

The Liberal Party and its Satellites

Brendan Gidley, Terry Cooksley, Jim Saleam

Introduction

It is time to be frank. There is a danger advancing upon the Australia First Party and upon the patriotic movement in general. There is an attempt to marginalize the party and the movement overall, to contain it by various means - *and as part of that overall strategy to have alternate (but similar looking) groups operate as competitors and distractions and agencies of ideological and political confusion in order to limit its impact and its growth. We dub the groups which perform this service – satellites. We use this term because they front for the Liberal Party and are subordinated to it ideologically and politically and circle around it in loyalty. They are the outer defence guards (and conduits/mediums/channels) of the political order.*

The Liberal Party is once again playing the old game. It is posing as a party that is willing to listen to certain public concerns and signals that it is willing to work with an array of 'right-wing', 'conservative' and 'patriotic' groups in loose alliances to protect Australia's sovereignty and heritage, to 'stop the refugee boats', to shelter ordinary folks from economic storms like water grabs and carbon taxes and to engage with them in building a bloc against Labor's evil 'socialist' plan to centralize power and socialize wealth. The satellites step forward to take their place in the sun.

All this is illusion. The Liberal Party, like the Labor Party, is simply a *regime party* and what it appears to do and what it is doing are two different things. The Labor Party is a party of capital and the Liberal Party is a party of capital. Each is committed absolutely, body and soul – to globalist New World Order hyper-capitalist economics and politics. Nonetheless, each has different 'bullshit' (to use Tony Abbott's favourite phrase) to keep its target markets in line.

This pamphlet assumes some knowledge on the part of the reader. Let our study begin and solutions to the danger be advanced

Sydney, May 2011.

Note: This pamphlet was was edited on June 17.

1. Hansonism, 1996 – 2003: The Management Of Dissent.

Many commentators have credited John Howard with real political intelligence in his *management* of One Nation (ON). We concur. Rather than openly oppose it, he let it run and when it reached the end of its tether, it could either break free of its restraints – or not. Howard took a risk and hoped and *organized* that it did not. In fact, it did not and Howard thereafter began the process of reeling the ON support back in to the Liberal-National family. One Nation members say to this day that "Howard stole our policies" on Aborigines and border protection. In truth, these 'policies' were watery in any case and were effectively things the Liberal Party *wanted to run with* and after they were popularised by One Nation, Howard could freely employ them. Once he did so, he demobilized One Nation.

When One Nation emerged, it offered to many people a hope that it might be a movement that would challenge the political establishment. It had that potential. One Nation made noises about immigration and "Asianization", about free trade, multiculturalism and more. It looked like a nationalist party in gestation.

As we shall explain below, a type of new conservatism had also come into being that mirrored much of this. It was this factor which was determinative of One Nation's failure. In fact, One Nation was not a nationalist party although it contained nationalist elements. One Nation was a type of popular-conservatism, wedded to electoralism as a tactic and with the notion that in giving 'voice' to the people, it would become a major parliamentary player. Some thought that ultimately it would influence the Liberal-National parties and become a balance of power (sic) in the parliaments. As we would say: a balance of power between what – given that Liberal and Labor are both globalist parties of capital? David Oldfield said that the "aim of One Nation was to make the Liberal Party more right-wing". What a vision! Not the thought of power (even parliamentary power) for itself, but the notion that a major party would adopt its

line. The Liberal-National parties – of course – joined with Labor in ‘preferencing One Nation last’ – and by so using the preferential voting system, kept it pretty-much out of the parliaments. The Liberal National parties also strung along One Nation supporters and voters that they might ‘listen’ and they stood by while the party dumbly employed the exhausting electoralist tactics as their only hope. In point, as was Howard’s way, the Liberal-National parties adopted the very positions it had foisted upon One Nation already, finally holding out the idea to ON voters that it was listening and totally frustrating and wearing out the ON cadres who thought their party was different. In this confused mess, in the haze of this struggle, One Nation was decisively defeated.

The Liberal Party set up and maintained specialized structures to deal with One Nation and to defeat also with the smaller Australia First Party established by Graeme Campbell in 1996. We refer below to certain structures of ideological conservatism, but first deal with political groupings.

(a) The Liberal Party recreated its so-called ‘conservative faction’ in New South Wales after August 1996. Tony Abbott directly re-organized the faction, calling back into action long-time conservative activists like Lyenko Urbanchich and David Clarke, who had operated a similar group up to about 1990. The ‘faction’ is no faction *but a group of organized reactionaries with a special task*. Its role is to project a face of the Liberal Party as ‘hard’, ‘determined’, social-conservative’ and ‘patriotic’. It was set up to anchor the Liberal Party, to make sure that few Liberals would ever truly defect to Hanson, just in case her party gained political independence of the Liberals; once that task was achieved and allowing that ON would exhaust itself in the struggle, it could serve the process of reeling the Liberal voters and some members etc. back in. The faction had allies in other States including in Queensland where the National Party had had similar experiences with the Confederate Action Party in 1992-3.

(b) Australians For Honest Politics (AHP) was established in the 1990’s as a dirty-tricks machine by the Liberal hierarchs. Led by Peter Coleman (father-in-law of Peter Costello) it raised funds clandestinely for operations against political targets. One Nation was one such target. It was this group which found the wastrel Terry Sharples who created the false court case against Hanson which engendered evidence (sic) which sent her to prison in 2003. It is understood that this group infiltrated agents into One Nation. The agents inside One Nation are now back ‘home’ and were major disruptors. Many of the names are known. It could be said that AHP was a major factor in the political defeat of One Nation. One might go further and suggest that AHP still operates runners in various groups and funds their operations. In effect, it is a sort of privatisation of the work formerly done by secret political police agencies.

(c) The Liberals were not beyond using media contacts and irregular auxiliaries - like the neo-nazis. On one major occasion in 1999, the group of David Palmer and Peter Coleman (no relation to the Honest Politics director) was used in the media to claim it represented the Ku Klux Klan and that it had seriously infiltrated One Nation. This lie achieved massive publicity and was highly disruptive. On other occasions, the gang has harassed other nationalist leaders and groups. The relationship between the Liberal Party and the neo-nazis is long established and goes back decades, yet no journalist or media outlet – or ‘opposing’ (sic) party – will touch it. Indeed, it is usually said by major editors of the liberal globalist press to younger staff *that this story is dangerous misinformation invented by the nationalists as multi-purpose propaganda*. The trouble is, as our pamphlet reveals, it is an allegation grounded in solid and disturbing facts. Indeed, the Palmer/Coleman gang has a long history, which we shall add to in a moment.

