸⁶ Left Link moderator’s comment

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

against Lorenzo Komboa Ervin filed by Philip Ruddock, Minister of Immigration, (to the Prime Minister below).

3. Don't use products made in AUSTRALIA such as Foster's beer, Qantas airlines, etc. A full list of products and services will be posted later.

4. Write letters to the Australian government about its racist treatment of the Aborigines and Torres Strait Island people living in the country to: Mr. John Howard Prime Minister Parliament House Canberra ACT 2600 AUSTRALIA e-mail: john.howard@liberal.org.au

5. Begin a campaign in your county to convince Olympics team officials and the government of your country not to send athletes or to participate in the Australian Olympics in the year 2000.

6. Begin a sanctions campaign in your country to convince the government authorities and business associations in your country to cut off all military aid, trade and economic support, and other foreign aid to AUSTRALIA until it recognizes the human rights of the Aboriginal people, gives them reparations for centuries of abuse, and recognizes their title to the land.

7. MAKE A DONATION to the Boycott 2000 Coalition. We will need money to fight, for printing, copying, mailing, phone calling and a host of other things. Your financial contribution is important:

BOYCOTT 2000 CAMPAIGN Account # XXXXXXXX XXXX Tennessee Bank
XXX Market Street Chattanooga, TN. 37402 (USA)

(Details in full in original post)

8. Reprint this article in your newsletter, newspaper, or Internet newsgroup to get the word out on the boycott. Write to newspapers, call radio talk shows, and television news departments as well.

9. If you would like a speaker to visit your college, community or your country to talk about the boycott and international human rights, please write to:

Lorenzo Komboa Ervin Black Autonomy International XXXXX Avenue
Chattanooga, TN. 37404 e-mail: XXXXX@mindspring.com OR:
XXXXX@hotmail.com

(Boycott 200 Web site under construction).

-END-

After the *Sunday Mail* refused to carry the story about the link between the Sydney 2000 Boycott and the Labor Party I contacted the *Courier-Mail* and once again demonstrated this. The paper reported the Ervin boycott threat under the headline "Ex-Panther urges Olympic boycott"²⁸⁷ (03/09/97). No reference was made to the Labor Party association. Here are extracts from that article:

Mr Ervin, who was initially granted an American visa despite serving 13 years in jail for hijacking an aircraft to Cuba in 1969, also refers to Pauline Hanson's One Nation Party as a 'fascist, white supremacist (sic) electoral movement'.

And

American black activist Lorenzo Ervin has called for an international boycott of the Sydney 2000 Olympics, and is using the Internet to rally support.

Mr Ervin, the former Black Panther movement member who was threatened with deportation from Australia in July, has given a list of 'crimes' of the Australian 'white racist regime' to international figures including US President Bill Clinton and British MPs.

²⁸⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/courerv1.html>

QANTAS the “Australian” airline

On the 23rd June 1998 Channel 9 News revealed that Qantas had sent a written request instructing them to censor news stories about Ms Hanson and her One Nation party from the inflight news bulletin²⁸⁸. The Channel 9 network is the news provider for the international airline:

Head of public affairs for Qantas, Mr Bernard Shirley, confirmed that a staff member of the airline’s inflight entertainment office, Ms Susie McGlinn, had written to Channel 9’s program manager, Mr Michael Healy, the previous Friday requesting the network to eliminate any reference to Ms Hanson and One Nation in the bulletins.

Mr Shirley said the letter was written after a Qantas staffer returning to Australia from overseas complained about inflight news items he found “unacceptable”. Mr Shirley would not name the staffer, but other sources familiar with the incident said they believed it was a Qantas manager returning from Indonesia who felt news items about Ms Hanson were offensive to Indonesian passengers on the flight.

Mr Healy passed the written request on to Nine’s news director, Mr Paul Fenn, who sent a strongly worded response to Qantas on Monday saying that if the ban on Ms Hanson were implemented, it would make it impossible for the network to provide any stories on Federal politics or the coming Federal election:

“I said with an election campaign coming up, we wouldn’t be able to mention [Prime Minister] John Howard or [Opposition Leader] Kim Beazley or [National Party Leader] Tim Fischer, which makes it a little bit tough,” Channel 9’s Mr Fenn said.

The letter drew a quick response from Qantas’ Mr Shirley, who wrote back to ‘clarify’ what he described as *“what seems to have been an overzealous internal interpretation of a request to delete any racially offensive material from the news Channel 9 prepares for Qantas”*:

In the interests of providing a worthwhile news service, Qantas does not want you to exclude any valid political stories from the bulletins. However, we specifically do not want you to include reports which contain material that is offensive to any particular ethnic group.

You will appreciate that in providing services to people from throughout the world, we try to ensure that we do not offend them through insensitivities in our inflight video programs.

It was reported that while Mr Fenn was happy to accept Mr Shirley’s clarification of the situation, Ms Hanson was understandably angry about the incident.

Her adviser, Mr David Oldfield, said it was *“disgraceful, un-Australian activity asking Channel 9 to be political censors on behalf of Qantas”*.

“Everything that is said publicly, people should have the right to judge for themselves whether something matters or doesn’t,” he said.

“But it certainly isn’t up to any airline or anyone else to decide that legitimate public debate isn’t to be viewed.”

²⁸⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/298/2406.html>

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

The “Racist” One Nation webmaster

On Friday 4th September 1998 I was contacted by Chris Griffith from the *Sunday Mail* who asked me to respond to an allegation in the Brisbane Anglican Church's September 1998 edition of the Focus paper that I was a racist.

As I knew nothing about the article, Griffith faxed me a copy which was headed “(One Nation) Party HQ emails show racist sentiment”²⁸⁹.

It was written by Focus' editor Paul Osborne who named me as the person “in charge of One Nation e-mail”. In the article Osborne refers to posts made over the Internet allegedly by One Nation including one which reads,

“Go away you (expletive) chin. Australia doesn't (sic) want you. (Expletive) off you yellow (expletive). Pauline Hanson”.

Griffith faxed me copies of the original posts as well. From these posts I was quickly able to ascertain that they had in fact originated from an Internet Service Provider called Netspace²⁹⁰ in Camberwell, Victoria. The “spammer”²⁹¹ of the One Nation e-mail address was most probably a very politically active Asian poster who had an anti-One Nation web site hosted by Netspace at that time.

I reported on the *Australian National News of the Day* that after I got back to Griffith and told him what my investigations had uncovered he seemed to lose all interest in the story when it appeared that the originator of the racist posts was not anyone associated with One Nation but most probably a spammer of Asian descent. He replied by e-mail the next day²⁹²:

Hi Scott,

I saw your reference to me on your web site. Actually I didn't lose interest in the issue as you claim & I've written a story about it. Whether it has appeared or not, I too will know tomorrow.

Chris Griffith

Of course the story was never run by the *Sunday Mail* (6th September 1998). The Murdoch chiefs-of-staff would not have published a story which contradicted their carefully presented view that One Nation was racist. However, had I admitted to making the posts the front page of the *Sunday Mail* would have been very different that day.

For the record, Focus published an apology in their November 1998 edition:

“Focus sincerely apologises to Mr Scott Balson, manager of Global Web Builder, for any hurt the article “Party HQ shows racist sentiments”, published in the September issue of Focus, may have caused him or his company.

“Focus acknowledges that the e-mail messages mentioned in the story were not sent by Mr Balson or anyone associated with his company or Pauline Hanson's One Nation Party, but by another source not connected to either Mr Balson or One Nation.”

The November apology only coming after pressure was brought to bear by me on the Church hierarchy after the editor wrote the following dismissive statement in response to my letter of complaint carried in the October issue, “*Focus rejects the claim of being judge, jury and executioner*”.

²⁸⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/0509.html>

²⁹⁰ See: <http://www.netspace.com.au/>

²⁹¹ “Spammer” is a person who uses the alias of others to hide his or her own identity on the Internet.

²⁹² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/0609.html>

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

“Making” the news

At the launch of One Nation's federal campaign just days before the October 1998 federal election the media ‘made the news’. David Oldfield became the target of the media's wrath at this event.

The launch was held at the Gatton Senior Citizens Hall in the centre of Blair where Ms Hanson had been selected as One Nation's candidate²⁹³.

Here are some brief extracts from Pauline's unpublished launch speech²⁹⁴:

“This Saturday Australians will decide if it is the elite of the media, of academia and those others who see themselves above ordinary Australians who dictate our future, or whether it will be the people themselves who decide our fate.

“This election, we either make a difference or we will be made to be different, as our Australian identity is taken from us and we are left as just another corner of the world whose standards of living and security has been lowered.

“I say jobs, jobs, jobs not just government handouts and the short-term action of simply creating government funded positions.”

Sydney Morning Herald senior political journalist, Margo Kingston, said later that it was a shame that the farce transpired after the launch *“because it had been the most positive One Nation event that she had covered in the lead up to the Federal Election”*.

After Ms Hanson's speech and the official public launch the media were asked by David Oldfield to leave and told that they could get more party policy documents as they left. The One Nation members remained behind to discuss the manning of booths in Pauline Hanson's seat of Blair that Saturday, and other issues related to supporting Pauline Hanson on election day.

For about ten minutes the journalists, cameramen and photographers complied, while the assembled One Nation supporters prepared for the private post-launch meeting. Pauline Hanson was signing a One Nation t-shirt on the back of one of her supporters when a disturbance was heard at the rear of the room.

The media were returning - lead by the Sydney Morning Herald's Margo Kingston and the Courier-Mail's Christine Jackman²⁹⁵.

The pair confronted David Oldfield in front of the members. The television cameras recorded every moment of a remarkable media-inspired situation where Margo Kingston cried foul because the policy documents had not been accompanied by promised costings²⁹⁶.

While Margo Kingston repeatedly shouted, *“Where are the costings you promised us Mr Oldfield*, for the benefit of those gathered in the hall. Oldfield said that they would be faxed to their offices later that day. They were.

The Courier-Mail's Jackman called Hill a liar over her comments on ABC Radio 4QR. *“Why did you lie about the Courier-Mail on radio today Mrs Hill,”* Christine Jackman shouted.

²⁹³ See: [http:// www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/federal/28sept](http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/federal/28sept)

²⁹⁴ See Appendix “A”

²⁹⁵ Jackman has since relocated to New York. The Courier-Mail intermittently carries her articles referring to Jackman as their “New York correspondent”.

²⁹⁶ For the record, the costings were faxed to the media at 5pm giving plenty of time to prepare commentary before the deadlines for the next day's papers.

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

The next day Jackman alleged in the *Courier-Mail* that Heather Hill had said on the morning of the launch “*you pick up the Courier-Mail and you have three pages of very detailed policy of the major political parties and only a few lines from One Nation*”²⁹⁷.

It was a most remarkable situation in that the media, instead of reporting on issues, were actually creating the story that would appear on television that night and in the Australian papers the next day.

The journalists and cameramen who came back into the private meeting were behaving in a manner which could do their profession no good, yet they would be judge and jury on how the incident was reported. No violent group of protesters, such as those at the One Nation meeting in Dandenong could have such an influence on the perception of what had happened. It was a defining moment for the press, and more so for those One Nation supporters who witnessed it in astonished enlightenment.

Despite the pleas and shouts for them to leave from the One Nation members assembled for a private meeting, they refused. The Kingston/Jackman questions were repeatedly shouted at anyone who would listen - leaving those in the hall wondering if the journalists were there to cover the news or to make it. Thoroughly intimidated, many supporters started to leave.

The event turned into farce as the media started interviewing each other with the remaining One Nation supporters sitting quietly stunned and shocked by the outrageous behaviour of the journalists and camera crews. Pauline Hanson stood on the stage watching, noting the damage that was being done not only to her party, but to the voice of the Australian people she represented.

The reporters and cameramen were no better than a group of gatecrashers who, uninvited and unwelcome, had taken over a private meeting. Kingston and Jackman led the gate crash and sat in the centre of the bright television lights²⁹⁸. The media interviewed both and then each other looking for a disparaging story - a story which they had created. Ms Hanson’s message at the launch of One Nation went unreported.

Oldfield went to the stage shortly after the media had taken over a corner near the front of the hall. He had advised the assembly that the police had been called to evict them. “*I would ask you not to become involved in arguments with the media, they are not worth it,*” he said.

He continued: “*Those members of the media who are not wanting to be involved in this particular situation and are decent enough to leave, please do so. Those of you who are not decent enough to leave, bear in mind we have just called the police and we will have you ejected.*” Not one moved – they stared challengingly back at him as if the words had no meaning.

A reporter, armed with a large microphone and recording gear, used his mobile to contact home base to get legal advice on whether he should leave the hall if the police ordered him to.

A few minutes later two policemen arrived. They walked into a situation where the alleged law breakers were those who had the power to report on events as

²⁹⁷ I was told by a reporter at The *Courier-Mail* that Jackman said subsequently that she had been misinformed and that her “liar” comment aimed at Mrs Hill was incorrect. Neither a retraction nor an apology was ever published.

²⁹⁸ See colour plates in centre of book

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

they saw fit. The police knew how to deal with normal protesters - but how do you evict journalists covering a private meeting or, more accurately, becoming their own news? The hapless police became the new focus of media attention with the cameras being turned on them. There could be no clearer form of intimidation – and indeed they featured in news stories on millions of television sets around the country that same night.

The police were intimidated and did nothing. They left – the media had won once again. After some lengthy discussions and with no more action likely, boredom finally made the journalists and reporters along with their cameramen and photographers leave the hall. The media sit in had lasted about half an hour.

There were no arrests - but the ethics of those who provide the news day after day were never questioned. How could the media be objective in their reporting of what followed the One Nation launch when they had so blatantly made themselves the news?

On leaving, the meeting the reporters once again attacked David Oldfield on the lack of the costings for One Nation's policies. He retorted: *"The Sydney media are leading an assault on democracy. The Sydney media are saying they are going to dictate to this country and the Sydney media are trying to tell people what to do and that they're in charge."*

Armed with their manufactured scoop which would make headline news on television, the journalists gathered outside and talked, gathering consensus for the spin on the stories that would appear in the papers read by millions the next day. Their stories were very different to the reality experienced by the One Nation members who had witnessed the event.

Under the headline *"Oldfield threatens media at launch"* the *Queensland Times* (Ipswich) on the 30th September, said: *"One Nation's Federal campaign launch yesterday fell into farce, with journalists threatened with arrest after trying to get costings for the party's policies"....*

The media were asked to leave (after the launch), but re-entered the building, seeking information on costings. Police were then called. After debating with party members, journalists left as 150 supporters chanted "out, out". The doors were then locked.

Ballot 98 On-line (the *Sydney Morning Herald*) extracts from article by Margo Kingston:

But the Gatton gathering quickly went the way of the rest of One Nation's campaign - rapidly straying from conventional electioneering into confusion, efforts to intimidate journalists and - in the face of hard questioning - a decision to ban the media.

Journalists returned to the hall but Mr Oldfield would not answer questions on the party's failure to honour its undertaking to cost its promises yesterday. Instead he yelled to about 200 One Nation members: "You can see quite clearly the way the media treats the people of Australia.

"You can see that they have absolutely no truth whatsoever."

Kingston overlooked the fact that after the launch the meeting was a private one. She also failed to mention that the costings were delivered by fax at 5pm.

The *Courier-Mail* on the 30th September carried a short article of the One Nation launch on page eleven. No coverage was given to Pauline Hanson's launch speech²⁹⁹ in a paper chock full of Labor press release-based articles.

²⁹⁹ See Appendix "A"

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

Christine Jackman's article headed "*Launch slides into farce over costings row*" failed to mention that the journalists had gate crashed a private meeting devoted to party housekeeping - and that is why the police were called. Ms Jackman reports, "*Journalists then returned inside to confront Mr Oldfield, who called the police after refusing to answer repeated questions about how One Nation would pay for the policies... Instead some One Nation supporters jostled and heckled the media...*"

Under the circumstances Hanson supporters were extremely well-behaved. Statements alleging *One Nation supporters jostled and heckled the media* were apparently manufactured in the discussions between reporters that took place after the event.

Later that week more thoughtful viewpoints on what had transpired were offered by journalists who had not even witnessed the launch.

Dennis Atkins wrote in the *Courier-Mail* on 1st October 1998:

The behaviour of the travelling media and the oppressive negative advertising of the Liberal party have fed One Nation and added to their voter support.

For the past week the media has turned One Nation events into warfare, culminating in the us-and-them stand off at Gatton on Tuesday.

If there is one thing One Nation's voter base distrusts and dislikes more than the political establishment, it's the media. Those journalists who have led the belligerent attack on One Nation at Gatton should consider their actions when the party picks up between six and eight seats.

This report, written by a man who was not at the event demonstrated a more accurate grasp of what had taken place than Christine Jackman who had been in the centre of the action.

Even the *Courier-Mail's* self-confessed One Nation-hating Terry Sweetman understood what had happened and reported in a predictably biased manner:

So One Nation goaded the "dogs" (media) into an ill-judged sit-in with the grey brigade jeering from the sidelines. The spin doctor's potion was made more potent by the fact that the media is one of those institutions that One Nation fans neither understand nor trust and now love to hate.

Both Dennis Atkins and Terry Sweetman criticised the media not for any breach of ethics, but because their bullying tactics were counter-productive in that they elicited sympathy for One Nation.

The line spun by the television stations on the night of the launch was that members of the media were just doing their job when they were thrown out by David Oldfield. According to Ten's news at 5pm, "*following Pauline Hanson's speech to supporters, senior party adviser and New South Wales candidate David Oldfield ordered the media out. Mr Oldfield was being questioned about policy costings.*"

Channel 10's coverage of Ms Hanson's launch speech extended to just four seconds and consisted of pictures of Pauline Hanson addressing the meeting with a voiceover telling the story of David Oldfield ejecting the media. Ten did not air a single word about the speech itself.

Channel 9 did a relatively better job but the coverage was misleading because it did not mention that the costings were faxed by 5pm. So it basically made its audience believe that angry scenes erupted because One Nation officials had flatly refused to release costing details.

On Channel 7, it was "*Pauline Hanson refusing to release costing details despite promising to do so. When the media protested, adviser David Oldfield*

Chapter 10 - Censoring the Truth

tried to throw them out. When that failed, police were called.” So once again, no mention of the faxing of costings by 5 pm.

Finally, the ABC did a fair job. Part of their report dealt with the contents of Pauline Hanson’s speech and properly conveyed the atmosphere of the launch. This is a departure from standard media coverage of Ms Hanson which typically portrays her as embattled and besieged.

In the 7:30 report, the ABC played footage that clearly showed the start of the incident. When picking up the documents released by One Nation, Margo Kingston asked about the costings. She was told that they were to be faxed to the media by 5pm. She then said: *“Why not now?”* This is how it all started. The ABC report noted that *“apparently, a 5pm release was not good enough”*.

At the end of the day it was only the ABC who relayed any of Pauline Hanson’s launch speech to the public. The rest had found a new media inspired issue and concentrated on that.

When Margo Kingston discussed with *Queensland Times* reporter Mark Strong late on the night of the election, *“how One Nation broke all the rules of engagement with the media”* – the irony should not be lost to the reader.

A journalist wrote: *Day of media shame*³⁰⁰

I am ashamed to admit I am a third generation journalist after seeing the disgusting display by my so-called peers at yesterday's policy launch. I have just read your report and I was so put off by the behaviour of these thugs and beat-up artists that (I am not too proud to admit) tears welled in my eyes. My father and grandfather, whose journalistic skills, abilities and ethics I hold high, would turn in their graves.

R.I.P. ethical, truthful journalism, for September 29, 1998, is the day that finally brought home to me (despite my clinging to hope against hope) the fact that these principles no longer exist in the profession.

As you said, how sad.

Regards,

Mark Brandon.

³⁰⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/498/0110.html>

Chapter 11 - Mainstream Media Censoring Others
Chapter 11
Mainstream Media Censoring Others

"People hate, absolutely hate, the media with a vengeance.

"There are no taboos. Any line can be crossed - as soon as it is Pauline Hanson the media think they have got a free kick to hurt, to impale, to attack, to murder to do anything they like. Any scurrilous allegation regardless of how lacking in substance or lacking in credibility the person who might be making the claim might be it gets a run. If you are willing to put up your hand and say 'I have got something really nasty to say about Pauline Hanson', you will find yourself on national television."

David Oldfield, Channel 9's Sunday program, 12/7/98³⁰¹:

The mainstream media demand the right to publish what they like based on the principle of freedom of speech. Unfortunately, as many have discovered, this freedom of speech only works one way.

The most recent example of this is the case between the Australian Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the *Australian Broadcasting Corporation* (ABC). The ABC took exception to a report critical of its bias, and particularly of its complaints procedures, in *"Your Rights 1998"* by ACLU President John Bennett. *"Your Rights"* is a popular legal handbook which has been published for many years which can be bought at many newsagents.

On pages 75/76 of the book Bennett had written:

*It's Your ABC – a Hoax*³⁰²?

The ACLU sent a letter to Maxine McKew on 19 May 1997 complaining about the discourteous way she interviewed Hanson. In the letter the ACLU President said that he had always admired her skill and her objectivity but thought she was rude and unprofessional in continually cutting off Ms Hanson in mid sentence. He said that he had never seen her interview any other politician in this way and said he was not sure why the interviewer insisted that Ms Hanson have a detailed media policy. "Her party had existed for about a month. The Liberal party had existed under that name for more than 50 years." He asked whether she would berate John Howard and continually interrupt him about his lack of any coherent media policy.

A copy was sent to Brian Johns the Managing Director requesting his comments. A letter was also sent to Kerry O'Brien asking why he did not seek to correct Robert Hughes when he said the percentage of ethnic Asians in Australia was 2.7%, when the estimate of demographers such as Dr Price puts the figure at more than 9%. I had not received a letter to the three letters of the 19th May 1997 by the 8th June so I sent a reminder letter to each of the recipients of my original letters. When no acknowledgment of the, by then, six letters had been received I sent further reminder letters on 15/11/97. I also sent a separate letter to Mr Johns on 15/11/97 referring to my earlier letters to Ms McKew, Mr O'Brien and himself stating that I had not received a reply or even an acknowledgment of any of my letters. I then asked is the oft repeated message

³⁰¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/sunday.html>

³⁰² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/abcacclu.html>

Chapter 11 - Mainstream Media Censoring Others

"Its Your ABC" directed only at ABC employees? I finally received a belated letter from Lateline on 23/11/97, more than 6 months after my original letter.

I enquired by phone whether I could expect a reply to my, by then, six letters to Mr Johns and Mr O'Brien (including one sentence reminder letters) and finally received a letter from the General Manager ABC Corporate Affairs, Roger Grant on 23/12/97 which, while not specifically referring to my original letters of complaint, and not dealing with the complaints, stated that the ACLU was pursuing a "political agenda" and that after the ABC had checked with a rival civil liberty organisation, the ACLU could not be regarded as part of the "official" civil liberties movement. Mr Grant also said by phone that he regarded me as a "vexatious letter writer", but he did not make clear whether the lodging of three brief complaints, or subsequent brief letters seeking a response was vexatious.

I could not see the relevance of these comments to the failure of the ABC to respond to my queries directed to Mr Johns and Mr O'Brien and to explain why Lateline took more than 6 months to respond to my letter of complaint. The letter from the ABC dated 23/12/97 drew a distinction between "pursuing a political agenda" and engaging in a "genuine public debate". It can be inferred that the ABC has a policy of not replying to complaints which it deems are following a "political agenda" and are not from what it regards as an "official" group after it has consulted a rival group. I pointed out to the ABC that pressure groups almost by definition have a political agenda and that the political agenda of the ACLU was to promote civil liberties and especially freedom of speech. I asked whether the ABC has a political agenda in relation to immigration, multiculturalism and Ms Hanson, and whether Ms McKew and Mr O'Brien ever pursued a political agenda or did so in relation to the startlingly different modes of interviewing Ms Hanson and Mr Hughes.

The letter from Mr Grant is one of the most interesting I have ever received in 30 years as a civil liberties activist. The lack of civility and good manners shown by Ms McKew in her interview with Ms Hanson which I commented on in a letter to The Age (11/6/97) is not confined within the ABC to Ms McKew as evidenced by the failure of the ABC (despite its stated policy to respond promptly to complaints) to reply to letters from the ACLU and by the cavalier and illogical response to ACLU letters by Mr Grant.

By way of contrast the Victorian police which nobody alleges is overstaffed, which is often the subject of criticism of the ABC, and which does not run a saturation media campaign, claiming "Its your Victorian Police", always promptly acknowledges letters of complaint and replies to them in due course. I write a detailed letter to Mr Johns and others in the ABC in the hope that the ABC can improve its administrative procedures and respond to complaints promptly and with more logic. The Chairman of the ABC, Mr Donald McDonald finally wrote to the ACLU on 2 April 1998 saying that the ABC did not intend to reply to my letters of 19 May 1997 to Mr Johns and Mr O'Brien.

The political agenda of the ABC is demonstrated by its refusal to allow majority opinion which opposes the current high level of Asian immigration, to be reflected in its programmes. The arguments of Dr Price in The Canberra Times (18/5/97) calling for a reduction in Asian immigration are seldom if ever heard on the ABC. When did you last hear someone on "Your ABC" putting the case for a reduction in Asian immigration? The ABC, like The Age and the Sydney Morning Herald is a vehicle for propaganda on some issues.

Chapter 11 - Mainstream Media Censoring Others

Dr Price in The Canberra Times said that the Minister for Immigration Mr Ruddock, rightly rejected the claims of Ms Hanson "that Australia will be 53.6% 'Asian' by the year 2040. On recent Asian ethnic strength will be only 24.9% though that is a rapid increase from 2% of 1978 and 9.6% of 1997." (Mr Ruddock's 7.5% 'Asian born' omits all Asians born in Australia.) Dr Price said that Mr Ruddock also challenges Hanson's 139,000 "immigration" (figure for 1995-96, saying that there were only 99,100 settler arrivals and 28,800 departures, a net of only 70,300. But Hanson includes an estimate of 69,000 visitors overstaying, either illegally or with official permission. Dr Price's calculations, for foreign born persons, show net of 130,000, quite near Hanson's.

Dr Price deplored the racist remarks and actions of some Hanson supporters and said he wanted Asian and other immigration to continue, but more slowly. Immigration has been so high that Anglo-Celts, who founded and developed modern Australia, could fall from 77% of population in 1978 to 70% in 1997 and to just 58% in 2040. Such speed of ethnic change is completely unacceptable in other countries and is now affecting peaceful intermixture in Australia. For 20 years governments have completely ignored the two-thirds of Australians wanting lower immigration. Many non-racist Australians, fed up with this are reluctantly supporting Hanson. Dr Price said that the more her opponents use undemocratic force to oppose her meetings the more her support will grow."

The ABC, which had been so determined to defend freedom of speech by playing the defamatory "I'm a Backdoor Man" song by Pauline Pantsdown³⁰³ on Triple J, took exception to the above article and wrote to the book's distributors, Gordon and Gotch, demanding that they stop distributing it. With the threat of legal action hanging over them Gordon and Gotch complied.

Rightfully incensed, John Bennett sent a lengthy letter to the ABC Board demanding an explanation³⁰⁴.

Five months after "Your Rights" was placed in newsagents by the distributor, Gordon and Gotch, the ABC wrote to Gordon and Gotch in a letter dated 7 September 1998, claiming that "pages 75-76 of the publication contained misleading and incorrect statements about the ABC". The letter then states "in the circumstances we request that you cease distribution of the publication or as a minimum, have the references to the ABC removed".

Bennett received no reply to his letter until I published all the background information on the Internet and the *Courier-Mail* published an article by Michael Duffy on the 28th August 1998:

The irony is that, having the power to do something about bias, there is so little of it to be found. The ABC, not being stupid, is on its best behaviour in this election.

Indeed, it is probably providing the most objective coverage in recent memory. Even if the corporation's news and current affairs sections are left-wing collectives with an agenda dominated by former ALP staffers, they're not stupid.

The simple reality, which is easily demonstrated by looking at the record, is that the ABC has been simply and objectively wrong about most valued issues it

³⁰³ There are clear indications that the ABC might challenge the Supreme Court's decision on "Pauline Pantsdown" in the High Court. This would be an interesting development in light of the recent appointment of Tony Abbott to the board.

³⁰⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/abcaclu.html>

Chapter 11 - Mainstream Media Censoring Others

has touched, from Hindmarsh Island, through industrial relations and immigration to the greenhouse hysteria. On such matters, for many years, it has routinely broken every rule in the journalistic book, ignoring its responsibility to be objective, keep an open mind, talk to both sides of a dispute and to check the facts.

Too often it has not been YOUR ABC, but THEIR ABC.

The only losers from this manipulation and destruction of a once proud institution are the Australian public.

On the 22nd October 1998, the ABC responded to Bennett's complaint with a letter, the gist of which was: "that's your problem". The tone of the letter can be deduced from the following sentence³⁰⁵:

The ABC is of the view that this matter is now closed and will not be entering into any further correspondence.

However the matter was not closed. By drawing the issue into the public arena Bennett was able to get the Murdoch as well as the Fairfax press to have a swipe at their media competitor - a government funded body. The ABC's "Media Watch" television program had, in the past, slated the ethics of the mainstream print media. Writing an opinion piece for the Sunday *Herald Sun* Michael Barnard wrote on the 8th November 1998:

What you are about to read is "misleading and inaccurate".

I know this because a) it is critical of Your ABC; b) I have arrived at this self-condemnation by way of amazing new criteria the ABC has discovered as a means of belting a critic over the head.....

Here is a huge, publicly funded corporation, supposedly dedicated to open debate, showing itself so sensitive to criticism – the type of criticism you could probably have read in many a public forum – it is prepared to indulge in what some might see as attempted censorship.....

For if I correctly diagnose the thrust of the argument, any criticism of the ABC must be presented in a way that meets its approval.

On the 27th October John Bennett responded to the ABC's dismissive statement with the following reply:

I invite members of the Board at its next meeting who support freedom of speech, the right to know, and the give and take of public debate, to carefully read my letters of 8th October and 19th October and withdraw the letter sent to Gordon and Gotch requesting Gordon and Gotch to cease distributing "Your Rights". If the letter is not withdrawn I intend to ventilate the above and other issues in Court and would be pleased if you would nominate solicitors to accept service of proceedings claiming inter alia interlocutory relief and damages for restraint of trade.

There is a happy ending to the withdrawal by Gordon and Gotch of "Your Rights 1998" after earlier receiving the ABC threats. On the 14th November 1998, after receiving growing adverse publicity in the mainstream media, the ABC suddenly called off its threat to close down the magazine through legal action.

Again, the simple moral to this story is: media diversity protects freedom of speech.

³⁰⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/photo98a/abc.gif>

Chapter 11 - Mainstream Media Censoring Others

“Killing the cow”

When I heard of Lachlan Murdoch’s comments from several sources within the Murdoch empire I reported them in the on-line *Australian National News of the Day* on the 16th September 1998. I wrote:

“Kill the cow”....

Three cryptic words used by a desperate Lachlan Murdoch to his senior News Limited editors days before the federal election was called. More than likely he was acting on his father’s instructions.

This horrifying abuse of Australia’s political system was confirmed to me by an extremely reliable source.

The cow is Pauline Hanson of course. “Kill” referring to her political career.

What we are now seeing in the feeding frenzy of biased reporting in our polarised Murdoch-dominated media - the results of that one instruction by a single, powerful young man half my age. A man who wields the power to make or break governments... and we think that we live in a democracy. Our extensive report “The Four Corners of Australia’s Trojan Horse”³⁰⁶ documents how Murdoch and his editorial cronies are ruling Australia through the media.”

The next day a most remarkable set of events took place – some would call it intimidation.

About midday on 17th September I received a phone call from the Managing Editor of the *Courier-Mail*, Gary Evans³⁰⁷ who warned me that the paper would sue me for breach of copyright on their articles allegedly carried in my daily on-line paper. No reference was made by Evans to my claim about Murdoch’s comment the previous day. Then, while working at my office that same evening I received a fax at 6.45pm from the Fairfax legal department³⁰⁸.

To receive two legal threats from major newspapers on the one day - the day after I had reported the “*Kill the cow*” statement - was quite extraordinary. Although monitoring my on-line paper over its three year existence, these organisations had never threatened to take any legal action against it in the past.

The Fairfax threat was a lengthy five page document that alleged that my business had “breached copyright and defamed a number of their journalists by doing so”. I was given until 10am the next morning to comply with a set of demands or face the prospect of being sued by the media giant.

The *Sydney Morning Herald* (Fairfax) on-line “election pages” reported on the matter on the 22nd September 1998³⁰⁹:

The most recent example of One Nation’s refusal to play by the usual rules of engagement was what at first appeared to be the appropriation of copyright material, written by Fairfax journalists, for use on a Web site linked to One Nation.”

Scott Balson, who gathers the information for Australian National News of the Day, says, in a disclaimer, that his site is “in no way connected with Pauline Hanson’s One Nation”. But he also told me in a phone interview on Monday night that his news site documented “the rise and rise of Pauline Hanson” and that he substantially agrees with her views.

³⁰⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/four>

³⁰⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/1809.html>

³⁰⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/photo98a/fairfax.html>

³⁰⁹ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/smh1.html>

Chapter 11 - Mainstream Media Censoring Others

Last Thursday, a number of Fairfax reporters were shocked to find their articles appearing on the Web under the banner of Australian National News of the Day, a subscriber site which charges viewers for full access. The Web site is run by Scott Balson.

In a reply to a Fairfax lawyer, Scott Balson claimed there was a “coding” problem which resulted in the false impression that Fairfax material had been stored on the site. He also claimed that Australian National News of the Day has “absolutely no association with One Nation” and that the information presents “the author’s own views on daily issues affecting Australians”.

Putting the coding claim aside, readers can check out the last assertion for themselves at www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/daily.html.

Meanwhile, before this article appeared, I had written to the Fairfax lawyers on Monday 21st September 1998³¹⁰ threatening them with legal action for breach of copyright and defamation. The letter followed the unauthorised use by the weekend edition of the *Sydney Morning Herald* of the 19-20th September 1998 of my photographs taken from my web site and used on the front cover of the paper for the promotion of Robson’s “The First Eleven” story³¹¹. The defamation threat related to remarks about me in Frank Robson’s article.

Despite the threat I have never received a reply nor an apology from Fairfax, and obviously the remarkable twist to their earlier story was never reported on.

Subject: MAI³¹²

Date: Mon, 15 Jun 98 15:52:49 PDT

Mr Balson,

I notice that your home page³¹³ is carrying my report in the Courier-Mail about the MAI. I own the copyright on that report. I receive a payment for the Copyright Council twice a year for articles of mine which have been copied and used.

I have not given you permission to use my report, or any other material which is my intellectual property.

Unless it is removed instantly, I shall sue.

In any event, I take exception to being described as "unethical". I regard that as grossly defamatory.

You will be hearing from my solicitors unless any and all references to me are removed from your website.

Yours sincerely (and determinedly) Peter Charlton³¹⁴

The Queensland Press Gallery³¹⁵:

Despite the best efforts of the media to discredit and marginalise the party, eleven One Nation MPs were sworn in on the first day of the new Queensland

³¹⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/2109.html>

³¹¹ See chapter headed “Censoring the Truth”

³¹² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/0407.html>

³¹³ I never carried the report on “my homepage”. Charlton is showing his ignorance of the Internet at a very rudimentary level – maybe I should call him “ill-educated”?

