



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.34, No.26

July 17th, 1998

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"To escape criticism – do nothing, say nothing, be nothing."*

– Elbert Hubbard

WHAT'S BEHIND THE ONE NATION FURORE? by Eric D. Butler:

Last week saw some extraordinary developments concerning Pauline Hanson and the One Nation Party, one of these being the publication in *The Australia-Israel Review* of a list of members of the One Nation Party with a promise of a further list. As pointed out by John Bennett of the Civil Liberties Union, the publication of such a list was a blatant violation of the rights of the members of One Nation. Mr. Mark Leibler, Chairman of the Board responsible for the publication of the One Nation list, made available by disgruntled members of One Nation, defended the publication on the grounds of serving "the national interest", and because One Nation was an "anti-democratic" movement. Obviously the Australian Jewish community was badly split by the publication of the One Nation membership list, with a number of Jews charging that a publication of the list was an intrusion of the privacy rights of a number of Australian citizens. *The Australia-Israel Review* pointed out that the privacy of those on the list had been protected by not giving private addresses or telephone numbers, which leaves unanswered the question of what was the **purpose** of publishing such a list. It may be that this is but one more example of the Zionist Jews outsmarting themselves as they have done so often in the past. The whole campaign against Pauline Hanson has, to date, proved counter-productive. As the League of Rights has found over many years, large numbers of Australians refuse to be intimidated by Zionist Jewish campaigns. Political parties appear to be more afraid of the loss of substantial financial support.

However, as information concerning the organisational structure of One Nation became more widely publicised, searching questions are being asked by concerned Australians. The autocratic structure of One Nation places Pauline Hanson in the invidious position where she is at the mercy of David Oldfield and David Ettridge. The financial structure of One Nation places David Ettridge in the position where he appears to be the major financial beneficiary not merely a paid employee. Pauline Hanson cannot remove Ettridge without the approval of David Oldfield nor can Oldfield be removed without the permission of Ettridge. It appears that Ettridge and Oldfield have been close friends for a number of years. Ettridge is the man who charged that the League of Rights was a fascist movement, and when challenged on this allegation referred to a coming book authorised by a former member of the American

based La Rouché movement. Presumably with Oldfield's support, Ettridge initially heavily promoted the book, which claimed to expose the dark side of Australian politics. Silly claims about me and the League of Rights were made. Eventually the book was withdrawn by Ettridge. There is no record of why this was done. Ettridge's known record does not indicate a close interest in politics. His early career was varied; he was at one time a sales representative, fund raiser for World Vision, a number of business ventures do not appear to have been very successful. Allegations of the mishandling of One Nation funds may be dismissed as a "sour grapes" attitude by some disgruntled One Nation members. Similarly, the allegations of Pauline Hanson's private secretary, Barbara Hazelton, can be dismissed as evidence of a thwarted political ambition, but the removal of Pauline Hanson's close friend and biographer, Helen Dodd, tends to confirm the Hazelton charge that the One Nation Party had been hijacked by Oldfield and Ettridge, both of whom have their own agenda. A former member of the Liberal Party seeking political endorsement there can be no doubt about the political ambitions of Oldfield, a man who early grasped the political potential of a One Nation Party headed by Pauline Hanson. Ettridge grasped the financial potential and how Pauline Hanson could be marketed like a pop star. This is not a criticism of Pauline Hanson, whose background has not equipped her to grasp the full implications of modern power politics. It must be said, however, that her public performances have greatly improved. Her own natural abilities and coaching by Oldfield have no doubt been responsible.

I repeat what I have said on a number of occasions: Pauline Hanson is a political phenomenon which reflects a feature of the current mood of a large percentage of the Australian people. An in-depth work on this phenomenon remains to be written. But it can be summarised as evidence that Pauline Hanson is a catalyst which could yet be a major factor in moving Australia off its present disaster course. Much will depend upon whether there are sufficient in One Nation to grasp the wider implications of what is involved, and to take appropriate action. It would be a human as well as a political disaster if Pauline Hanson is destroyed. The situation is one with all the elements of high drama. One of my major concerns is that the failure of One Nation would be a major blow for national morale. In my address last week to the Melbourne Conservative Speakers' Club I listed a number of failed attempts to challenge basically what Pauline Hanson has, obviously unknowingly, challenged. The classic example of threatening pitfalls is what happened in the Western Canadian Province of Alberta during the polls at the 1934 elections. The forces responsible for the Great Depression are the same forces responsible today for internationalism in all its manifestations, including multiculturalism and global economy. But the Social Credit Government of William Aberhart soon discovered that much more than an orthodox political election win was required to win the battle in which they had engaged. Election as Members of Parliament does not of itself win the battle. The forces of internationalism are much stronger today than they were in the thirties. Any serious challenge to the internationalists is going to require much greater skills than have as yet been demonstrated by those directing One Nation. This does not mean that they are not capable of learning. That is why the League of Rights has persistently claimed that a long term view is required along with an in-depth educational programme.

The persistent venomous attacks upon the League is striking evidence that it is the one movement feared by the internationalists. They have already taken careful note of the Queensland election results and can be relied upon to take whatever action is felt necessary to destroy or subvert any threatened challenge at the coming Federal elections. As usual, the League stands ready to offer advice and assistance to those prepped to seek it.

(Essential reading: *The Alberta Experiment*, \$10.00 posted from all League addresses.

TELSTRA EMPTIES ELECTORAL PORK BARREL by David Thompson:

Since the term "economic rationalist" has almost become a form of personal abuse, how is it that the economic rationalist manages to survive? It appears as though Mr. Howard's proposal to use \$150 million of the proceeds from the sale of Telstra to "buy" votes in regional Australia by improving their telecommunications systems answers that question. They bribe their critics. But the genius is not in the "bribery" itself, but in the fact that the bribery is **also funded by the victim!** Some of the proceeds from the Telstra sell-off were also supposed to buy off textile workers in regional areas. Around \$800 million was earmarked for regional manufacturers, in order to pacify the "battlers". The only question is how many regional textile manufacturers are actually left in business?