We have used the term ‘management of dissent’. In our country, dissenters are not murdered and seldom imprisoned (although the latter has occurred). They are usually stage managed. This can involve wreckers sent into, or encouraged inside, target groups. It can allow for the creation of parallel groups that waste the energy of the target group. Media smear can be employed to weaken the group in the eyes of its audience, or to develop tensions within the target (ie. such that leaders are challenged by the agents or the well-meaning for the ‘bad image’ they bring to the target). This *management* can be carried on by the political police; at various points, the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation in its reports to parliament has confessed to achieving “operational success” against patriotic groups while the NSW State authorities stated openly in a 2007 police journal, about targeting nationalist and patriotic groups and even *weakening them by using “effective disruption” methods*. All this begs the question: what did the political police actually do?

Of course, whenever this function of the political police has been mentioned by nationalists in public, journalists suggest they reveal a paranoid disposition. Pimps inside the groups regale that leaders are witch-hunters out to preserve their own petty authority. Some members find the whole business unsettling. Of course, the facts reveal that these operations against the patriotic groups existed in the past – and reasonably still do. How we go about dealing with it is the real issue. In the discussion of the satellites, specific methods are also needed because the satellites are special ‘opponents’.

In our view, the creation of the satellites was a major achievement. It represented a further development over the structures discussed in this section. The structures just discussed – in one sense – represent *the privatization of the functions of the political police*. The satellites go beyond that and have independence of movement and leadership; they represent a further privatization of the function of management of patriotic dissent.

2. ‘Satellites’ What Are They And How Do They Operate?

We live in a country where liberal-globalist-capitalism is the dominant ideology. This ideology is upheld by two broad party arrangements: Labor and Liberal-National. These parties are the product of history and carry about certain baggage and forms. These parties conduct mainstream politics in Australia. A key part of their function is to manage dissent, to corral it and to defuse it. In that way, the parties look to their clienteles who may become restive and they talk in a language of deception.

In the past, the Labor Party, because of its origins as a social-democratic party, was able to persuade some leftist minded folks to support it in the hope that socialism might be legislated into being. In the past, the Liberal-National parties held themselves out as the party for militant conservatives who might even be tempted to break the law to preserve Australia from socialism.

The *idea* of satellite parties and groups is not new. In the past, communists spoke of groups being ‘coopted’ by the ruling system; they meant that a group might have a certain policy and do certain actions, but not really being aware that by acting as it does *it serves another interest*. This meant that a group *might not* have to be directed by a malignant individual or clique, but simply act independently in order to serve the dominant forces.

This challenging idea has been developed by the nationalists. Let us define further what an Australian satellite is and how it works.

a. A satellite comes into being with a programme and a plan for action which may look like an independent position in politics. Yet, this programme and the actions undertaken will have the Liberal-National parties (the Coalition) as their focus and they exist on the same continuum with references to ‘conservatism’, ‘patriotism’ and opposition to ‘collectivism’. In this assessment, we must now essentially treat the two ‘conservative’ parties as one, the Coalition. The two parties divide only as to social sector work.

b. A satellite ‘party’ or group, will, in one way or another, register electoral loyalty to the Coalition.

c. The satellite will profess loyalty to the symbolic or legal arrangements of the Australian state and ‘pretend’ or say that these things are transcendent of the party warfare and are the one sure expression of Australian heritage and identity. Of course, the state is controlled by the globalist forces of whom the Coalition is also an instrument.

d. The satellite will usually berate both Coalition parties for this or that policy, even for ‘betrayal’ of their true principles and will act to pressure the members of these parties to live true to their principles of social conservatism, or to prosecute the War on Terror to victory, or to defend farmers’ interests and so on. Again the Coalition is the vortex of action.

e. The satellite may on occasion exhibit cranky, violent or other tendencies, *particularly if it is not a ‘party’ but an action group*. In that case it may be based upon any political element of the neo-conservative agenda and mobilize from there.

f. The satellite functions in a defence line for the Coalition parties. The smaller groups are a picket line and the 'party' groups a battle line against any force that threatens to undermine the Coalition. They are the privatized forces of defence of one of the regime parties – the Coalition. As a nationalist party mobilizes, these forces are there to fight it for position, to keep it weak, to mirror it, to mislead its potential clientele and so forth. A hundred tactics may suggest themselves.

Whether nationalists like it or not, we are compelled to confront the satellites, if only because they act offensively against us.

It will be necessary to act against the satellites' leaderships as the political battle is joined. The fight will be a protracted one. At any point, other Coalition agencies (the Liberal 'conservative' faction', AHP, neo-nazis etc) may act in support of the satellites.

Party activists and (particularly new) supporters will have to be educated to identify and understand the satellite idea, otherwise it might simply be thought that these entities are really our 'friends' and that we are being uncharitable to them. Some satellites hold out that very idea.

The party must also differentiate between persons who have innocently joined a satellite group and the leaderships of these groups. It may be taken that the former can be won to Australianism, while the latter will remain implacable opponents. Indeed, because the satellites must ape nationalism, they run a side-risk that *some of their members may also sympathize with the genuine article and be available for us to recruit*. We must always labour to show these persons that it is their leadership which is the problem, that we will welcome them.

To convert people from a satellite structure to our Australianist faith and to convince our own activists and supporters that we are upholding a true cause, it is necessary at all times to develop the Australian nationalist ideology and politics. Equally, it is necessary to explain what the new satellite politics is all about.