³¹⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/cour2.html>

³¹⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/29jul98/>

Chapter 11 - Mainstream Media Censoring Others

Parliament while party leader Pauline Hanson watched from above in the public gallery.

The party had invited me to cover the event. After receiving a security pass I entered the press gallery overlooking the Parliament below. I walked through the press cordon in the press gallery area to greet Ms Hanson and her party who were seated on the other side of a narrow cord stretched across the walkway. The cord divided the Press Gallery from the Public Gallery.

My ability to get close to the Hanson party and to take posed photographs of the One Nation leader and David Oldfield, and maybe my criticism of their reporting standards on the “*Australian National News of the Day*” did not endear me to the members of the Press Gallery standing talking nearby³¹⁶.

I was approached by a bureaucrat who enquired whether I was a journalist. I replied in the affirmative referring to my daily on-line newspaper “*The Australian National News of the Day*”³¹⁷. One Nation officials standing nearby vouched for my position as a reporter for the party.

The bureaucrat asked me to move back behind the cord separating the press gallery from the public gallery, which I did. Adrian McGregor from *The Australian* stood alongside. He pointed out to me a number of his old colleagues seated opposite in the Public Gallery. “*They used to be editors and senior political journalists in the Courier-Mail,*” he said, “*now they work as press liaison officers with higher salaries for the new Labor government.*” A cosy little arrangement not exposed in the mainstream media.

All was well for a few minutes until Channel 10’s Mike D’arcy, the president of the State Press Gallery came to question me about my status. Though he apologised and was very diplomatic, he made it clear that as I was not a recognised member of the Press I would have to stop taking photographs. I left so as not to cause a disturbance at such a historic event.

A few days later I contacted D’arcy, who had given me his phone number. During the conversation he confirmed that he had had no right to prevent me taking photographs or covering the historic event as there was no Speaker of the House at that time. He could give no credible reason why he had told me to stop taking photographs, particularly when commercial television cameras had been filming from the floor of the Parliament itself.

The media are very protective about their power and ability to control people’s perceptions. But they are alarmed when they hear that “*they have been reported on in the Internet*”. Those who make the most outrageous and insulting remarks about public figures like Members of Parliament are those who most object. Like all bullies they are cowards at heart.

When covering a One Nation event journalists routinely reminded me of their ability to sue me for defamation. So much for freedom of speech. It’s alright for journalists to label people, parties and organisations in mass circulation papers

³¹⁶ See colour plates in centre of book.

³¹⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/daily.html>

Chapter 11 - Mainstream Media Censoring Others

but let a dissenting voice be heard and they respond with intimidatory tactics and blatant censorship.

Chapter 12

Just who are the Extremists?

UGLY scuffles between Pauline Hanson protesters and her supporters, who include menacing National Front youths with trademark cropped hair, are the most common images of One Nation Party launches.

Media coverage of this week's Adelaide launch showed police dragging away angry young men, riot-protected horses forming a wall against threatening crowds, distressed girls injured by the crush of hatred outside the convention centre, eggs hurled at windows and enough abuse to make average Australians uncomfortable.

While these scenes in the sedate and plain streets of a west Adelaide suburb provide easy footage and photographs for the media, it is what was happening inside the European Convention Centre that ought to be of most concern to Australia's established political parties.

Because inside, 600 mainly middle-aged men and women - ordinary folk, with ordinary ambitions and fears - were clinging to Ms Hanson's words. They whooped and cheered and whistled and clapped with enough sincerity to dispel any notion that Ms Hanson will fulfil the hope of many and simply fade away.

Ms Hanson clearly has tapped a sympathetic vein that has been missed, and missed badly, by the other parties. Nothing sophisticated happened at the launch, and Ms Hanson's supporters seemed to celebrate that very fact. Here were ordinary people; the last thing they wanted was the glitz, the bands and the big-stage entertainment and the polished speakers that the elites got at their trendy political events.

Bill Birnbauer, The Age, 14/6/97 ³¹⁸

The bias of the media towards One Nation was clearly demonstrated in their coverage of the party's meetings that were usually marred by the presence of rowdy and often violent demonstrators. The reporting on the meetings was largely restricted to bemoaning the alleged racism of the party and its leader. The photographs were of the protesters.

The launch of One Nation:

At the launch of the party at the Ipswich Civic Centre on 11th April 1997 there was a good-natured group of Aboriginal protestors holding hand painted banners³¹⁹. They sang near the entrance and made no attempt to prevent One Nation supporters from entering the hall.

About an hour before the launch a busload of demonstrators arrived³²⁰. They were largely white, highly organised and carried professional-quality placards. They physically assaulted elderly people who had come to be part of the historic launch of a new Australian political party. A woman in her forties complained bitterly about being spat upon by demonstrators. The police allocated to monitor the launch found themselves outnumbered but managed to hold a small corridor

³¹⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/theage.html>

³¹⁹ See colour plates in centre of book.

³²⁰ See chapter headed "The anti-One Nation extremists" to discover the ALP's role in these demonstrations

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

open through which the supporters had to run a gauntlet of abuse to gain access to the hall³²¹.

When Ms Hanson's arrival was imminent the demonstrators became even more physically violent, hitting supporters over the head with their placards and verbally abusing them with foul language.

Eventually Ms Hanson after running the gauntlet practically alone, as seen on national television, addressed the 400 supporters who packed the hall³²².

Despite the *Sunday Mail*'s report³²³ that there had been a media blitz on the One Nation launch, very few people saw, read or heard much of it. For example, the *Sunday Mail* gave more coverage to a report of fifty fans rallying over the closure of their tennis centre in Milton than to the launch of Pauline Hanson's One Nation Party. The headlines for that particular Sunday's issue were reserved for a Brisbane tradesman who has taken his employer to court for being sacked for not saying "Good day".

Here are extracts of Ms Hanson's launch speech³²⁴:

The chance to finally rid ourselves of the inequity that has grown from years of political correctness, where we have not been able to speak our mind, or express our views without being called names intended to make us look backward, intolerant or extremist.

The chance to stand against those who have betrayed our country, and would destroy our identity by forcing upon us the cultures of others.

The chance to turn this country around, revitalise our industry, restore our ANZAC spirit and our national pride, and provide employment for all Australians who have given a fair break would seize the opportunity for a better way of life, for themselves, and for their families.

The chance to make sure the Australia we have known, loved and fought to preserve will be inherited intact, by our children, and the generations that follow them.

And:

We now have Aboriginal Australians, and Indonesian Australians and other ethnic minorities. We want everyone to think of themselves simply as Australians, and to be Australians.

If you came here for a better life then live that better life with us.

Be with us, be one of us, be a part of One Nation, not one of the many parts of a divided nation. There is no need to forget where you came from, but above all, remember where you are.

And:

Our immediate goals:-

- ☐ *To stop all immigration except that related to investment that will lead to employment, and for this to continue until Australia's unemployment is solved.*
- ☐ *To treat all Australians equally, and in so doing, abolish divisive and discriminatory policies such as those related to aboriginal and multicultural affairs.*

³²¹ See colour plates in centre of book.

³²² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/onenat1.html>

³²³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/1304.html>

³²⁴ See Appendix "B"

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

- To restrict foreign ownership of Australia, repeal the Native Titles Act, abolish ATSIC, and reverse WIK and MABO.
- To restore tariff protection, revitalise Australian manufacturing, and help small business and the rural sector.
- To take positive action on such matters as taxation reform, education, health, crime, and the discrimination created by political correctness.

And:

Again I say, it is the truth that will save Australia, not the lies.

I am about the truth.

I am about us being Australians.

I am about us being one people.

Under one flag, and with one set of rules.

When next you hear them call me a racist and a bigot, remember it is not just me they speak of, but everyone who believes in these things of which I speak.

It is an insult shared by millions of decent patriotic Australians.

The media covered the violence. It covered the justifications of the demonstrators at One Nation launches – targeting the book “*The Truth*” as proof that the new party was ‘racist’. It studiously ignored the message behind Ms Hanson’s speech. One Nation became a media scapegoat for all Australia’s ills – from a drop in Asian tourists and students to an alleged increase in racist attacks against ethnics and indigenous people.

Such charges were absurd. Firstly Asia’s economic turmoil was far more likely to account for any alleged drop in tourism. Secondly HREOC’s own annual report from the Anti-Discrimination Tribunal for the year 1997-98 documented a “sharp fall” of 37% in complaints of racism – much to Commissioner Zita Antonios’ petulance³²⁵. Secondly the *Courier-Mail* features article headed “Overseas warms by degrees” on page 13 on the 17th November 1998 states:

Despite fears that Australia’s education sector would be hard hit by the Asian crisis and the emergence of One Nation, Jane Fynes-Clinton found an increase in numbers.

All subsequent reporting of One Nation was according to a template: the demonstrators were presented as anti-racist heroes confronting the evil, racist, simplistic and gullible supporters of Pauline Hanson’s One Nation party. This same media later complained that One Nation had not “played by the accepted rules of engagement with them”³²⁶.

Rally against racism:

Just a few weeks later on the 25th May 1997 Brisbane Lord Mayor Jim Soorley organised a Rally against Racism³²⁷ in Ipswich’s Queen Park. The media hailed it as a success and as part of the healing process in fighting racism. A large Chinese contingent attended erecting signs for the Queensland Chinese Community Voice (QCCV) a new political body which had all its literature at the rally in Chinese – despite this, it was not seen by the media as racist.

The spokesman for the QCCV was a young Chinese lawyer by the name of Lawrence Ma³²⁸. In his campaign against One Nation, Ma later claimed a faxed

³²⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/ajones12.html>

³²⁶ See opening chapter headed “Murder by Media”

³²⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/china/>

³²⁸ See colour plates for photo of Lawrence Ma at the “rally against racism”.

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

threat addressed to him was proof that racism was on the rise in Australia. His claim received nationwide publicity³²⁹. The subsequent revelation that the fax originated from a Chinese organisation went unreported³³⁰.

On the same day as the Rally against Racism, just to stir things up the *Sunday Mail*'s Terry Sweetman³³¹, indulged in a bit of purple prose (*"Pauline shows her contempt for youth"*³³²):

Make no mistake, that's really what drives Pauline Hanson and her ugly supporters. It's not the rich against the poor, single against married, European against Asian, white against black.

She is pitting the old and the fearful against the young and the hopeful.

Young and old are attitudes of mind, not necessarily measured in years. Some of her supporters are ossified in their teens, some of her opponents sprightly in their 70s.

Hanson is a mental Methuselah, seemingly progressing from primary school name calling and thuggery to feebleness without passing through an age of wisdom and grace.

This old, old woman peddles such a wide range of prejudice and fear that somewhere she has fleeting appeal for all of us (I'm fairly partial to declarations against the waste of Aboriginal funds).

But to accept any portion of her so-called platform is like forgiving Hitler his sins because he built the autobahns or rehabilitating Mussolini because he made the trains run on time.

And...

She's speaking for a world where everyone ate mutton and mash, where intellect was despised, where mental midgets decided what you could read or view, where strong men fainted at the sight of a nipple, where everyone purported to be Christian, where men were men and women knew their places, where there was no Aboriginal problem because Aborigines were invisible, where strangers were wogs and newcomers were reffos, where Ashes cricket series passed for foreign affairs.

In this diatribe Sweetman perfectly demonstrated the contempt for Australia and its history which is typical of the politically correct elites. Yet this same journalist wrote in the *Courier-Mail* on 15th September 1998³³³ the following racist (by his own standards) remark: *The king hit assailant was an Islander, one of those lads fed growth hormones with their mother's milk and allegedly a member of an infamous northside knuckle gang.*³³⁴

Newcastle launch of One Nation

A few days after the Rally against racism, on the 30th May 1997 Pauline Hanson said at the Newcastle launch of One Nation³³⁵ in Labor heartland:

³²⁹ See chapter headed "Media reports half told"

³³⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/2406.html>

³³¹ Note Terry Sweetman is a regular writer of anti-Hanson opinion pieces in both *The Courier-Mail* and *The Sunday Mail* (both Murdoch owned).

³³² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/2505.html>

³³³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/1509.html>

³³⁴ "Gang tackling the seeds of division" 15th September 1998

³³⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/newcastl.html>

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

"I cannot begin to describe the difficulties that have been associated with my being here tonight.

"Suffice to say, that protesters, the Newcastle Council, the Labor Party, and I suspect various minority groups and multiculturalists have done their best to stop me from speaking to you here this evening."

A witness who attended this One Nation meeting in Newcastle later reported³³⁶:

Police were expecting up to 10,000 protesters and were there in force. They had closed off streets and placed barriers that held the protestors back and well away from the venue. This allowed our guests to enter the venue without having to push their way through crowds. The usual placards were evident and they all incorrectly focused on the same old racist and Nazi themes.

If only those protestors could have been inside where they could have witnessed a dignified and concerned group of people seeking answers to problems they believe are changing Australia's future. No racism, no zealots, no bigots, just regular, decent Australians who want the best for this great country. The protestors would have thought they were protesting at the wrong meeting!

We closed the meeting with everyone singing Advance Australia with a level of patriotism and emotion that is rarely seen. The verdict? Pauline Hanson won the hearts of at least 1500 Newcastle residents and at the next election they have at least one chance to vote for someone who will make some changes to their lives and futures.

After the meeting the organiser, Peter Archer³³⁷, was attacked by a mob of protesters³³⁸ as he left the entrance of the Civic Theatre. It took a cordon of nearly 100 police to escort Archer through the thugs who tugged at his clothes and yelled abuse at him despite this protection. One man was charged with inciting to riot during the incident. A visibly shaken Mr Archer was forced to leave in the protection of a police car.

Continuing the media assault on One Nation, that same night Channel 9's "A Current Affair" host Ray Martin's opened with a story from Hong Kong³³⁹ on the damage that Ms Hanson was doing to business relations with our Asian neighbours.

A small business owner claimed on the show that Ms Hanson was to blame for Australia now being seen as not the "lucky" country anymore but the "racist" country. Martin said the man had been advised by Asian customers to remove reference to his cosmetic products being produced in Australia.

Martin also interviewed a Chinese businessman there who said that the real danger to local businesses was the manner in which the communist Chinese would respond to the democratic system once they took over control of Hong Kong at the end of June 1997. Despite this more plausible reason for a negative impact on trade with Hong Kong and Asia, Channel 9 continued to quote the small business owner's blame of Ms Hanson during news broadcasts for the rest of the evening.

This was at the exact time that Kerry Packer, through Liberal merchant banker Michael Kroger, was lobbying the Federal Coalition to change the media

³³⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/newcastl.html>

³³⁷ Archer later became a dissident One Nation member establishing "Australia's One Nation". See chapter headed "Media reports half told".

³³⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/3105.html>

³³⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/0106.html>

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

ownership laws to enable him to take control of Fairfax thus further concentrating media ownership³⁴⁰.

Gold Coast Launch³⁴¹

On the 1st of July 1997 Pauline Hanson launched the party's Gold Coast branch in the City Council's massive Arts Centre which has a main hall with banked seating for 1,100 people. A group of mainly white demonstrators had verbally abused and threatened many of the supporters arriving for the launch³⁴². Before going into the Gold Coast launch venue I met and interviewed Hajime Kitamura the Sydney Bureau Chief for *TV Asahi*³⁴³ outside the venue.

TV Asahi and *Korean TV*³⁴⁴ were there to cover the 'racist' One Nation party that they had heard about in the mainstream Australian media³⁴⁵. Overseas media outlets uncritically accepted this as fact. The Australian media then complained about One Nation's damaging influence on Asian perceptions of Australia because of the foreign media's interest. It must be granted the strategy has a simple elegance.

The images and story on racism in Australia would be shown to the Japanese and Korean people that weekend. It seemed to be of little concern that Japan is one of the most racist countries in the world.

SB (Scott Balson): *"Have you ever been to a One Nation meeting before?"*

HK (Hajime Kitamura): *"No, but we are interested in a kind of racism. The Japanese government is warning about the racism here in terms of tourism and trading."*

SB: *"What about Japanese parents sending children here?"*

HK: *"Despite what Ms Hanson might say parents will still want to send their children to Australia for an education."*

SB: *"Is there racism in Japan?"*

HK: *"We don't call it racism - we call it discrimination. In Japan there are minority groups who are discriminated against. There is discrimination against people on the island of Okinawa by mainland Japanese for example."*

SB: *"Isn't it somewhat ironic you came to cover racism in Australia yet you have it in Japan?"*

HK: *"Yes. Okinawa is a good example of this discrimination."*

SB: *"So why are you here?"*

HK: *"Japanese people who have invested here (on the Gold Coast) are disappointed and have said that the Japanese government should take a stand against racism."*

SB: *"Thank you Hajime."*

³⁴⁰ See chapter on: "Media barons and media ownership"

³⁴¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/gold>

³⁴² See colour plates in the middle of the book.

³⁴³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/gold/japan.html>

³⁴⁴ See colour plates in middle of the book.

³⁴⁵ See chapter headed "Labelling and racism"

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

As 2UE Radio's Alan Jones commented on the 6th November 1998:³⁴⁶

"One wonders how long it will take before some of the great political untruths of the past twelve months will start to reveal themselves. One was the persistent argument that Pauline Hanson was a racist responsible for racist remarks. Of course its easy to confuse criticism with racism. I notice that the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission are now saying that the number of complaints about racial vilification fell by 37% in the year to June 30. This was at a time when racial intolerance was being fostered, arguably, by people like Pauline Hanson."

The One Nation branch meeting at Dandenong

The fourth estate is a vacant block³⁴⁷

When it comes to One Nation meetings, the media's vision can become blurred by bias and the need for expediency. Clearly, and for some time, there has been an issue begging for some coverage. This issue is one close to the heart of all journalists: free-speech. It doesn't usually take much to spark some media fury over free-speech, particularly when it is under threat.

Amazingly, when Pauline Hanson is involved, the media lose their capacity to do what they think they exist for: fight real injustice and real prejudice. Channel 10 and SBS described the arrival of the people to the One Nation meeting as "running the gauntlet." This used to be a military punishment involving being hit while passing between two rows of people. It describes fairly what those who wished to attend the meeting (and other One Nation meetings elsewhere) had to endure. Many who were outside the building that night reported a significant number of incidents where protesters had their hair pulled or were even punched on the head as they made their way through the gauntlet. Verbal assaults were common but strangely, none made the news. It really is cause for alarm when the media stops doing their job because they don't like the interests that would benefit from a fair coverage. It would be cause for greater concern if the police who filmed everything from adjacent buildings decided not to charge anyone.

Less than a week after the Gold Coast launch the demonstrators overstepped the mark in Melbourne's suburb of Dandenong on the 7th July 1997. JG Estiot of Media Watch Interactive had gone to the meeting to cover what happened there.

There were about 1,000 demonstrators and just 100 supporters at the One Nation meeting. Many, like Keith Warburton who was bashed unconscious by three demonstrators, had come to find out for themselves what One Nation stood for. In doing so he was exercising his democratic right to freedom of assembly.

"I'm just an individual without political leanings," Warburton said after the attack from his Dandenong Hospital bed. "An attack like this is just not Australian, where we believe in freedom of speech."

Here is part of Estiot's report³⁴⁸ on the Dandenong meeting:

I was about to return to the building to catch the beginning of the press conference when an argument between a man and a lady (black jacket) caught

³⁴⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/ajones12.html>

³⁴⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/adelmedi.html>

³⁴⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/dan>

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

my attention. He was being called a racist and nazi, and shortly after this photo was taken, he turned back and started to walk with the crowd. A man (who is not on this photograph) came from behind and king-hit him with a right hook to the right side of the face. I took a photo of the man who punched him but for legal reasons, it cannot be published here.

According to the police, the man was bashed by three individuals, one punched him, the other took him into a head-lock and the third kicked him. As he fell, already unconscious, he hit his head on the curb. It all happened very fast, probably around 5 seconds.

Keith Warburton, the victim, is a man without political affiliation. he came to the meeting to get a few facts on One Nation. He confirmed that the impression he got was the opposite of what he had heard in the media. To his surprise, he found One Nation to be anti-racist.

When incidents such as this one happen, the stirrers run in all directions pretending they have no responsibility. One of them, Cr Greg Harris, the Mayor of Dandenong has polarised his community when the proper course of action for an official in his position was to let One Nation meet and not use his office for political purpose. This stupid habit of organising counter-meetings is only giving One Nation more publicity and is ultimately defeating the aim of the organisers.

Stephen Jolly is an individual who engaged in deception to cover his tracks the following day. His feeble attempts to throw back the responsibility onto One Nation backfired badly. He said that violence started when Jim Cairns was ejected from the meeting but Jim Cairns had already been pelted with missiles on his way into the building. Is he also suggesting that some waited for Jim Cairns to be ejected to go to the shop and buy 30 dozen eggs? Or is it more accurate to say that some in the crowd had made up their mind well in advance? Neil Mitchell on 3AW answered his question 'why did this happen in sleepy Dandenong' in no uncertain terms. Mr Jolly was also claiming that security and police were provoking the crowd. His version of events were such that at times, I had doubts I actually had been at the meeting.

In many ways, this senseless but isolated incident took the focus away from the real violence. For weeks, the people who have attended One Nation meetings have been assaulted, physically and verbally. But the most serious assault has been perpetrated by Jolly's thugs on the basic democratic right to free speech every Australian should enjoy. And to complete the farce, one of their policies, should they ever accede to government, is the removal of police from demonstrations!

Good on you, clowns.

His comments drew this response from the man he had described in his report as screaming abuse from the top of a podium³⁴⁹:

Subject: Launch of One Nation at Dandenong

Hello.

I am the "young man" who was standing on the "podium" (a milk crate) who was repeatedly asking people to "get active", at the Dandenong protest of One Nation. I am a member of Resistance from Sydney, one of the many Resistance activists in Melbourne at the time for our national conference held between 4 - 6 July.

³⁴⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/dan/active.html>

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

I am quite perplexed at how you can draw from my urging to ordinary people to get active against racist ideas, that I was inciting people to get more angry?!? Didn't I also say that the only way to defeat racism was to help build an anti-racism movement and that this was what I meant by "get active"!?! If you want a photo of me, it's on page 4 (or 6) of the July 16 issue of Green Left Weekly - the rat bag with the beanie on.

This "news" site is so obviously a pro-Hanson propaganda site; you could be more effective in manufacturing consent for racist ideas like Pauline's if you weren't so blatant about it! (not that I want to encourage you).

*Just a point on violence at one nation meetings. I wouldn't be surprised if NOT ONE Hanson supporter cares that reports of racially motivated violent attacks on Asians & migrants recorded by the Human Rights Commission³⁵⁰ (sic) has doubled since Hanson's maiden speech. Yet the newspaper headlines scream "DISGRACEFUL!" when *one* person is hurt.*

*Now let me be clear. Resistance does not support those who say anti-racists should call for Hanson's meeting to be closed down - peacefully or violently. (we certainly don't believe in violence). We don't want racist views to go *back* underground, where they have been the whole time through such glorious periods of Australian history such as the White Australia Policy (founded by the ALP), or the "Stolen Generations" (which Minister for Aboriginal Affairs Senator Jon Herron apologised for by saying some Aboriginal children benefited from being stolen - akin to saying the Jews benefited from the Holocaust).*

No, we want them out in the open where we will defeat them openly once and for all. Calling for people to build an anti-racist movement where 50,000 people - not 5000 - will turn up to One Nation meetings to show who really is in the majority, is the best answer. You can do nothing against this strategy except continuing media propaganda like this site which will only slow it down.

See you on the street.

from - just an activist.

Andrew Gianniotis

*Graphic television footage showed eggs and urine filled balloons being thrown at One Nation guests arriving at the small hall. There were a few minor reports on the violence at Dandenong in Queensland. The next day the *Courier-Mail* gave extensive and detailed coverage to the illegal visit to Australia by the ex-Black Panther terrorist and plane hi-jacker, Lorenzo Ervin³⁵¹.*

Ms Hanson said on Channel 9's "A Current Affair" on 9th July 1997³⁵²: "The violence is getting worse - I admit to that - and all are political terrorists. It is an organised organisation"³⁵³.

"I'm not going to say to people 'don't come', because if I say that, well then, these people have got away with what they are trying to do - to incite their violence on to others to get their point across."

³⁵⁰ See Jones comments on racial vilification falling by 37% in the year to June 30

<http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/ajones12.html>

³⁵¹ See chapter "Censoring the Truth" and:

<http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/397/1007.html>

³⁵² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/397/0907.html>

³⁵³ See chapter headed "The anti-One Nation extremists" and commentary on Left Link.

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

David Ettridge told the media at this time, *"The police should start arresting some of these people, especially their leaders, who are inciting this sort of civil disobedience."*

Editorialists are quick to call for political leadership on non-issues such as racism. It was disgraceful that they failed to call for leadership when the very foundations of democracy were being rocked by the attacks on free speech and freedom of assembly. Even more disgraceful was the "silence of the lambs" - Australia's political leaders who watched yet said nothing.

On Saturday 12th July 1997, following the Dandenong incident the *Courier-Mail* carried a story on the demonstrators at One Nation meetings titled "Faces of Hatred". Miranda Devine wrote³⁵⁴:

It is no mistake that a copy of the Socialist Worker lay next to an unconscious 59-year-old man with blood trickling from his mouth³⁵⁵ after being beaten by protesters at an anti-Pauline Hanson rally this week.

Providence put it there for the world to see that the violent anarchy engulfing anti-Hanson rallies is not a spontaneous expression of anger from a disillusioned citizenry but a deliberate and well-organised campaign by people whose ultimate goal is to smash the capitalist system.....

Ian Rintoul, spokesman for the International Socialist Organisation said, "We don't condone individual vigilant acts against Hanson supporters, but we are for militant protests and mass action to close meetings down."

Overlooked by Devine was the fact that all these groups used the Labor Party's "Left Link" to promote their planned demonstrations.³⁵⁶

Here are two posts that were made on Left Link shortly after the violent protests at Dandenong:

Shut the racists up³⁵⁷

Date sent: Tue, 15 Jul 1997 13:48:20 +1000

From: Sandra Bloodworth xxxxx@pgrad.unimelb.edu.au

Subject: LL:Hanson in Geelong

There will be a mass leafletting this Thursday 17 July outside Flinders St station to help build the anti-Hanson demo in Geelong this Friday.

Meet outside the main entrance from 4pm onwards.

If you need a lift to the Geelong demo, Socialist Alternative has organised a number of buses to leave from 4.30pm onwards. Meet outside the Elizabeth St entrance to Flinders St Station. There will also be some cars leaving later up until 5.30pm, but spaces will be limited. So please book tickets via e-mail or by phoning 9427-7274. Cost is \$8/4.

The demo starts in Geelong at 6pm at the South Barwon Civic Centre, cnr Reynolds Rd & Princes Highway.

Personally I found the Geelong demo incredibly inspiring. Large numbers of local working class youth really wanted to have a go at the Hansonites and the cops. This is reflected in the fact that the three young guys charged with assault by the police were all locals from Doveton & Dandenong. In the current media

³⁵⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/dan/prot.html>

³⁵⁵ Photographs taken by Estiot of Warburton at this time show that this was not the case.

³⁵⁶ See chapter headed "The anti-One Nation extremists"

³⁵⁷ Copy of original Left Link post at:

<http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/left/geelpro1.html>

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

climate they stand to be crucified. Whatever people may think of what they did they need to be defended as people fighting back against racism.

Mick Armstrong for Socialist Alternative

And:

Geelong Hanson Demo

Date sent: Wed, 16 Jul 1997 12:41:42 +1000

From: Jenny Campbell xxxxx@werple.net.au

Subject: LL:Geelong Hanson demo

I attended the Geelong anti-Hanson organising meeting last night. Drinks start at 5.00pm Friday at the South Barwin Civic Centre, so the organisers are prepared for the demo to start then. Parking will be limited. Many from Ballarat and the Western District are also coming to protest. Pauline Hanson is expected between 5-6pm and will probably enter from the back, which will be heavily protected by police.

Jenny Campbell

Militant

Brisbane Anti-Racism Committee incitement

The posts above were made on the Internet at the height of the violence at One Nation meetings. Such juvenile excitement was nothing compared to the intelligence received from a One Nation Aboriginal informant who attended a meeting of the Brisbane Anti-Racism Committee on the 14th July 1997.

Here is a transcript of that report³⁵⁸:

To: Ms Pauline Hanson MP, MLA

Mr David Ettridge, National Organiser, One Nation

Last night, 14th July 1997, at the "Anti-Racism" Committee's meeting at the ACTU³⁵⁹ house in Peel street, Brisbane a number of matters were discussed including the following:

- 1. Their legal adviser/solicitor "George", a half-caste Aborigine, said they should become incorporated and then they would get funding from ATSIC (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission).*
- 2. They should hurry up and book King George Square in Brisbane for the "National Day of Action" on the 31st August 1997 before someone else books it. This will be followed by a march to the Executive Building, presumably Parliament House, and then to Musgrave Park. Jim Soorley is on their side.*
- 3. "George" believes Herron is sympathetic to the Aboriginal people and should not be harassed.*
- 4. The Committee's priority is to shut down all Pauline Hanson meetings.*
- 5. They want to get someone (and there was a volunteer - a Hispanic ethnic) to break through the crowd and physically assault her. It was felt that in order to do this and not to have much repercussion in the media (on this Committee) it should only be attempted when they can organise more protesters, ie over 500, as a "few loose cannons" are more significant among a small group than a much larger one.*
- 6. Their efforts (the Committee's) should be targeted on Howard and Hanson. Not the Coalition and One Nation.*

³⁵⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/scoop1.html>

³⁵⁹ Labor's Australian Council of Trade Unions building

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

7. *The Committee must actively approach other groups for sponsorship, that have been contacted in the past, ie The Trade Unions, the Greens, ASU, ACTU and the Murri Organisation. (Sam, thought to be Watson, attended the meeting for some 25 minutes and then departed).*
8. *A Dick Martini to be approached to see if the PA fee can be waived.*
9. *“George” is disenchanted with the Chinese community for their lack of support. He feels they - the Committee - are carrying them in their fight. Note: For an anti-racist he does not seem to like Chinese anyway.*
10. *A Jean Shears and Jack Shellington of the Hiroshima Day organisation want support at a Rally because that would give them “Hiroshima Day” the right to march. The police had refused them a permit and they were upset about it.*
11. *The cost of one bus to the Gold Coast rally³⁶⁰ was \$395 and \$185 was collected towards that and the rest was paid by the PTU (it's thought that might be the Parent Teacher Union).*
12. *The attached flyer is for information, especially the last item. The Committee are trying to organise a rally against the Ipswich meeting.*

Though I immediately broadcast this report to the media, only the *Queensland Times* and 6PR Radio in Western Australia (through Howard Sattler) fully covered the allegation of a threatened physical assault against an Australian Member of Parliament. The *Queensland Times* carried the threat as its headline news (summarised later in this chapter).

Following the 6PR interview I was contacted by a reporter from *The Australian* in Perth about the threat to Pauline Hanson. Despite all the relevant facts being faxed to her the story about the physical threat was never run by this national Murdoch paper.

Channel 10 and Channel 7 reported objectively on the allegation in Queensland although it was treated as a local issue and the allegations were not televised in Australian states outside Queensland.

The *Courier-Mail*, on the 17th July, carried a page 13, two column, 5 centimetre report which read as follows³⁶¹:

Hanson assault claim rejected

An anti-racism group last night rejected claims it was plotting to physically assault One Nation Party leader Pauline Hanson.

Ms Hanson yesterday claimed to have exposed a plan by Brisbane Anti-Racism Committee for a “Hispanic ethnic” to assault her at a demonstration.

Party national director David Ettridge said “minutes” from a committee meeting were leaked.

But the committee said Ms Hanson was trying to discredit it because it had been effective in rallying opposition against her party.

“The role of the committee is to build rallies against racism, not to violently disrupt One Nation meetings,” said spokesman Roberto Jorquera.

The *Courier-Mail* article then referred to an article by anti-Hanson journalist Terry Sweetman under the heading “*Protests fuel the Hanson bandwagon*”. In the article he said, ironically, *Now I think I was half wrong - or only half right, [when referring to extracts from an earlier article by him in the Sunday Mail] at*

³⁶⁰ See Gold Coast rally above

³⁶¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/397/1707.html>

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

least - because although the battle to expose Hanson has been won, the war against extremism is being lost.

It was quite clear to a growing number of Australians who the extremists were - and they were not Hanson supporters.

Compare the Murdoch owned *Courier-Mail*'s passing coverage to the front page story of, the O'Reilly owned, *Queensland Times* which ran a front page article under the heading: "Hanson Assault threat"³⁶²:

The information, titled, "Transcript of an intelligence report", detailed 12 points of the source's impressions of the meeting and was posted on the Internet³⁶³ on Tuesday.

The fifth point says: They want to get someone (and there was a volunteer - a Hispanic ethnic) to break through the crowd and physically assault her. It was felt that in order to do this and not to have much repercussion in the media (on this Committee) it should only be attempted when they can organise more protesters, ie over 500, as a "few loose cannons" are more significant among a small group than a much larger one.

Three members of the Brisbane Anti-Racism Committee who were at the meeting at ACTU House at South Brisbane yesterday (Monday) denied the matter had been discussed.

Robert Jorquera, Jim McIlroy and Martin Thomas said all other matters on the Internet report had been discussed, but the fifth point was not.

The Prosper Australia Rally – One Nation AGM – Brisbane

A few months later on the 4th October 1997 Brian Webb of the Brisbane Anti-Racism Committee led a large number of demonstrators through the streets of Brisbane³⁶⁴. Thirteen demonstrators, including Webb, were arrested outside Festival Hall for acts of violence³⁶⁵.

Although the reporters were quick to cover the violence of the demonstrators, they ignored Ms Hanson's speech at the Prosper Australia rally³⁶⁶.

The *Sunday Mail*'s report by Michael McKenna and Sid Maher on the Prosper Australia rally revealed more of the same old biased journalism with no coverage of Ms Hanson's message. As a correspondent who attended the rally wrote³⁶⁷:

These two journalists lied about the numbers of protesters and supporters, claiming there was 500 for each side. I figured that the supporters outnumbered the protesters about four to one and at the close of the meeting the police figures revealed that the protesters only numbered 300 at their peak. The supporters were numbered at about 1100.

The violent actions of members of the Brisbane Anti-Racism Committee led to Virginia Clarke's resignation from her executive position on the sister Ipswich Anti-Racism Committee.

Ms Clarke, who later stood for the Labor party against Ms Hanson in the seat of Blair in October 1998, told the *Queensland Times* in April 1998 that she had

³⁶² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/397/1707.html>

³⁶³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/scoop1.html>

³⁶⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/bne/three.html>

³⁶⁵ See colour plates in middle of book.