The pre-electoral pork-barrelling appears to have been brought to a crushing halt, however, by Senator Colston's vote against the sale of the rest of Telstra. That it was a shock to the Government (and to the ALP who had abused Colston throughout the Telstra debate) is a testament to the insensitivity of those involved, particularly the Minister for Communications, Mr. Alston.

The Prime Minister himself flew to Brisbane to attempt to secure Senator Colston's vote, although the Liberals claim that they will not accept Colston's vote, since he is charged with fraud. This would have been an interesting exercise. How do you get Senator Colston to vote with a government that has refused to accept his vote, without some sort of double standard? Senator Colston is a legitimately elected Senator from Queensland, and the fact that he has abandoned the Labor Party, and is charged with fraud, does not render his Senate function illegitimate. Mr. Howard's rejection of Senator Colston's Senate vote is, in effect, an insult to Queenslanders whom he represents. Should they be disadvantaged because Mr. Howard dislikes their Senate representative?

Senator Colston has obviously sniffed the political breeze, and concluded that the sale of Telstra is most unpopular in regional Australia, and taken steps accordingly. Perhaps Mr. Howard now regrets not actually "asking" for, and accepting, Colston's vote.

CONDITIONAL REPRESENTATION: The curious question that has so far remained unanswered concerning the Telstra pork-barrel, is why it is necessary for Telstra to be sold in order to provide rural services. Queensland National Party Senator O'Chee is quoted as saying that "For the bush, the choice is either a telecommunications stone age, or going ahead with the privatisation". This makes no sense at all, and almost amounts to a threat to rural Australia. Accept the Telstra sell-off, or no more services.

Are Senator O'Chee, Mr. Howard, Fischer, etc., saying that **only the sale of Telstra** will enable them to properly represent rural and regional constituents? Is Mr. Fischer actually admitting that the National Party is completely ineffective, unless Telstra is sold? That the Nationals, as a Coalition partner, are unable or unwilling to exert their influence on the Government on behalf of rural constituents?

Rural constituents already suspect that the National Party is ineffective, which is one reason why they have been turning to One Nation in their droves. It may be that the Howard/Fischer Telstra bribe is far too little too late to convince regional Australia that they are important in the whole scheme of things. What has Mr. Howard (or Deputy Prime Minister Fischer) done about rural depopulation, and the death of the country town? What have they done about the erosion of services (shopping,

335.405
ONT

banking, medical, educational) to country areas? What have they done about the virtual elimination of a list of rural industries (like the citrus and pork industries), except assist in their destruction? Why should country people be fooled by a pre-election hand-out of a free mobile phone?

The fact is that all Australians should have access to efficient communications in this technological age. And access to medical treatment, banking facilities, and schooling for their children. So far as the sale of Telstra is concerned, why does Mr. Howard argue that the sale of Telstra is necessary to provide the kind of services Telstra should have been providing anyhow?

THE DOUBLE STANDARDS OF THE ELITES: Former National Party Senator, and former Secretary to the Treasury John Stone, is another who is of much more use after leaving politics than he was in the Senate. In his column in *The Australian* (10/7/98) Stone takes to task fellow columnist Greg Sheridan, who is bitter in his condemnation of "the lunatic right" and One Nation. As an Asian correspondent and "expert", Sheridan was lamenting "the sheer dimensions of the economic mess in Japan right now". Sheridan noted that "it is precisely Japan's wish to preserve certain cultural traits . . . which is bringing it so much economic pain . . . Japan believes citizenship should derive from ethnicity, from blood".

Sheridan is obviously correct in this observation, but as Stone points out, they are entirely free to hold such views. Stone did not do so, but he could easily have referred to the Japanese restrictive immigration policies, institutionalised discrimination against Koreans, Chinese, etc.

John Stone did point out, however, that the same desire to preserve "certain cultural traits" in the Japanese can also be found among Australians, which Stone wrote, "is precisely what our elites appear to find so shocking in Hansonism."

If Australians are prepared to risk a certain amount of "economic pain" as the cost of preserving the Australian cultural heritage, then let John Stone's "elites" concede that we are entirely free to do so. And who knows: the "economic pain" might turn out to be not nearly as painful as the same elites (like Sheridan) are fond of warning.

PETER WELLINGTON MP: The new Independent Member for Nicklin, Mr. Peter Wellington, could play a decisive role in the composition of the new Queensland Parliament. From what is known about Mr. Wellington, he may prove to be a tremendous asset. He does at least have a background in local government, and is not a political novice. Together with the other Independent Liz Cunningham, Mr. Wellington is expected to hold the balance of power in Queensland. This is a much more critical situation than in any other Australian Government, since Queensland is the only Government in which there is only one Parliamentary Chamber.

In addition to this, Mr. Wellington is reported to have a strong interest in initiative and referendum. Ms. Cunningham also expressed an interest in CIR, and presented a petition to the previous Queensland Parliament on the issue. If Peter Wellington or Liz Cunningham – either together or privately – were inclined to introduce a proposal for initiative and referendum to this Queensland Parliament, it is likely, on paper, to have an excellent chance of success. One Nation is reported to support initiative and referenda, and although their own CIR model had serious deficiencies, Queenslanders are justified in expecting One Nation to support a CIR Bill. Even the National Party have declared their support for CIR, although they did little to ensure that Queenslanders had access to such a mechanism. In our view, Mr. Peter Wellington is a positive addition to the new Parliament, and a man to be watched.