3. Building A New Conservatism.

From the 1990's and with the collapse of international communism as a broad movement, the establishment Right has laboured might and main to reinvent a type of conservatism attuned to contemporary facts. It could no longer use the communist bogey in any way to convince people of the virtues of liberal capitalism; in one way it no longer had to, so it simply proclaimed the end of history and the advent of the globalist nirvana upon the bones of communism. Very quickly that position was revised. Globalism asserted in the 1990's a new set of enemies: it stated that nationalisms and tribalisms were the enemies of progress and it found a new overarching enemy in Islamism. Both these new sets of enemies were challenges to globalisation and both offered the opportunity to mobilize certain people for the regime such that their activism could work against any internal challenge

The latter enemy was the primary one and it would be reasonable to say that Islamists certainly represented a global challenge to just about everyone. Islamists sought not only to place obstacles in the way of the globalisation of Moslem societies, but to wage a jihad against 'the West'. In saying that, we are very conscious of one key fact: the *Islamists do not draw any particular distinction* between 'the West' of the corporations and banks, of social-depravity, sexual degeneracy, liberalism, consumerism, drugs and so forth – and the traditional cultures of European peoples who have been compelled through their emergent nationalist and other people's parties to resist' that 'West' also.

The establishment recognised *strategically* that they too could blur the distinction and *claim to speak for all* against the jihadists. Indeed, if the jihadists did not exist, the system would have invented them! The blurring of this distinction offered great opportunities to blunt and defeat any challenge from nationalist and other anti establishment forces. To do this, a new conservative ideology was constructed in every 'Western' country.

In Australia, this effort centred on a number of pillars.

(a) The conservatives announced that they were critics of multiculturalism. They have in 2010-2011 become absolutely shrill about it, stating that multiculturalism had 'failed', that some ethnic groups had

failed to assimilate, that ghettos had formed, that tensions were rife, that alienated groups had turned against their host society. This critique built slowly, with Quadrant magazine, John Howard, John Stone and other leading figures making these statements throughout the 1990's. Indeed, Howard made his foray into that 'line' in 1988 when he condemned multiculturalism and the pace of immigration from Asia (note: the 'pace' was questioned, not the program). When Hanson emerged, Howard was careful to say that some criticisms of multiculturalism had validity and people weren't 'racist' to say so. 'Hard' policies (a full sham in fact) were announced in 2001 about refugee policy and so forth. Islamists were attacked verbally and security measures enacted against them.

Cleverly, the conservatives, *blurred the distinctions between multiculturalism and multiracialism*. At no point was multiracialism denounced, nor did the Liberal-National government curtail immigration. It is our claim that over time many ordinary patriotic type people could not see the difference in what was being said.

(b) The conservatives condemned the Aboriginal industry. They pointed out how the Aboriginal industry had created two nations in Australia and that Australia was 'one Australia' – perhaps preparing the way for One Nation. They said that there should be one law for all and that Aborigines should be treated as all other Australians – *regardless of race*.

This notion suggested an Australia which would be composed of other races (of course, with the Aborigines that is in one sense inevitable) but colour-blind and with assimilation the goal. By denying that the Aborigines were to be accorded any consideration on the basis of their race, they denied that race existed. This line was different to the line of Labor, covering 'one side of the fence' from challenge.

(c) The conservatives also asserted the importance of Israel to their world view and to world politics. This was crucial *to them*. Any claim made by pseudo patriots that the matters of Israel and Middle East politics generally are irrelevant to our political struggle kid themselves: it is a key defining ideological element of the ruling ideology and politics and it is necessary to respond to it, albeit in a correct way.

For the new conservatism Israel was the proof-in-the-eating of the validity of the democratic world-view. It was seen to be a moral absolute born from the 1945 defeat of fascism by the democracies. It could never be questioned. Further: Israel was always viewed as an ally against firstly the Arab secular nationalisms - and then, the Islamists. Conservative journals like Quadrant, conservative commentators like Gerard Henderson and conservative politicians like John Howard and David Clarke, have all said as much. The idea that Israel is part of the problem with Arab nationalism and even with the Islamists is denounced - and anyone who questions will be denounced as soft on Islamism. A Christian gloss is given to all this, albeit a special type of Christianity which locates the Zionist entity of Israel as a validation of Christian theology. This is known as 'Christian Zionism'.

(d) The conservatives make much of the legal system and constitutional forms inherited by Australia from Britain. That position can be used to establish themselves as traditional patriots and it may even draw in 'harder' patriotic type people who see this connection as being of even more critical relevance to Australian Identity. Now we nationalists *do not have* the view that the legal and constitutional inheritance is necessarily the best part of our legacy from Britain; much of it is ambivalent because in some British historical constitutional documents the reactionaries see 'stability' and 'order' in Westminsterism, whereas we can see *the idea of popular sovereignty or the alternate radical democratic tradition*. We might prefer other parts of British heritage (language, some cultural aspects and the valuable 'blood' Britain has passed into the Australian pool), but we note always the more backward patriots cling to legalisms – and that means they are available to be coopted as satellite persons.

(e) In the new conservative ethos, a globalised economy is seen as the goal as it guarantees the survival of capitalism, which in turn is thought to ensure the survival of the *Christian-Zionist theology* of the regime necessary to the weather through the current 'world crisis' with Islam. The logic is circular. With a culture organized around a civic-patriotism, the unity of Australia under conservative control becomes complete.

The new conservatism was preached with ardour after the election of the Coalition government in 1996 and after the Twin Towers attack of September 11 2001.

We conclude that conservatism's precepts travelled far beyond the borders of the Coalition parties and their immediate structures. As we have suggested, independent groups and activists could arise who were strongly influenced by these ideas but who did not seek out membership in the Coalition parties. They entered other groups and played a role designed to unite the conservative camp (sic) for the global struggle against Islamism. They preached for a strong united civic-culture so that Australia could be in form for the fight. And they were prepared to act against other would-be and actual patriotic people *who refused to buy their line*.

4. Hostile Takeovers: 2003 - 2007

In the period after the (first) removal of Hanson from the scene (her resignation from One Nation in 2002), the politics of the so-called 'Right' was recast. Hanson was falsely imprisoned in 2003, courtesy of the Australians For Honest Politics group of which Tony Abbott was a mover. Other groups were in crisis and flux. The Liberal-National parties were riding high.

Let's name some of the players.

(a) The Vinnecombe clique.