³⁶⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/bne/speech.html>

³⁶⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/497/0610.html#letters>

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

been on the executive of the Ipswich branch of the “Anti-Racism Committee” but had “got out when the Brisbane branch of the organisation threatened violence at a One Nation meeting in Ipswich”. The admission was made after I wrote the following letter to the *South Burnett Times* and the *Queensland Times*:

19th March 1998,

Dear Sir,

I have noted the recent arrival of Virginia Clarke as the ALP's hopeful for the federal seat of Blair. I am not surprised.

What voters in this seat need to be aware of is the role that this self-same lady has played in trying to disrupt One Nation meetings and, indeed, by association threaten to assault Pauline Hanson as reported in the Queensland Times on July 17 last year.

The background to this statement is as follows. One Nation had a plant at a Brisbane Anti-Racism Campaign (ARC) meeting on 14th July 1997. It was attended, I am told, by Virginia Clarke reported as the head of the (Ipswich) ARC in Oxley (see page 123 the book 'Hansonism, Tricks or Treat' by Don Veitch).

One of the issues discussed by ARC at ACTU house in Peel street, Brisbane on that day was recorded as follows: They (ARC) want to get someone (and there was a volunteer - a Hispanic ethnic) to break through the crowd and physically assault her. It was felt that in order to do this and not to have much repercussion in the media (on this committee) it should only be attempted when they can organise more protesters, ie over 500, as a "few loose cannons" are more significant among a small group than a much larger one.

The fact is that Ms Clarke's association with ARC is an issue that she needs to publicly address with the conservative voters of Blair who have, on occasion been the victims of ARC protesters. She has never admitted publicly to being associated with this campaign which had just one objective in mind - to close down One Nation and damage the democratic process in Australia.

This comment is best demonstrated by the actions of another of the (Brisbane-based) ARC members, Mr Brian Webb, who I personally overheard saying through a megaphone at the One Nation Prosper Australia rally on the 4th October 1997: “We should go through the police lines, let's cut through the police lines. Let's go in through the doors.”

Shortly after saying this thirteen people were arrested by the police who had been sent to protect One Nation guests who had assembled to hear what Pauline Hanson had to say. There can be no excuse, no way out for Ms Clarke she has been tarred by association with this ALP front which staged disgraceful, violent protests in a most un-Australian manner normally reserved to infighting in the trade union movement.

I challenge the ALP's candidate for Blair to refute my allegation that she was closely involved with the ARC and this drive to usurp democracy.

Scott Balson, Karana Downs

Then, as if by magic, following demonstrations in early September 1997 at an Ipswich branch meeting³⁶⁸, the co-ordinated anti-racism protests just seemed to stop. One month, dozens of well co-ordinated demonstrators lined up to heckle members going to branch meetings in Ipswich and elsewhere, the next month there were none. For those who had faced the abuse it was the most obvious

³⁶⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/ipbranch/>

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

proof that what they had endured was a carefully waged campaign of intimidation. Through sources close to the Anti-Racism Committee it was learned the protestors had been warned by their mates in the Labor Party that the heat was on from higher up.

The Labor hierarchy knew that the demonstrators had failed to thwart interest in the new party and had instead created unwanted, sympathetic support for One Nation amongst a growing number of Australians. The cessation of the Labor party's co-ordination of and hidden support for the demonstrators certainly had nothing to do with the fear of being reported as being behind the violence at meetings. The media would never do that. It was to be about twelve months later, just after the Queensland state elections, that the Labor Party set their radical extremists loose again through organisations like Left Link³⁶⁹.

One Nation – the 'Nazi' tag

The great dichotomy in what you read in the mainstream papers and what you see when you attend a One Nation meeting is quite simple. As JG Estiot put it, *"(the media's)... version of events were such that at times, I had doubts I actually had been at the meeting."*

The very violence and abuse directed at One Nation perversely justified the labelling of its supporters by the political correct. It has been rightly said that we hate those whom we have harmed.

"It is right that people should say sorry when someone suffers pain (at the hands of others)" Jim Soorley³⁷⁰, 7th February 1998

Early on Ms Hanson discovered that the 'Nazi' label became an acceptable media-inspired extension of her now accepted 'racist' one.

The Labor Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Jim Soorley³⁷¹ first threw the Nazi line publicly at Ms Hanson. Just days after the launch of One Nation he told the *Courier-Mail* on the 16th April 1997³⁷² that Ms Hanson was trying to build an *"evil empire"* that would destroy Australia's social fabric.

"She operates by racism and the manipulation of people's fears and insecurities - Hitler started that way," he said. *"What she represents is evil. Look at her face listen to her voice. What she is doing is projecting her own anger and inability to relate to our society's minorities."*

Ms Hanson was about to board a small plane on a trip to make speeches to communities in central Queensland when the media caught up with her and asked her for her views on Soorley's comments. She said that they were bordering on defamation and that she wouldn't *"get into a slanging match with someone who, after all, should be more concerned with roads, drainage and garbage"*.

She commented that this sudden attack by Soorley was very strange because she has said nothing different in the launch of One Nation to her comments over 12 months ago.

³⁶⁹ See chapter headed "The anti-One Nation extremists"

³⁷⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/sorry.html>

³⁷¹ See colour plates in middle of book.

³⁷² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/1604.html>

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

Ms Hanson said that she challenged Soorley to stand against her for the seat of Oxley at the next Federal election after his remarks that *"She must be stopped."*

"I will be more than willing to debate him at that time."

"This is a feeble attempt to lead the ALP's attack against the everyday people of Brisbane and Australia who are flocking to the ranks of One Nation in droves."

On the day of Soorley's Nazi comment it was reported in the *Courier-Mail* that the Brisbane City Council's 26 Labor and Liberal councillors were unanimous in their condemnation on Pauline Hanson and her *"dividing, racist"* tactics.

The next day the Prime Minister, John Howard, distanced himself from Mayor Soorley.

"It (his comment) shows an absolutely abysmal understanding of history," Howard said, "That is one of the most unintelligent, uninformed comments I have heard in politics for quite a while."

When asked by a reporter if Howard thought Ms Hanson was a racist he answered, *"I wouldn't use that expression - no."*

Journalistic ethics should have led the media to debunk Soorley's comments as soundly as Howard did. Yet they were reported with no condemnation. In this way legitimacy was given to the comparison of One Nation with the Nazi movement.

Like the 'racist' label³⁷³ attached to One Nation and Ms Hanson it was a term that, despite Howard's comments, would never be shaken.

In June 1998 Aboriginal organisation FAIRA³⁷⁴ distributed a press release including the following extract without incurring any media criticism for their provocative language:

The advance of a 'Nazi (One Nation) Party' in Queensland is an insult not only to our races but to the many Australians who fought against the Nazi Government of Germany in World War 2.

Tourism minister Bruce Davidson, famous for his geographical confusion over rhino habitat, also seems to have a problem with his history or his sense of occasion.

Asked whether he would put the Nazi party before the ALP on a ballot paper, he said, "I'll always put Labor last".

His long suffering Miss Fixit came running with the Tarzan's grip to patch up the results of his latest attack of dropsy by saying the comment was a throwaway line in response to a hypothetical question.

Some throwaway line, such sparkling repartee.

In case Davidson has forgotten the Nazi Party was an evil German organisation led by Adolf Hitler which took the world to war, laid waste to half of Europe, brought tears to Australian homes and murdered millions of people.

Terry Sweetman³⁷⁵, Courier-Mail³⁷⁶

³⁷³ See chapter headed "Labelling and racism"

³⁷⁴ See chapter headed: "Censoring the truth".

³⁷⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/sweet2.html>

³⁷⁶ See chapter headed "Political Power of Australia's New Age Media Barons"

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

Even the ABC joined in. I first met reporter Tony Jones and producer Virginia Moncrieff³⁷⁷ on Saturday 27th June at Queensland's Parliament house³⁷⁸. The occasion was the first gathering of One Nation's newly elected State MPs.

They assured me they would do the "*right thing - unlike 60 Minutes*" in their upcoming *4 Corners* feature on One Nation. Moncrieff and Jones were given the exclusive opportunity to film Sir Joh Bjelke Petersen talking to the new One Nation MPs during the weekend – an opportunity that the Channel 9 crew headed by Paul Lyneham³⁷⁹ would have given their eye-teeth to have been allowed to record. Lyneham was instructed to leave after just a short visit.

Several days after the weekend *4 Corners* contacted me with a request to participate in an interview for the program. The interview took place during most of a sunny July afternoon at my office in Karana Downs.

When the ABC's *4 Corners* program went to air on Monday the 10th August 1998 it mirrored the bias against One Nation that had hitherto been the preserve of 'infotainment' *60 Minutes*³⁸⁰. It turned out that Moncrieff's and Jones' promise to do "*right thing unlike 60 Minutes*" had as much integrity as the *60 Minutes* producer John Westacott's written undertaking to David Ettridge³⁸¹. As my comments during the interview did not match their negative perceptions of One Nation, it did not surprise me that none of the interview was covered in the resulting program.

The letters to the editor to the *Australian National News of the Day* reproduced below clearly demonstrate how One Nation supporters, the majority of whom had previously held the program in respect, responded.

*Subject: Floored Corners*³⁸²

What really surprised me, having sat through Pauline's 3/4 hr speech in the first Perth meeting, & observing the Flawed (ABC's 4) Corners camera people filming the entire speech, they did not use any of it at all! All they were interested in was showing Pauline in the toilet etc! One must take an educated guess & say that the ABC must be petrified of actually screening what Pauline says regarding any policy matters. Otherwise the One Nation vote would sky rocket from 11% nationally to 30% immediately. The more I think about it, examples like this is even more reason to encourage Mr Kroger to de-knacker the GayBC.

Also, I think it is about time a MAJOR expose was done on the "Resistance" & the National Socialists. These people are communist crims. What must be done is to expose WHO is financing their nefarious operations, & make the Australian public realise these are the crims who secretly influence the Labor Party.

Steve (Blizard) – Perth

Given the authority of the ABC, the Nazi label cast upon David Oldfield during the program, was by now well and truly stuck to Pauline Hanson's One Nation with superglue. The left wing extremists had a new media-spun catch-cry on which to base new found legitimacy for violent demonstrations at One Nation meetings.

³⁷⁷ See colour plates in middle of book.

³⁷⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/qldmp/day2/>

³⁷⁹ See chapter headed "The 60 Minutes credibility gap"

³⁸⁰ See chapter headed "The 60 Minutes credibility gap"

³⁸¹ See chapter headed "The 60 Minutes credibility gap"

³⁸² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/1208.html>

One Nation and the Ku Klux Klan tag (see “Winners and Losers” chapter)

While labelling³⁸³ or negative media-perpetuated associations such as Nazi just washed off the major parties it, somehow seemed to stick like glue to the blemished image of Pauline Hanson and One Nation.

For example, on the 27th May 1997 when referring to the Prime Minister's handling of the post-Wik native title debate³⁸⁴, Daryl Melham, Labor's Aboriginal spokesman, compared the Liberal Party to the Ku Klux Klan on *ABC Radio* saying: *“There's only one thing missing from this debate and that's the white sheets and the burning crosses and that's been the undercurrent in this debate.”* Prime Minister John Howard went on the attack in Parliament two days later demanding an apology from opposition leader Kim Beazley for failing to discipline Melham.

Just days later in June 1997 at the height of the violence directed against One Nation, Prime Minister John Howard travelled to London.

His staff advised the media that he would use his two week trip overseas to compare Hanson's rise in popularity to that of the former Ku Klux Klan leader David Duke and right-wing French politician Jean Marie Le Pen.

The media responded by carrying cartoons of Ms Hanson dressed in a Ku-Klux-Klan outfit. The *Courier-Mail*³⁸⁵ showed a catwalk with a figure dressed in white walking across it and the words *And now to evening wear, and this stunning little number designed by David Duke especially for our Pauline.*

On the 12th August 1997 *The Australian* wrote³⁸⁶:

*The whole of Asia indeed the whole world, will watch Howard's actions. Howard apparently was surprised at how strongly the British media played the Hanson story during his recent visit to London*³⁸⁷....

In England, Howard compared the rise of Hanson to that of former Ku Klux Klan leader David Duke in the US and National Front leader Jean-Marie Le Pen in France. These cases, though in many ways not really opposite comparisons, ought nonetheless instruct Howard's response.

*In 1991, Duke won the Republican nomination for the governor's race in Louisiana*³⁸⁸. *In response, then Republican President George Bush urged republicans in Louisiana to vote for the Democratic candidate against Duke. Bush was not particularly a champion of racial inclusion or sensitivity to minorities or anything else that might be deemed politically correct. But what he was, was a basically decent, conservative leader. He commented of Duke, who had tried to moderate his image for the Louisiana race: “When someone has an ugly record of racism and of bigotry that record simply cannot be erased by the glib rhetoric of a political campaign.”*

The case of Le Pen in France is equally revealing. All mainstream French parties condemn Le Pen unequivocally. Of course the danger Hanson poses to Australia is much greater than that posed to France by Le Pen. Le Pen spews

³⁸³ See chapter headed “Labelling and Racism”

³⁸⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/3005.html>

³⁸⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/four/Courier1.gif>

³⁸⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/aust1208.html>

³⁸⁷ It has got to be noted that Murdoch's media influence in England is gaining the same stature that it enjoys in Australia.

³⁸⁸ See: <http://www.gulker.com/jf/wilson.html>

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

fourth filthy anti-African poison that disfigures and diminishes France, and causes unnecessary suffering to many French citizens of African extraction.

What was lost to the reader of *The Australian* was the fact that it was the Labor Party who had first compared the Coalition government to the Ku Klux Klan causing Howard to rebuke Beazley in Federal Parliament. Howard then used a similar comparison of the extremist white power organisation to deride the fledgling political party Pauline Hanson's One Nation on the same unfounded but politically expedient basis as Labor had on his party. The media's coverage of One Nation compared to the Liberals revealed the bias.

In early June 1999 a One Nation member based in Sydney, Peter Coleman, went public about his involvement with the Ku Klux Klan, saying³⁸⁹, "*he had done much of his KKK recruiting at One Nation branch meetings*". This unverified statement was all that was needed for a media blitz portraying One Nation as a pariah... the Ipswich-based Queensland Times editor, Mark Hinchliffe, presenting an extraordinary campaign of hatred against the party. This included a highly offensive cartoon³⁹⁰ supported by an article referring to Coleman as³⁹¹ "*a One Nation identity*", and a follow-up editorial effectively laying the blame for the formation of the Ku Klux Klan in Australia at Pauline Hanson's feet.

Surprisingly, it took *The Courier-Mail* through reporter Michael McKenna to put the record straight. His article headed "*A cry of hatred*" (5th June 1999)³⁹² simply explained the facts hidden by a week of sensationalised reporting. He quotes Pauline Hanson as saying, "*Coleman would never have been able to use One Nation for a recruitment drive for the Ku Klux Klan,*" she said. "*I would have heard about it and thrown him out of the party.*"

"This fellow belongs to an overseas organisation and its aims are not compatible to the aims and objectives of One Nation. We believe in equality no matter what race, colour or creed. I have never been approached by this organisation, and they have never been active in the party. It is absolute rot."

What was accepted without investigation by the media was the claim by Coleman that he had used the net extensively to generate recruits in Australia. As the One Nation webmaster handling all the party's email a search revealed that no email had ever been sent to or received from Peter Coleman and the Queensland Times' reference to him as "*a One Nation identity*" could not have been further from the truth. No-one in the party had ever heard of him – he was simply an entry in the party's very large database.

One Nation's labelling³⁹³ by the media reflects some interesting perspectives being faced by militia organisations, whom Channel 9's *60 Minutes*³⁹⁴ saw as extremists in their "*A Call to Arms*"³⁹⁵ program run days before the Queensland State Election.

³⁸⁹ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/couroff22.htm>

³⁹⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/99a/qt0306.jpg>

³⁹¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/299/0306.html>

³⁹² See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/couroff22.htm>

³⁹³ See chapter headed "Labelling and Racism"

³⁹⁴ See chapter headed "60 Minutes credibility gap"

³⁹⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/packer/60.html>

Chapter 12 - Just who are the Extremists?

Just who are the extremists? Australians who want to retain their country's identity or those who want to destroy the foundation of this country's democracy and the cultural fabric that has made it great.

If you are to believe the Murdoch/Packer media it is the former – not the latter.

Chapter 13

The anti-One Nation extremists

Exposing Left Link - the Labor party's extremists

"We don't condone individual violent acts against Hanson supporters," he says. "But we are for militant protests and mass action to close meetings down."
Ian Rintoul, spokesman for the International Socialist Organisation.³⁹⁶

The media never questioned who the protestors really were and why they were there, but uncritically reported the demonstrations as spontaneous events.

The Labor Party's Left Link is the organiser of those who assaulted democracy at Dandenong and of the violent thugs who closed down a One Nation meeting at Hawthorn on the 19th July 1998.

A witness to the violence at Hawthorne reported to the *Australian National News of the Day*³⁹⁷:

Those arriving slightly late to this meeting (expecting to hear Pauline Hanson speak) were confronted with an abusive cordon of hostile, jeering fanatics. Is this the new face of 'free speech' in Oz? As a result of these totalitarian antics, the planned speech had to be cancelled. So much for democracy! Those supposed neutral guardians of law and order in the State of Victoria (the Victoria Police.. whose motto, incidentally, happens to be 'Uphold the Right') apparently did not lift a finger to assist people going about their lawful business (viz: attending a lawfully constituted political meeting).

On the strength of this, one could indeed question the political neutrality of this organisation. Are they in fact just another arm of the political repression in this State, characterised in the grim persona of Jeff Kennett?

The next day 2UE Radio personality Alan Jones said³⁹⁸:

"It is valid to ask seriously what kind of society we are becoming. At the weekend vandals smashed windows at the office of the Queensland One Nation MP Mr David Dalglish only a week after he was punched in the face in the street.

"In Melbourne yesterday a rally by a legitimately registered political party had to be cancelled because a crew of screaming thugs successfully launched a violent attack on free speech. This is nothing to do with the policies of Pauline Hanson or the One Nation Party.

"What this seems to be about is attacking the Prime Minister and those who hate free enterprise and personal responsibility and family life and financial prudence and it seems that these people are prepared to seize any pretext to attack John Howard who they see as standing between themselves and political power.

"The watching world is entitled to expect that Australians do not attack police. The watching world is entitled to expect that Australians do not break up political party meetings. The watching world knows that the sort of disgraceful behaviour exhibited by these people yesterday takes place in dictatorships.

³⁹⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/dan/prot.html#ian>

³⁹⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/2007.html>

³⁹⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/ajones4.html>

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

"This is the way Mussolini's men behaved to break up Socialist rallies in 1923. This is the way Hitler's brownshirts behaved in 1934, Stalin's thugs did much the same thing in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and the Baltic States.

"The print media and the ABC have been in the habit of describing such violence as 'Clashes between protesters and One Nation supporters' as is to give the impression that One Nation supporters are equally to blame. Surely in Australia anyone is allowed to meet for any lawful purpose. Surely the propounding of political views whatever they may happen to be is a lawful purpose, or do we live in a country where political discussion is replaced with the clenched fist?"

Background to Hawthorn³⁹⁹ 19th July 1998:

The massive turn out of 1500 violent protesters was no accident. It was no spontaneous outpouring of anger against Pauline Hanson's One Nation. It was an event carefully planned by the extremists in the Labor Party movement. They are violent thugs at best and de-facto criminals for their roles in orchestrating a terrible new trend in Australian politics.

At Hawthorn busloads of One Nation supporters were turned away - with only 250 out of 800 braving the violence. The elderly who had come to the meeting early before the violence erupted began fearing for their lives in the hall as the mob of hooligans ranted outside.

An 87 year old man Wally Dunlop, a One Nation supporter, came through the thugs at Hawthorn with blood pouring from a wound above the eye after he was assaulted by the protesters. His plight was flashed across the television screens of the nation.

"They are a mob of thugs - that's all they are," he said.

Victorian One Nation co-ordinator, Robyn Spencer, who also attended said on Channel 9's *Today Program*⁴⁰⁰, on 20th July 1998 *"...we saw the ugly side of multiculturalism, the intolerance, the violence and the absolute aggression against old people."*

Ms Spencer also accused the police of telling Ms Hanson lies about her safety - resulting in her non-attendance.

"...they (the police) said that the whole hall was circled by protesters with their arms around each others necks - eight deep.

"Yet the back of that hall backs straight onto the Hawthorn police station and it was very easy to secure an entrance and an exit for Pauline Hanson. Indeed the 250 who did come came mainly came through this entrance.

"The police tried to stop us having our meeting inside the hall.... They read us this statement 'On speaking to the organisers outside the hall they ... they... they're the thugs have given us an undertaking that if the meeting does not proceed they will let us take all your people out.' How dare the police negotiate with the multicultural thugs outside who were preventing freedom of speech, our police are negotiating with them rather than the citizens inside who have a right of association and a right of freedom of speech."

Deals between the mainstream parties secure the censorship of damaging stories⁴⁰¹. The lack of media coverage of the Labor party's role in the violence at

³⁹⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/left/meljul98.html>

⁴⁰⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/2007.html>

⁴⁰¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/four>

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

One nation meetings stands as an indictment of this blatant abuse of power and democracy by the elites. These journalists and politicians are the men and women who continually parade themselves as representative of ethics and honest politics but who are in reality little more than pawns in a bigger game controlled by big business.

While One Nation is exposed to ridicule by the media with baseless assumptions of being linked with extreme right elements Ron Brunton⁴⁰² summed up the true state of affairs thus:

It should also be realised that at different times and places during the last couple of decades, the Labor party, the Liberals and the Nationals have all been infiltrated by extremists of the Left or the Right.

The political thugs behind the co-ordination of the demonstrators, referred to by Spencer above, at Hawthorn on Sunday 19th July 1998 are largely the same as those behind the violence at Dandenong and Geelong in 1997. They represent the extreme violent left wing of the Labor Party as identified by Brunton but the mainstream media do not report it.

The on-line organisation acting as a distribution point of information for these co-ordinated demonstrations is Left Link, Victoria's Broad Left Mailing List⁴⁰³. Left Link is proudly displayed as a member of The Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) of which The Australian Labor Party is the political arm. It is listed on the ACTU's links page on the Internet web page⁴⁰⁴.

The mailing list is managed by a business called The New International Bookshop which is located at the ACTU's TRADES HALL on the corner Victoria & Lygon Streets in Melbourne.

"One Nation's site is designed and managed by a company called Global Web Builders, run by Mr Scott Balson, who has been the target of vigorous attack on a Victorian chat site called LeftLink.

"Some visitors to that site have demanded Mr Balson be banned from the Internet, along with One Nation."

Garry Barker⁴⁰⁵, *The Age*, 01/09/98)

Left Link is financially sponsored for an unknown amount by a trade union/politically correct group called SEARCH⁴⁰⁶ which provides grants to selected organisations. SEARCH has senior Labor figures on its board.

Through this funding Marg Hutton's The New International Bookshop produces the posters promoting demonstrations, and the placards used by demonstrators at the One Nation meetings. The Left Link mailing lists includes unmoderated mailing lists for the fringe elements of our society such as gays and lesbians and extremist left wing groups.

These are the sorts of minority groups now canvassed at election time by the mainstream political parties. A deplorable outcome of Labor's government in the

⁴⁰² See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/coredit10.html>

⁴⁰³ See: <http://www.alexia.net.au/~www/mhutton/>

⁴⁰⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/left/links.html> for copy of ACTU links page as at July 1997

⁴⁰⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/0209.html>

⁴⁰⁶ SEARCH Web Site: <http://www.search.org.au/>

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

1980s was the recognition by these minority groups of their political influence after Graham Richardson said Labor would go out to retain government “whatever it takes”.

Bob Hawke, Labor Prime Minister, 1986: “By 1990 no Australian child will be living in poverty.”

Salvation Army December 1998: “We estimate that 100,000 young Australians are homeless today.”

Left Link's role in the Hawthorn violence:

Leftlink guidelines state:

*LEFTLINK is a moderated list. This means that extraneous messages such as requests for subscriptions and other messages that do not meet the guidelines are not published*⁴⁰⁷.

Given the guidelines, it is clear the moderators deliberately decided to promote the violence and undemocratic actions at One Nation meetings. The decision to carry posts promoting the Hawthorne demonstrations by the Leftlink moderators went ahead despite the earlier violence at a One Nation meeting at Dandenong.

The moderators of the Left Link on-line list are:

- ☐ Alistair Air (Undergraduate Student Member of Council, University of Technology, Sydney)
- ☐ Marg Hutton (proprietor of the New International Bookshop, Melbourne)
- ☐ Katrina Beard (apparently associated with Militant)
- ☐ Barbara Romeril (Executive Director Financial and Consumer Rights Council)
- ☐ Peter Ewer (with the Union Research Centre on Organisation and Technology (URCOT))

The extremist groups Militant and Socialist Alternative posted the messages below on the Left Link list in the lead up to Hawthorne⁴⁰⁸:

*Militant's Stephen Jolly (co-ordinator of violent protest in Dandenong in 1997*⁴⁰⁹):

1) Subject: **LL:AA: Hanson in Melbourne**

From: xxxxxx@mira.net (Militant)

Date: Tue, 14 Jul 1998 22:32:08 +1000

*Pauline Hanson is speaking at a One Nation meeting this Sunday at Hawthorn Town Hall, 360 Burwood Hwy. A rally has been called for 4pm
Militant PO Box xxxx, Collingwood, Victoria 3066, Australia*

2) Subject: **LL:AA: More on Hanson meeting Sun 19 July**

From: Sandra Bloodworth xxxx@pgrad.unimelb.edu.au>

Date: Tue, 14 Jul 1998 22:43:45 +1000

⁴⁰⁷ See: <http://www.alexia.net.au/~www/mhutton/guidelin.htm>

⁴⁰⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/left/melju98.html>

⁴⁰⁹ See chapter headed “Just who are the extremists?”

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

We have just heard from a source inside One Nation that Pauline Hanson will be speaking to an invitation only meeting in Melbourne this Sunday 19 July.

We realise this is short notice buthere's your chance to demonstrate against everything she stands for.

The demonstration is: 4pm SUNDAY 19 JULY

HAWTHORN TOWN HALL

360 BURWOOD RD near cnr Glenferrie Rd

HAWTHORN

POSTERS AND LEAFLETS WILL BE AVAILABLE FROM THE NEW INTERNATIONAL BOOKSHOP AS FROM WEDNESDAY.

FOR MORE INFORMATION PHONE SOCIALIST ALTERNATIVE ON 9427xxxx or e-mail us.

Please post this on any other lists you are on.

For the authorities having to deal with cleaning up the posters all over town - send the bill to the New International Book Shop at: TRADES HALL, corner Victoria & Lygon Sts entrance in Victoria St.

3) Subject: LL:REM: anti-Hanson DEMO

From: Sandra Bloodworth xxxx@pgrad.unimelb.edu.au

Date: Wed, 15 Jul 1998 22:08:36 +1000

We have had a number of requests asking us to confirm that the anti-Hanson demo this Sunday is definitely on.

It seems definite that Hanson herself will be speaking at the hawthorn town hall. This has been confirmed by the local progress press newspaper and the Boroondarra council.

We have also been told by a source inside the council that the police have been to the hawthorn town hall to make arrangements to protect Hanson.

A group of us will be meeting 2pm this Sunday July 19 outside the clocks at flinders street station before going to the demo. We will hand out leaflets advertising the demo against Hanson and then go as an organised group on the train to the demo. If you want to give us a hand then just turn up.

The demo itself is on at 4pm Sunday 19 July Hawthorn town hall 360 Burwood rd Hawthorn (near Glenferrie station)

This demo has been called at such short notice, there is no organising committee. This means everyone needs to take responsibility for contacting individuals, groups, unions etc who may be able to get a few people along, and who can bring banners, placards, means of making noise etc. Don't assume anyone you know has been contacted - ring, fax, e-mail them. If anyone can use posters/leaflets, we can fax you a copy if you ring 9427 xxxx, or pick up a copy at the New International Bookshop, Melb Uni SRC or La Trobe Uni SRC.

Don't let Hanson come to Melbourne without a massive response!

Sandra Bloodworth (Socialist Alternative)

The day after the demonstration Mick Armstrong of Socialist Alternative sent the following report to Left Link. It says much about the mentality of the protestors that he was proud that violence had stopped a legitimate public meeting:

*1998: Subject: LL:ART: **Organiser's report on anti-Hanson demo***

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

From: Sandra Bloodworth xxxx@pgrad.unimelb.edu.au

Date: Mon, 20 Jul 1998 11:34:44 +1000

As one of the people who initiated the successful demonstration that stopped Pauline Hanson from speaking at her meeting in Hawthorn on Sunday I was inspired by the magnificent turn out, given that we had only a few short days to organise it.

Over two thousand anti-racists turned up to protest despite a virtual total media black out on advertising the demo. The ABC banned any mention of the demo on radio because "anti-Hanson demonstrations are political" as the producer of John Fane's program on 3LO put it to me when I rang to complain about their censorship. So much for "freedom of speech". Hanson can get her views on national television anytime she likes but anti-racists who want to organise against her are systematically silenced.

The media black out meant we had to rely on word of mouth, ring arounds, a bit of postering, leafleting, radio 3CR and Left Link to get the word out. If we had had more time there is no doubt that we would have had tens of thousands at the demo.

The hostility to Hanson was evident everywhere.

As usual the media went over the top about "violence" at the demo. But as someone who was consistently moving around the crowd, megaphone in hand, trying to co-ordinate the activity of the protestors I saw very little "violence" from protestors. In a tactic copied from the recent MUA struggle we formed a solid picket line around the meeting. People linked arms and formed up to try to prevent the One Nation supporters entering the meeting. Protestors were on a number of occasions attacked and assaulted by some of the One Nation supporters, but we stood our ground. Later on the police made a series of outrageous and unprovoked attacks on the crowd using their horses.

The police galloped their horses up Burwood Road outside the Hawthorn Town Hall knocking over and injuring people who were well away from where any confrontation was taking place. I saw one young woman knocked to the ground right in front of me by a galloping horse, even the Socialist Alternative bookstall which I was standing behind at the time was knocked over by charging police horses!

This police action was clearly aimed at breaking up and demoralising the crowd. But it totally back fired on the police. The demonstrators were not intimidated and stood their ground and the police were forced to admit defeat and Hanson abandoned the meeting. This was an important victory for anti-racists, something we need to build on if we are to turn the tide against the Hansonites. It showed that determined mass action can push back the racists.

We should not be intimidated by press lies about "violence" or their hypocritical chorus about "freedom of speech" from defending the demonstration on Sunday and building further demonstrations. Hanson has more "freedom of speech" than any of us could dream of, all the media and the Liberals want to do is to silence our right to protest against racism. No one has the right to foment racism and go unchallenged. We have seen what has happened in Europe when the racists were allowed to organise without being systematically opposed and demonstrated against. It has led to real violence: the murder of Asian and Turkish migrants, skinhead gangs roaming the streets.

It is no coincidence that in Melbourne where there has consistently been militant demonstrations against One Nation whenever they have tried to

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

organise that their support is lowest. The demonstrations give confidence to anti-racist and to Asian people and Aborigines who are under attack from Hanson and they also serve to make it much harder for One Nation to build up a strong group of active supporters in Melbourne.

We now need to go on from our success on Sunday to build a broader anti-racist movement. We need to put pressure on our trade unions, student unions, Ethnic Community organisations, Aboriginal groups and so on to combine to organise a huge anti-racist demo which takes over the streets of Melbourne like we saw in support of the wharfies during the height of their magnificent struggle.

Mick Armstrong

Socialist Alternative

So much for the media-portrayed spontaneity of the demonstrations. In mid July, shortly after Hawthorn, International Socialist Organisation (ISO) leader, David Glanz, said in a post targeting another One Nation meeting on Left Link:

“Martin Ferguson MP and local Labor candidate Mary Delahunty have been invited to speak.”

When I enquired over the phone on Wednesday 22nd July 1998 about the Labor MPs participation, David Glanz told me that both Ferguson’s and Delahunty’s offices had been contacted by ISO over the previous two weeks and that they were sympathetic. He told me that Delahunty was expected to attend the ISO rally against One Nation at Northcote in a private capacity.

The Labor Party stands condemned for its hidden involvement in co-ordinating violent and abusive demonstrators at One Nation meetings. The facts speak for themselves:

- ☐ Left Link’s association with the ACTU (as shown on the ACTU’s Internet web page)
- ☐ The ALP is the political arm of the ACTU.
- ☐ The funding provided to Left Link by SEARCH – a non-profit body with several Labor leaders on its board.
- ☐ The location of Left Link’s facilitators, the New International Bookshop, at Trades Hall (ACTU owned offices)
- ☐ The direct contact between Labor politicians like Martin Ferguson and the organisers
- ☐ Demonstrators catch buses to One Nation meetings from Trades Hall
- ☐ The links from Left Link home page to the ALP and the Australian Democrats

Despite this information having been given to the media time and again it has been totally ignored. This is a remarkable demonstration of biased reporting when you consider the manner in which the media creates fact out of fantasy based on the slightest negative rumour and innuendo against One Nation. This is the same media that has a reputation of not publishing a correction in instances where their reporting has been proven to be inaccurate⁴¹⁰.

Some of the unmoderated on-line gay and lesbian bulleting board links promoted by Left Link⁴¹¹:

⁴¹⁰ See chapter headed “Just who are the extremists?”.

⁴¹¹ See: <http://www.alexia.net.au/~www/mhutton/>

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

Australian Queer Mailing Lists; Australian Queer Resources Directory; Brother Sister; Digital Queers Australia; Lesbians & Gays for Reconciliation; International Gay & Lesbian Human Rights Commission; Lesbian.org; Lesbian and Queer Resources; NSW Campaign For Equal Age of Consent; Pride Sydney Gay & Lesbian Community Centre; Queensland Association for Gay and Lesbian Rights; Queers for Reconciliation

Some of the political parties and figures that have been and are promoted by Left Link:

Sinn Fein; Communist Party of Australia; Communist Party of the United States; Militant; Labor Party; New Labor Party; Mumia Abul-Jamal (Black Panther terrorist).

The only report that has ever appeared discussing allegations of a link between the Labor Party and Left Link in the media appeared in the O'Reilly owned *Queensland Times* on Tuesday, 18th August 1997.⁴¹²

The Australian Labor Party was sanctioning a boycott of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games because its Internet site was linked to a letter by activist Lorenzo Komboa Ervin⁴¹³, Federal Member for Oxley Pauline Hanson said yesterday.

Ms Hanson said even though the Federal Government had banned Mr Ervin from entering the Australia, he was in contact with "radicals in Australia through LeftLink, a violent, on-line underground arm of the ALP".

She said correspondence LeftLink had posted on the Internet stated that Mr Ervin was planning to return to Australia and had set up a "Boycott 2000 Coalition" in the 17 countries that had protested his deportation from Australia.

She said LeftLink was accessed through the ACTU web page⁴¹⁴, which described LeftLink as a national organisation. The ACTU web page was included on the ALP web page, therefore the ALP had sanctioned the information LeftLink presented.

An ALP spokesman and ACTU spokesman did not respond to an invitation to comment on the matter yesterday.....

Ms Hanson said extracts from the correspondence between the Aboriginal Nyungah tribe and Mr Ervin posted by LeftLink proved Australia must denounce Mr Ervin.