A faction inside One Nation led by Bob Vinnecombe in New South Wales came into being. As it did so, many One Nation leaders of the earlier period went from the scene. Many eventually ended up in the Liberal Party some years later – Chris Spence, Lex Stewart, John Reynolds, Nigel Kendall and many others. Their job was done. It was time for the 'new leaders' to stymie One Nation. Vinnecombe sought to bloc One Nation with the Christian Democratic Party. He adopted the anti Islamic rhetoric of the establishment-connected Christian Democratic Party and he proclaimed the virtues of Christian jihad (sic). When he eventually quit One Nation in late 2010, Vinnecombe ended up with the CDP and other Liberal elements. Vinnecombe's line on several questions of the new-conservatism seeped into One Nation in other States, especially Queensland where this line was already strong. It was Vinnecombe's plan to openly align One Nation with the Liberal Party 'Right', the CDP, other anti Islamists. Ironically, after he left (job done, again), One Nation lurched even further in these directions (at least in certain places).

Interestingly, in early 2007, a member of the Liberal 'Right' had met secretly with One Nation president, Jim Cassidy, to propose the liquidation of the party and the entry of its members into the Liberal Party. It was said that the Liberals could quite easily accommodate the views of the ON members. This was rejected by Cassidy. Again, we see the attempt to link One Nation with the Liberals.

Now we see in Queensland, under the 'leadership' of Jim Savage and Ian Nelson, the 'linking' of One Nation with the united Liberal National Party (LNP), offers from the former of preferences and political support, suggestions that One Nation has cast off its 'racist' baggage to embrace open *multiracialism* (more on that below) and suggestions that One Nation is now 'conservative'.

(b) Klub Nation.

In January 2005, Klub Nation (KN) was formed in Sydney. This group contained some persons who were interested in conducting a regular speaking forum and in providing a social venue for 'patriotic' people and so forth. Later, some of these people would see the Klub as an organizer for music venues, a survivalist group and so on. We say nothing against these few – *other than they should have exercised more caution over their other KN associates*.

Unfortunately, the Klub was poisoned from the start and was in many ways initiated by, members of the former Palmer/Coleman gang, the neo-nazi clique which had waged a veritable war of threats, petty harassments against nationalists – since 1988. Indeed, Palmer admitted finally to a connection with the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO) and Coleman has long been known as an informant for the last (corrupt) boss of the notorious Special Branch police – Superintendent Neville Ireland. The NSW Police Royal Commission and other court proceedings – effectively exposed Coleman as an informant. This is an open secret in the journalist fraternity given the importance of Coleman to a number of legal processes. The evidence of Coleman's informer status has been laid out more than once in public documents and finally Coleman even confessed it to a former officer of Australians Against Further Immigration.

In the period 1999-2002, Palmer and Coleman had tried to steal the funds of the old British-Israel World Federation until driven out. A scum pool including these two, Mark Pavic (he was involved in the disposing of his mother's body, her manslaughter and so forth and served prison time in the 1980's, a veritable psychopath) and others, had formed in that period. Operating through KN, they would also pick up dross from other movements, people who were removed from genuine groups and who harboured resentments against genuine nationalists and patriotic people. This gave KN new scope for disruption. Sometimes, the group picked up contacts from various patriotic groups who came along to its speech-nights and so on. They were milked for intelligence and they might go back to genuine groups and sanitise KN as a place to meet.

The group would meet at the Humanist House in Chippendale (in Sydney) every month, their entry allowed by a certain David Duffy. Duffy, despite his other views which suggest he is a sort of establishment conservative, was on the executive of the Humanist Society. *Knowing what they were as he must have*, Duffy let them in - to use the Humanist's building. He must also have ultimately understood what they really wanted – to acquire control of the Humanist Society's assets. Why not resist?

For over five years, KN served as an ear upon the legitimate nationalist and patriotic movement, first in Sydney and thence elsewhere. It collected intelligence, traded it, operated against groups and destabilized them. As the charade that they were a genuine group was run, the meetings would often degenerate into drunken sessions where threats of terrorist violence would be made (and undoubtedly informed on). Occasionally sitting in the midst of much of it, silent and enjoying a drink, would be John Boyle, barrister and solicitor, the man who had represented the Palmer/Coleman gang in the Supreme Court in their scheme to steal from the British-Israel group, a personal friend of David Clarke, an immigration-agent for Chinese migrants and a most decidedly Liberal man – the former boss of the 'Chinese Special Branch' of the Liberal Party. Ever helpful to his clients, Mr. Boyle's office served for years as Mark Pavic's official address and the two would socialise together. Was Mr. Boyle any sort of neo-nazi or would-be terrorist? Hardly. So, why was he really there? We shall meet Mr. Boyle again below.

In 2009, KN upgraded its activities and began to promote itself as a veritable alternative leadership for the more 'radical' sectors of the nationalist movement (if we can use such a phrase). They tried to move in on various groups.

Ultimately, a money scam run by a few KN leaders. Many people were duped into paying in sums of cash for a "property" that was to become a new training and political centre and silver bars were traded to members. One member from a nationalist group, who was conned into putting in some cash, said KN was like a cross between pyramid selling and a Tupperware group. Then efforts were made to 'take over' the Humanist Society itself and be able to apply its assets to their own activities. Members of KN joined the Humanists and began to vote as a bloc, just as the Palmer/Coleman gang had done in British-Israel years before. They even pretended that they were the real Humanists! Pavic, who had tried similar raids on the Theosophical Society and the Henry George League – and who dreamed ultimately of taking over the Mechanic's Institute - was in charge of the nuts and bolts of the operation. In late 2009 – early 2010, the ploy fell apart as the Humanists resisted takeover and KN found itself 'out' of the Humanist Society building and its members removed from the Society itself. Thereafter, KN unravelled. But the damage (and we shall mention more below) had been done.

We have been told that some members of KN have since taken membership in the Liberal Party.

The best way to understand the Klub Nation network is to see it as a major player in the Liberal satellite arrangement. It linked many people together and operated against legitimate nationalist and patriotic groups and collected intelligence. That is the true way to describe its political function – and that *stands regardless of the intention of any single participant or any person duped by it*. It is better that KN stays very dead – but that can never be guaranteed.

(c) *The Fellowship Of The Round Table (FORT)*

This organisation came into being about 1998. David Duffy was intimately involved in the group which met (and meets) at a private house in Bondi Junction. In 2006, it traded up and started using rooms at Parliament House to conduct special forums.