The letter from Mr Ervin said⁴¹⁵: "cause it not only makes your wishes known, but it confirms our statements that an international boycott of these bread and circus Olympic games, on stolen land soaked with the blood of your ancestors, is really the way forward to winning the human rights of the indigenous people in the land known as Australia.

What is interesting is the fact that none of the press have ever reported on this extremist arm of the Labor party and its role in the violent anti-Hanson protests. Instead Australians have been fed the nonsense that the thoroughly organised demonstrations are spontaneous reactions that somehow just happen.

⁴¹² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/left/alp.html>

⁴¹³ See chapter headed "Censoring the truth"

⁴¹⁴ See: <http://www.actu.asn.au/links.htm>

⁴¹⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/left/ervin4.html>

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

(See chapter "Censoring the truth")

The Australia/Israel Review⁴¹⁶ (AIR)

Citizen's Electoral Council⁴¹⁷ on the AIR:

As far as the "Money Power" behind AIR, here are the figures who have been most closely associated with the magazine in recent years, and their net worth according to the latest BRW "Rich 200" list:

Frank Lowy⁴¹⁸, key figure in Sydney AIR operations (\$2.1 billion, Australia's 2nd richest man); Isador Magid, co-founder of AIP, with Jabotinsky⁴¹⁹ follower Robert Zablud (\$165 million); Solomon Lew, key figure in Melbourne AIR operations (\$600 million); Isi Leibler, called for founding of AIR, and whose Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ) overlaps personnel with AIR (\$80 million);

Mark Leibler, present chairman of AIR (net worth unknown, but represents at least 30 people on BRW "200 Rich List", and sits on the board of Coles Myer under Chairman Stan Wallis, author of the Wallis report to deregulate Australia's financial institutions).

As for AIR chairman and tax lawyer Mark Leibler, he is perhaps best known for inventing tax havens to get his super-wealthy clients off with little or no taxes. When ABC's 7:30 Report did a story on July 8 1996 asking "Where is the missing \$800 million?" that the government had promised to collect from ultra-wealthy tax dodgers, it answered its own question, stating "All roads to Leibler--Mark Leibler". Indeed, the 1984 McCabe LaFranchi Report on Tax Avoidance named Leibler as a director of seven companies, and an advisor of many others, which went to the "bottom of the harbour" in the well-known scam of that name.

Mark Leibler is a senior partner in the specialist tax business Arnold Bloch Leibler⁴²⁰ which is based in Melbourne. It reportedly boasts about 30 of Australia's top 200 wealthiest families as clients. He is also a director of Coles Myer Ltd⁴²¹ and Jetset Tours Pty Ltd and a former president of the Australian Zionist Organisation which is directly funded by the openly racist state of Israel. He has also been allegedly associated with Israel's secret service, Mossad.

Amongst his 'community activities' he heads the Ethnic Coalition of Australia based at his offices under convenor, Helene Teichmann. Teichmann told me on 17th December 1998 that the Ethnic Coalition of Australia was an exclusive club targeted at combating racial vilification but limited to acting on behalf of only the Italian, Greek, Vietnamese, Chinese and Jewish communities. She also told me "that other Asian, Indian, and even indigenous communities were not welcome"

⁴¹⁶ On-line at: <http://www.join.org.au/aijac/>

⁴¹⁷ See: <http://www.cecaust.mel.net/page4.htm>

⁴¹⁸ Frank Lowy is Australia's 2nd wealthiest person. He owns 45% of the "Westfield Shopping Centres". Coles Myer is normally a major tenant at preferential rental arrangements - subsidised by the small businesses operating there. See: http://www.brw.com.au/root_brw/rich200/fs_family.htm#

⁴¹⁹ See also "Hansonism, Tricks or Treat" by Don Veitch

⁴²⁰ See: <http://uniserve.edu.au/law/pub/journals/mulr/Vol19No4JohnAzzi.html>

⁴²¹ See: http://www.colesmyer.com.au/about_cml/photo_lib/people.htm

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

within this Ethnic Coalition. It is under this organisation that Leibler claims to represent a '*broad alliance*' of communities.

Leibler and his brother Isi have boasted that many of Australia's one hundred wealthiest families have contracted their companies to look after their tax affairs. This means they assist the wealthy to avoid paying tax by using offshore companies and trusts in countries like the Bermudas where there is no tax.

It was through services, such as those provided by Mark Leibler, that Kerry Packer, Australia's richest man, was assessed as owing just Au\$32 in personal income tax over three years.

Kerry Packer is not an Australian citizen he is a bona-fide multinational and should, therefore, be stripped of all his media assets.
Scott Balson

The Sydney Morning Herald wrote on the 17th September 1997:

One of the advisers to many of the 100 families on this hit-list, the Melbourne-based lawyer Mark Leibler, detailed the embarrassing backdown by the ATO, Treasury and the Howard Government in a paper to a conference in June on "Effective Utilisation of Trust Structures". Leibler describes the crackdown as a "witch hunt", and defends the legitimate use of trusts.

In May last year, Costello began the back-peddalling when he announced that collection of the \$800million had been deferred by one year "to allow time to develop appropriate responses to extremely complex issues".

Costello's August Budget said that the figure was merely the amount of "revenue at risk", rather than what could be collected. Instead of \$800million, the Budget papers put an estimate of \$100million for this financial year and said it was impossible to make estimates for subsequent years.

This assessment was quite at odds with Ralph Willis' announcement of the crackdown, which talked about "additional revenue" of \$800million.

The residual is a mere estimate of the amount of revenue lost from tax minimisation by these 100 families. Collecting the money, as experience has shown, is another thing altogether.

It is also of interest to note that the Pauline Hanson Internet site, managed by Global Web Builders, managing director Scott Balson (GWB), has provided an Internet link to the racist publication The Strategy which claims "... to present the 'truth' without fear or favour, irrespective of its source". However, the associations between GWB and The Strategy exceed simply sharing of common ideology, rather it appears that the two organisations have formed a business arrangement, whereby GWB promotes The Strategy and vice-versa.

Mr Mark Briskin, Director Research and Publications of the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission said, "It appears that One Nation has become a forum for a range of far-right groups to advance their ideas, including militias, conspirators and xenophobes, as evidenced in the effective merger of the Australians Against Further Immigration with One Nation. There is striking resonance between the views espoused in extremist publications such as The Strategy and the National Interest with the speeches given by Hanson. No one should doubt One Nation's right-wing credentials."

Leibler clearly saw Pauline Hanson's One Nation as a threat not because of the allegations of racism, but because of the demand by Ms Hanson that everybody, *including the country's wealthiest* – his big-spending clients - started paying their share of tax. Ms Hanson was well known for taking the multinationals that paid little or no tax to task. She was serious about closing the loopholes.

It is therefore ironic and hypocritical that the *Australia/Israel Review* questioned the financial affairs of One Nation's director of administration, David Ettridge. In an article which received wide publicity in the mainstream media Michael Kapel made allegations about David Ettridge's past use of the same tax avoidance techniques recommended by the Leibler brothers.

In the *Australia/Israel Review*, August 1997 Kapel⁴²³ wrote:

The company (Ettridge's) was established as an International Company under Vanuatu's complex web of company provisions, which make the tiny island state one of the most impenetrable tax havens in the world. Global Communications is exempt from stamp duty and has few government fees. It was registered in several hours, according to the staff at the Financial Services Commission. Julian Ala, Commissioner of the FSC, confirmed to the Review that the company is not required by the Government of Vanuatu to "pay income tax, capital gains tax, withholding tax or estate dut". Nor are there any exchange duties, foreign currency regulations or reporting requirements attached to it. Ala also confirmed to the Review that the company is guaranteed strict secrecy by Vanuatu legislation (Ala stated that under Vanuatu law, if he revealed further details of the company to us he could face a lengthy prison sentence) and requires only a registered agent in Vanuatu and the payment of an annual registration fee of \$450.

The story dominated the nation's headlines for weeks. David Ettridge was personally vilified by the Murdoch media and questions were asked as to what The Australian Tax Office would do about it. Ettridge was later able to demonstrate that he never owned the company – a point lost to the media. The mainstream media has never investigated any link between the Leibler brothers and their select clients or with the *Australia/Israel Review*.

The Murdoch media's selective outrage was ironic in light of what the Washington Post had to say about the Murdoch empire's tax avoidance just months later on the 7th December 1997⁴²⁴:

In the mid-1980s, media tycoon Rupert Murdoch abruptly renounced his Australian birthright and became an American citizen. The move allowed him to comply with U.S. law prohibiting foreign ownership of television stations -- and helped Murdoch build a global entertainment empire that now includes 22 U.S. TV stations, TV Guide magazine, the 20th Century Fox movie studio and a huge U.S. broadcast network.

Today those U.S. subsidiaries provide Murdoch's company, News Corp., with the vast majority of its revenue and profit. But through the deft use of international accounting loopholes and offshore tax havens, Murdoch has paid

⁴²² See: <http://www.wej.com.au/adc/media/10June.htm>

⁴²³ See: <http://www.join.org.au/aijac/97-08-29/company.htm>

⁴²⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/multi/newstax1.html>

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

corporate income taxes at one-fifth the rate of his chief U.S. rivals throughout the 1990s, according to corporate documents and company officials....

A 1989 report by an Australian parliament committee -- apparently the only government accounting of News Corp's taxes made public -- found that the company earned all of its total annual profits through subsidiaries in low-tax countries such as the Netherlands Antilles and Bermuda.

In contrast, News Corp's main subsidiaries in Australia, Britain and the United States, all relatively high-tax countries, recorded losses that year. Thus, by routing profits through low-tax jurisdictions and, simultaneously, accumulating expenses and recording losses in high-tax domains, News Corp. was able to greatly reduce its overall tax bill.

Israeli officials late last year went beyond merely studying News Corp. Tax authorities in Jerusalem and Haifa raided a News Corp. subsidiary in an investigation into whether the company had schemed to evade taxes on \$150 million in income, according to published accounts. News Corp. has vigorously denied any wrongdoing.

But of course none of this damaging expose was ever reported in Australia -- except for a brief passing flurry in Fairfax - and no politician who had any desire for a future would have dared raised the issue.

Another Australia/Israel Review anti-Hanson reporter is David Greason. Greason admitted in a book he published at university, "I was a teenage fascist". Commenting on the riff-raff who support Ms Hanson he wrote:

No, John Howard looks at her supporters, and he takes out his Casio pocket calculator and his Malcolm Mackerras pendulum, and thinks: Those people should be mine. And if I keep my trap shut a little longer, and wait till Pauline self-destructs, they will be mine.

Well, they won't be. They won't be because she's happy to talk about Asian immigration swamping us, and get called a racist and she doesn't back down. Howard said the same in 1988 and back-pedalled a thousand miles an hour once the blowtorch came out. People remember that. In fact, Howard can't win however he cuts it. He tells the media that Hanson's not a racist, as he said the other month, and her supporters don't think, Mmm, he's on our side, they think, So why did you expel her from the party during the election?

Frankly, these people don't care what the bleeding heart liberal elite has to say about Hanson. We don't care if she doesn't have the answers, they say, because neither do you. They back her out of spite, like some US blacks back that hokey old fascist Louis Farrakhan simply and solely because he bugs out whitey.

Considering that the Australia/Israel Review justifies Israel's racist persecution of the Palestinians it was rather hypocritical of him to write⁴²⁵:

6) Israel claims that Palestinian complaints over an extra 4000 Jewish apartments at Har Homa are ingenuous. Israel is building 3,500 Palestinian homes in Jerusalem neighbourhoods. Further, Arab building and population in Jerusalem has skyrocketed. In 1967 there were 12,200 Arab owned apartments in Jerusalem. In 1995 there were 27,066 - an increase of 122%. Between 1971 and 1994, the Jerusalem Council granted permits for 1.1 million square meters of residential development by Palestinians. The real figure is believed to be double, with many buildings having no permits. Arab construction has also been done in a strategic manner to surround the Jewish Old city with new Palestinian

⁴²⁵ See: <http://www.join.org.au/aijac/97-03-22/10sins.htm>

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

neighbourhoods emerging in the North, South eastern and Southern parts of Jerusalem.

It is an undisputable fact that the Arabs make up 20% of the population in Israel. While B'nai B'rith and the Zionist *Australia/Israel Review* propaganda machines plough out mountains of vile claiming that Pauline Hanson and One Nation are “racist” these representatives of the Israeli state should be reminded of the words of the first Arabic candidate for the Israeli presidency, “*Arabs are paid less than Jewish Israelis and are excluded from positions of influence in the Israeli government*” (March 1999).

The common Arab position on Israel is censored from media reports⁴²⁶.. this is, *Zionism has resulted in an oppressive regime (not unlike its neighbours), and a denial of another nation's human and national rights. The attempt at re-enacting the Exodus in 1896-present in a most violent manner, has sowed the seed for future conflicts and bloodshed. I refuse to buy the Zionist argument that the cause of the Palestinian problem lies in the Arab refusal of the 1947 partition plan.*

How did anyone expect the Palestinians to agree to a plan that forfeited their rights to half their land, and that without them even being consulted? Zionism, instead of encouraging a symbiosis between the Jews and the Palestinians (who racially are their next of kin), instituted a policy of dispossession upon a nation already exhausted by centuries of occupation.

But of course double standards are par for the course in the Australian media.

AIR and Leibler's list

But previously, no one has ever suggested that the answer to these problems was to publish the names of all party members indiscriminately.
Ron Brunton⁴²⁷

The *Australia/Israel Review* overstepped the mark when it unilaterally published a list of names of some 2,000 One Nation supporters under the banner cover “*Gotcha!*” in the week of the 9th July 1998⁴²⁸.

The source of the list, illegally copied from the Manly office computer files of One Nation was unknown. It was later discovered that a former One Nation supporter in Victoria, who apparently managed the office computers, had taken copies of computer files when he left the party in early 1998. This is the most probable source.

The unauthorised and intimidatory publishing of the list of names and their suburbs smacked of Nazism - it was the very intimidation that Jewish people complained of and warned about.

Incredibly the Murdoch media, with one exception outlined below, did not condemn the bastardry of the men and women who were behind this appalling behaviour. The vilification of One Nation has been so intense only people with courage ‘came out’ as supporters. It was not paranoia to be alarmed at the prospect of exposure. Showing his contempt for people’s rights to privacy the

⁴²⁶ See: <http://www.geocities.com/WallStreet/Floor/5779/commentary.html>

⁴²⁷ See: See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/coredit10.html>

⁴²⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/0907.html>

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

editor of the magazine Michael Kapel said, *"We believe in a healthy democracy... (allowing us to publish the list)"*.

Fortunately some prominent people publicly rebuked the *Australia/Israel Review*. In the *Courier-Mail* of 18th July 1998 Ron Brunton condemned its callous disregard for people's safety and its hypocrisy⁴²⁹:

The magazine also claimed that it had withheld the addresses and telephone numbers of members "in the interests of privacy". But the magazine did not care tuppence about anybody's privacy. It is very easy to work out the details of many people on the list, especially those with less common names or who live in small towns. Using a sample of 250 names as a test, I was able to discover the full addresses and telephone numbers of about 30% in only a couple of hours.

Given the physical violence that has already been directed against One Nation supporters, publication of the list can only be seen as intimidation - not against the extremists who have infiltrated the party, or its autocratic leaders - but against a rather haphazard collection of ordinary people who have joined One Nation for a variety of reasons. Had an Arabic newspaper, or a magazine of the anti-Israel hard left, published a list of members of a Zionist organisation, there would have been much justifiable outrage and anxiety in the Jewish community and the Australia/Israel Review would have led the condemnation.

As if to demonstrate Brunton's point, Natasha Bita⁴³⁰ from *The Australian* contacted a One Nation donor, J Bubb, whose name and suburb had been listed in the notorious article contacted me on the 4th July 1998 at 2.30pm saying: *"I am perturbed that my name was published in this magazine. The Australian newspaper was able to track me down from the listing because the article listed my suburb - who else could now use that information? If my house is fire bombed who do I blame?"*

Pauline Hanson's political adviser, David Oldfield, said:

"It's just a disgraceful intrusion. You leave these people potentially open to persecution by lunatics. The history of the Jewish people, which we all are very, very sorry about, must surely tell them that you don't go around publishing lists of confidential memberships."

Radio personality Alan Jones summed up the widespread disgust at the Review's dangerous tactic extremely well on the 9th September, when he said:

"There is no doubt that we are now seeing evidence of an appalling Australian characteristic. If you can't win on the intellectual front - call people names. Pauline Hanson's emergence has threatened the conventional political forces.

"Every politician now knows that a lot of people out there have had a gutful of being ignored, unrepresented, and force fed policy and decision that they don't agree with, but now the best it seems, and the most vicious way to counter all this is to call Pauline Hanson a 'racist'. Say it without any proof.

"In other words if people disagree about the way Aborigines should be best treated call them 'racist', if they disagree on the levels of migration, call them 'racist'.

"Now we have the appalling business of members of the One Nation party being named in the Australia/Israel Review, 2000 One Nation members and the suburbs in which they live, do you mind.

⁴²⁹ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/coredit10.html>

⁴³⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/0907.html>

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

“What the hell are we up to? Are these people rapists, are they paedophiles, are they thieves, are they criminals?”

“Do we have a list of those who are members of the Communist Party, the Labor Party, the National Party, or is this just designed to promote hatred and vilification of Pauline Hanson. Well it won’t work.

“Quite frankly there are many Australians who think the emergence of Pauline Hanson’s party is a welcome burr in the political saddle, but they don’t believe that after the next election anyone other than John Howard or Kim Beazley will be riding the political horse, but now we have name calling, vilification, and even attempts to deny freedom of association and freedom of speech.

“Pauline Hanson’s Party emerged by wondering out aloud what kind of Australia we were creating.

“Her critics are now proving Pauline Hanson was right to ask that question.”

Perhaps the most important, yet poignant point about the unauthorised publication of the 2000 names is summed up in the e-mail received at the *Australian National News of the Day*:

Dear Scott,

In light of the recent Media hysteria and naming of people associated with One Nation, I wish to be removed from the One Nation Mailing list permanently. I trust this will happen swiftly and I will not receive any further communication.

regards, (Name Withheld)

The publication of Leibler’s list marks a black day in Australian political life. Thankfully it back-fired. The media have often referred to Pauline Hanson’s One Nation party as anti-Semitic with absolutely no basis for the comment. Though Leibler’s list was clear evidence that the Zionists in Australia had used Nazi style tactics, the *Australia/Israel Review* suffered little criticism of any substance in the mainstream media. Unlike the continuing episodic references to Ms Hanson’s death video to ridicule her, the Leibler’s list story which was of great importance in Australia’s political history was soon shelved.

Leibler’s impact in the bigger media picture is quite small, but the publication of the list is an example of the techniques used on a far larger scale in Canberra by the Murdoch/Packer media empires.

AIR respond to “Murder by Media”

It did not take long after the launch of “Murder by Media” for the senior staff at the *Australia/Israel Review* to go into damage control using their mainstream media mates and the publication itself to try to denigrate my character.

A senior editor at the AIR, Jeremy Jones, who is also National Vice-President of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry wrote a long diatribe headed “*Always Conspiracy*” which was carried in the 29th January to 28th February edition of the AIR.

The article is a direct response to the comments made in this chapter. Amongst the claims made in Jones’ article are the following classic misrepresentations of the truth⁴³¹:

Of course @notd has in its sights not just soft drinks, but evil media barons who will as easily mislead the public on health issues as they will immorally portray Pauline Hanson and One Nation as other than a squadron of winged

⁴³¹ See: <http://members.tripod.com/balson/air.htm>

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

virtues flying in to save us from the Westminster system, constitutional law and cultural diversity.

One criticism which particularly upsets @notd's editor and the One Nation Revolutionary Guards who comprise most of its contributors, is that One Nation is "racist", and in the context of the Australia/Israel Review it is worthwhile recording @notd's track record in this area.

Balson himself described Australian Jewry as an "elite racist community", whatever that is meant to mean, Israel as "the world's most racist state", and referred recently to George Soros as "a Jewish parasite". He has referred to Jews as Nazis and claimed Israel survives because of "well-placed Jews in the US".

Of course the only place that I have made the connection between "Jews as Nazis" is on page 180 of this book under the heading "AIR and Leibler's list" I state: *The unauthorised and intimidatory publishing of the list of names and their suburbs smacked of Nazism - it was the very intimidation that Jewish people complained of and warned about.*

Very different to the diatribe that he wrote. The claim that I described Australian Jewry as an "elite racist community" is untrue. I have referred to the anti-Palestinian racism of Israel on page 177 of this book where I say the "openly racist state of Israel"... there never has been a comment like this in the @notd despite Jones' claim.

Jones very cleverly gets the @notd "mixed up" with "Murder by Media" with the book getting a passing reference at the end of his article when he writes,

Perhaps the main charges which @notd's contributors level at Jews is undue influence over the media, and it "is the media" which Scott Balson targets in his first venture into the world of ink and paper, "Murder by Media, Death of Democracy in Australia".

Apparently Jones' article went down very well at the *Courier-Mail* because on the Monday 15th March 1999 the paper carried an opinion piece "Web of Hate" written by a Jane Fynes-Clinton⁴³² in which Jeremy Jones is the star "witness".

The article, accompanied by the image of a large burning cross towering over a computer monitor, gives Jones another exclusive opportunity to present his perspective on the @notd and myself.

In the article, Fynes-Clinton writes, *He is concerned about a web site which gears the features of a news group and describes itself as an Internet newspaper called Australian National News of the Day. It is published by One Nation's web master, Scott Balson, and often contains overt as well as ambiguous anti-Jewish material.*

"Every so often, Balson will refer readers to a specific document and some of the documents recently have included one from the World Church of the Creator which is one of the most violent white supremacist groups in the United States," Jones says. "Having a link to such a site or promoting a site is only one step away from saying these things himself."

In true *Courier-Mail* style I was not contacted to allow for balance on the views that Jones was making. And no reference to this book was made.

Jones' claims were, of course, false. I sent a "right of reply" that day and immediately contacted the *Australian Press Council*⁴³³ (APC) who contacted the *Courier-Mail* on Thursday the 18th March.

⁴³² See: <http://members.tripod.com/balson/cour1.htm>

Chapter 13 - The anti-One Nation extremists

The *Courier-Mail* only carried an edited version of my right of reply on the next day, Friday, four days after receiving the APC's request and on the suggestion of the APC. The right of reply read (*the text highlighted being edited out by the Courier-Mail*):

No Knowledge of this group

I refer to the article in the Courier-Mail (15/3/99) headed "Web of Hate" by Jane Fynes-Clinton alongside the image of a big burning cross coming out of a computer screen. The reporter makes reference to me by name and labels me as maintaining a web site which "often contains overt as well as ambiguous anti-Jewish material". If the unsubstantiated claims against me did not get the message through the burning cross did.

As you would be aware I am the author of the book "Murder by Media, Death of Democracy in Australia" which was released in January this year. This book clearly identifies the Courier-Mail as not always maintaining the highest journalistic standards.

The article referred to above is classic Courier-Mail with about as much credibility as the flow of bias emanating from a number of Labor party media advisers. These men and women have reported for you on political issues in the past - when Labor has been in opposition and their political jobs have been made temporarily redundant during this period.

For a start the reporter never contacted me to get any semblance of balance in her story. The sole source of her "information", Jeremy Jones, is a reporter at the Australia/Israel Review - that Jewish publication which, last year, published the names and suburbs of 2000 One Nation members and donors in a style reminiscent of that used by the Nazis in the 1930s.

For the record I am not anti-semitic. I have never heard of the "World Church of the Creator" a group which Jones refers to as "the most violent white supremacist group in the United States". Jones is obviously far better informed about their activities than I am and I would suggest that your readers consider why - seeing that this raises an issue of race not religion.

Scott Balson, Karana Downs

⁴³³ The APC have an on-line complaint form at:
<http://www.presscouncil.org.au/pcsites/compform.html>

*Chapter 14 – Part One - Media Reports half told –
Dissension in the One Nation ranks and One Nation factions.*

**Chapter 14 – part 1
Media Reports half told –
Dissension in One Nation ranks and factions.**

While the freedom enjoyed by the press carries with it the responsibilities not adhered to by all journalists, that essential freedom to honestly report what is of genuine public interest or concern must be maintained through a situation of independence, and not be allowed to in any way to be influenced by one or two powerful individuals. The Australian people have reason to be concerned by any decision that may lead to any form of conflict or potential monopoly. I urge our current government to be very careful with the issue of media.

Pauline Hanson⁴³⁴, press release, 26/6/97

Stories to maximise damage to One Nation at the expense of balance and ethical reporting are a daily occurrence in the mainstream Australian media.

Typically a Labor faction member - a Coalition or Labor politician - claims that Pauline Hanson and/or One Nation has had a negative effect on trade, tourism, the exchange rate, overseas students' enrolments, incidents of racial abuse It's remarkable that One Nation has not yet been blamed for global warming and the spread of AIDS⁴³⁵.

The media then run with the stories domestically, and frequently their claims of damage to Australia's international reputation generate interest in the overseas media, setting up a vicious circle.

The reports become fact even though they are based on half-truths and at times, outright lies. When the lie is discovered there is no retraction published and the other side of the story is rarely if ever told.

One of the Murdoch media's favourite stories is the “*demise of One Nation*”. Reports of its falling apart started to circulate just months after the formation of the party and have continued with predictable and monotonous regularity.

David Oldfield observed that any disenchanted member could phone up the papers and be guaranteed nationwide coverage if he or she claimed that there was a revolt in the party.

The following examples demonstrate the truth of his observation. The media has never reported the true outcomes. Thoughtful Australians must eventually wonder how the party not only continues to grow but has even survived after all the gung-ho reports of its 'demise'.

Beaudesert

One Nation held their annual general meeting at the Prosper Australia rally⁴³⁶ in Brisbane in early October 1997. Shortly afterwards there was a meeting held by a few disaffected members of the party at Beaudesert.⁴³⁷

⁴³⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/onenation/press/260697.html>

⁴³⁵ See: <http://www.cycad.com/cgi-bin/pinc/july97/feitz-oz-pc.html>

⁴³⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/bne>

⁴³⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/497/2410.html#one>

**Chapter 14 – Part One - Media Reports half told –
Dissension in the One Nation ranks and One Nation factions.**

Among them was Brian McDermott who was later identified as a member of Graeme Campbell's Australia First party. Also attending was Malcolm Taylor the president of the party's largest branch in Hervey Bay⁴³⁸ (on the Queensland central coast). Without the knowledge of the party's executive, these dissidents registered a "One Nation Queensland" party and invited Pauline Hanson to be the party's patron.

The dissent was widely reported in the media, and the claim was made that the party was splitting because of the autocratic structure headed by David Oldfield, David Ettridge and Pauline Hanson.

On Sunday the 2nd November 1997 I attended a meeting in Hervey Bay aimed at resolving the issue⁴³⁹. Also at the meeting were the two Davids and Pauline Hanson.

At that meeting, attended by over a hundred members of the Hervey Bay branch, Pauline Hanson expressed her total confidence in the two Davids and said that she had no confidence in Malcolm Taylor after his action in registering "One Nation Queensland" without consulting her first. To emphasise her point she said, *"I will resign from politics if someone tries to run my party (without my blessing)."*

Malcolm Taylor was given the right to reply by the One Nation executive. This was his response:

"I have refused to talk to the media. I have refused to talk to the television stations who have dogged me.

"I will be the first to admit that I have erred in my decision to register One Nation Queensland.

"When I signed the document I had to spew because I was so upset about what I had done.

"We never had the intention to cause a division.... I sleep in the back of my truck or sometimes on the side of the road while going out (for One Nation) to drum up support.

"I will be the first to apologise for what I have done."

Outcome: the death of the short-lived media-inspired 'revolt'. Malcolm Taylor's apology to Ms Hanson was never covered by the press.

Newcastle

In December 1997 Peter Archer, the One Nation organiser who had been hounded by the demonstrators at the Newcastle meeting some months before, broke away from the party⁴⁴⁰.

With nationwide television coverage and front page newspaper reports, Peter Archer, Ken and Val Doran claimed that they had established the new "Australian One Nation" (AON). They claimed to have taken over one third of Pauline Hanson's One Nation (PHON) branches – some 78 branches⁴⁴¹.

⁴³⁸ See colour plates in centre of book.

⁴³⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/hervey/>

⁴⁴⁰ See chapter headed "Just who are the extremists?"

⁴⁴¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/497/1812.html>

**Chapter 14 – Part One - Media Reports half told –
Dissension in the One Nation ranks and One Nation factions.**

On the 15th December the *Sydney Morning Herald's* Greg Roberts carried this story⁴⁴²:

Mrs Pauline Hanson's One Nation party is in turmoil, with rebel members forming a rival party and police investigations involving her supporters under way in three States and federally.

The party of the Independent MP for Oxley shows signs of imploding amid allegations being levelled by members against each other ranging from secretly taping private telephone conversations to making animal pornography videos.

The rebel party, the Australian One Nation Party, was launched at a meeting yesterday in Cessnock attended by 75 people.

Representatives from eight Queensland branches and three South Australian branches of the Hanson party met simultaneously in Rockhampton and Adelaide to endorse the rebels.

The new party claims to be backed by the leadership of 67 of Mrs Hanson's 220 branches.".....

Mr Peter Archer said he was sacked as Hunter Valley region organiser last month largely because of concerns he expressed about the growing influence in the party of right-wing extremists, particularly Mr Tony Pitt⁴⁴³, publisher of the journal Wake Up Australia.

I decided to check out the claims with the dissidents first hand⁴⁴⁴:

SB (Scott Balson): Can you confirm that the Orange branch of PHON has broken away and joined AON?

VD (Val Doran): Certainly not Orange - the indication was that there is only one branch which has broken away in the central west and that is Gilgandra.

When I spoke to David Ettridge, the national director of One Nation later that day, he confirmed that one person who used to be a member of Gilgandra, Gary Edwards, had left the party - however the branch remained intact.

SB: So how many branches have you taken away from PHON?

VD: 78 branches. 67 from New South Wales, 3 from South Australia and 8 from Queensland.

SB: Are you saying that 78 branches of PHON have actually voted to leave PHON?

VD: Yes. There is a lot of dissatisfaction and disillusionment with PHON. Some members, full branches and branches which have been dissolved are joining us. About 2000 people from PHON representing the 78 branches are joining us. We only include existing PHON branches in that figure of 78.

At this stage Ken Doran took over the interview.

KD: There is some confusion over the figures. Val gave you the wrong number there are actually 67 branches who have left PHON to join AON. 59 are in New South Wales and 8 are in Queensland. We have some members from 3 South Australian PHON branches joining us. As Val said we do not include branches where only a few members have joined AON in the 67. We are talking ENTIRE PHON branches. Examples of entire branches in Queensland that have moved to AON are: Rockhampton and Townsville. The Queensland state branch, under Peter Boyle, meet in early February.

⁴⁴² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/497/1612.html>

⁴⁴³ Tony Pitt is no longer a member of Pauline Hanson's One Nation party

⁴⁴⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/497/1812.html>

**Chapter 14 – Part One - Media Reports half told –
Dissension in the One Nation ranks and One Nation factions.**

I contacted the presidents of both Rockhampton (Herb Clark), and Townsville (Mark Swain) PHON branches.

Here are their verbatim statements:

Herb - Rockhampton: *"I can tell you that we are 100% behind Pauline Hanson. We have no thoughts of breaking away or joining Peter Archer." "I am speaking for my whole committee and 2,000 PHON members in central Queensland."*

Mark - Townsville: *"That (KD's claim) is totally incorrect. "We have not broken away. "We had the same concerns and problems (as AON) that we raised with Pauline Hanson directly and they have all been sorted out, they have been put behind us are we are now moving on 100% behind Pauline Hanson. The people causing the trouble (AON) now are politic opportunists. They forget that it was Pauline Hanson who put us in the same room together. The way they (Manly head office) have structured the party protects the membership. It protects the management (from legal or financial claim)."*

SB to KD: I have heard that PHON membership is exploding.

KD: That's a lot of crap. We have the membership figures of PHON. It did explode in June to August. However in Victoria they had less than 2,000 paid up members on the 1st November. I can tell you who member number 1948 who signed up on that day was. He was Ronald Wilson. His membership number on his PHON card is 1948.

According to David Ettridge who searched the database:

"We do not have a Ronald Wilson in our membership. Membership number 1948 belongs to someone else. Just like much of everything else that AON say that is total fabrication.

"The membership detail extracts supplied to Archer and others were supplied to them in their official capacity as PHON executives. For them to keep the records after they have deserted and to then use them to try to white ant us shows their true intentions.

KD (continues): Peter Archer was given a print out of all PHON members. As was Eric Bell in the south.

It was at this stage that I phoned David Ettridge and got the contact numbers for Rockhampton and Townsville (see statements above from branch presidents).

While speaking to Mark Swain from Townsville to get his statement Ken Doran phoned me back.

Second phone call with KD from AON:

SB: Ken, there is something that does not add up here. I have just received statements from the presidents of both Townsville and Rockhampton branches of PHON. They have confirmed that they are 100% behind Pauline Hanson and David Ettridge.

KD: We count a committee that has been sacked from PHON in the past as the true representatives of PHON.

SB: Are you saying in fact, that if PHON has fired a branch committee in the past for whatever reason and that if PHON still has an official branch running after they have been sacked that you do not recognise the official PHON branch but count the sacked executive as the PHON branch in your claims?

KD: Yes. Examples are Rockhampton, Kingaroy, Mudgee and Dobebe.

**Chapter 14 – Part One - Media Reports half told –
Dissension in the One Nation ranks and One Nation factions.**

SB: So your earlier claims that "entire" branches like Rockhampton and Townsville have joined AON are based on the involvement of presidents and branch committees who have been thrown out of the party in the past?

KD: Yes.

SB: So a branch like Rockhampton with hundreds of existing PHON members is totally discounted in favour of a sacked executive when counting your 67 PHON branches?

KD: Yes. But eight PHON branches met with Peter Boyle in Rockhampton last Sunday. Here are some contacts of people who were there: Brendan Bell, Bruce Whiteside, Peter Boyle and Alf Dennis.

Outcome: the AON party disappeared within weeks and One Nation's branch network continued to grow, but the media never reported it. Of greater concern was the fact that I so easily got the truth of the matter within an hour. Reporter Greg Roberts reported the Archer/Doran line as the truth – which it was not. No investigation into the facts was undertaken before headline stories were run parroting Archer's claims under the banner of "One Nation falling apart".

Petrie (Queensland)

On the 10th August 1998 National Party Senator Ron Boswell was invited to address the Petrie branch meeting in Redcliffe. It was widely reported that "200 members of One Nation would leave and join the National Party"⁴⁴⁵. Instead Boswell spoke to just five One Nation members and a much larger media contingent. The 25 year old branch president, Brendan Bogle, discovered that support for his move was just not there.

That same Monday night, *4 Corners* broadcast⁴⁴⁶ a lengthy pre-recorded interview with Bogle and two other members of One Nation outlining their dissatisfaction with the party. Among their claims was the comment that the entire Petrie branch would defect to the National Party. Back at the meeting Senator Ron Boswell complained that the missing 196 plus members had been intimidated because they had been contacted and discouraged to turn up. That the media failed to interview any of those allegedly intimidated members speaks for itself.