Attendees at the house meetings have included John Boyle and David Clarke – and a certain Steven Moore (who we shall meet shortly).

The FORT styles itself as a defender of traditional Western conservatism. It states that it is against all totalitarianisms and against liberal political correctness. In practise, the defence of conservatism *sums to a commitment to the actions of the American superpower and its NWO allies*. The FORT also stands by Israel against the 'threat' of Islam. The stand with 'allies' against totalitarianism was an old canard of the Cold War anti communist Right. It is a trap for the unwary.

In FORT, there is not the slightest commitment to the notion of the sustainability of Australia's current population policy, nor any stance critical of an immigration program that is undermining the national identity. The slogans about the conservative ethos of God and Family and our Allies and so on, are meant to define 'identity' for Australia. For us, that is not sufficient. This 'identity' can be 'adopted' by anyone at a citizenship ceremony.

The FORT functions as an unofficial forum structure of the conservative faction (sic) of the Liberal Party.

(d) The Australian Protectionist Party (highlighted through two case studies)

The disintegration of the old Australia First Party in the period 2006-7 was a direct result of the new ideology and politics of conservatism seeking to take it over. When the would-be conspirators failed to capture this respected vehicle, they opted to wreck it on the way out, eventually setting themselves up as the Australian Protectionist Party (APP).

The attack upon the old Australia First Party began in 2005, just after the Civil Uprising at Cronulla. As the party struggled to get the numbers to re-register as a Federal party, a dissenting group around Mark Wilson was formed.

(i) *Mark Wilson* has a long history in the Australian scene after arriving from Britain in the early Nineties. In Britain, he was a nationalist and member of the British National Party (BNP). It does appear that in 2005 he adopted the then-new line of the BNP on civic identity and Israel. That party, having once been nationalist, revised the essentials of British nationalist ideology and proclaimed that if it was to oppose Islamic migration to Britain it had to support Israel as a foreign policy option and the Zionist lobby in Britain as a de facto ally; via this new route it was claimed the 'racist' and 'fascist' accusations against BNP would be overcome, the group would get favourable press and 'reasonable' members and voters and enter the mainstream. The BNP also started to operate in a way that made 'Britons' out of alien immigrants if they spoke English, disliked Islam and so forth. It was also considered by Mark Wilson that Australia's connection with Britain could be strengthened by ethnicising (sic) the relationship to a certain degree and the APP and the BNP were proclaimed brother parties straight after the split within Australia First in August 2007.

In 2006-7 Wilson attempted to impose his new line upon Australia First by creating or engendering an internal climate of chaos such that 'power' could be seized. In practise, he campaigned for purging persons whom the media (sic) might consider unacceptable, ridding the party of people who had a critical attitude towards Zionism and demanding the party copy the supposedly successful methods and ideas of the BNP. This line was called mainstreaming. In the period 2006-7, this disruptionist game was played with some energy and with results. The targeting of individuals was the key method and a number of leading nationalists found themselves the targets of smear and disinformation. This propaganda was disseminated by word of mouth and via web-boards.

Mark Wilson's most amusing effort was to attempt to foist upon the party a part-time pornography salesman and former Liberal Party member, Darrin Hodges, as '*Australia's Nick Griffin*' (Griffin: leader of the BNP), a "cleanskin" who would lead the clean movement. Hodges created a parallel structure within Australia First which liaised with CDP, other Christian Zionists and Middle Eastern Christians. Wilson has always been aware of Hodges's rabid pro Zionism which centred on the exaggerated anti-Islamist style and the 'need' (sic) for a united anti Islamic front. This was all rather ironic as Wilson was previously one of Zionism's most ardent critics inside the Australian nationalist movement. In those earlier days, he regarded

any refusal to confront Zionism as a sign of ideological weakness, a veritable litmus test to pass for any potential cadre. In his new period after 2005, he would tell genuine nationalists that he didn't really believe the new line was 'true', but merely that it was the right way forward. By taking this position, some people would indeed follow him into APP, creating a group with two faces: those clever ones who would only be pro Zionist in public, but who knew the score – and those who regarded Israel as a "Project Of Civilisation". We will leave to God to sort out who is who and who believes what. It is beyond us to play nod/nod and wink/wink.

When it was clear that Australia First could not be taken over, the Wilson group, already primed in advance, took the ideological label of *Protectionism*. This was itself revealing. *The first Protectionist Party was one of Australia's original conservative parties and it was an alternate and 'softer' 'patriotic' position to that of the nationalist-based labour movement* which inspires the modern nationalist position.

In the pursuit of his mainstreaming goals, Wilson has steered the APP towards the Liberal Party. The APP has recruited persons who were previously Liberal officials, liaised with the notorious Michael Darby of the Liberal 'conservative' group, encouraged his nominal boss (Andrew Phillips, president of APP) to write regularly on the Liberal web-board New Conservative and so forth in order to recruit and influence the disgruntled conservative voter. Indeed, Andrew Phillips also did a stint in the Liberal Party in the late Nineties. He considers himself a conservative and once tried to launch a so-called Australian Conservative Party.

Significantly for this discussion, in February 2009 when in Sydney, Mark Wilson negotiated a friendship arrangement with the Klub Nation group – which hitherto he had called 'Nazis'. He had denounced this group consistently for years and the parent Palmer/Coleman gang before that. In theory, he was all for ridding the nationalist movement of anyone who could be called by the media a 'Nazi' extremist; anything smacking of that was said to get in the way of creating the pro Zionist anti Islamic front. Yet, there he was dealing with 'neo-nazis'. Just like his friend Hodges who told a group of young Queensland nationalists at the Sydney Forum in August 2007 that he was a "National Socialist"! Why say such a thing? The wheel of Liberal interest turns. Opposites unite because they are not opposite. Wilson was looking to direct hammer blows at Australia First and other nationalist people by having a two flank attack: his wing would say the nationalists were unacceptable and extreme; the so-called neo-nazis would say that the nationalists were too soft in their ideas and methods. *It is always a matter of understanding who is paying the piper.*

Unfortunately, Mark Wilson has done great damage in dividing nationalist people with his games, severing long-standing friendships and relationships with his false flag operation.

(ii) *Steven Moore*. Moore is not necessarily the sort of person who we would characterise as a major player in nationalist politics. It is just that his career is instructive to the picture we are painting. We are trying to show the irregular nature of the warfare waged to disintegrate nationalist politics in Australia

Moore appeared in Melbourne in 1997 in the old National Action group. He was not trusted by the leadership and thought (probably accurately in hindsight) to have been connected to the 'men in black' group of Ross Diggins and Dean Clarke.

We digress to explain. This 'men in black' group came into being in the shadows in Melbourne in 1997. First, Diggins got control of the League of Rights's tape service, a business which over a year, he wrecked, leaving with thousands of dollars worth of materials. Second, Clarke offered himself and a group of security guards dressed in black to groups in Melbourne (including One Nation) in 1997 - as protection against mob violence. Before too long Diggins and Clarke were targeting National Action with harassment and threats and pseudo intimidation. They were elbowing their way into the core of One Nation.

Both men were anomalies. Clarke had a drug problem and an Asian lover (while putting himself over as some sort of 'racist' hard-man) and both had fathers who were involved in policing. Diggins's father was booted from the Victorian police for corruption and Clarke's dad was in the Federal Police. Both men were associated with a mystery man, Brendan Bride, who later turned up in an anarchist front group only to have it conveniently 'denounced' (really??) by Tony Abbott who told the Herald-Sun, he had received an

ASIO briefing about the group! What was Bride doing there? Was he a nationalist infiltrator, an anarchist who had infiltrated the patriotic scene, or a plain pimp?

In 2002, the men in black finally disintegrated after leaving considerable wreckage.

By this time, Moore was long in Sydney and associated with various groups. He joined the Fellowship of the Round Table and was close to David Duffy. He was present at a meeting of the worthy Patriotic Youth League in April 2005, just in time to witness its effective break-up in Sydney. Witness?!

In December 2006, Moore was present in a Cronulla hotel with Hodges and three other persons (two of whom dissociated themselves from the purpose of the meeting) to plan the New South Wales takeover of Australia First and the purging of several leaders and members. It was agreed to target these leaders as people with bad image and as ideological 'Nazis'. As he later told one of the writers of this pamphlet: "that's just politics".

For some time after that, Steven Moore's name was not heard. Then in 2008, he became involved with Klub Nation. At this time, it is understood that he was also a member of the supposedly respectable, 'mainstreamed' APP, which was favoured by some in Klub Nation as a suitable vector for activity. Moore promoted within Klub Nation the idea of forming a group of 'Wolves' and he issued *patches* for the group. Plans were hatched to organize target practise shoots and a camp. All the time, he was close to FORT and its Liberal members and friendly with John Boyle. Were the Wolves ready to engage in violence? If so, it would have been provocation. More likely, it was a honey trap for naïve youth. It fizzled out.

Currently, this person is reputed not to be active, but trace information reveals associations in the demi-world of Walter Mitty characters issuing forth from the collapse of Klub Nation.

Why was this man always present at the right time (sic) as groups were targeted and disrupted? Why did he always know the main players of disruption? Why the link with FORT?

(e) The Stormfront network of Baron von Hund

In 2004, the web board Stormfront obtained a new moderator for its Downunder section. His name was David Innes and he wrote there under the unlikely name of Baron von Hund. Innes suffered from Bipolar Disorder. In 2005-7, he used Stormfront to develop a network of supporters and friends. In those years, he launched consistent written and oral attacks upon nationalists in the eastern States and paraded himself as some sort of new leader for the scene.

Late in 2006, Innes was brought into the scheme to disrupt and takeover Australia First. In 2007, in a unique thing for Australian nationalist politics, the web-board was used to destabilise the party prior to the coup that would place it into the hands of the new conservatives. Ultimately, in July 2007, this effort failed and after representations to the American owners of the site by Australians and others, Innes was purged from control of the Australian section. With him went a swathe of persons – most of whom ended up in APP.

Quite significantly, Innes passed over the personal details of a number of young patriotic people to the 'anti racist' group FightDemBack. One wonders where his loyalties lay. However, the damage was done and in the temporary break-up of the old Australia First, the enemy scored a major win.

(f) The story of the disruption of the Patriotic Youth League

The Patriotic Youth League (PYL) was a group of nationalist-minded students formed in 2003 in Newcastle and which soon attached itself to the old Australia First Party. It had great potential

In 2005, it was obviously the target for disruption with Steven Moore in the wings and with Mark Wilson who suggested endless organizational changes with it which undermined the leadership.

In 2005, it passed to the leadership of Luke Connors of Melbourne. After the Civil Uprising at Cronulla in December 2005, the League was deluged with enquiries, all of which seemed to end in 'no result'.

Harassed by the media and denounced as a 'fascist' and so forth, Connors caved in. He concluded that 'bad image' was the entire problem with the Australian nationalist movement generally and he made himself available to Mark Wilson, David Innes and others for the new conservative politics. In mid 2006, the PYL was dissolved amidst Connors's claims that it was associated with 'Nazism'.

Connors was also close to the APP in 2007-2010 and wrote regularly on its web-board with every smear possible against the nationalists in Australia First and elsewhere. Connors adopted the new conservative line that multiracial conservative mainstreaming and pro Zionism was the way forward for nationalism (!!).

In Summation

We have painted a picture of determined individuals and groups targeting nationalist politics for destruction. There are patterns. They have common ideological positions based around mainstreaming or in the mirror reverse will talk of violence and revolution. They shamelessly plot against the groups they may join or conduct activities against them from the outside. They often have connections to the Liberal Party and to its 'conservative faction'. Whilst they are all different and independent, the inter-linkages suggest at least some degree of co-ordination in their work. Our satellite model does not preclude that. Indeed, it ensures that the satellites are always kept focused on their mission.

5. The New Satellites In Action: 2007 - 2011

The satellites are active. Let us sum up and name these groups for the convenience of Australia First nationalists.

Christian Democratic Party
Fellowship Of The Round Table
One Nation (*some members and some branches*)
Australian Protectionist Party
Pauline Hanson's campaign group (*some members*)
Australian Christian Nation Association
Australian Defence League
Q Society

It is the position of the nationalists that each of these groups has a vector or vectors that bind it to the thinking of the new conservatism – and therefore to the Liberal-National parties.