In scenes of high farce, a special bus had been hired by the National Party to transport the 200 new members to meet party leader Tim Fischer who, not surprisingly, was disappointed when the catch consisted only of those who had been seen earlier on the ABC's *4 Corners* report.

A One Nation member who reported on the meeting wrote to me saying:

Humour ended the evening of an interesting Tuesday the 11th August 1998 as an illegal One Nation meeting ended as a legal National party meeting. An empty large bus awaiting 200 one nation defecting members to be spirited away to Tim Fischer, who was waiting on an open line, in sheer disappointment as ONLY FOUR One Nation rejects clamoured onto the Nats bus.

Earlier in the evening on Brisbane's Channel 7's Today Tonight, Brendan Bogle proclaimed that 200 one Nation members would defect.

However, the only crowd available for his meeting appeared to be a large media group, a beguiled Senator Boswell and an empty bus.

⁴⁴⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/1108.html>

⁴⁴⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/1108.html>

**Chapter 14 – Part One - Media Reports half told –
Dissension in the One Nation ranks and One Nation factions.**

Bon voyage to Brendan Bogle and his three associates from Raymond Bower (Candidate for the Federal seat of Petrie for Pauline Hanson's One Nation).

Outcome: the media dropped the subject when it became clear that the Bogle claims were totally discredited. As Queensland State Director Peter James told me on the day of the meeting, "You can count the number of One Nation members defecting to the Nationals on one hand while the mass defection of thousands of Nationals to One Nation goes unreported by the press."

The "4 Corners" report.

Media Watch Interactive had this to say about the 4 Corners Report on One Nation:

Subject: ⁴⁴⁷*Robson and Four Corners*

Sydney Morning Herald's Frank Robson asked you why you thought the media coverage of Pauline Hanson and One Nation was biased. Just in case you have not convinced him, feel free to give him my e-mail address. I have analysed over 1000 newspaper articles and dissected several hundred hours of TV news and current affairs. I have been exposing the tricks used to vilify Hanson since 1996, both on the Internet and on radio. And you know what? In nearly three years I have never been contacted by a journalist for my opinion on the matter, and the reason is deceptively simple. One of the many tricks they use is to go to "experts" which will tell them what they want to hear, and not to the real experts who will tell them (with proof in hand) the way it really is.

Pauline Hanson, like all other politicians is not above criticism. One Nation like any other party is not above criticism. But there are ways of doing it. I have examples of good newspaper articles which were critical of One Nation. A critical article is fair when it puts One Nation under the same type of scrutiny as the Liberals or the Labor parties. You can talk about shonky journalism when they start using a different size magnifying glass for One nation. You can talk bias when they give maximum exposure to statistical mistakes made by One Nation officials, but keep relatively quiet on even bigger mistakes made by Costello and Alston on the same week. This difference in emphasis is what contributes to making the coverage completely biased. Of course, there are neat little tricks of the trade, like picking Hanson's worst photographs and increasing their contrast to make her look like a hard, heartless woman. Other tricks include deliberately confusing "of Asian nationality" and "of Asian origin" to make Hanson's figures look completely wrong. Recently, some gutter tricks have (re)appeared. Some in the media are saying that "the majority of Australians do not support One Nation". This is true but the majority of Australians do not support any other party since none will be getting more than 50% of the primaries. The most disappointing thing is that people fall for this kind of rubbish.

Give me a TV crew and I will do exactly the same story Four Corners did on One Nation last Monday. The difference? It would be the Labor party and their notorious undemocratic branch stacking that would be the subject of my report. I would also ask Beazley how democratic it is to thrust Mary Delahunty at the

⁴⁴⁷ Frank Robson the reporter who compiled "The First Eleven" article in The Good Weekend – see chapter headed: "Censoring the truth"

**Chapter 14 – Part One - Media Reports half told –
Dissension in the One Nation ranks and One Nation factions.**

head of the queue in Northcote (Victoria). I would go through Labor's record in government and pull them apart. I would show them as having cheated Australians on Immigration, deliberately favouring the immigration of nationalities that Labor controlled via various ethnic groups like FECCA, for the purpose of increasing their power base. And if you gave me another Monday night slot, I would do the same kind of job on the Liberals.

A One Nation supporter wrote⁴⁴⁸:

Subject: Shame 4 Corners! Shame!

This once insightful, objective and influential current affairs programme (oh! for the days of Chris Masters!) has now descended to the level of gutter journalism and intellectual prostitution typified by the likes of: the Murdoch 'press', Packer Industries, Sixty Minutes and Richard Carlton et al...perhaps it should be re-named 'For Shame!' The smarmy, condescending and sarcastic tone of the journo-in-residence(Tony Jones)⁴⁴⁹, mapped the course for this disgraceful exhibition of bias, innuendo and fabrication...

The 'promo' hinted that one of the major lights of ON Party(David Oldfield) was a 'National Socialist'(viz: 'Nazi!'). With that kind of bait, who could resist? The doubtless much-mutilated interview of Mr David Oldfield revealed that he describes himself as a 'nationalist', who believes in certain 'socialist' ideas. How does this make him a Nazi? Nazis have a fairly clearly delineated set of ideals and beliefs. Does Mr Oldfield ascribe to these, and what evidence exists to say that he does? Still, never let the facts get in the way of a good lie(especially, a big one!)...when you've built a 'straw man', stick with it!...

Next, we were subjected to a farrago of unsubstantiated and random allegations from disaffected former ON Party 'members'....everything from Russian Roulette to violent physical eviction from ON Party premises by the resident Party Brownshirts! No checks or details of these peoples' backgrounds was done, nor was any body of evidence presented to satisfactorily explain _why_ they decided to 'go public' with their grievances(or whether any inducements or 'persuasion' were involved), nor was any attempt made to verify or corroborate their 'stories'. The reasons/motivation behind Terry Sharples' Supreme Court injunction were left up in the clouds with the rest of the facts(or, more likely, on the cutting room floor!) The dubious ethics of journo Jones (perhaps he should seek a 'bit part' on the ABC comedy series 'Smith & Jones!') nearly came unstuck thanks to the glaringly obvious sliminess and 'ducking and diving' of Liberal Party hack, Tony Abbott...whose patently evasive answers to the source and scope of Sharples' mammoth legal bill in the Queensland Supreme Court nearly unravelled this pathetic tissue of lies! You wouldn't have had to be a rocket scientist to figure out that most, if not all, of the telephone-number sized legal bill was covered by funds from the bottomless coffers of the Laboral Party!

Lest the viewers start asking too many difficult questions, however, 'For Shame!' moved quickly along to the violent 'demos' accompanying nearly all ON Party meetings. To the accompaniment of suitably dramatic music, the sombre voice of T.Jones informed us that 'this is not the Australia I knew!'.

⁴⁴⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/1108.html>

⁴⁴⁹ See colour plates in centre of book

**Chapter 14 – Part One - Media Reports half told –
Dissension in the One Nation ranks and One Nation factions.**

Indeed it isn't, Mr Jones! The Australia you grew up in was one of full employment: where small businesses and small farms flourished and big government/big business were minimised....an Australia where there was a minimum of bureaucrats, where a man had the right to defend himself and his family in his own home, where politicians actually came from the working-class and listened to their constituents (instead of to certain supra-national organisations, vocal minority lobby groups and 'intellectual elites'), where society and families were stable, where children were actually taught 'knowledge' and 'discipline' in schools (and graduated fully literate and numerate, ready to take their places as responsible and useful members of society), where the dominant culture/religion was Christian, and where people could say what they thought in the workplace, the home, the streets, the schools and the sporting fields without fear of the Thought Police descending on them!!!!...an Australia where children could play safely in the streets and in the parks and the elderly were not barricaded inside mini-fortresses! And people hoping for a return to even a semblance of what once passed for normality are now accused of 'divisiveness' and castigated as 'racists' and instigators of 'political violence and instability'! The indisputable and well-documented fact[s] that the violence at these 'demos' is perpetrated and instigated by a Trotskyite Rent-a-Mob (with identifiable Laboral Party connections) was, of course, never gone into or explored...so much for investigative journalism! Mrs Hanson summed up the situation nicely: "It's the Australian people who are driving this [the rise and rise of ON Party]. Not me or anyone else"

A word of caution: this disgraceful and sorry debacle should serve as a warning-notice to ON Party members, supporters and officials: that, as far as the mainstream media in this country is concerned, they are on their own. Obviously, the media cannot be prevented from 'reporting' on ON Party meetings, rallies and decisions. However, a policy of studied indifference, where the only comment is 'no comment' (or, better still, cold disdain) - the only 'photo opportunity' is a strategically placed back, would seem to be in order here!

Dubbo

On the 30th October 1998 a meeting was called in Dubbo, New South Wales, by Bevan O'Regan from Nyngan and Freddie Mezudia from the North Coast⁴⁵⁰, to have the executive of the party - i.e. Pauline Hanson, David Oldfield and David Ettridge - thrown out.

Once again the media carried the story as headline news claiming that the group represented the majority of One Nation voters. The so-called committee of eighteen that the breakaway members intended to establish was a trifle optimistic, as those proposing the motion numbered just three. At a meeting attended by about eighty people the motion was almost unanimously rejected.

Outcome: once again the media refused to report on the dismal failure of a small group of disgruntled people to achieve their aims trumpeted so loudly before the meeting.

Queensland State Conference 27-29 November 1998⁴⁵¹:

⁴⁵⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/498/2910.html>

⁴⁵¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/onenation/qlldstate/conf98/>

**Chapter 14 – Part One - Media Reports half told –
Dissension in the One Nation ranks and One Nation factions.**

In the lead up to the state conference held in Rockhampton the mainstream media were claiming that One Nation would “fall apart” and that the cross roads would be reached at the conference.

The end result was a unanimous vote of support for Pauline Hanson and the two Davids by some 134 delegates from across Queensland. Delegates left on Sunday afternoon full of hope and happiness because the impending revolt that the media had predicted had not eventuated. New friendships were forged and old friendships re-ignited.

However Pauline Hanson’s statement that the word “*democracy (in Greek) means ‘mob rule’*” on Saturday was latched onto by the media as was political adviser David Oldfield’s comment that “*One Nation has too many idiots...*”

The support that the One Nation executive received at the Queensland State Conference was totally overlooked by the media which went after Ms Hanson and Mr Oldfield with vigour after taking the comments out of context.

The speeches by Ms Hanson and Mr Oldfield that day were not supposed to be covered by the media. It was only because of the decision to honour an unauthorised invitation by a member of the state executive, despite serious concerns about the manner in which they would twist what was said, that they were allowed to attend.

Pauline Hanson said, “*Democracy (the Greek interpretation) really means mob rule. People don't like it at times, and neither do I, but I have to make the final decision, because at the end of the day the decision reflects back on me personally. There are too many people out there who think they can make the decision, but I tell you they can't.*”

What Ms Hanson was referring to is the proven point that whatever One Nation does is tied up by the media as carrying her personal endorsement.

And David Oldfield said, “*One Nation has too many idiots in its midst who are willing to stand up in front of a camera and just spill their guts and the media just eat it up. Opinions are like backsides - everybody has got one. It is just a few idiots who cause trouble. Democracy is about the majority making up the direction. You don't act like school children who kick over the sandcastle because they don't like the design.*”

Of course in the three second grab shown on television the full context is meaningless. In true modern media “go kill ‘em” reporting style the journalists at News Limited started to feed off their own interpretations of what Ms Hanson meant when talking about democracy and Mr Oldfield’s “idiots”. Not once in all the countless opinion pieces did they try to balance Ms Hanson or Mr Oldfield’s comments with what they had said directly after making the “cut and paste” extracts.

Despite a very successful conference the following examples were typical of the mainstream media's coverage.

Editorial in the *Courier-Mail*, 2nd December 1998 under the heading “*One Nation questions democracy*”⁴⁵²:

One Nation's Queensland Parliamentary leader Bill Feldman has been remarkably silent on the extraordinary comments by his party's national president Pauline Hanson that "democracy really means mob rule". He also had nothing to say about party adviser David Oldfield's observation that the trouble

⁴⁵² See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/couroff7.html>

Chapter 14 – Part One - Media Reports half told –

Dissension in the One Nation ranks and One Nation factions.

with One Nation was there were "too many idiots" who made delusionary comments to the media. One Nation's weekend state conference at Rockhampton was an exercise in damage control which barely worked...

Mrs Hanson is wrong about democracy. Representative democracy should be as Abraham Lincoln said at Gettysburg in 1863, "of the people, by the people, for the people". That she exposed an anti-democratic disposition is not surprising as Ms Hanson became increasingly intolerant of questioning and criticism during the federal election. At the same time, Mr Oldfield laid down his own views of party members which should offend the many good men and women who put their faith in One Nation."

Scott Emerson wrote in *The Australian*⁴⁵³ on the 4th December 1998:

In the lead-up to the Rockhampton meeting, there was talk of a grassroots revolt to reclaim One Nation for the party's rank-and-file. But once the meeting began, the bravado turned to bleating as the rebels were reduced to sheep in the face of a tongue lashing from Hanson and Oldfield.

Their numbers had already been reduced by a party purge in the weeks leading up to the state conference. And both Hanson and Oldfield warned that any other dissenters could also depart.

Hanson herself dismissed the calls for democracy with the remark:

'Democracy really means mob rule'.

In the end the votes were all but unanimous in support of Hanson and co and the cringing, kowtowing delegates left with tails between their legs.

Oldfield even confidently predicted that any similar move to depose the party leadership at a national conference in Sydney in January would also fail.

That One Nation remains so dominated by the triumvirate of Hanson, Oldfield and Ettridge and unwilling to tolerate dissent demonstrates how fragile the fledgling party remains less than five months after it won eleven seats at the Queensland election.

*While the Murdoch press were quick to label Pauline Hanson's One Nation's state conference at Rockhampton a disaster they totally overlooked the trauma going on within the Labor Party in South Australia at this time*⁴⁵⁴.

This guide to factions within the Labor Party is a direct result of the traumatic events that occurred at the 1998 ALP State Convention.

Ron Williams a member of the ALP Bright Sub-branch lamented a "tumultuous weekend" and his attempts to "break the "Machine" factions stranglehold of the Labor Party, and to bring about democratic change within the SA Branch of the ALP".

*Williams' comments about the Labor Party, reveal the frustrations of a knowledgeable member. His frustrations were not raised in the press. On his web page Williams has written*⁴⁵⁵:

"What is the "Machine"?

The "Machine" is the term used to describe the current coalition between the Bolkus Socialist Left faction and the Right's Labor Unity faction. It is led by a handful of powerful Left/Right Union Bosses and several senior State and Federal Members of Parliament.

⁴⁵³ See: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8789/aust2.html>

⁴⁵⁴ See: <http://www.searchadelaide.com.au/alpfacts/>

⁴⁵⁵ See: <http://www.searchadelaide.com.au/alpfacts/>

**Chapter 14 – Part One - Media Reports half told –
Dissension in the One Nation ranks and One Nation factions.**

So what is so dangerous about the "Machine"?

"The "Machine" is dangerous because it has almost total control over every level of the decision making process within the South Australian Labor Party.

This includes nearly all Sub Branch and FEC delegates to State Council and State Convention, membership of the State Executive and the State Platform Committee and other Party Committees, Party Office Positions, Parliamentary Caucus and the Shadow Cabinet. Even Mike Rann's position as leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party is based on the "Machine's" continuing support, (particularly the Socialist Left).

However, because factions tend to be secretive about their operations, particularly at the sub branch and FEC level, most rank and file members are not even aware that their branch/FEC is aligned. For example, the "Machine" factions carve up the sub branches and FEC's between them and then support each other's candidates for delegate positions to State Convention and State Council and all other Party Committees. Independents often just don't get to first base.

The "Machine" uses this lack of knowledge of its operations by grass root members to ensure their delegates are elected and thereby maintain its grip on power.

Without the support of the "Machine" it is now virtually impossible for a rank and file member to be elected to a position of power or influence within the ALP. Fear of either losing support for a Party position, being labeled (sic) a "spoiler", or having a political career cut dead is enough to keep most faction members in line.

Open debate and democracy are the big losers under the "Machine" and any moves to challenge its power are ruthlessly dealt with. The 1998 ALP State Convention was a classic example of the "Machine" in action. It takes real courage to stand up to the "Machine" heavies and their venom.

But doesn't the "Machine" represent 80% of the Convention vote?

Yes it does, but let's look at how those 80% of delegates are elected.

First, as I have already mentioned, most sub branch delegates are picked and supported by the "Machine" faction bosses and therefore have the financial and material backing of unions and certain Parliamentary offices to promote themselves.

Second, most union delegates to convention have been hand-picked by the Union bosses. Union rank & file members have little or no say in their selection and are unlikely to even know who they are.

Third, in the lead up to sub branch elections for Convention and Council delegates hundreds of "new" members are enrolled and their membership fees paid for by the "Machine" factions to ensure "Machine" candidates have the numbers to get elected (known as branch stacking). Most of these 'new' members will never go to a sub branch meeting or help at the polling booths at election time.

So even though the "Machine" can claim to represent 80% of the Convention vote, in reality, it only represents the views of a small number of faction and union bosses and fellow travellers. That is why moves at the 1998 State Convention to increase the voting strength for sub branches to give them a greater say in who their local candidate should be was so bitterly fought.

Why have you decided to go outside Party forums on this issue?

**Chapter 14 – Part One - Media Reports half told –
Dissension in the One Nation ranks and One Nation factions.**

“As an ordinary rank and file member it is impossible to get this message through normal party structures. There are dozens of sub branches and thousands of members. Information on who is a member of the ALP is not available to rank and file members. The whole apparatus of ALP Party machinery is controlled by the Party State office, itself controlled by the "Machine" factions.

I believe the stranglehold the "Machine" currently has over the South Australian Labor Party is so damaging that it is vital it be brought to the attention of the rank and file – no matter how unpopular this may be with the "Machine" power elite.

Every ALP member has the right to know how the "Machine" operates and the disastrous impact it is having on the Party.

Apparently such open dissension in the Labor Party ranks is not newsworthy to the mainstream media. Yet the same media continue to snipe at One Nation. They create a story, attach a label and then add the assumptions which become fact as articles embellish half-truths into factual-fantasy.

The media have never considered that One Nation has the same factions as Williams describes in the state Labor party⁴⁵⁶:

Labor Unity is in fact made up of two parts – the conservative ‘old right’ led by Don Farrell, Secretary of the SDA and the more progressive ‘new right’ led by Senator John Quirke, previously a major figure in the Centre-Left faction until its disintegration in 1995. These two sub factions are drawn together by mutual convenience although there are currents of dissent lying just below the surface.

One Nation factions

What we are seeing today in One Nation is not so much fracturing of the party as the media would claim, but the formation of two, clearly identifiable factions. And that is not a bad thing, because both factions believe in the same core ideals of the party. Free comment and vigorous debate always provides for better answers than mealy-mouthed consensus. Scott Emerson's claim in *The Australian* that, *“In the end the votes were all but unanimous in support of Hanson and co and the cringing, kowtowing delegates left with tails between their legs.”* is an outright lie.

These One Nation factions won't go away following the 1999 One Nation annual conference to be held in Sydney, when the new democratic constitution will be tabled.

The factions can be identified as the 'old Hanson guard' and the 'New One Nation Right'.

The old Hanson guard is largely made up of members of the Pauline Hanson support group who originally rebelled against the formation of One Nation, have questioned the roles of the two Davids and, more recently, demanded a new democratic constitution. This faction believes that the party's future is dependent on Ms Hanson's continuing involvement and leadership. The underlying fear is that the party has been somehow hijacked by the two Davids. Many of the more vocal members of this faction are now seen as dissidents by the media and even by some party members.

⁴⁵⁶ See: <http://www.searchadelaide.com.au/alpfacts/>

**Chapter 14 – Part One - Media Reports half told –
Dissension in the One Nation ranks and One Nation factions.**

The New *One Nation* Right is the faster growing One Nation faction which, while also questioning the old constitution, is not so dependent upon the role of Ms Hanson as party leader – being more focussed on the issues that she has raised – like globalisation. Like the old Hanson guard they recognise Ms Hanson's key role in changing the face of political history in Australia.

What the media has, possibly deliberately failed to grasp, is that just like the Liberal and Labor parties, One Nation now has these identifiable factions. They can be seen at any large branch meeting or event.

To survive its early days the young party required very firm leadership. This strength was presented by the media as evidence that One Nation was not democratic.

The party leadership was expanded by two at the 1999 AGM following the election of Senator-Elect Heather Hill and John Fisher after the two Davids and Pauline were re-elected unopposed. The expanded executive followed increasing media interest in the "*autocratic*" power of the "*triumvirate*".

The media continued its spin that One Nation was "*undemocratic*" following the AGM despite the 700 party attendees at the meeting⁴⁵⁷ being witness to the fact that the entire selection process for the new executive was democratic. Fly-in-the-ointment dissident, Terry Sharples, became the evening news after his claim that he had been "*karate chopped in the kidneys*" when he tried to attend the meeting. Unsurprisingly, despite the police being called by Sharples, an event which was seen on the evening news, they refused to press charges against anyone – a fact somehow overlooked by those covering the charade.

⁴⁵⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/99agm/>

Chapter 14 – part 2

Media Reports half told – Dissenting voices.

If the Internet is to be an election battleground, then, so far, Pauline Hanson is firing most of the shells.

One Nation's web site is the most colourful, active and aggressive of the main contenders.

Garry Barker, *The Age* 1/9/98 ⁴⁵⁸

Barbara Hazelton

David Oldfield's dismissal of Barbara Hazelton, Pauline Hanson's private secretary and Hazelton's subsequent criticism of One Nation provided the media with yet another excuse for spinning the image of a party in revolt.

In a remarkable turnaround for a well-respected woman who said that she "would never do anything to hurt Pauline", Mrs Hazelton's about-face ensured nationwide front-page coverage both in papers and on television talk-back shows for a week. Murdoch's *Courier-Mail* feasted on headlines that claimed the demise of One Nation.

At the height of the media blast against One Nation I received an unsolicited phone call from Mrs Hazelton on the 2nd July 1998. She would not reveal her location or phone number because she was 'in hiding' somewhere on the Gold Coast hinterland.

Within minutes of ending a lengthy and cordial discussion with her, *The Australian's* Nicolas Rothwell contacted me. He asked me would I mind discussing the state of the party with a reporter and confirmed that Mrs Hazelton had just given him my name. I agreed to do so.

"I will get Leisa Scott to contact you from our Brisbane office," Rothwell said.

A short while later, Leisa Scott, who normally reports for the *Courier-Mail*, was on the phone. I refused to take questions over the phone, instead asking Ms Scott to send her questions by e-mail so that both parties had a record of what was asked and what was said. She complied.

The questions and answers below never formed part of any article in *The Australian* or the *Courier-Mail* simply because my answers did not accord with the view being presented by the Murdoch press that the party was collapsing from within⁴⁵⁹.

Leisa Scott wrote in the e-mail:

What is your official involvement with Pauline Hanson's One Nation:

"I am the web master for Pauline Hanson's One Nation."

How long have you been involved with the party.

"Since April 1997 - joined the night of the launch (Membership #6)."

How would you describe your relationship with Pauline Hanson.

"Excellent, a woman I admire deeply."

How would you describe your relationship with the two Davids.

"Professional"

The questions listed below were answered by way of a statement:

⁴⁵⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/0209.html>

⁴⁵⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/0207.html>

Chapter 14 – Part 2 - Media Reports half told – Dissenting voices.

- ☐ What are your concerns, if any, about the way in which One Nation is being run?
- ☐ What, if any, changes would you recommend to the running of the party?
- ☐ Have you noticed any change in Ms Hanson's level of involvement and/or influence in the party?
- ☐ What is your opinion of Barbara Hazelton's claim that Mr Oldfield and Mr Ettridge have undue influence over Ms Hanson?
- ☐ Do you believe One Nation members have enough say in the party's direction?
- ☐ Are there any elements of Ms Hazelton's claims which you agreed or disagreed with?

In my e-mail response I authorised Leisa Scott to publish the following response⁴⁶⁰ to the questions above:

I have a tremendous amount of time for Barbara and Helen [Dodd]. They have both been very involved with Pauline Hanson's One Nation and served that party with a considerable amount of dedication. It is for this reason alone that I have agreed to comment.

I have read what both say about the two Davids and their alleged hold over Pauline Hanson and the running of the party. Barbara will know that I have shared concerns with her in the past.

However, what I have personally witnessed over the last few weeks has shown me conclusively and, without hesitation, that both David Oldfield and David Ettridge are critical to the ongoing development of One Nation.

The Queensland State Election was a triumph of 'people power' at grass roots level working with the closely knit party executive. The most influential force, I believe, in the party gaining the support of the people of Queensland was David Oldfield.

Let me make it quite clear that Mr Oldfield, like all of us, is not without his faults but that should not be used as the basis of a personal attack on him or the party. This has been the case in newspaper, radio and television reports over the past few days.

I was given the unique opportunity to be part of history last weekend. I was invited, in my position as webmaster for the party, to join the eleven state candidates in meetings at Parliament House with statesmen and women including Pauline Hanson, Sir Joh Bjelke Petersen and Yvonne Chapman. No other media or outsiders bar 4 Corners were allowed in.

I watched the new MPs being trained, coached and guided for hours at a time by David Oldfield, a man whose obvious pride shone through in his pivotal role in turning Australian politics on its head and giving people a voice. I have never before seen David Oldfield so reflective as he was when coaching the new parliamentarians. He was free of the media and totally focussed on the mission that he had been given.

During these meetings both Pauline Hanson and David Oldfield made the statement that the MPs there were to be guided by the people who voted them in. It was made clear to them that neither Mrs Hanson nor Mr Oldfield would come between them and the wishes of their constituents. It was also made clear to them that the Queensland branch of One Nation must make its own decisions based on the wishes of the people it represented.

⁴⁶⁰ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/0207.html>

Chapter 14 – Part 2 - Media Reports half told – Dissenting voices.

This flies in the face of what has been said in the papers, on the radio and the television. I believe Barbara Hazelton has lost sight of the bigger vision because of her very emotional attachment to Pauline and the party. This has blurred her perspective in the evolution of what was a very small entity when she started working for Pauline Hanson.

What Barbara and others have got to realise is that Pauline Hanson's One Nation party has evolved, grown at incredible rate because the Australian people now realise that there is something dreadfully wrong with the manner in which the major political parties represent the mums and dads of Australia.

With this dramatic growth has come the need for delegation. Pauline Hanson has delegated a great deal of responsibility onto the shoulders of the two Davids, and the pressure shows on both of them at times. With all their faults and the mistakes they may have made in the day to day running of the party their ability to be focussed and to continue to hold on to what is effectively a wildly bucking horse shows an admirable dedication to the task that Pauline Hanson has given them.

I am reminded by Pauline's comment at Hervey Bay last year where she said, "I will resign from politics if someone tries to run my party."

Without Pauline Hanson the party would be nothing. It is the embodiment of her spirit which drives all those below her (and that includes Messrs Oldfield and Ettridge).

Anyone who knows Pauline as well as I do knows that she means what she said at Hervey Bay.

Outcome: *The Australian claimed the party was falling apart. The paper continued to lead the nationwide assault against One Nation at this time, and Leisa Scott's article the next day totally ignored my statement. Totally. There was no room on the editor's cutting table for balance. There was extensive negative coverage given by the television stations. They provided a platform for Mrs Hazelton to broadcast her complaints against the party to the Australian nation.*

The extreme right tag

Happy to run with the pollies' lies, the Murdoch press widely broadcast⁴⁶¹ the outlandish claim made in the Senate by National Party Senator Ron Boswell on 19th June 1997 that Pauline Hanson's One Nation was advertising in the *Strategy*. The *Strategy*⁴⁶² is a patriotic independent monthly broadsheet which the Murdoch media have previously smeared as being aligned with the *extreme right League of Rights*.

One Nation had not advertised in the *Strategy*, possibly for no other reason than its precarious financial situation did not allow it to do so. The editor of the *Strategy*, Ray Platt, contacted the mainstream media to refute the claims made by Boswell but he was ignored.

He wrote the following press release which was carried in the on-line *Australian National News of the Day*⁴⁶³:

The Clown Prince of Coward's Castle has shown yet again, when he starts ranting about the "fringe" or "extreme" right, that he can't get his facts straight

⁴⁶¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/1906.html>

⁴⁶² Strategy web page: <http://users.netcon.net.au/strategy/>

⁴⁶³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/1906.html>

Chapter 14 – Part 2 - Media Reports half told – Dissenting voices.

and thus misleads the Senate. Perhaps if the Clown Prince were to make an in depth study of the Constitution, if he can, he just might find that through ignorance he fits the cap of betrayal of the Australian people, and not those who he is wont to collectively “rubbish”.

An outright lie - One Nation has appealed for support??? - never!

One Nation has never asked us to place an advertisement for them or to run any articles about One Nation or Pauline Hanson. All adverts relating to One Nation, that have been used by this paper, have been put out as “media releases” for all or any publication to run. We felt that people generally deserved as much information as possible to make up their own minds as to what they wanted.

To link the Strategy with any particular group, be it the League of Rights or the American Militia movement just shows the petty-mindedness of the Clown Prince of Coward’s Castle.

The obvious job of a reporting publication is to present “the truthful facts”, and that is what the Strategy aims for at all times - not like the controlled major media.

Because the Murdoch and Packer produced papers advertise a large amount of pornographic material etc and “brothels” does that make the publishers ‘pimps’?

Ray Platt

Editor, The Strategy

Outcome: After the blatant demonisation of One Nation many people are now rightly beginning to question the 'anti-Semitic' tag that the media attaches to the League of Rights. Perhaps the League has been demonised just like One Nation has – in fact it is my personal view that the 'extremist' League of Rights is more committed to the future of our children than the multinational-run media are.

The Chinese 'connection':

The Queensland Chinese Community Voice (QCCV) was a major supporter of Brisbane Lord Mayor Jim Soorley’s Rally against Racism on the 25th May 1997⁴⁶⁴ held in Ipswich just weeks after the launch of Pauline Hanson’s One Nation Party.

The media spokesperson for the QCCV was a young lawyer by the name of Lawrence Ma⁴⁶⁵. I met Ma at the rally and agreed to keep in contact with him. This casual friendship proved to be very useful in exposing one of the more blatant media cover-ups of a story that got nationwide coverage for the sole reason that it denigrated Pauline Hanson’s One Nation.

On the 23rd June 1997⁴⁶⁶ Ma appeared on national television claiming that an extreme right organisation had sent him a death threat by fax. Channel 7’s Today Tonight current affairs program ran the story displaying a copy of the threatening fax that had been received by Ma.

I contacted Ma the next day and requested a copy of the fax that he had received from the 'extreme right' movement. He was happy to do so. The

⁴⁶⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/china/>

⁴⁶⁵ See colour plates in centre of book

⁴⁶⁶ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/2406.html>

Chapter 14 – Part 2 - Media Reports half told – Dissenting voices.

organisation sending the letter⁴⁶⁷ claimed to be The Anglo Saxon and European Rights League.

Here is a transcript of the letter:

Colonel W. Turnbull

Major E. Zawadski

Anglo Saxons and European Rights League

P.O. Box 354

Carnegie Vic 3163

29/4/97

Mr -----MA

Queensland Chinese Community Group, Brisbane, Queensland

Dear Mr MA,

You and your people have insulted every Anglo Saxons (sic), Anglo Celtics (sic) and Europeans (sic), when you question the right of Pauline Hanson's party. In case you don't realize we will fight to the last drop of blood for her rights to say what she wishes (which is 100% correct about Asians) and for the existence of her party. Who in hell do "you" and you people think you are (sic), you so easily forget "you are living in "our" country it is not "us" living in your country.

Yes, we note how you try to destroy cultures and take control in countries, such as Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia and Phillippines (sic). However, the local people are aware now to the Chinese take over and in all cases are fighting back. You will never be allowed to take control in Australia. Most people today realise you and your people are the greatest risk to the stability, peace and security to Australia. Never assume we would allow you to take control of Australia. The Chinese will be the reason for "future open conflict" and we would welcome a Bosnian campaign as it would be over within months, without the problems associated with, in the Civil war in Bosnia - Herzegovina, as you and your people stand out like monkeys in the trees.

The majority of Australians support Pauline Hanson, and her policies, and look at her as the Australian "Joan of Arc." A referendum on Asian Immigration would see a 90% vote to "stop Asian immigration. Of course you are safe for the moment as the weak Australian Government is reluctant to put Asian immigration issue to referendum because of their worship of the Asian dollar. Still be assured "we" are watching the situation closely.

You and your people have alienated yourselves against all Australians with your attack on Pauline Hanson. We know some of your people hold Australian Citizenship still we cannot be fooled, its not worth the paper it written on, as we know in body, mind and heart you will always remain Chinese.

We never expected you to support us or Pauline Hanson party (sic), what we cannot understand is why you want to live here, it would be far better for all of you to return to your own countries and live among your own people. Most Australians never wanted you here in the first place. Especially since you force upon our people, your culture, your ideology, your political points of views which we don't want. Asians were allowed into Australia only through the kindness and weakness of our government.

Believe us, our forebears did not fight in two world wars to every (sic) allow you to "Asianised" (sic) this country, you are sadly mistaken to foster this. This

⁴⁶⁷ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/297/qccv.html>

Chapter 14 – Part 2 - Media Reports half told – Dissenting voices.

is Australia and not Asia. However no matter which country Chinese invade, they always create problems.

Still we are already prepared to fight for our rights, anyway necessary.

Finally we believe that our democracy is sufficiently strong to cope with discussions about the level on immigration. However our democracy is “not strong enough” to cope with the massive levels of “Asian immigration”. Most Australians want a stop to Asian immigration, else it will destroy Australia and results (sic) in open conflict.

The problems facing Australia today is the Chinese invasion and not our Joan of Arc, Pauline Hanson.

Take note “Hand Off”.

Anglo Saxons and European Rights League

Yours sincerely

Colonel W.J.G. Turnbull, Major. E. Zawadski, Capt. H. Hoffman

I faxed the fax that I had received from Ma to Pauline Hanson’s political adviser David Oldfield. He concurred with Ma that the letter appeared to come from an extreme right wing group. Nevertheless Oldfield questioned why it had taken two months (the letter having been written on 29th April 1997) for Ma to bring it to the attention of the press. He then questioned why a group calling itself the SINO-SOPHIE ACADEMY had faxed it to Ma at just after 3am on The 22nd June 1997. The SINO-SOPHIE ACADEMY was discovered to be based in a Victorian suburb neighbouring Carnegie where the alleged original letter from the extreme right movement originated.

Mr Oldfield, when raising the issue on radio, was asked if he was accusing the Chinese community of writing the letter. He responded “no”, because that would be defamatory. He revealed that the faxes which Channel 7 and other media had received in the initial press release with the SINO-SOPHIE ACADEMY fax signature had been handed over to the Federal Police. He also revealed that the writing style of the letter appeared to compare to that of written death threats received by Ms Hanson - one of the main reasons why she was protected by Federal Police.

Mr Ma said that he had the original letter and would hand it over to the police.

The question raised by Mr Oldfield about the fax header is an interesting one and demonstrates what scant regard the Australian mainstream media has for checking out a story's authenticity in their rush to get a scoop.

Although fully informed, the Murdoch press failed to make any mention of the twist in the story. The Australian people had been told that an extreme right wing group sympathetic to Pauline Hanson’s One Nation had threatened Mr Ma, and that was it. Yet even the most cursory reading of the fax demonstrated a native English-speaker did not write it. Linguistically it is beyond doubt that the fax was sent by an ethnic person. Even people with no linguistic training would recognize that the following phrases are simply un-English:

“Yes, we note how you try to destroy cultures”; and “you are sadly mistaken to foster this”.

The fax had been sent by real racists to discredit One Nation, but the media never bothered to report it. The once very public Lawrence Ma was never to be heard from again.

The One Nation “funny money”:

Chapter 14 – Part 2 - Media Reports half told – Dissenting voices.

Whenever One Nation released its policies the media continually looked for an angle to ridicule them.

One of the more bizarre examples was the response to One Nation's Primary Industry policy. The mainstream media and the politicians lampooned it as One Nation's "Funny Money" policy. The ridicule followed the suggestion that the government had the power to issue credit to make money available to small business and farmers at low interest rates. David Ettridge was ridiculed for making the mistake of explaining it in simple terms: that more money should be 'printed'.

The One Nation Primary Industry policy released in June 1998 stated⁴⁶⁸:

"One Nation will lobby the federal government to support the establishment of a government sponsored Australian national bank whose primary purpose would be low interest funding to primary producers and rural industries for income producing infrastructure development, soil and water conservation measures, and stock and equipment. One Nation will negotiate with the federal government to obtain special financial packages to be provided in times of severe drought and natural disasters."

A special edition of *News Weekly* devoted to Australia's economic woes (13/6/98)⁴⁶⁹ gave convincing reasons why 'printing more money' made perfect economic sense:

"In a country in which we all wonder who actually runs the "Australian" Reserve Bank, we need to regain control of our currency which has become a tool of currency players, as its recent sharp drop dramatically demonstrates. "

The edition even quoted Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the US Federal Reserve Board:

"Central Banks can issue currency, a non-interest bearing claim on the government, effectively without limit."

"With leveraging, there will always exist the possibility, however remote of a chain reaction, a cascading sequence of defaults that will culminate in financial implosion if it proceeds unchecked. Only a Central bank, with its unlimited power to create money can with a high probability thwart such a process before it becomes destructive. Hence, Central Banks will of necessity be drawn into becoming lenders of last resort".

(Greenspan, speech to the 34th Annual Conference on Bank Structure and Competition May 7th 1998)

And page 29 of the Campbell report states:

From 1913 - 1917, low interest, long term credit was provided by the Commonwealth Bank to finance the construction of the Transcontinental Railway. It advanced 17 million pounds at 1% PA and got it back.

It was also how Australia financed its commitment in the First World War. The Commonwealth Bank loaned the Australian Government 325 million pounds, interest free. Indeed, until as recently as 1984, the Reserve Bank of Australia paid only 1% on government working balances and advanced money to the Federal Government at 1% for its working operations."

(It was in the fateful year of 1984 that Australia's banking system was deregulated by "the world's greatest treasurer", Paul Keating. Deregulation was necessary for the big foreign banks running the World Trade Organisation

⁴⁶⁸ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/onenation/qldstate/polprim.htm>

⁴⁶⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/298/1806.html>

Chapter 14 – Part 2 - Media Reports half told – Dissenting voices.

(WTO) to establish the Financial Services Industry Agreement⁴⁷⁰ (FSIA) which permitted the foreign ownership of Australian banks. The FSIA is the international agreement fuelling the major changes taking place in the banks resulting in massive job losses, reduced services and ever growing fees. No wonder that Keating earned the title of “world’s best treasurer” from the banks behind the WTO.)

In an interview on the ABC's 7.30 Report on the 18th June 1998⁴⁷¹ Federal Treasurer Peter Costello tried to link One Nation with the League of Rights. He did this by comparing One Nation’s policy of a "people's bank", "printing money" and "low interest loans" with "League of Rights economic policy".

Costello said, *"The League of Rights is Australia's premier anti-Semitic organisation....One Nation is being manipulated by forces that it probably does not even understand."*

After facing a week of ridicule, Pauline Hanson called a press conference at which she said⁴⁷²:

"I absolutely reject Mr Costello's allegation of a link between One Nation and the League of Rights or any other group."

"I also reject completely allegations of the same type that have been made by John Howard, Tim Fischer, Robert Hill and others since the formation of Pauline Hanson's One Nation last year."

"Our policy on the low interest loans of the Queensland Trust and the possible duplication and enlargement of this policy at a national level with carefully targeted projects has been formulated by our own people, using our own research from many places including the federal parliamentary library."

"This policy is reflective in many ways of the original function of the Commonwealth Bank born in 1911 under the Fisher Labor Government."

"The Commonwealth Bank was created to make national credit available to anyone with decent security to offer, help reduce public debt and provide real competition to private banks. Any profits were returned to the federal government."

"Australian Labor Party policy in 1934 planned to have the Commonwealth Bank utilise the credit of the nation for the benefit of the people, in essence, even if only in a small way to start, this is our principle as well."

"Prime Minister John Howard recently attended the funeral of the Australian visionary, B.A Santamaria - a man who also advocated utilising the power of sovereign governments to issue credit in competition with the private banks, for the benefit of the people just as we do."

"In its time as a truly national bank, the Commonwealth Bank financed much of Australia's commerce and infrastructure including the entire war effort in World War I, and the East-West Railway."

"When Mr Costello lies in an attempt to discredit us through association with the League of Rights, he conveniently omits all the others who are associated with our platform."

"We have no association with this organisation, in fact we are not even aware of their policies."

⁴⁷⁰ See chapter headed “The winners and losers in today’s media”

⁴⁷¹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/298/1906.html>

⁴⁷² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/onenation/press/190698a.html>

Chapter 14 – Part 2 - Media Reports half told – Dissenting voices.

“If you are to believe Mr Costello's lies, then you must equally believe the Labor Party, the parliamentary library and even John Howard are connected in some way to the League of Rights.

“Clearly, this is as foolish and as dishonest as the whole of Mr Costello's attack.

“I suggest Mr Costello try to defend his own party on the allegations surrounding the high ranking Liberal Party official in the NSW seat of Maitland who was last year reported to be selling Hitler's early biography Mein Kampf and other Hitler and Nazi materials by mail order.

“Mr Costello is a politically motivated liar, nothing more.

“He has discredited himself before the Australian people and is unfit to aspire to the Prime Ministerial position he so obviously covets.

“Mr Costello, you are telling lies, I know it, you know it and the Australian people know it.

“The need for a peoples' Bank is as great now as it ever was and we will inform the Australian people of its use and continue this debate regardless of the Treasurer's self interest in stopping such discussion.”

On the 23rd June 1998 a word of common sense came from 2UE Radio personality, Alan Jones at the height of the controversy⁴⁷³:

“We had a Royal Commission into banking in this country in 1937 and it stated that the central bank and I quote “can lend to the government of others in a variety of ways” unquote and can even quote “money available to the government or others free of charge” unquote.

“In fact we used to have a so called ‘People’s Bank’ to provide such funds, but under the current banking system we would never have got a Snowy Mountain scheme.

“Let’s forget about Pauline Hanson. The cost of money is an enormous obstacle to generating employment in this country. There is nothing wrong in theory with governments lending money at low cost or no cost to productive Australia.

“The fact that it does not happen is bad enough. The fact that untruths are told about the idea in order to win some political points is absolutely reprehensible.”

Despite all the elite ridicule, banks really do have a license to create credit - i.e. issue credit. There is absolutely nothing stopping the government of an economically sound nation from creating a bank and doing it⁴⁷⁴.

In case some people are confused with the expression "a license to print money", the only body which can legally print money (that is notes and coin) is the Reserve Bank. But these notes and coin (cash money) are only a very small part of Australia's monetary system (It is interesting that the banks are pressing for a cashless society where all transactions are 'plastic').

It is ironic therefore that the Federal Government under treasurer Peter Costello has in fact been responsible for 'printing' the largest amount of M1 money in the developed world⁴⁷⁵ last year. Costello has presided over a massive increase of M1 money - 12.2% in just 12 months - amounting to billions of dollars making One Nation's Au\$150 million a drop in the ocean. The additional note and coin

⁴⁷³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/press/ajones1.html>

⁴⁷⁴ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/298/2206.html>

⁴⁷⁵ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/398/2508.html>

Chapter 14 – Part 2 - Media Reports half told – Dissenting voices.

authorised by Costello's department was printed to prop up the Australian economy in the lead up to the October 1998 Federal election and to buffer it against the Asian financial crisis.

With all the evidence of the reasonableness of One Nation's policy freely available, the Murdoch media's journalists never impartially critiqued the policy. Instead, when the Federal Treasurer and all the other politicians, being good little globalist boys and girls heaped ridicule on One Nation, the media were more than happy to run with the monumentally stupid 'funny money' theme.

Many Australians still do not understand there is another side to the story. They still deride One Nation's "funny money" policy without realising that the last laugh is actually on them.

Chapter 15

The Solution

This book demonstrates the fact that democracy itself has suffered “murder by media” in Australia because of the industry’s concentration in too few hands.

It is time for Australians to question why and what can be done to stop this sorry state of affairs continuing. But they won’t get the answers from today’s politicians.

Short Term:

It is absolutely imperative that *every Australian* use whatever tools they can to draw the authorities attention to their concerns about the misuse of media power.

The most effective short term way of doing this is through the Australia Press Council (APC). The APC handles media complaints on behalf of Australians. It has now made itself very accessible to those on the Internet⁴⁷⁶ where it states,

“The Australian Press Council is the self-regulatory body of the print media. It was established in 1976 with two main aims: to help preserve the traditional freedom of the press within Australia and ensure that the free press acts responsibly and ethically..”

For those with access to the Internet there is a simple process available to a complainant. This involves completing an on-line “complaint form”⁴⁷⁷. Before you do so it is important that you understand the APC’s “Statement of Principles” – which are on-line⁴⁷⁸. The APC will respond to your complaint in writing requesting a copy of the offending article (remember to keep it). The APC contacts the editor of the paper publishing the article requesting an explanation. If the paper’s explanation does not satisfy you (you are sent a copy of the reply) you are legitimately able to request the APC committee to arbitrate on your behalf. If the paper is found to be at fault they have to publish a retraction.

Here are some interesting statistics in relation to Australia’s, until now, best kept secret⁴⁷⁹ (only 434 complaints were registered in 1997/98):

Category of total Complaint	No. Complaints 1988/97	No. Complaints 1997/98	% of complaint ‘88/97
Headline: false/misleading	93	47	51% of total
Sensationalism	54	10	19% of total
Bias	142	25	18% of total
Distortion	135	16	18% of total
Invasion of Privacy	170	29	17% of total
Racism	194	22	11% of total
Bad taste	53	2	4% of total
Sexism	81	3	4% of total

⁴⁷⁶ See: <http://www.presscouncil.org.au/pcsite/apc.html>

⁴⁷⁷ See: <http://www.presscouncil.org.au/pcsite/compform.html>

⁴⁷⁸ See: <http://www.presscouncil.org.au/pcsite/complaints/sop.html>

⁴⁷⁹ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/99a/apc2.gif>

Chapter 15 - The Solution

For those not on the Internet, contact the *Australian Press Council* on their toll free phone number: **1800 025712** and request them to send you a complaint form.

Taking this action will force the papers to become accountable in the short term because the regulatory body will be judging their reporting – an editor's worst nightmare. And he is the person who has to respond to the complaint.

The more people that start becoming active in lodging valid complaints the faster the media will be forced to report ethically.

The longer term solution:

The long term solution that we must strive for is surprisingly simple. Just as government policy has allowed the Packer and Murdoch families to take over control of Australia's media, policy can be changed to force them to sell their controlling interest in many of their media assets.

This of course makes perfect sense to the 99.9% of the Australian population outside the 'system'. Unfortunately democracy doesn't work this way in Australia at the moment – not under the two party system where those in power now depend on the goodwill of the Packer/Murdoch duopoly for their very political survival. As you have seen in this book the Laboral factions have shown time and again that they bow to the will of the media barons.

The only way democracy can be returned to the Australian voter is through the ballot box. And the answer lies in a political party established outside the two party "system".

The question is: *"Do Australians care for their future enough to become politically active or is the nation bound for a future determined not by the people, for the people but by the media barons, for the media barons? And will the people, next time round, understand the role that this country's press plays in destroying political threats to the media masters."*

The political answer might not be Pauline Hanson or her One Nation party. It might be a similar political group with the same guts, determination and resolve to rip apart the undemocratic facade wrapped around this country.

The real phenomenon of the late 1990s was:

- ☐ that despite Pauline Hanson's 'politically-uneducated' small business background she became a national identity;
- ☐ that despite the media bias and grilling, she received growing support;
- ☐ that despite her policies being regarded by the establishment media as 'racist', many have now been effectively adopted at state and federal levels;
- ☐ that One Nation rose from the ashes of people's despair as a symbol of hope.

The message is simple. The concerns of a growing number of Australians will not disappear. The political system in Australia is due for a major shake-up. One of the major parties becoming the casualty as it disappears into irrelevance.

When people are truly represented by this new party in government it goes without saying that the media empires will be fractured into a hundred little pieces with journalists once again being able to enjoy real independence. At this time the workings of thousands of shadowy bureaucratic committees will be exposed to a nation which will read with stunned disbelief the travesties that have taken place in this generation. May the politicians of today sit up and take note.

As Michael Duffy wrote, *"What we do have, is a group of leading Australians who, thanks to Hanson, have demonstrated that they regard the rest of us with contempt and fear."*

Chapter 15 - The Solution

Pauline Hanson once said “*Wake up Australia*”. Australia has now well and truly woken up. It is now time for democracy to rise from the ashes.

Chapter 16
The American Chapter
By Bob Djurdjevic

***How the Establishment Media Is
Undermining Freedom and Democracy in America***

"Journalists say a thing they know isn't true in the hope that, if they keep saying it long enough, it will be(come) true." (Arnold Bennett)

"All truth passes through three stages . First, it is ridiculed, second it is violently opposed, and third, it is accepted as self-evident." (Arthur Schopenhauer)

"At a time of universal deceit - telling the truth is a revolutionary act." (George Orwell).

"Free press exists if you own one." (A.J. Liebling)]

STEP 1: DUMBING DOWN OF AMERICA

America is rapidly becoming a nation of mutts. Our country's traditional character is being systematically destroyed by nihilistic "liberals"⁴⁸⁰, "the New World Order's centurions whose only God is the Almighty Dollar.

The same kinds of people invented the "dictatorship of the proletariat," and applied it to the unsuspecting Russians. Now, they are trying to ram a "dictatorship of the minorities" down the naive Americans' throats.

In its present form, America's social demise is a more benign mutation of the "Bolshevik" revolution, perhaps the kind of a gradual change which the "Menshevik" communists would have preferred.

Either way, the desecration of America the Beautiful is not a spontaneous event. Nor is a deliberate dumbing down of our nation. It is a multi-pronged process carried out by the Wall Street elite and their vassals in government, education, media and the entertainment industry.

Why would the bankers and industrialists want America to be a nation of "ignorant blunderers or dunderheads," according to Oxford Dictionary's definition of "mutts?" Or a country of "mongrels, fools or muttonheads," according to Webster's?

Because such a stupefied population is easier to subjugate by the elite's financial shackles than would be the free-spirited, free-thinking, patriotic, enterprising Americans who had made this country the envy of the world.

"It doesn't take very long to dumb down a nation," agreed a former publishing CEO, a long-time advocate of better quality education in America. "After only two or three generations, you can easily produce a nation of morons."

⁴⁸⁰ See APPENDIX C for a definition of the New World Order "liberal"

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

Sadly, knowledge and artistry are yielding to materialistic values in today's America. As A.J. Liebling cynically noted, "Free press exists if you own one." "Money makes the world go around," we are told by those who have it.

Really? More likely, money is what will run the free world aground. If the Almighty Dollar does become everyone's "God" (Heaven forbid!), those with most of it will become autocratic emperors of the world. And that will spell the end of freedom and democracy for the rest of mankind.

In preparation for such an ultimate enslaving of the free human spirit, a new, ugly, primitive, obedient America is being crafted by the New World Order (NOW) architects. As a first step, however, they must knock down the country's Christian foundations. And the establishment media must lead the way.

* * * *

The U.S. Immigration Act of 1965, signed into law by the Democratic President, Lyndon B. Johnson, launched "a demographic event of seismic proportions," says Peter Brimelow, a *Forbes* magazine editor, in his best-selling book, "Alien Nation." Mr. Brimelow calls this process the "browning of America."

Immigration from Europe, the traditional source of American immigrants who shared the cultural heritage with the original American settlers, was immediately choked off by this act. By late 1980s, immigration from Europe was dipping below 10 percent of total inflow.

Meanwhile, immigration from Third-World countries soared. As a result, the U.S. government now officially projects that the American whites will be on the verge of becoming a minority (53 percent) by year 2050, if the current trends continue.

And even that figure (53 percent) understates the rapidly declining share of Americans of European descent, who for nearly two centuries had accounted for more than three-quarters of the American population. The U.S. Census Bureau, which made the above year 2050 projection, counts all immigrants from the Middle East and North Africa as "whites," according to Mr. Brimelow.

More than just creating an ethnic cauldron of arguably incompatible cultures which may boil over into violence one day, the U.S. 1965 Immigration Act has seriously eroded the quality of the American labour force.

Why? Because in a free U.S. Labor market, unskilled or less qualified immigrants can and do help lower the overall labour wages by merely competing with the indigenous Americans for jobs.

As a result, the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer in America. Phoenix, Washington, DC, and many other American cities have their own "Great American Divide" stories - a divide between the haves and the have-nots. But nowhere is the desecration of the American Dream more visible than in the "financial capital of the world," Gotham City - host both to Wall Street and the United Nations.

As President Bill Clinton and his entourage used a South Bronx neighborhood in New York for a pre-Christmas confidence-boosting photo-op in early December 1997; as Wall Street celebrated another "bull" market year; as the economists hailed the supposed strength of the U.S. economy, especially in contrast to the Asian crisis, the Washington-based Center on Budget and Policy

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

Priorities (COBPP) released a devastating report. Income inequality has been growing in 48 of the 50 states. Only in Alaska and North Dakota has the gap between the incomes of the richest and the poorest residents narrowed over the past 20 years. Nor did the so-called "middle class" fare much better. The incomes of MIDDLE income families DROPPED by 22 percent during the same period.

"Robust economic growth in recent years has done little to turn around the long-term trend toward increasing inequality," said Kathy Larin, co-author of the report and a policy analyst at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. And guess where the Great American Divide, which separates the rich and the poor, is widest? New York.

The 10 states where the gap is greatest between the incomes of the HIGHEST-income and LOWEST -income families with children is the greatest are (in declining order) - New York, Louisiana, New Mexico, Arizona, Connecticut, California, Florida, Kentucky, Alabama, and West Virginia, the COBPP report said.

New York is also leading the nation in terms of the gap between HIGH-income and MIDDLE-income families with children. During the past two decades, the gap widened the most rapidly in New York, Indiana, Arizona, California, Georgia, Connecticut, West Virginia, Texas, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee (again, the top 10 in order of the highest-to-lower discrepancies). In other words, New York is America's "plutocracy capital."

The latest census data merely confirm the earlier trends. In an August 1997 report, for example, the same Washington-based research organization noted that, the wealthiest ONE percent of Americans received as much after-tax income in 1994 as the bottom 35 percent of the population - COMBINED. And that the top 20 percent of the population had nearly as much income as the bottom 80 percent.

Between 1977 and 1994 - the first and last years for which COBPP had issued such statistics - the share of the national after-tax income received by the top one percent of the population rose substantially. In 1977, the bottom 35 percent of the population had nearly twice as much after-tax income as the top one percent, the analysis found. By 1994, these two groups had essentially the same amount of income.

The COBPP analysis shows that in 1994, the 2.6 million wealthiest Americans (top one percent of the population) had as much after-tax income as the 88 million with the lowest incomes (bottom 35 percent of Americans). Similarly, the 52 million Americans with the highest income (top fifth) received 49 percent of the nation's after-tax income, nearly as much as the other 206 million Americans.

"Income has become much more concentrated among a relative handful of the wealthiest Americans," noted ***Isaac Shapiro***, a senior fellow at the COBPP and co-author of the report. Shapiro said that the average after-tax income of the top one percent of families equaled \$374,000 in 1994, or 15 times the average after-tax income for the middle fifth of families, which stood at \$25,650.

In fact, the COBPP studies understate the width of The Great American Divide. The census data used for its report did not include capital gains income

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

as family income, for example, understating the incomes of the top fifth of families who receive most of the capital gains income. The Census data did not reflect earnings above \$100,000 for any one job, either, further understating the incomes of the American elite.

On the other hand, partly offsetting those factors, was a corresponding omission from the data of welfare benefits, such as food stamps, which poor families may receive. In all, however, the COBPP said its report "UNDERSTATES income disparities between the top and middle fifth, and, to a lesser degree, those between the top and bottom fifth."

How things like that can happen in a free and democratic society? It can't, of course. Not if Logic 101 is applied. Which means that America is no longer a "land of the free," though it still may be a country "of the brave."

In other words, the United States of America is an even greater plutocracy than these alarming numbers suggest. And the disparities between the rich and the poor are approaching those in some other countries before their elites were eventually sent to the dustbin of history by the common folk who rebelled against such "taxation without representation."

* * * *

Once upon a time, America was a Republic practicing real democracy. And white Americans exercised their majority power over other minorities, sometimes ruthlessly. Now the tables have turned. The corruption of the American political system by Wall Street's and foreign money, and the "liberals" willingness to sell out true liberalism for a dictatorship of thought, are making the majority of Americans subjects of reverse discrimination.

Take the term "politically correct" (PC), for example. It is fervently used by politicians and the establishment-owned media, and rigorously imposed on our children - from K-12 to colleges. Yet, being "PC" really is a "dictatorship of minorities." The majority of Americans are not supposed to acknowledge this fact out loud, however - for fear of offending the minorities.

So American Indians have become Native-Americans, usurping that attribute from other native Americans, starting with George Washington. Blacks are no longer black; they are now African-Americans, thus claiming the entire continent, despite the presence of the white people, like the Coptic Christians, since time immemorial, on this allegedly "Black Continent."

But how is such a dictatorship of the few over the many possible in the "land of the free," the "greatest democracy on Earth?"

Easy. They buy the politicians. They buy the educators. They buy the media. And then, they tell them what they want Americans to think. Or else. And suddenly, America is no longer free.

Once upon a time, this writer lived under such a system. It was called communism. As a young man, I faced the same choices as above. I chose the "else." I came to America, the "land of the free." Or so I thought. Now I am not so sure...

At least the "political commissars" under communism operated openly. Everybody knew what they were - the moral whores (if not who they were), and what their job was. So freedom-loving people in communist countries used to discount or ignore anything the establishment media wrote.

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

But here, in our supposedly "free" American society, we are much more vulnerable. We are taught to believe what we read or see on TV.

"You'll believe what you read in (the) news magazines until the first time you see an article on a subject which you know," a veteran West Coast editor, a former Associated Press journalist, wrote to this writer in August 1992. "Then you will never believe them again. Most 'civilians' (meaning ordinary readers) never have a sufficiently jarring experience to fall victim to this piece of (journalistic) folk wisdom."

* * * *

Princess Diana's death, in August 1997, highlighted both the gullibility and the emptiness of an average citizen's life. And how the media serves up a substitute virtual life by way of compensation. It's all a part of dumbing down process - not only of America, but of the western world.

She chose to live in the fast lane of the aristocratic jet set. She died in the fast lane of a Paris underpass after trying to outrace some photographers.

We are told it is a tragedy. It is. Any time someone dies in this world, it is a tragedy. Especially if it is someone who cared about other people. Since it is considered bad manners to bring up the deceased person's shortcomings in a eulogy, we'll skip over them.

We are told it is a Greek tragedy. It is not. Old Greeks had more common sense than to travel at 121 mph through city streets in murderous projectiles called automobiles. Thank God no innocent bystander or driver was killed.

We are told the paparazzi had killed her. They did not. Not unless you're prepared to blame the tip of a whip for striking you, rather than the hand which held its other end. Paparazzi are the convenient scapegoats. They were merely doing their job. Professional sports players, not to mention racing car drivers, are revered by the masses for this kind of hustle. They are also paid a lot of money, just as the paparazzi were trying to earn.

Contrast their hustle with the media buzzards like Barbara Walters or Peter Jennings of *ABC TV*, for example, who are feeding off the remains of this news story like desert vultures feasting off a corpse.

So who killed Princess Diana? Mostly herself. But also the West's living dead. The West's living dead? Yes. The Tom, Dick and Harry's... and the Jane, Sheilagh and Mary's... They held the end of the whip.

That's hundreds of millions of miserable human beings who don't have a life of their own; at least not a satisfying and fulfilling one. The "Full Monties" of this world. Deprived of spiritual food by the materialistic industrial era, these people have vicariously lived the high society life they were craving through the TV characters like Princess Diana. Would they have wailed as loudly (or at all?) if their favorite cartoon character died in a car crash?

More importantly, do they weep for the Unknown Soldier who died while fighting for their freedom or safety? Do they cry for the Unknown Fireman who perished while trying to save a stranger's home.? Do they shed their tears for the Unknown Policeman who was killed while protecting someone's life or property?

Instinct tells me they don't. Unlike Princess Diana, these true heroes are unknown to us because our society is being brainwashed into de-emphasizing the patriotism and unselfishness, while elevating the glitz and greed.

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

That so many millions can be made to feel such deep emotions for a person they've never met, is yet another example of industrial man's degradation from physical to virtual life. It is also another victory for the industrial elites, who can now manipulate emotions of the masses on a scale unprecedented in human history.

Which ought to send shivers down the spine of any free man still walking tall on this world.

The staged-for-TV massacres of Sarajevo civilians by their Muslim government, apparently using foreign screenwriters, directors and producers, are recent examples of how dangerous this macabre New World really is (check out the May 1992⁴⁸¹, February 1994 and August 1995 massacres - to mention only three of a number of such gruesome "Sarajevo TV productions").

Unlike Hollywood productions, however, these government-sponsored murders spilled the real blood of real people in the hope of winning the sympathy of the world's TV viewers.

In a bizarre way, this is the ultimate New World Order nirvana... real life becoming a servant of virtual images. And as with the London funeral of Princess Diana, the big-name TV buzzards (Jennings, CNN's Christiana Amanpour, etc.) were on hand in Sarajevo to record the carnage.

So when the millions of the living dead lined the streets of London on Saturday to see the funeral procession; when the hundreds of millions of their international compatriots joined them through the TV screens; when Britain fell silent for one minute in a tribute to Princess Diana... that's when this writer spent a silent minute in spirit at the graves of all those patriotic soldiers whose names mean nothing to us; all those unselfish firemen, all those brave policemen, or all those decent neighbors we never met.

Unlike Princess Diana who lived in the fast lane, and died in it, too - these ordinary heroes lived their lives in relative obscurity. They died without the pomp and ceremony awarded to those born with a silver spoon in their mouth. Yet they are the true nobility of mankind.

* * * *

The entertainment industry is another purveyor of the destructive forces which are tearing apart the traditional fabric of the American and other western societies. Just as the drugs are destroying the bodies of young Americans, Hollywood, the record companies and the professional sports owners and sponsors are poisoning the minds of America's youth.

Take violence, for example. "Thou shall not murder," command the Christian Scriptures. Yet, more people are probably killed in movies on America's screens every day than had died in any day in this century's wars. Is it any wonder, therefore, that America is one of the most dangerous places to live in the world?

Or, take the music. The romantic serenity of the "classical" (Christian) composers, like Bach, Chopin, Mozart, Beethoven, Tschaikovsky, Dvorzak, Liszt

⁴⁸¹ For more details see "Peacekeeper," a book by the Canadian Gen. Lewis MacKenzie (1993); and "The Sharp End, A Canadian Soldier's Story", by James R. Davis, published by Douglas & McIntyre, Vancouver/Toronto, 1997

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

and others has been usurped by the pagan beat of rap or the heavy metal rock bands which dominate our airwaves.

Finding a classical music radio station in America today is like counting hen's teeth. Why? Why should the descendants of these great European musicians be deprived of their fine art?

"Because there is no money in it," we are usually told. "And why is there no money in it?" Because the powers that be in today's America have chosen not to put the money into Christian music!

Instead, they have opted to invest their money into pagan drum beat music and violent movies. Or into gladiator-like sports, like football or basketball. Meet America's role models, the superstar gladiators.

It's all a part of the dumbing down process, one reader suggested, after having read my Aug. 31, 1997 *Washington Times* column, "Dancing 'Round the Golden Calf," which dealt with these issues. You cannot program people unless you have the rhythmic drum beat. Just like the repetitive work in the factories.

Actually, the picture which this comment evoked in this writer's mind is one of the Roman galleys, with chained slaves tugging on oars all day long in unison to the sound of the drums.

* * * *

And then there is the programming which goes on in our schools. "I filled in the bubble opposite the 'C' on the multiple choice question, although I had no idea what the question meant, let alone what the right answer was," fessed up an honest student on his way to becoming another NWO human robot. "But I got an 'A' on the test. Guess I guessed right."

An education system which can be reduced to games of chance has more in common with Las Vegas casinos and the New York stockmarket than it does with knowledge.

No wonder our "bubble" generations tend to applaud on the same cues at talk shows; idolize the same heroes; dress the same; drink the same; talk the same; cuss the same; and, of course, think the same.

The extent to which they vary from each other is merely in the choices they make between prepackaged answers served up by others - again as with the bubbles - rather than by coming up with their own, independent thoughts.

As a result, we have raised several successive generations of morons in this country - well-dressed and often overfed, but intellectually impoverished. So after decades of letting them guess which bubbles to fill in, rather than reply to who, what, why, where and when questions, our educators have joined the process of dumbing down of America.

* * * *

But the biggest wreckers of America's national fiber are the multinational companies. Loyal only to money, they call for free trade incessantly, and wear the national colors of the countries in which they do business merely as camouflage. The ideal world for these chameleons is a world of mutts, a cheap and not too smart labor force, willing to put the bosses' materialistic ideology ahead of their national interests, their cultures, and their national pride. The U.S. is no exception.

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

America used to be a country in which most people worshipped Jesus Christ, the son of God, who died on the Holy Cross. Now most Americans worship the Almighty Dollar, the son of Usury, enslaver of Free Man, in shrines like Wall Street.

But for their pin-striped suits, they might as well be the high-rolling Las Vegas gamblers. For, the stockmarket has long ago ceased to be the "barometer of economic activities," as we were taught in schools, and as some Wall Street people still claim.

In the 1990s, for example, U.S. companies have spent over \$660 billion into buybacks of their own shares - without creating a single product or a job. That's more than all multinational companies in the world have made in direct investments in all developing countries in the world during the same time frame (\$550 billion). And that's legal in America?

Today's stockmarket is nothing more than a "Ponzi scheme," according Dr. Michael Hudson, a respected economist, who heads up the Institute for the Study of Long-Term Economic Trends in New York. It is a means of siphoning off the money from wage-earners (retirement savings, social security funds, private investment accounts, mattresses), and transferring it into the pockets of financial institutions (banks and brokers).

But in order for a Ponzi scheme to work, you have to keep the public unaware. Which is where the establishment media comes in. It plays a valuable role for Wall Street - by having stayed largely mum about such scams. Until recently. But when this writer started commenting about the stockmarket Ponzi schemes in his *Forbes* columns in mid-1997, he soon found out that the magazine's budget for outside columnists had suddenly dried up. Such is the "free press" in the land of the Almighty Dollar.

STEP 2: MEDIA DECEPTIONS, OMISSIONS, DIVERSIONS

Until now, we've mostly looked at the ways America's plutocrats and the establishment media try to "program" the masses by techniques which more or less stem from the art of marketing. But sometimes, they do more than that. Sometimes, they blatantly lie or deceive the American public by omissions and diversions of the news stories. In other words, by news manipulation. In this section, we'll look at a number of case studies involving the major U.S. news media.

□ Media and Vote Fraud (1996)

The book "VOTESCAM: The Stealing of America", 1992, authored by Jim and Ken Collier (Ken is now deceased) - exposed the results of a 13-year investigation into a methodical corruption of America's once free and honest election process. The Republican primaries in 1996 also showed that "votescam" is still alive and well.

The Voter's News Service (VNS), for example, is a private corporation created and mutually owned by ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN and AP. According to a New York Times Feb. 29, 1996 story, "Three Networks Admit Error in Arizona Race Reports," "all the networks, and other news organizations that pay to

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

receive voter-poll information, get their data from the same source, the Voters News Service. The networks formed a consortium to create VNS in 1992... "

Of course, we know from the communist-style censorship that the first step of controlling the news is to CENTRALIZE its source. Why that's important and how it was used to destroy the candidacy of the populist Presidential candidate, Pat Buchanan, can best be seen from the following examples.

CONDIT: SUMMARY

Condit's message to Americans... Computer voting is dangerous. People who program the computers can cheat, and hackers can change votes leaving no trace. In states where voting is done by computer there is very little hope of ever uncovering vote fraud. Therefore, Americans must begin to work on the precinct level and re-establish ballot boxes in their localities. In areas where ballot boxes exist - get out and monitor the vote count. Take notes, video tape procedures when possible, tape conversations and above all, have witnesses with you.

MCCAIN ALSO CONGRATULATED BUCHANAN

The former Arizona governor, Fife Symington, was not the only one to have committed a "faux pas" of prematurely congratulating Pat Buchanan on his Feb. 27 primary victory. The Arizona Senator John McCain also did it. Here is a message which the Truth in Media posted on the Internet on March 16, 1996, in response to the above CDR story regarding the VoteScam in America:

"Congratulations on your research regarding the VoteScam in America.

Thought you may be also interested in a few of other factors concerning the Arizona primary which backs up your research about the possible election fraud. Had the "Establishment" started to panic and pulled out all stops after Pat Buchanan's electoral successes during February leading up to the Arizona vote?

(1) "LIVE" TV COVERAGE PHASED OUT AS THE "ESTABLISHMENT" PANICKED?

The Iowa caucuses, which Bob Dole was expected to win hands down, were covered "real time" by a large number of channels. One could literally channel-surf from coverage to coverage. Dole won Iowa on Feb. 12, but it was a squeaker. Buchanan declared a moral victory.

The New Hampshire primary was covered "live" only by C-Span and CNN. Buchanan won anyway, sending the Party "establishment" into a tizzy.

So the Arizona primary was NOT COVERED LIVE AT ALL by any TV channel, not even the local Arizona stations! Why not? So that results could be "fixed" "off-line?" Was Buchanan robbed of Arizona victory?

Maybe. I don't know for sure. But consider the following news story...

(2) MCCAIN CONGRATULATES BUCHANAN ON ARIZONA VICTORY

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

As your subject report stated, Arizona's governor, Fife Symington, called the Buchanan State HQ at 4 p.m. on Feb. 27, the day of the Arizona primary, to congratulate him on his victory.