(a) In the case of the CDP, it is quite open and more-or-less understood by people. The CDP is a 'party' with members of the parliaments, newspapers, publications, conferences and so on. It is a fundamentalist Christian mobilization which relies on its 'moral' stands to attract the unwary. But in the current climate, its Christian Zionism lines it up as an essential tool of the establishment in their fake war on terror (war for resources and war for Israel). Its campaigns against Moslem immigration endear it to those who think it can be 'converted' to a general anti immigration position (it can't and it seeks large immigration targets); hence, some ON members and the APP consider it a focus for action and alliance.

(b) The FORT offers a place where members of different groups and parties hear a higher-brow new conservative line and may attend its forums and other events. Here all liaise together and learn to exchange data and so on.

(c) One Nation (some members) offers electoral (and only electoral) action on the lines of civic patriotism, anti Islamism and the illusion of participation in actual struggle. Many members of One Nation are alert to this and want to take their party forward. Whilst many are admittedly still in thrall to electoralism as a tactic, they *certainly do* consider themselves campaigners against free trade, against immigration generally, for democratic rights and freedom of speech, for a fairer Australia where the common person may expect reward for labour and as patriots who revere Australia's history. We must unite with these people and oppose the others.

A sure sign of the effective split inside the party may be seen in the article from the Queensland press:

We reproduce a part of it into this pamphlet:

It's preparing to re-launch before the next state election, meaning Queenslanders will be seeing more of Mr Nelson before March 2012.

And if Sansanee, or their daughter Patti, join him on the hustings, voters could be forgiven if they do a double take.

As an aircraft mechanic, Nelson has lived around the world, including in Thailand, where he met his second wife.

Like most new Australians, it took Sansanee time to find work because of her limited English.

But she persevered, with the encouragement of her husband, and now works in a restaurant while presiding over the family's neat home and garden north of Brisbane.

Despite witnessing his wife's difficult adjustment to a new culture and country, Nelson has no sympathy at all for the most recent targets of multiculturalism's critics.

For him, the woman he affectionately calls "little one" is not like the other new Australians, particularly Muslims, at the heart of the current national debate.

"It's the ones that don't [assimilate] and live in their little enclaves that's unacceptable in this country," he said.

"We've got some wonderful people who are coming into this country.

"They talk like Australians and they have the barbecues and they assimilate right into Australia.

"The ones who scare me are the Muslims, they terrify me."

His fear seems to stem from a difficult relationship with two Lebanese-Australian apprentices, and the Cronulla riots.

"They are a race that don't assimilate, they treat Australian women like dirt ... how many were gang raped?" he said of the 2005 violence.

It is very clear that here we see the goal of multiracial assimilation put forward as a vision for One Nation – with the ranting against the Moslems as the cover. Most One Nation members are not inclined to the ideal of multiracial assimilation. We note that this line is very similar to that of the APP.

It is also true that the new Queensland leadership (as mentioned above) favour deals with the LNP in their State.

(d) The Australian Protectionist Party shadows Australia First very closely and reserves its screaming venom for this vanguard nationalist force (as reflected in a neurotic web-board operated by this so-called 'party'). Much of this campaign came originally from sell-outs like Luke Connors of the disbanded Patriotic Youth League, Darrin Hodges, Mark Wilson and Nicholas Folkes (ex Liberal Party official who is also in favour of multiracial assimilation). It goes on with some of these and new persons. The rants are generally an undignified mess which rather belies the APP's claim to mainstreamer and respectable status.

The APP will also deceptively mirror genuine nationalists in One Nation and Australia First, but it always asserts it is a modern movement alert to presenting a positive image in the enemy's media (a rather stupid idea?). Last year, Folkes wrote in the columns of a British paper:

"The Jewish people have the most to lose with the Islamisation of Britain. As some commentators have said, "Jewish leaders are mostly left wing" and this will be their destruction if Patriotic British Jews do not support groups like the EDL. Western people all over the globe are in the same struggle to stop the advancement and appeasement of Islam so Christians, Jews and Atheists unite against the Islamofascists".

Interestingly, Folkes called on British Jews to support EDL and will undoubtedly soon call for Australian Jews to support the Australian Defence League (just formally established after over a year of secretive APP effort to get one going). He also seeks to present himself to the Zionists who direct the Australian Jewish community as a responsible nationalist who can be trusted to run a party that will never be anti semitic (note: this is a straw-man: there is no anti-semitism in Australia). That means *in practise* that the Australian nationalist movement, if transferred to APP custody, would not harbour anti Zionism and agitate against the 'war on terror' politics of the Australian state.

The APP has an obsession with being called 'extreme' or 'fascist' or 'racist'. It seeks "the moral high ground". It has shown that it is willing to leap any hurdle to be seen as mainstream. The genuine people attracted to this fraud of a group will waste their time performing like seals for no reward – as the enemy changes the goalposts. The leaders must know what they are doing: they cannot be that foolish. By introducing the poison into the broad patriotic movement that mass support awaits the 'clever' and mainstream group, they do a great service for the state.

(e) Pauline Hanson's campaign group was activated in recent times in New South Wales from the wreckage of the Pauline's United Australia Party, a group founded in Queensland in 2006 for no other reason than to support her 2007 candidacy to the Queensland Senate. It fielded other candidates in other States and split the 2007 Senate vote with One Nation. Some members of her new campaign group leave much to be desired. Graham Abel, a former Liberal Party candidate and a personal friend of David Clarke, was placed upon her ticket for the NSW Legislative Council in 2011. Brian Burston, a confirmed reactionary, has been close to Hanson for several years after originally being a splitter from the original One Nation in 2001 and founder of the David Oldfield break-away One Nation (NSW)..

The question of Hanson is a divisive one, with many ordinary Australians feeling she is a wronged patriotic person worthy of support, while many activists in the know consider her a recipe for political defeat.

We were informed that in her recent bid for a seat in the New South Wales parliament that the Liberal party was aware of her plans before even One Nation.

We note that in recent times Hanson has also adopted the anti Islamic line, the line that actually *favours* legal refugees and so forth. Whether her own decision, or that of minders, the effect is the same and a person regarded as credible by the mass is utilised to serve the contrived purpose. A new Hanson party or sustained Hansonist activism may be calculated as serving as a satellite agenda.