But did you know that Sen. John McCain, who initially backed Phil Gramm, then switched his support to Bob Dole just before the AZ primary, sent a FAX the same day to the AZ media also congratulating Buchanan on victory?

According to an Associated Press report carried by the PHOENIX GAZETTE on Feb. 28, 1996, McCain's office "sent out a FAX minutes after the Arizona polls closed, congratulating Pat Buchanan on his victory."

"Today, Pat Buchanan deserves our congratulations for winning a plurality of support from Arizona Republicans," McCain said in a statement sent to media outlets across Arizona minutes after the polls closing," the AP reported.

The statement was apparently issued after McCain's press secretary called CNN to get the early results. McCain's office later issued a press release he had prepared admonishing Steve Forbes, the eventual "winner" of the Arizona primary, for spending \$4 million on media ads.

**DID SOMEBODY FORGET TO TELL MCCAIN THAT
BUCHANAN WAS NOT GOING TO WIN ARIZONA - COME HELL OR
HIGH WATER?**

*Bob Djurdjevic
Founder
TRUTH IN MEDIA
Phoenix, Arizona*

Of course, none of this mattered in the end. In a "demo farce" that the American elections have become, Bob Dole sailed through the rest of the Republican primaries to claim the party's presidential domination, notwithstanding Buchanan's early victories. Which meant that the two frontrunners in the race for the White House both raced for the same stable owner - Big Business. As their support for each other on just about any foreign policy issue has proven.

Is there any wonder that in the November 1998 elections, 62% of Americans stayed away from the polls? Especially for those who saw the ABC News "Monday Night Goofball" at its Internet Web site on Nov. 2, 1998.

□ Media and Vote Fraud (1998)

Trying to beat its competition to the punch on the eve of the U.S. mid-term elections, the network which claims the first three letters of the TV alphabet soup went all out in its election coverage. One day before Americans had a chance to cast their votes, ABC News already knew the outcome. On Monday, Nov. 2, ABC posted on its Web site the results of the Tuesday, Nov. 3 elections. Now, that's got to be the mother of all scoops. Or of all goofs. And a big new bone for the conspiracy theorists to chew on.

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

For example, in California's race for the U.S. Senate, the incumbent Democrat, Barbara Boxer, defeated her Republican opponent (Fong) by 2,155,456 votes (50%) to 1,916,746 (45%), according to ABC News.

[Boxer did win in real life, too].

In Arizona, Senator John McCain was re-elected over his Democratic Party challenger by a comfortable 64% to 34% margin.

[McCain did win in real life, too].

In New York, the incumbent Republican (D'Amato) overcame two handicaps to defeat his Democratic challenger (Schumer) by a 50% to 42% margin. D'Amato's first handicap was D'Amato. His second handicap was Mayor Guiliani's support. But both were evidently easily offset by voter rejection of the Schumer booster - Bubba Clinton. Exit polls showed, however, that the deciding factor weighing on New Yorkers' minds was not Monica Lewinsky. (Not only because she wasn't running; everybody knows she is better at kneeling). It was the traffic tie-ups which Clinton causes every time he comes to Manhattan looking for handouts.

[In this case, Shumer defeated D'Amato in a real life vote].

On Tuesday morning (Nov. 3), the alphabet soup network apologized to its readers. "Last night, during testing of the site (abcnews.com), we inadvertently posted results and erroneous predictions on the outcomes of the political races," a note on the ABC Web site read. "There was no bias intended by what we posted, and the predictions do not reflect the reporting or news judgment of ABC News," the Reuters newswire reported Tuesday (Nov. 3).

Wonder whose news judgments are reflected on ABC News Web site, if not that of ABC News?

Whoever did post the fake vote results has evidently breathed a new sign of life into the ABC TV programming. Long known for its popular "Monday Night Football" broadcasts, the network now has a chance to supplement them with a new of "Monday Night Goofball" series. Production costs should be quite low, as they can be all taped at ABC's studios in New York, where there is evidently no shortage of goofballs.

□ Manipulating Foreign News

Manipulating foreign news has been much easier. Until the Internet revolution, that is.

First, because there were few, if any, U.S. eyewitnesses. Which gave the establishment media's foreign correspondents a virtual monopoly on the spin of foreign events. Second, because a part of the "dumbing down of America" process is that average Americans have been brainwashed into a myopic attitude toward the world. One only needs to watch the local TV news broadcasts to appreciate the enormous dominance of the local fires, murders or rapes, over the foreign wars, earthquakes or elections.

But the establishment media's monopoly on foreign news reporting and analyses is being seriously eroded by the Internet revolution. Suddenly, a newsletter publisher of, say, the Truth in Media Global Watch Bulletins, can compete with, and often outscop, the media giants. That's due, in part, to thousands of volunteer reporters around the world who share this newsletter publisher's passion for truth and liberty.

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

What follows are only some of the several dozen of examples in which the Truth in Media has caught the establishment press with its hands in the cookie jar - lying, covering up, omitting stories and facts.. And even sometimes writing diversionary articles so as to deflect the readers' attention from the main event.

New York Times: "All the News That Fits Editors' Opinions"

The New York Times front page motto reads, "All the News That's Fit to Print." That's the theory. In practice, "All the News That Fits Editors' Opinions" is often more appropriate for this New York daily which is widely regarded as America's foremost authority on foreign news. Here are some examples which illustrate why New York Times is actually a candidate for being America's foremost manipulator of foreign news.

On Aug. 19, 1993, the Truth in Media sent a fax to the New York Times which could qualify as the world's shortest letter to the editor. It consisted of only one word. But so that it would not be lost on the editors, we printed the word using almost a two-inch font. All the letter said was: "LIARS!"

What brought it on was an Associated Press photograph from the Bosnian war which was published the same day (Aug. 7, 1993) by both the Washington Times and the New York Times.

The Washington Times caption read, "An elderly Croatian woman and her son mourn over the coffin of her son and brother in Posusje, Bosnia-Herzegovina yesterday. Funeral services were held for 18 of 34 Croats killed by Muslims."

The New York Times caption read, "A Croatian woman grieved with one son yesterday and for another who died as a result of an attack by Serbian forces in the town of Posusje in July."

Our one-word letter to the editor was never published. But the Times did run a correction six days later.

Nor was this an isolated instance of news manipulation. Nor an accident. The Truth in Media started to track the New York Times' media demonization of Serbs back in late 1988. By March 1993, we had produced a comprehensive study documenting four years of anti-Serbian propaganda by the New York Times. Our research encompassed some 1,200 NYT articles, including 120 Editorial and OpEd pieces on the subject of the former Yugoslavia, three of the four years being BEFORE the Bosnian war started.

Of that total, 93% were anti-Serbian, 7% were anti-Croatian; NONE were anti-Muslim!!

Furthermore, we were able to prove that the New York Times editors DROVE the Balkan news, not the other way around. In 1990, for example, the Letters on Yugoslav topics outnumbered Editorials and OpEd articles by a 17-8 margin. But by 1992, the year in which the Bosnian war started the Editorials and OpEd columns dominated the Letters by a 89-32 margin.

In late March 1993, our report was presented to the NYT editors in person by a concerned American. They just shrugged it off.

The escalation of violence in the Serbian province of Kosovo in early 1998 provided additional proof of the New York Times' biased reporting. Here's an excerpt from my March 15, 1998 Washington Times column, "Ginning Up Another Crisis:"

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

"Here we go again. 'Bosnia II' is in the making in the Serbian province of Kosovo. The U.S. government officials are stoking the fires of another ethnic war while publicly opposing it. They are playing their usual, duplicitous roles pulling the strings behind the scenes. Just as they kept adding fuel to the ethnic fire in Bosnia while claiming to douse it.

The special U.S. envoy for the Balkans, Robert Gelbard, was in Serbia only days before the latest outbreak of violence. And just as his predecessors at the State Department declared in June 1991 that the territorial integrity of the former Yugoslavia is inviolable, Gelbard warned the secession-minded Albanians that Kosovo is an integral part of Serbia.

But words are cheap. Especially those of the U.S. diplomats. Less than a year after such a solemn declaration, the U.S. recognized in April 1992 Slovenia's, Croatia's and Bosnia's secessions, setting off the three-and-a-half year Bosnian war.

So Kosovo looks like Bosnia "déjà vu all over again," in the words of Yogi Berra. Why should we, Americans, care? Because Kosovo, just like Bosnia, will ultimately lead to American involvement, including a deployment of U.S. troops.

How do we know that? Well, the New York Times, for example, has already been clamoring for redeployment of American troops in Macedonia, a stone's throw from Kosovo..

Another tell-tale sign of upcoming trouble in Kosovo was the arrival of some U.S. establishment media buzzards there. The New York Times reporter, for example, was given a private tour of Albanian terrorists' hideouts BEFORE the latest outbreak of violence. This implies a coordination between the U.S. government, the Albanian terrorists, and the 'independent' U.S. media.

A far-fetched speculation? Only for the ignorant. For, the same pattern was discernible during the war in Bosnia. The western media buzzards "miraculously happened to be in the neighborhood" when grisly killings occurred. The CNN, ABC, or SKY... cameras were rolling even before some of the victims had died.

Good journalism? Luck? Or careful coordination? Take your pick.."

After seeing the truth in media being massacred so many times over the last 10 years that the Truth in Media has been keeping a watch on the establishment media, the New York Times would have to be the leading candidate for a top spot in the Truth in Media "Hall of Shame."

Muffling the Voice of America

And then there was a story about Clinton's National Security Advisor trying to muffle the Voice of America, the State Department's voice to the world. "U.S. Officials Tried to Stop Broadcasts of (the Chinese dissident) Wei into China," was the headline of a Wall Street Journal Dec. 17, 1997 report. "Voice of America Was Warned on China Interview," the New York Times piped in the following day (Dec. 18).

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

Now, who were these totalitarian, undemocratic, communist-sympathizer U.S. officials the two leading American establishment media papers cited?

"They" were one Samuel Berger, the top official in the Clinton administration in charge of national security. Egged on by the U.S. ambassador to China, James Sasser, Berger reportedly called Evelyn Lieberman, director of *Voice of America*, trying to stop the Wei Jingsheng interview from being aired.

Yet by law, the *Voice of America* is supposed to make its editorial decisions independently. Berger's move showed just how little regard Clinton officials have both for democracy and for law.

No wonder his spokesperson, Anne Luzzatto, subsequently denied that her boss tried to influence *Voice of America*. While conceding that he did make the call to Lieberman, she said that he was merely "trying to make sure she was aware of the foreign policy implications of the interview," according to the *New York Times*.

And that's not trying to influence editorial decisions? Why does an independent editor need to worry about "the foreign policy implications?"

Meanwhile, "it's disgraceful that anyone in government would circumvent the Board of Governors which was designed to be a firewall [against] that kind of pressure," David Burke, chairman of International Bureau of Broadcasting board, told the *Wall Street Journal*.

Indeed it is. But notice how there has been no action to prosecute, or even only reprimand Berger, if indeed he broke the law?

In the end, despite their "not trying to influence editorial decisions," Berger and Sasser did succeed in blocking the Wei interview from being aired by the *Worldnet TV*, a U.S. government propaganda tool not subject to the editorial autonomy law which governs the *Voice of America*.

And all that happened in the "land of the free," where people think that the *Voice of America* was supposed to be our voice (since we pay for it), the voice of free America, not that of a NWO clique which has infiltrated our federal government, while kowtowing to foreign or Big Business interests.

HOW MEDIA AND GOVERNMENT FOREIGN POLICIES ARE COORDINATED

The above *Voice of America* incident, plus the fact that the generally "conservative" *Wall Street Journal* has advocated similar foreign policy positions as the generally "liberal" *New York Times*, and not just similar to each other, but also in line with the U.S. government policies, suggest several things:

- (a) There is precious little difference between the "liberal" and "conservative" media when it comes to foreign affairs
- (b) Both sets of editors generally toot the same horn as the U.S. government spokespeople
- (c) There is no such thing as "independent press" among the establishment media organizations

The fact that the establishment media publishers and senior editors regularly rub shoulders with Big Business leaders and government brass at globalist "town hall" meetings, such as the Council on Foreign Relations, or even the White House State dinners, can help us understand how such coordination of official government policy and media editorials takes place.

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

Once upon a time, a *Truth in Media* reader asked us to define what we meant by the term "New World Order" (NWO), an expression this reader frequently encountered in our reports earlier last year. We thought it was an excellent question, though perhaps a more appropriate place to direct it to might have been, for example, to George Bush. For this U.S. President was the first person to use the NWO term (in 1990), while declaring a victory by the West Side Gang (our term, not his) over its Cold War's East Side (Kremlin) Gang.

We replied that a specific answer to his question may be found among the membership rosters of such NWO globalist Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO), such as the Council for Foreign Relations (CFR), or the Trilateral Commission (TC) or the Bilderbergers.

The late-October 1997 visit to the U.S. by the Chinese President, Jiang Zemin, provided an opportunity for the uninitiated at least to find out "who's who" in the "China Wing of the NWO." The occasion was the gala White House state dinner, which the *Washington Post* summed up in its Oct. 30, 1997 report: *"Forget diplomacy. Money makes the world go round."*

"There's nothing like the prospect of a few billion dollars to brighten up a party," the Post wrote. "Last night's state dinner for Chinese President Jiang Zemin was a glittering celebration of trade and capitalism, bringing together the biggest names in American business and commerce."

Big Business executives among the dinner guests told the *Post* that were attracted to China by the size of its market. Just as the British textile manufacturers thought a century and a half ago, when their trade delegation visited China. "My, they marveled at the size of the Chinese market, if only we could get each Chinese to wear his/her shirt sleeves one inch longer, the textile mills of Lancashire would be busy for the next 100 years," the trade delegation reported upon returning to England.

Meanwhile, 100-plus year later, the Chinese can wear any length of shirt sleeves they please - most made in China, of course - while the textile mills Lancashire rust in the dust as monuments to western businessmen's folly.

Well, folly seemed in abundant supply at the Clintons' Oct. 29 state dinner for China's communist leader.

"I think it's important to open up the communications," said Harvey Weinstein, co-chairman of Miramax Films. He doesn't speak Chinese -- yet," the Post reported. "But I'm willing to learn, he said with a quick laugh."

Anything for a buck!

"An invitation to this dinner was one of the hottest of the Clinton administration, and a place on the guest list of 234 was a genuine prize. To underscore the importance of Jiang's visit, the White House invited former president Jimmy Carter, former first lady Lady Bird Johnson and five secretaries of state: Madeleine Albright and her predecessors - Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, James Baker and Alexander Haig. Congressional leaders included House Speaker Newt Gingrich, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott and Sen. Jesse Helms, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee."

Chapter 16 - The American Chapter By Bob Djurdjevic

But the real power came from the business world, with no fewer than 30 presidents, chairmen or CEOs, including Michael Eisner of Disney, Steven Jobs of Apple Computer, James Wolfensohn of the World Bank and Steven Spielberg of DreamWorks.

"I'm not here as a businessman," the overly modest Spielberg told the Post. "In a sense, I feel like I'm 'Forrest Gump' eavesdropping on a moment in history."

The guest list was also heavy with powerful media names: Arthur Ochs Sulzberger Jr., publisher of the New York Times; Peter Kann, publisher of the Wall Street Journal; Katharine Graham, chairman of the executive committee of The Washington Post Co; Tom Johnson, president of CNN; CBS anchor Dan Rather; NBC anchor Tom Brokaw; and ABC correspondent Diane Sawyer.

Appendix D contains a list of some of the members of the "China Wing of the NWO," along with their NGO (Non-Governmental Organizations) affiliations.

Appendix "A": Pauline Hanson's One Nation federal launch speech

Appendix A

Pauline Hanson's One Nation Federal Launch speech

29th September 1998

Fellow Australians,

Today is the beginning of the real campaign.

Today the others find out we have not yet begun to fight.

Today marks the run up for change or more of the same.

This Saturday Australians will decide if it is the elite of the media, of academia and those others who see themselves above ordinary Australians who dictate our future, or whether it will be the people themselves who decide our fate.

Until now this election has been little more than posturing by the major parties as they each attempt to direct the issues rather than address the issues.

To some degree they have succeeded in keeping the election focussed on tax rather than unemployment and job creation.

It is understandable that the Liberals, Nationals and Labor would largely wish to avoid reminding Australians of their appalling record on unemployment.

The only serious attention paid to unemployment was the work of Labor.

This was little more than a plan to spend taxpayers' money to largely create taxpayer funded jobs.

It is not a long-term proposition for the government to just create jobs by creating more government funded employees.

While government must assist to create jobs, the majority of our jobs must be founded in the private sector if we are to have a proper balance between government income and expense.

Real on-going employment in large numbers can only be financially encouraged by governments it cannot be financially sustained by governments.

We must assist private enterprise by providing the incentive to build and expand.

We must re-industrialise to assist in providing jobs of different types that not only suit the diverse needs of our population but also build our national strength and capacity for self-reliance.

The only notable impact made by Labor's backward entrance into employment was Mr Beazley's statement that unintentionally raised the question over the true level of unemployment.

Mr Beazley's promise he would create a million jobs over the next six years to achieve a lowering of the unemployment level to 5% discloses more than Mr Beazley intended and more than Mr Howard's government would have wished.

With current unemployment officially standing around 8% and representing about eight hundred thousand Australians, this means Mr Beazley's million jobs for a 5% outcome is very revealing.

Mr Beazley is, by accident, telling us one of two things. Either a further seven hundred thousand or more Australians will lose their jobs over the next six years or he is acknowledging the true unemployment rate is at least double the so called, 'official figures'.

Appendix “A”: Pauline Hanson’s One Nation federal launch speech

For many years successive Liberal/National and Labor governments with their policies of globalisation and economic rationalism have positioned Australia so our industries would close and our jobs would be exported to benefit the workers and families of foreign lands at the expense of our own people.

When our government decided to bend to foreign interests in their bid to be citizens of the world, did they understand what they would do to their own country?

Was the existing outcome of government policies the result of simple mismanagement through a lack of foresight or are Australians suffering now because of the self-seeking nature of a handful of individuals whose actions were not overturned by their successors.

We cannot continue to believe in or follow policy direction that clearly devastates our industry and manufacturing, exports our jobs, reduces our standard of living and reduces the level of safety in our community.

Unemployment and the need to pro-actively create real long-term jobs must be our number one priority.

Not only because of the personal despair and loss of self worth felt by those who struggle to find their place and an income in these difficult times, but because of the accumulating cost to the community through the destructive nature of unemployment and its terrible impact and multiplying effect on so many other issues.

In the late eighties, Mr Hawke told us by 1990 no child would be living in poverty and yet today over seven hundred thousand Australian children are living, or perhaps I should say, surviving, in families where neither parent has a job.

Seven hundred thousand children suffering alongside their parents in seemingly hopeless circumstances while Mr Hawke collects countless thousands of dollars for personal appearances.

Never forget, Mr Hawke and Mr Keating were the only Prime Ministers in our history who managed to become multi-millionaires while in office and yet at the same time these two also gave us record unemployment and the recession we had to have.

We should all be asking them to please explain.

Mr Howard struggled for more than a generation to become Prime Minister and a hundred days after he finally made it he told the country he was comfortable and relaxed.

Mr Howard told us there were two different types of promises, core promises and non core promises and now he is going to give us a GST even after he told us that would never ever happen.

For Mr Howard there may be two types of promises but most of us recognise that however different promises may be, they often end up as the same lie.

Today, the real fight begins.

Will we allow the lies and treachery of Liberal, National and Labor to be our guide for the future?

Will we allow those who claim to keep the bastards honest to divide us with race hate by their election platform of black against white?

Appendix “A”: Pauline Hanson’s One Nation federal launch speech

Will we continue to allow the sale of our country, the export of our jobs, the increase in crime and substance abuse, race based policy and the destruction of our national pride and heritage through inappropriate immigration and the segregation that is multiculturalism?

This election, we either make a difference, or we will be made to be different as our Australian identity is taken from us and we are left as just another corner of the world whose standard of living and security has been lowered by the loss of our sovereignty and the intermingling of globalisation.

One Nation stands firm on the issue of jobs.

It is this issue that most needs a champion for it is this sore that has been glossed over and left to fester.

Crime, substance abuse, family breakdown and even suicide are all interlocked with the level of unemployment.

The despair and hopelessness felt by so many of our people is what drives them to extreme actions that a sense of security would never allow.

To address unemployment and provide Australians with a belief in the future, in their security and a comforting understanding of what lays ahead for their children will lower crime reduce the dependence on drugs and help to hold families together.

Young Australians in particular have a right to expect the life we leave them will be better than the life we experienced.

It is the responsibility of every generation to pass on a better standard of living to the generation that follows.

Our standard of living cannot be judged by whether you have a computer or are connected to the Internet, whatever access you may have to modern appliances or how many channels you can find on your television set.

A standard of living must be judged by your feeling of well-being, your financial security and the safety you have on the street and in your own home.

A standard of living must be judged by whether you will still have your job next week and next month and next year.

A standard of living must be judged by whether you will ever own your own home and be able to afford your children’s education and your own retirement.

A standard of living must be judged by being able to speak out when things are wrong and your ability both individually and collectively to right those wrongs.

No matter how modern our lifestyle may be, if we do not possess within ourselves a feeling of security and a belief in the future then the material things that surround us will be of cold comfort as we face the uncertainty of each new day.

I say again jobs, jobs, jobs and I mean real jobs not just government handouts and the short-term action of simply creating government funded positions.

Pauline Hanson’s One Nation is committed to provide the incentive for Australia to once again be a strong self-sufficient manufacturing nation with an equally strong rural sector and a people who believe in themselves, their heritage and their future.

All policies regardless of the issue must consider a component of employment as important in the overall outcome and objective.

Appendix “A”: Pauline Hanson’s One Nation federal launch speech

We will provide low interest loans through our national trust which will make monies available on a highly targeted and tendered approach based on the creation of jobs in the private sector.

This money will not be hand-outs but funds to begin the re-development of our rural sector, regional Australia, manufacturing, industry, small business and the sponsorship of Australian invention.

The concept of such development funding is not new, rather it has been removed from us by our government in favour of allowing the high profits of private financial institutions.

Such funding has worked well in the past and in some countries such as Japan, is still available today.

In fact even in our own country our own government has proven such funding can be made available by creating 1.5% business development loans on the basis of race to Aboriginal Australians.

We will make available funding for thousands of real apprenticeships across Australia to once again give young people a chance in trades and our country the opportunity of home grown skills.

This funding will be based on a wage supplement to employers where young apprentices after completing the equivalent of year 10 in High School will have in the first year of their apprenticeship 80% of their wage paid by the government, in the second year 60% and in the third year 40%.

This policy will be known as the Young Australian Apprenticeship Revival Scheme.

One Nation will audit all regions of Australia to identify and assess our raw materials and the capacity for value-adding on a region by region basis to both create further employment in devastated rural and regional areas and vastly improve Australia’s export potential as well as our ability to compete domestically with products currently imported.

We must recreate Australian Made.

We must squeeze it, bottle it, can it and weave it, on our own and reap the benefit for our own through value-adding.

One Nation will further improve the prospects of domestic employment by encouraging those who produce goods that are Australian owned and manufactured as well as identifying those goods with simple and obvious labelling.

One Nation will reassess tariffs and other forms of protection to at least give these new industries and existing industries the ability to compete with cheap foreign imports while still being able to have growth in pay levels and improvements in the standard of living for Australia’s workers.

Fellow Australians,

this Saturday Australia is at a cross-roads. We can continue to destroy rural and regional areas of Australia, and continue to leave our young with little prospect of employment, and continue to make our jobs our most successful export while allowing increasing substance abuse and crime and family breakdown, or we can decide to have change.

Appendix “A”: Pauline Hanson’s One Nation federal launch speech

Change is a simple matter of voting for Pauline Hanson’s One Nation and sending all of those parties that have brought us to where we are now a clear and simple message,

that message is – you have failed.

I say again, to Liberal, to National, to Labor, to Democrat, to Green, to all those that in the last couple of decades have come before us – you have failed.

The chance is now or never.

If we allow the continuation of the policies that have so clearly failed our nation, we ourselves will contribute to that failure.

After this Saturday we must be well placed with more One Nation members of Parliament or the future will simply carry the same devastating results as the past.

Our own flag, our own People, our own Language, our own Future, our own Nation.

One Nation,

Thank you for listening to me.

*Appendix "B":
Pauline Hanson's speech - launch of One Nation in April 1997*

**Appendix B
Pauline Hanson's One Nation launch speech**

11th April 1997:

"My friends,

my constituents of Oxley,

my fellow Australians,

Tonight there is cause for celebration.

We, all of us here tonight, and millions of people across Australia can celebrate, at last there is the chance for change.

The chance to finally rid ourselves of the inequity that has grown from years of political correctness, where we have not been able to speak our mind, or express our views without being called names intended to make us look backward, intolerant or extremist.

The chance to stand against those who have betrayed our country, and would destroy our identity by forcing upon us the cultures of others.

The chance to turn this country around, revitalise our industry, restore our ANZAC spirit and our national pride, and provide employment for all Australians who have given a fair break would seize the opportunity for a better way of life, for themselves, and for their families.

The chance to make sure the Australia we have known, loved and fought to preserve will be inherited intact, by our children, and the generations that follow them.

Ladies and Gentlemen, chances are fleeting, they must be held tightly, and so tonight more than celebration, is a time for resolve, for if we fail, all our fears will be realised, and we will lose our country forever, and be strangers in our own land.

As it stands, the future is one where the majority of Australians will become second class citizens in their own country, under a government who panders to minority interests and denies the majority their right of decision.

This is already happening.

The few politicians who care enough to recognise the situation will not speak out, because the politically correct multiculturalists, and sections of the media will call them names, their colleagues will distance themselves, and their party will destroy them.

In my own case, when I said what we all know to be the truth, the Liberal Party disendorsed me, and used me as an example to others of what will happen if you break ranks and speak the truth.

The truth is frightening, and must not be spoken, because the truth is:-

In 1961, unemployment stood at 2.6%, and yet in 1996, even after creative accounting it was 8.4%.

Today it is even higher, despite the promises of the current government.

There are at least 1.5 million Australians out of work.

Appendix "B":

Pauline Hanson's speech - launch of One Nation in April 1997

But these real figures are hidden by the method used to calculate unemployment, because if you work one hour a week, you are considered to have a job.

In 1961 27.5% of Australians were employed in manufacturing, but by 1996 that figure had dropped to 12.9%, less than half, and yet even as we threaten what remains of our car industry and other manufacturing, we ask, where are the jobs going?

The jobs are going to countries like Indonesia, where the pay is 39 cents an hour.

The government's enthusiastic removal of tariff protection has forced manufacturers overseas.

It's no wonder Asia boasts of their "Tiger Economics", they manufacture our goods, to their benefit, and at the cost of our jobs.

In the seventies Australia accounted for 4% of world trade, in the nineties it is down to 1% and still falling.

We are simply not keeping up with rest of the world.

In the financial year 1995/96, the Foreign Investment Review Board, which was set up to protect us, doubled its approvals to Au\$57 billion.

Nearly Au\$50 billion being spent to buy up existing Australian assets, with no new jobs created.

It isn't enough that the government gives Australian jobs to foreign countries, each day they let more and more of our country be sold away from us, never to be recovered.

In Rural Australia, 30 families leave the land every week.

Without change, we will lose 24,000 farmers to the welfare queues.

Will the government then import even basic crops, perhaps rice, to get us more used to it.

Think of the difference some of the more than Au\$30 Billion given to ATSIC would have made if used to help Australian farmers, rather than being unaccountably squandered, with no apparent improvement to the plight of indigenous Aborigines.

When we don't have any farms, manufacturing, jobs, or land, whose citizens will we be then?

When the Liberal party sought to silence the truth by disendorsing me, they thought they would finish me.

They were wrong.

After my maiden speech when sections of the media, the multiculturalists, and the aboriginal industry tried to portray me as a simple fish and chip shop lady, and an uneducated, uniformed race bigot, they thought they would finish me.

Now they think I can't do it, they think I don't have your support, they rely on Australians remaining apathetic.

They think Australians will just lay down and see their country disappear before their eyes.

Are they right?

No they are wrong again.

Appendix "B":

Pauline Hanson's speech - launch of One Nation in April 1997

Because if we let ourselves be stopped now, who will be left to take up the fight?

Some may believe it is almost too late, but we've come too far to be stopped, and we won't be stopped.

We will reclaim our country, and the future of our children.

We have been pushed far enough.

Tonight we start to push back.

It's a mammoth task that lies ahead, but we cannot step lightly, even though we tread where our enemies are waiting.

We must be resolute and unflinching.

We must not be slowed by the many obstacles that will be thrown in our path.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Who of you would not join this fight?

Who of you would not stand up for your country?

And yet there are so many people in Australia who do not think of themselves as Australians.

They have simply transplanted the problems of their way of life to our country.

Where will they stand in any future crisis, beside us, or behind us, or will they themselves be the crisis?

What will the face of Australia be if we continue to be the world's immigration soft touch?

How long can Australia pay for other countries mistakes, by importing their problems to our shores?

How many more unemployed will there be if we continue to fill our country with people who have given us nothing in return?

We cannot continue with this lack of sense and fairness.

We must all be treated equally.

We must remove the divisiveness of ATSIC, the aboriginal industry, and multicultural affairs.

Government policies have given us different classifications for Australians.

We now have Aboriginal Australians, and Indonesian Australians and other ethnic minorities. We want everyone to think of themselves simply as Australians, and to be Australians.

If you came here for a better life then live that better life with us.

Be with us, be one of us, be a part of One Nation, not one of the many parts of a divided nation. There is no need to forget where you came from, but above all, remember where you are.

Surely most people who have come to Australia have come for a better life. Do they want our country to become like the place they left?

Do You?

What of your dream for Australia?

Do you want it to be like another place?

Indonesia perhaps?

Cambodia or Vietnam?

How about Iran or Iraq or maybe Lebanon?

Appendix “B”:

Pauline Hanson’s speech - launch of One Nation in April 1997

Are there so many good things about these places that you would want Australia to be like them?

Do you want race riots, religious fanaticism, gang and drug wars?

Do you want civil war?

We have a chance for Australia to be the best place in the world, but we won’t achieve that by aspiring to be like so many places people want to leave.

We won’t achieve it with population policies that have no regard for the affect on our environment.

We won’t achieve it by giving our jobs to Asia, or selling off our assets to foreign ownership.

We won’t achieve it by crippling small business, making farmers extinct, or destroying what little remains of Australian manufacturing.

We won’t achieve it by throwing our money and our land at so called reconciliation, when in fact we have nothing to feel guilty about, and the cost of this guilt we have no reason to feel reduces what could be spent on our hospitals and schools and other areas where we could all benefit from the difference, rather than a few benefiting from the misappropriation.

We won’t achieve it by allowing heinous crimes previously unknown to us such as home invasions and the extortion of shop keepers to be imported along with so many cultures so alien to the Australian way of life.

And we most certainly will not achieve it by just giving away the most valuable commodity of all, Australian citizenship, the right to live free, and the right to honestly make of yourself, in what can still be the best place in the world.

We can win, we can make the difference, we can be the best place, but we must learn the lessons of the mistakes made by so many other countries.

We must stop our government repeating these mistakes, before we become like all the other places everyone wants to leave.

We cannot continue pursuing the failures of multiculturalism.

We cannot just give away what we all know to be so valuable.

If you want to live here permanently, you must want to be an Australian.

We must stand together to make these changes, or eventually be dragged down by the conspiracy of divisiveness that has been encouraged by our governments, and let loose upon the people of Australia without their permission.

Australians can no longer afford the luxury of apathy.

We must stand up.

We must all pull together.

We must win this battle, or lose the war.

Our immediate goals:-

- ☐ To stop all immigration except that related to investment that will lead to employment, and for this to continue until Australia’s unemployment is solved.
- ☐ To treat all Australians equally, and in so doing, abolish divisive and discriminatory policies such as those related to aboriginal and multicultural affairs.
- ☐ To restrict foreign ownership of Australia, repeal the Native Titles Act, abolish ATSIC, and reverse WIK and MABO.

Appendix "B":

Pauline Hanson's speech - launch of One Nation in April 1997

- To restore tariff protection, revitalise Australian manufacturing, and help small business and the rural sector.
- To take positive action on such matters as taxation reform, education, health, crime, and the discrimination created by political correctness.

The years of bandaid policies and questionable objectives have left us with a great deal to do.

The interests of the Australian people, and the future of our country must be determined by Australians themselves, not by the governments of other countries, and not by the United Nations, and not by trade agreements that benefit everybody except us.

We must recognise the truth, and no longer allow ourselves to be imperilled by governments whose sole objective is re-election, at any price, to stay in power, at any price, not for our benefit, but for their own.

From Graham Richardson's admissions we understand that the lies are so deeply rooted in the Australian political culture that even the politicians cannot tell the difference any more.

We should be afraid of their lies, and the consequences of believing their lies.

All Australians must be told the truth.

We must not be afraid of the truth.

But we must be afraid of the lies, for it is the truth that will save Australia, not the lies. We must always remember the sacrifice of so many Australians who fought to save our country from outsiders who would have taken it.

We must not now allow our country to be taken from within.

Again I say, it is the truth that will save Australia, not the lies.

I am about the truth.

I am about us being Australians.

I am about us being one people.

Under one flag, and with one set of rules.

When next you hear them call me a racist and a bigot, remember it is not just me they speak of, but everyone who believes in these things of which I speak.

It is an insult shared by millions of decent patriotic Australians.

We have only one chance.

One chance, and that is to be, One Nation.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is with a great sense of Purpose, Pride and Patriotism, that I officially launch the voice of the people, the Party of Truth, Fairness and Equality for all Australians, Pauline Hanson's One Nation."

APPENDIX C

THE NEW WORLD ORDER "LIBERAL"

The term "liberal" was used in apostrophes earlier in this chapter because it is another New World Order oxymoron. How can anything as dogmatic as the "PC" (politically correct) terminology ever be truly liberal, given that "liberal" means "freedom of individuals to act or express themselves in a manner of their own choosing," according to Webster's?

Today's "liberal" has come to mean a person who believes in nothing. Well, not quite nothing. He/she worships the new Golden Calf. Here's an example.

The Dec. 17, 1997 issue of the (London) *Guardian* said the following about the leader of the (Serbian) Democratic Party, Zoran Djindjic, one of the Belgrade protest leaders who had been pounding the pavement of Serbia's capital for 88 days in the hope of achieving democracy. "Stevan Niksic, a commentator on *Nin* magazine, thinks Mr. Djindjic... is close to Clinton, as a postmodern politician. He really believes in nothing,"

"Close to Clinton... believes in nothing." Now that sums up the NWO "liberal!" But since in Eastern Europe the word "liberal" still had its original, positive meaning (open-minded, tolerant of others), this writer tried to explain to some Serbian demonstration leaders why the above epithet about the alleged nihilism would actually be considered a COMPLIMENT in the liberal NWO speak. The more faceless, drab, materialistic, corruptible... a person is, the better he/she is suited for a LEADERSHIP position within the globalist world order.

By contrast, let's see how such a liberal nihilistic ideology might have played with the Belgrade pro-democracy demonstrators. Here's a mock "news report" about a fictitious speech by a fictitious Serbian opposition leader. Let's call him - Levi Desnic (a "Lefty Rightwing" in loose translation).

Levi Desnic steps toward the microphone to address a crowd of several tens of thousands of protesters. He pauses, he thumps himself on the chest and proudly declares: "I BELIEVE IN NOTHING!" He pauses again.

The crowd seems stunned. Demonstrators can be seen pointing their index fingers to their heads, as people do when wondering if a person had gone mad.

"And because I believe in nothing," Levi Desnic continues, "I am the most qualified politician to be the next President of Serbia."

The crowd chuckles, evidently assuming Levi Desnic is building up to a joke.

"Why must Serbia have a President who believes in nothing?," Levi Desnic asks rhetorically. "Because Serbia needs the support of the international community if it is to rejoin the community of nations. Everybody in the international community knows that only people who believe in nothing can lead it."

Now the crowd is roaring with laughter.

"Levi-Nothing," "Levi-Nothing," some are chanting spontaneously, as if it were a sporting event's shutout score.

Realizing the crowd took his remarks as a joke, Levi Desnic rushes to offer a proof of his theory: "So you think believing in nothing is a joke? Well then, let me offer you some proof to the contrary. Do you believe that Helmut Kohl, for example, believes in nothing?"

Appendix "C" The New World Order "Liberal"

"Daaa," the crowd replies, albeit after some hesitation. "Maybe Kohl believes in a bratwurst," one participant can be overheard as muttering. "But what the heck; the man's gotta eat."

"Do you think that Bill Clinton believes in nothing?" Levi Desnic continues to test the demonstrators, as if lecturing at a university auditorium.

"Daaaaa," the crowd roars back.

"Do you think that Boris Yeltsin believes in nothing?"

"Daaaaaaaaa," the crowd responds louder and longer.

"Do you think that Madeleine Albright believes in nothing?"

"Daaaaaaaaaaaaa," the crowd shouts back its longest and loudest approval.

"And aren't all these people respected leaders of the international community?" Levi Desnic uses Logic 101 to set up the victory line.

"Daaa," some in the crowd reply. Others are seen shaking their heads, as if realizing that maybe this was not a Levi Desnic comedy hour.

"Therefore," Levi Desnic delivers his punch line, "when I tell you that I believe in nothing, that means that I am the only political leader in Serbia on a par with all these world leaders. Even (Serbia's president) Milosevic believes in something... He believes in socialism. He believes in corruption. He believes in his wife. He believes in his police. Who knows, maybe he even believes that his son can win an Indy 500 race..."

A loud laughter forces Levi Desnic to pause. After a delay he continues.

"By contrast, I can assure you that I believe in nothing. Nothing, do you hear?" he shouts for added effect. "I don't believe in God; I don't believe in life after death; I don't believe in holy matrimony; I don't believe in democracy; I don't believe in autocracy; I don't believe in military; I don't believe in 'flower children,' I don't believe in Santa Claus... I tell, you - I believe in nothing!"

He pauses to allow the stirring crowd to settle down.

"Which is why I am the most qualified politician to be the next President of Serbia! Don't you agree?"

"Levi-Nothing," "Levi-Nothing," some start to chant meekly.

"Kohlbright-Nothing," "Kohlbright-Nothing...", other pick up the refrain.

"Klinton-Nothing," "Klinton-Nothing..."

"Yeltsin-Nothing," "Yeltsin-Nothing..."

"Nothing-Nothing," "Nothing-Nothing..." (the ultimate "liberal nirvana"...)

As the crowd of demonstrators disperses for the night, exuberant Serbian democratic opposition party officials gather around their leader to congratulate him on his speech. "My, Levi, you really had them going..." one of them says, patting Desnic on his back. "But surely, you must believe in something?"

"I believe in the same thing Clinton believes in," Levi Desnic replies.

"Oh, yeah? And what's that?"

"The Almighty Dollar."

"The Almighty Dollar?"

"Or a Deutsch Mark... Or a Yen... We are not that particular. We'll take anything Wall Street gives us. It's the money that makes the world go around, man! Crosses, crescents, flags, anthems... these are all archaic symbols for the backward masses. In our brave New World, we'll do away with all of them."

"The masses or the symbols?"

APPENDIX D

"WHO'S WHO" IN THE CHINESE WING OF THE NEW WORLD ORDER

(Media names are highlighted in bold face)

THE WHITE HOUSE STATE DINNER FOR CHINESE PRESIDENT JIANG ZEMIN - Oct. 29, 1997

Some of the Dinner Guests	Industry	Affiliation/Title
COUNCIL FOR FOREIGN RELATIONS		
Clinton, Bill and wife Hillary	Government	US President/Host
Allen, Robert and wife Betty	High-tech	AT&T, CEO (fmr.)
Armstrong, Mike and wife Anne	High-tech	AT&T, CEO (new)
Gerstner, Louis and wife Robin	High-tech	IBM, CEO
Gingrich, Newt and wife Marianne	Government	US House Speaker
Graham, Katharine and David Rockefeller	Media/Banking	Wash. Post/Chase
Johnson, Robert and wife Sheila	Media	Black Enter. TV, CEO
Johnson, Thomas and wife Edwina	Media	CNN News, President
Kann, Peter and wife Karen Elliott House	Media	Wall St. Jrnl., CEO+Ed.
Kissinger, Henry and wife Nancy	Government	US Secr. of State (fmr.)
Levin, Gerald and wife Barbara Jo	Media	Time-Warner, CEO
Mondale, Walter and his wife Joan	Government	US Amb. to Japan
Noto, Lucio and wife Joan	Energy	Mobil, CEO
Pena, Federico and wife Ellen	Government	US Energy Secr.
Pickering, Thomas and wife Alice	Government	US Amb. to Russia
Rather, Dan and wife Jean	Media	CBS News, Anchor
Richardson, Bill and wife Barbara	Government	US Amb. to the UN
Rockefeller, John and wife Sharon Percy	Govern./ Media	US Sen. (D, WV)+ TV
Rubin, Robert and wife Judith	Government	US Treasury Secr.
Sasser, James and wife Mary	Government	US Amb. to China
Sawyer, Diane	Media	ABC News
Schultz, George and wife Charlotte	Government	US Secr. of State (fmr.)
Smith, Raymond and wife Phyllis Goldstein	High-tech	Bell Atlantic, CEO
Welch, John F.	High-tech	General Electric, CEO

Appendix “D” Who’s who in the Chinese Wing of the New World Order

Albright, Madeleine and Patrick Stewart	Government	US Secr. of State
Allaire, Paul	High-tech	Xerox, CEO
Baker, James	Government	US Secr. of State (fmr.)
Barshevsky, Charlene and Edward Cohen	Government	US Trade Rep.
Berger, Samuel and wife Susan	Government	US NSA Advisor
Bowlin, Michael and wife Martha	Energy	Atlantic Richfield, CEO
Brokaw, Tom and wife Meredith	Media	NBC News, Anchor
Carter, Jimmy and son James Earl III	Government	US President (fmr.)
Greenberg, Maurice and wife Corinne	Insur/Fin. Serv.	AIG, CEO
Greenspan, Alan and wife Andrea Mitchell	Govt./ Media	Fed. Reserve/ NBC
Haig, Alexander and wife Patricia	Government	US Secr. of State (fmr.)
Johnson, Lady Bird and Charles Robb	Government	US Fmr. 1st Lady+Sen.
Kantor, Mickey and Heidi Schulman	Government	US Commerce S. (fmr.)
Scowcroft, Brent and daughter Karen	Government	US NSA Advisor (Fmr.)
Shattuck, John	Government	US Asst. Secr. of State
Steinberg, James and Sherbourne Abbott	Government	US NSA Deputy Adv.
Talbott, Strobe and wife Brooke Shearer	Government	US Deputy Secr. of St.
Wolfensohn, James and wife Elaine	Banking	World Bank, CEO
Zuckerman, Mortimer and Marla Prather	Media	US News & World Rep.

TRILATERAL COMMISSION

Clinton, Bill and wife Hillary	Government	US President/Host
Allen, Robert and wife Betty	High-tech	AT&T, CEO (fmr.)
Gerstner, Louis and wife Robin	High-tech	IBM, CEO
Graham, Katharine and David Rockefeller	Media/Banking	Wash. Post/Chase
Greenberg, Maurice and wife Corinne	Insur/Fin. Serv.	AIG, CEO
Greenspan, Alan and wife Andrea Mitchell	Govt./ Media	Fed. Reserve/ NBC
Johnson, Lady Bird and Charles Robb	Government	US Fmr. 1st Lady+Sen.
Kantor, Mickey and Heidi Schulman	Government	US Commerce S. (fmr.)
Kissinger, Henry and wife Nancy	Government	US Secr. of State (fmr.)
Rockefeller, John and wife Sharon Percy	Govern./ Media	US Sen. (D, WV)+ TV
Schultz, George and wife Charlotte	Government	US Secr. of State (fmr.)
Scowcroft, Brent and daughter Karen	Government	US NSA Advisor (Fmr.)
Talbott, Strobe and wife Brooke Shearer	Government	US Deputy Secr. of St.

Appendix "D" Who's who in the Chinese Wing of the New World Order
BILDERBERGS⁴⁸²

Clinton, Bill and wife Hillary	Government	US President/Host
Allaire, Paul	High-tech	Xerox, CEO
Berger, Samuel and wife Susan	Government	US NSA Advisor
Gerstner, Louis and wife Robin	High-tech	IBM, CEO
Graham, Katharine and David Rockefeller	Media/Banking	Wash. Post/Chase
Kissinger, Henry and wife Nancy	Government	US Secr. of State (fmr.)
	Govern./ Media	US Sen. (D, WV)+TV
Rockefeller, John and wife Sharon Percy		
Wolfensohn, James and wife Elaine	Banking	World Bank, CEO

Source: Truth in Media Global Watch Bulletin 98/1-5, Jan. 8, 1998

See: <http://www.truthinmedia.org>

Final Comment: Notice that Bill Clinton, IBM's Gerstner, the Rockefellers and Henry Kissinger are/were members of all three NOW-NGOs? No wonder Jiang "honored" IBM's Gerstner by paying him also a private visit in New York, following the Oct. 29 White House dinner.

Also, notice the absence at the White House state dinner of prominent names from the world of academia? Kind of puts in perspective the (low) pecking order of all those foreign policy "think tanks" where the NWO elite goes shopping for opinions it wants to hear. They seem to be merely the talking heads hired to brainwash the plebes.

⁴⁸² See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/multi/bild.html>

Appendix E

The MAI is no ‘Conspiracy theory’

Response to the *Courier-Mail's* article "Conspiracy Theories"

In the article ‘Conspiracy Theories’ (Courier 21/03) national affairs editor Peter Charlton ridicules valid concerns about the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI). He takes the liberty of using the majority of his resource material from links found on the Internet web pages of my company, Global Web Builders. However, in a classic case of selective censorship he does this without providing the Web address to allow your readers to gain a balanced perspective.

As I have been researching the MAI, the FSIA and other international treaties for over a year now I would like the opportunity to reply to Charlton’s biased, poorly researched and one-sided diatribe.

Charlton reveals his own political bias by referring to the former High Court chief justice, Sir Anthony Mason’s, concerns about MAI without any negative slant to his good name or character, but then in a classic case of ‘perpetuating the myth’ calls the same concerns raised by Pauline Hanson as those of an ‘ignorant, ill-educated person with a political barrow to push’.

Hanson’s objections to MAI, which are shared by Democrat leader Meg Lees, are referred to elsewhere in the article as ‘ill-informed, illogical, not based on fact and hysterically outlandish’. Yet Meg Lees escapes personal mention and any form of vilification.

The quickest method to expose the inadequate research behind Charlton’s article is to compare the MAI with the FSIA. Both are acronyms for recent international treaties involving Australia. The FSIA stands for the ‘Financial Services Industry Agreement’ unlike the MAI it is a ‘done deal’.

Over the past few years hundreds of international treaties have been simply ratified by Australia’s Governor General and have hardly ever been presented to the public or parliament for debate. This despite the impact that treaties like the FSIA have on our country and our children’s future.

Unlike the MAI with its initial 20 year term the FSIA is a treaty without an expiry date. It is a treaty which has been used as the tool by foreign investors to ‘legitimately acquire’ Australia’s banking industry. It was first signed by Australia in 1995 and follows the deregulation of the banking industry by Paul Keating in 1985. It should be of no surprise that very few of your readers will have ever heard of the FSIA because it was never debated. Despite extensive research I have been unable to find a copy of the FSIA anywhere, including the Internet - the only reference (on the World Trade Organisation Web site) being to clauses which have an impact on our Australian banking industry.

In 1995 the ALP’s Minister for Trade, Bob McMullen, described the FSIA thus, ‘The financial services agreement will directly benefit Australian banks, insurance companies and securities traders.’

In December 1997 a revised FSIA was signed under our current Coalition which includes the following new clause as outlined on the WTO’s web site: ‘Eliminates a prohibition on the acquisition of control of any of Australia’s four main banks. Also eliminates a measure which prohibits banks (resident or non-resident) from holding shares in the Commonwealth Bank of Australia (CBA) and other entities from holding more than five percent of its issued share capital;’

Appendix "E" The MAI is no conspiracy theory

The Coalition are currently pushing for the sale of Telstra with a 'commitment' that foreign ownership will be restricted to just 35%. Consider what the ALP said about this issue when they decided to sell off the CBA. Yet here, under an international treaty no-one has heard of, the FSIA, the rules have changed for the CBA without anyone taking the time to inform the Australian public.

Just this week Communications Minister Senator Alston ducked the question of foreign ownership of Telstra by asking which government would want to change the guidelines currently being proposed by the Coalition.

The ripple effect of the FSIA has already been felt by some 40,000 ex-bank employees around Australia and rural shires like Kilkivan who no longer have a bank. (What effect would the MAI have on Telstra's services in the bush?)

No politician from the major parties has dared to mention the role of the FSIA - or maybe they are the 'ignorant, ill-informed ones'. One would hope so because today, Austrade tells us, 86% of our banking industry is foreign owned and looking up ANZ's top 20 shareholders will reveal that US based Chase Manhattan Nominees is its biggest shareholder with 11.6% of the company. ANZ is laying off 1,700 Australian staff this year and closing rural branches.

Yet the FSIA was never debated by the Australian Parliament, it was never put under the spotlight by a Joint Standing Committee on Treaties. Quite simply it was Pauline Hanson whose media clout was responsible for drawing the attention of Australia to the MAI - resulting in this development being forced on an unwilling Parliament.

The travesty of international treaties is the simple cause and effect. Historically the cause is never debated openly but the adverse effect is felt by Australians who have seen their standard of living dramatically deteriorate under consecutive Coalition and Labor governments who have been party to these secret treaties.

Charlton's report is centred on the mistaken belief that the MAI has always been open to public scrutiny. Let me assure you the MAI document only appeared on the OECD web site for the first time this year - this after enormous political pressure from Canada and the leaking of the 1997 draft versions onto the Internet, in a text format, by concerned bureaucrats to others like Canadian Maud Barlow.

It is blatant re-writing of history for Don Johnson, the Secretary General of the OECD, to now claim that the negotiations have always been open. The February 1998 draft MAI was only put up on the Australian treasury department's web site days before Pauline Hanson had a meeting with senior bureaucrats on this specific issue.

The MAI drafts on the OECD and Australian treasury Web sites are presented in a application-dependent graphic Adobe Acrobat format. Unlike a simple readable text file (normally found on Web pages), this makes it impossible to view the information from a floppy disk without first having the Adobe software on your PC. (The 2.3 megabyte executable file is too large for a floppy disk). This point is overlooked by Charlton when he refers to this point in Ms Hanson recent speech to parliament on the MAI.

The veil of secrecy that has been wrapped around this agreement should be of concern to all Australians as exclusions, referred to by Charlton, will be wound back or cancelled under the current MAI draft agreement while no new exclusions requested by a signatory country will be entertained. With the incredible changes taking place in technology today how could we be so stupid to agree to this?

Appendix “E” The MAI is no conspiracy theory

Telstra will be in the midst of these technology changes and, like the CBA, will be a prime target for foreign takeover as the MAI, once signed, will sooner rather than later invalidate any government restrictions on foreign ownership in our valuable communication giant.

Furthermore, how can an Australian government sign a treaty which will allow multinationals, like McDonalds (the fastfood chain), to take any level of government in this country to an international court if they believe that they are being discriminated against? In a recent pre-MAI example McDonalds took the Port Douglas shire, with just 3,000 ratepayers, to an Australian court because the council would not allow Big Mac to breach its council regulation by erecting a large golden arches sign. How could the shire afford to defend itself in an international forum against this financial giant?

Renato Ruggerio, Director General of the World Trade Organisation has this to say about the MAI ‘We are writing the constitution of a single global economy.’

I have only touched on the implications of the MAI and discussed two of hundreds of international treaties that Australian bureaucrats have negotiated on Australia’s behalf without any public debate. The cause and effect of these treaties is only known by few - and we aren’t supposed to be included in that number. This self-interest behind closed doors has resulted in legitimised plundering of what is of value in Australia.

Your readers need to consider the impact of secret international treaties on our living standards which have been undermined in the last twenty years with some 5,000,000 Australians now reportedly living below the poverty line.

Finally I would like to correct Charlton with respect to his comment about ‘Hanson’s taxpayer provided computer (for surfing the Internet)’. For a reporter so keen to call Ms Hanson ill-informed let me reveal his blatant hypocrisy. I personally sourced, purchased and installed Ms Hanson’s second hand 486 PC that she uses to ‘surf the Internet’. She paid \$700 for it with a personal cheque issued earlier this year.

I am honoured to be associated with Pauline Hanson and One Nation - a party that is tackling issues affecting all Australians that the major parties and career politicians have continually failed to address. Pauline’s views on foreign investment are quite simple and practical - foreign investment does not have to mean foreign ownership.

Scott Balson is the web master for Pauline Hanson’s One Nation and carries extensive on-line research on international treaties like the MAI and FSIA.

Appendix F

Don't dare call it "*Censorship*" in Australia.

"If you are rich you can say what you like and what's more, you can stop anyone else saying what you don't want heard... it's the triumph of the raw power of money"

Terry Lane, Free Speech Committee speaking on ABC's 7.30 Report (9/4/99)

Before the launch of "*Murder by Media*" in January 1999 I negotiated a national distribution deal for the book with Dymocks head office in Sydney. The 90 or so Dymocks stores and franchises were to play a key role in ensuring that average Australians had access to the well researched facts covered in this book.

Within two weeks of the launch sales were brisk and I had, as distributor, received orders from a large number of Dymocks stores – orders approaching 1,000 books. Branches in Perth had just re-ordered stock after Howard Sattler discussed the book on *6PR* Radio. The mainstream media studiously ignored the book's very existence and, despite being invited, the media boycotted the launch⁴⁸³.

On the 9th February 1999, nearly three weeks after the book's launch, I received a phone call from a customer who complained saying that Dymocks on the Gold Coast had advised him that head office had requested earlier that day that the book be withdrawn from sale. I had not received any notification as to why so I contacted Anne Maher in their Sydney office to find out what was going on.

Ms Maher expressed surprise at the instruction which had, for the first time, "*come directly from the Chairman, John Forsyth*". She confirmed that she had received no complaints but that the decision was out of her hands and that Dymocks' lawyers had been asked to give advice on the company's possible exposure to defamation action. She suggested that I contact the General Manager Paul Clark by email. I did that day – I have never received a reply from him.

The next day I wrote to Ms Maher requesting a formal explanation. Then at 9am on Friday 12th Dymocks broadcast the following fax to all their branches:

In Anne Maher's email of 9 February we advised that, pending legal advice, stores should not purchase any copies of this title, and should remove any existing stock from shelves until otherwise advised.

All stores have no doubt followed that recommendation, but following legal advice which we have now obtained, and for both the protection of Dymocks and all of its franchisees, an instruction is now given that any stock be removed from the shelves, and no further copies of the book be sold.

The fax was signed by John Millard the Company Secretary.

That day I received a response from Dymocks which read, in part, as follows⁴⁸⁴:

I note your comment that the book cannot be the subject of legal threats because "it is based on fact and what reporters have written over the last three years". Even if that is in fact the case, we have been advised that truth alone is not a defence to defamation actions in Australia...

⁴⁸³ See: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/launch99>

⁴⁸⁴ See: <http://members.tripod.com/balson/dymocks.htm>

Appendix “F” Don’t Dare call It “Censorship” In Australia

and the following, not to subtle, warning:

To remove any possible doubt in your mind, I wish to stress that Dymocks does not exercise any censorship role in the books which it sells, nor is it influenced in any way by political considerations in determining which titles it will stock. The sole ground of its decision in this case is the possibility that the book may be defamatory. In view of the comment made on the back cover of your book relating to printers, I put you on notice that any statement which you make which suggests that Dymocks’ decision resulted in any way from an attempt to censor your book and the views expressed in it from being circulated, will result in the commencement of legal proceedings against you without notice.

My political views have apparently had a bearing on their decision to withdraw the book, as the letter states, “... in view of the close involvement which you have with One Nation Party, you are not a disinterested observer of the matters which are referred to in the book”.

The letter, signed by Keith E Perkin, Dymocks’ Managing Director, concludes with the following instruction:

As this letter provides you with the reasons for our decision, we require that the present references to Dymocks and its stores be removed from your web site, and that any further reference to Dymocks be limited to a statement as follows:

“Dymocks has resolved to withdraw the book from sale because of a concern that it may be defamatory.”

At no time before the withdrawal was I given the opportunity to address or respond to Dymocks’ concerns.

The singling out of “*Murder by Media*” for this special “*treatment*” reflects the concerning trend of institutionalised and selective censorship in Australia. The fact that truth is no defence in a defamation action might well be true, but then one would think that to retain credibility one would expect the book chain to review hundreds of others titles on its shelves.

My understanding is that it has not.

In fact it stocks books like “*Two Nations*” – in this case a book written by politicians and journalists openly deriding Pauline Hanson’s One Nation.

What the decision does expose is the quite astounding fact that in a “*democratic*” country where “*freedom of speech*” is so highly valued two sets of rules apply. The Packer/Murdoch press have open slather in defaming people day after day without question – but when extracts from their published newspaper articles or interviews are carried in a book to support an argument or point of view *this can then be subject to a defamation action...*

This “*threat*” “*forced*” the withdrawal of “*Murder by Media*” from Dymocks.

Since this time I have had many reports and feedback from people trying to buy the book at Dymocks that they have been told as recently as June 1999 that the book was withdrawn “*because of legal action that has been taken*”. A member of staff of the Darling Harbour branch of Dymocks told me personally in April 1999 that there was “*a problem with the book*” and that “*legal action had been taken against the publishers*” and “*that was why the book had been withdrawn from Dymocks*”.

Of course all these comments are blatantly untrue and prejudicial against the book’s credibility. As author and distributor and my company as publisher have to date of this second print received no writs or legal threats.

But don’t dare call it censorship in Australia.

Appendix G

Recommended Internet links for further reading:

Media under the spotlight:

To lodge complaints about media reports to the *Australian Press Council*:

<http://www.presscouncil.org.au/pcsite/apc.html>

Media Ethics (Yahoo):

http://www.yahoo.com/News_and_Media/Media_Ethics/

Four Corners of Australia's Trojan Horse:

<http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/four>

Truth in Media:

<http://www.truthinmedia.org>

Graham Strachan's Web Site: <http://www.overflow.net.au/~bizbrief/>

The Australian Political and Media Menace:

<http://www.fan.net.au/%7eanthony/index.html>

Independent on-line newspapers and opinion pieces:

Australian National News of the Day:

<http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/daily.html>

Truth in Media: <http://www.truthinmedia.org>

Worldnet Daily: <http://www.worldnetdaily.com/>

Who are the "racists" – you be the judge?

Pauline Hanson's One Nation: <http://www.onenation.com.au>

British National Party: <http://www.bnp.to/>

Palestine's Islamic Page: <http://www.utexas.edu/students/msa/palestine.html>

Indonesian Govt: <http://www.wsws.org/news/1998/feb1998/indones.shtml>

Japan: <http://www.twics.com/~anzu/1-Worker.html>

Issues:

MAI: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai>

FSIA: <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/mai/fsamain.html>

UN Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples:

<http://www.gwb.com.au/un.html>

Organised Asian crime in Australia:

<http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/onenation/ncareprt.html>

Bibliography:

Dodd, Helen, "Pauline: The Hanson Phenomenon", Boolarong Press, (Brisbane), 1997.

Huntington, Samuel P., "The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order", Simon & Schuster (New York), 1996.

Kenny, Chris, "It would be nice if there was some Women's Business", Duffy & Snellgrove (Sydney), 1996.

Pasquarelli, John, "The Pauline Hanson Story by the man who knows", New Holland Publishers, (Frenchs Forest, NSW) 1998

Sheehan, Paul, "Among the Barbarians: the Dividing of Australia", Random House Australia (Sydney), 1998.

Veitch, Don, "Hansonism: Tricks or Treat", David Syme College, 1997.

Wilson, Dulcie, "The Cost of Crossing bridges", Small Poppies Publishing (Melbourne) 1998

"Pauline Hanson, The Truth", published in 1997 (no author acknowledged)

Reference to the media and powerbrokers

- 4 Corners*, 7, 8, 11, 164, 189, 190, 191, 192, 199
60 Minutes, 13, 14, 36, 109-117, 164, 166
7.30 Report, 10, 14, 205, 245
ABC News (US), 220, 221, 239
ABC Radio, 17, 54, 110, 165
ABC Radio, Country Hour, 80
ABC Radio, Triple J, 77, 78, 142
ABC TV, 4 Corners, 6, 7, 11, 166, 189, 190, 191, 192, 199
ABC TV, 7.30 Report, 10, 14, 205, 245
ABC TV, Lateline, 141
ABC TV, Media Watch, 143
 Ackland, Richard, 144
Age, The, 3, 4, 6, 12, 15, 91, 110, 125, 141, 142, 153, 175, 203
 Alexander, John, 11
Among the Barbarians, 103, 104, 252
Associated Press, 215, 222
 Atkins, Dennis, 138
Australia/Israeli Review, 176-184
Australian Broadcasting Authority (ABA), 11, 79, 114
 Australian Consolidated Press, 15
Australian Financial Review, 15, 16, 101, 103
 Australian Journalists Association (AJA), 39, 129
Australian National News of the Day (anotd), 78, 106, 139, 144-146, 164, 167, 168, 182, 183, 200, 252
Australian Press Council (APC), 20, 39, 129, 184, 208, 252
Australian, The, 10, 11, 49, 56, 65, 69, 81, 98, 103, 104, 146, 159, 165, 166, 181, 194, 196, 198, 200
 Balson, Scott, 39, 44, 63, 90, 106, 122, 128, 134, 135, 145, 153, 162, 170, 177, 180, 183, 184, 187, 244
 Barker, Garry, 170, 198
 Barnard, Michael, 148
 Bennett, John, 140, 142, 148, 216
 Berliner: Michael, 69
 Berthon, Simon, 9
 Birnbauer, Bill, 148
 Bitá, Natasha, 181
 Black, Conrad, 15
 Bolt, Andrew, 63-65
 Bowers, Peter, 10
 Bransdon, Mark, 139
 Brimelow, Peter, 212
 Brown, Wallace, 20
 Brunton, Ron, 170, 180, 181
Bulletin, The, 13, 103
Canberra Times, 15, 98, 122, 141, 142
 Carlton, Richard, 117, 191
 Casimir, Jon, 83
 Charlton, Peter, 10, 25, 39, 54, 55, 127-29, 145, 242-244
 Claiborne, William, 67
 Cleary, Paul, 54
CNN, 214, 216, 217, 221, 226
Country Hour, 80
Courier-Mail, throughout the book
 Cruden Pty Ltd, 15
 D'arcy, Mike, 146
 Darville, Helen, 63
 Devine, Miranda, 157
 Dodd, Helen, 120-123, 199, 247
 Dowling, Joseph, 22
 Duffy, Michael, 35, 95, 98, 130, 142, 209, 247
 Emerson, Scott, 194, 196
 Estiot, J G, 75, 100, 113, 124, 155, 157, 162
Fairfax, 6, 9-17, 22, 36, 38, 53, 143-145, 153, 179
 Fenn, Paul, 133
 Fifth Protocol (See FSIA), 49
 Focus, 6, 134, 135
 Forbes, 212, 218
 FSIA, 46-49, 56, 117, 129, 205, 242-244, 247
 Fussell, Anne, 128
 Fynes-Clinton, Jane, 155, 183, 184
Gold Coast Bulletin, 30, 32
 Greason, David, 179
 Griffith, Chris, 30, 32, 134
 Hansonism, Tricks or Treat, 7, 36, 37, 161, 176, 247
 Hayes, Liz, 109
 Healy, Michael, 133
Herald Sun, 3, 4, 37, 94, 102, 143
 Heslin, Dale, 74
 Hilmer, Fred, 11
 Hinchliffe, Mark, 46, 166

Reference to the media and powerbrokers

- Howson, Peter, 37, 94
Hull, Gary, 69
Huntington, Samuel, 102, 247
Jackman, Christine, 135-36, 138
Jones, Alan, 2, 3, 21, 37, 59, 80, 106, 154, 168, 181, 206
Jones, Tony, 164, 191
Kapel, Michael, 178, 181
Kennerley, KerriAnne, 121
Kingston, Margo, 14, 40, 126, 135-139
Kitamura, Hajime, 153
Korean TV, 153
Kroger, Michael, 10, 1315, 21, 38, 48, 49, 117, 153, 165
Larin, Kathy, 213
Lateline, 141
Lau, Emily, 115
Lehmann, John, 21
Lyneham, Paul, 116, 164
Madigan, Michael, 121
Maher, Sid, 130, 131, 161
MAI, 16, 47, 49-59, 80, 89, 127-129, 145, 242-244, 247
Martin, Ray, 72, 90, 91, 113, 114, 152
Maryborough Chronicle, 30, 32
Masters, Chris, 191
McDonald, Donald, 141
McGlinn, Susie, 133
McGregor, Adrian, 146
McKenna, Michael, 161, 166
McKew, Maxine, 140-141
McMullen, Jeff, 36, 110, 112, 114
McMurtrie, Craig, 100
McMurtry, John, 104
Media, Entertainment and the Arts Alliance (MEAA), 39
Media Watch, 143
Media Watch Interactive, 100, 124, 154, 195
Meryment, Elizabeth, 121
Midday Show, 121
MIGA, 59, 60
Mitchell, Chris, 128
Mitchell, Neil, 155
Moncrieff, Virginia, 164
Morris, Grahame, 9, 21, 38
Murdoch, Lachlan, 8, 19, 39, 144
Murdoch, Rupert, 9, 10, 13, 14-21, 24, 25, 30, 32-34, 36, 38-39, 53, 63, 82, 103, 105, 106, 121, 122, 130, 134, 143, 144, 159, 160, 167, 178, 179, 181, 182, 185, 191, 194, 198, 200, 201, 203, 207, 209, 246
Muscat, Bob, 11
New York Times, 218, 222-224, 226
News Limited, 9, 10, 15, 16, 19, 22, 38, 121, 122, 144, 193
News Weekly, 66, 73, 91, 92, 98, 103, 204
Oakes, Laurie, 10, 113
Osborne, Paul, 134
O'Brien, Kerry, 140, 141
O'Reilly, 15, 50, 160, 175
Packer, Kerry, 7-17, 22, 32, 36, 38, 39, 82, 103, 106, 110, 115, 153, 167, 177, 182, 191, 201, 209, 246
Parrington, Drena, 30, 32
Partington, Geoffrey, 98
Pasquarelli, John, 19, 79, 121, 247
Pauline, the Hanson Phenomenon, 120-122, 247
Perkins, Chris, 129
Phoenix Gazette, 220
Pitt, Tony, 187
Platt, Ray, 200, 201
Powers, Brian, 11-13, 16
Publishing and Broadcasting: Limited, 8-12, 38
Queensland Newspapers, 19
Queensland Times, 35, 45, 46, 50, 52, 76, 84, 101, 121, 137, 139, 159, 160, 161, 166, 167, 175
Radio 2UE, 17, 21, 37, 106, 154, 168, 206
Radio 3AW, 155
Radio 4QR, 136
Radio 6PR, 159, 245
Radio, ABC, 13
Radio ABC, *Country Hour*, 80
Radio ABC, Triple J, 77, 78, 142
Radio Voice of America, 223, 224
Raparapa, 125
Reuters, 60, 221
Richardson, Graham, 7, 13, 15, 21, 22, 32, 34, 37, 38, 113, 117, 171, 236

Reference to the media and powerbrokers

- Robson, Frank, 125-127, 145, 190
 Roberts, Greg, 192, 194
 Rothwell, Nicolas, 198
 Santamaria, B A, 37, 205
 Sattler, Howard, 159, 245
 Scott, Leisa, 198-200
 Sheehan, Paul, 41, 42, 63, 103, 104, 106, 247
 Sheridan, Greg, 72, 104
 Silverstein, Ken, 63
 Simper, Errol, 11
 Sommerfeld, Jeff, 78, 79, 120, 121, 126
South Burnett Times, 161
 Strachan, Graham, 101, 114, 247
 Strategy, 177, 178, 200, 201
 Strong, Mark, 139
Sunday Mail, 3, 15, 30, 32, 63, 130-132, 134, 149, 151, 160, 161
 Sweetman, Terry, 20, 25, 34, 138, 151, 160, 164
Sunday Programme 30-32, 40, 104, 140
Sydney Morning Herald, 3, 4, 6, 11, 14, 15, 54, 55, 78, 104, 106, 125, 126, 135, 137, 142, 144, 145, 177, 187, 190
 Sykes, Roberta, 41
 Syme, David & Co, 12, 247
 TCN9, 8
 The Cost of Crossing Bridges, 97, 247
 The Pauline Hanson Story by the Man Who Knows, 121, 247
 The Real Rupert Murdoch, 9
 The Truth, 123, 150
Today Program, 41, 169
 Toorang, 15
Triple J, 77, 78, 142
Truth in Media, 219-225, 241, 247
TV Asahi (Japan), 153
TV Channel 7, 11, 19, 53, 139, 159, 189, 201, 203
TV Channel 9, 7, 9, 10, 11, 33, 34, 36, 40, 41, 90, 109, 110, 113-116, 121, 133, 139, 140, 152, 153, 157, 164, 167, 169
TV Channel 10, 46, 64, 98, 139, 146, 154
TV, Korea, 153
TV SBS, 73, 75, 154
 UN Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 80, 84, 88, 91, 252
 UN - Water as a commodity, 59-61
 Veitch, Don, 7, 36, 37, 161, 176, 247
Voice of America, 223, 224
Wall Street Journal, 211-214, 218, 223, 224
 Walsh, Max, 11
Washington Post, 16, 67, 178, 225, 226
Washington Times, 217, 222, 223
Weekend Independent, 29, 30, 34
West Australian, 15, 122
 Westacott, John, 109, 164
 Wilson, Dulcie, 97, 247
 Wilson, Nigel, 65