(f) The Australian Christian Nation Association is a core Christian association that unites Christian Zionist churches and individuals and certain fundamentalists who are wary of Islam. A few years ago, they invited that arch Zionist, the Jewish-American historian Daniel Pipes, to Australia. Pipes coined the very phrase "Islamofascism" which was used by George Bush and he was close to the neo-cons (sic) who took America to war against Iraq and who now wish to attack Iran. Michael Darby was in his Sydney audience as an organizer for the meeting and the association. The Christian Nation group has played a decisive agitational and ideological role in binding groups together.

(g) The Australian Defence League is a branch of the English Defence League and part of an International of leagues that purport to be the militant face of anti Islamist and anti Moslem immigration struggle. Our skin crawls. But these leagues are stormtroops for support for Israel which is praised up as the one country fighting Islam – rather than *the cause* of much Moslem unrest. The English group was used to marginalise the British National Party with its shrill calls to really 'fight' Islam and for people to be wary of the BNP's 'racist' and 'fascist' past. The BNP was snookered by them. The Australian Defence League has the covert support of the APP (irony: the BNP says that none of its members may be members of EDL) and APP leaders have played a role in launching it here. The idea is to build a street movement and possibly – if enough real idiots can be found for it – direct it against the nationalists in the different groups.

After all, if one doesn't fall for the anti Islamist game of the Liberal Party – then one must be in love with Islamic nutter extremists, eh? We denounce the Australian Defence League as a Zionist provocation which will receive the protection of the political police.

(h) The Q Society is an anti Islamic group with some resources which is rabidly pro Israel. It asserts that the very cause of part of the Islamist stupidity – Israel – is in fact our salvation from it. Its website proclaims the 'ideology' of the new conservatism: that 'Jewish' type of Christianity, the allusion to our "Anglo-Saxon and European" roots and the "non European" migrants absorbed into the civic identity.

"Our members insist the bedrock of this society must remain Judaeo-Christian in ethics and values on which our mainly Anglo-Saxon and European forefathers have built the Australian Nation. We acknowledge the indigenous people of this continent and surrounding islands and appreciate their long relationship with this land, which we now all share as Australians under one law and one flag. And we equally appreciate the valuable contribution from those who came from non-European countries to embrace and share Australian values."

This line also lent itself to full support for the Zionist terror state as a "multiethnic" and "democratic" state and ally of multiracial Australia.

Again, this peculiar ideology is important to the system. Indeed, the Society links to a 'Former Moslems' group, one of a series of organisations supported by American based bodies with connections right into the US establishment and its campaigns in the Moslem world to overthrow governments!

We smell rats.

The Q Society will make a perfect ally for the other satellites and is likely to play a crucial role in directing them. It recently played an important role in harassing the Greens' party controlled Marrickville council in Sydney which first opted to boycott companies based in Israel. Ultimately, the Greens' decision was overturned, but not until the Greens Mayor, Fiona Byrne, found herself harassed and stood-over in various ways. It is thought that the APP lent late-night commandos (sic) to paint over Green party election posters – with the inevitable swastikas and slogans suggesting her criticism of Israel was Nazi.' (Byrne was a candidate for State parliament last March)

All this echoes the rantings of the APP and Bob Vinnecombe against any criticism of Israel. In October 2006, Vinnecombe co-organized with Fred Nile of CDP a meeting addressed by Pastor Sookhdeo, a personal friend of the war criminal Tony Blair (don't we all recall the 'weapons of mass destruction' lie that was used to invade Iraq?). The Pakistani Christian spoke about Israel as an ally of Christians in the war with Islam. This meeting was disrupted by nationalists and they were denounced by Vinnecombe and Hodges (who in his APP phase continued to refer to this meeting and the nationalist intervention). The Sookhdeo meeting foreshadowed the Pipes tour and now the advent of the Q Society.

The Q Society has connections with the Quilliam Foundation in Britain which supports the 2011 "revolutions" in the Arab world, things cooked up by the plethora of organisations linked to billionaire George Soros. The matter runs deep. Quilliam may be understood as a NGO of a peculiar sort, one which performs functions conducive to the New World Order program for change in the Moslem world, change that favours Israel and access to oil by the oil multinationals (who were in part behind the Iraq war and now the unrest in Libya).

Given the importance to the Coalition, indeed our state itself, in manufacturing consent for Australian support to the NWO schemes, we can understand the process.

In summation:

It is very clear to us that the satellites all push a similar line and their efforts flow together to sustain the dominant ideological position of the Liberal and National parties. The new conservative ideology of the Coalition and their related forces has obviously underwritten the politics of the satellites. They have their deluded civic identity patriotism with its phobic anti-Islamism as a driving motor.

6. Australia First Party And Its Independent Political Line

As a direct result of new conservative subversion, it was necessary to reconstitute Australia First Party in September 2007. The new party went on to become a registered Federal party. It is now growing slowly throughout the nation.

The Australia First Party struggles to maintain its independence and initiative. It refuses to be co-opted into another's game. We are not blinded by the promises of 'big support' when in truth – *superior forces and able groups are set to absorb us into their arrangements*. The party will take a different perspective:

(a) The party will work amongst its social base to establish its own secure clientele.

(b) The party will work to create a united front of all oppositional social groups and political and other groups. It will only work with structures which are oppositional to globalist politics whether 'liberal' or 'conservative' in their presentation..

(c) The party will wage political struggle against establishment politics and develop its organization in that struggle. The party will secure itself and purge from it any elements which seek to 'mainstream' it.

Australia First Party is reviled by the enemy if only because its ideological line is a nationalist line and its politics are independent. It is a harder road than the one of satellite status where one can be befriended by Coalition politicians and their agents and be feted by other allies in the delusional alliance.

The true nationalists understand the critical relevance to the Australian state of the Zionophile patriotism that is now pushed by the satellites. It is part of a state project to establish both an ideological hegemony that is difficult to challenge and practical structures that operate against any ideological and political challenge. Even though we conduct our day to day struggles around various themes and issues to create a new grassroots people's movement, we cannot escape this game imposed upon us by the overall political circumstances. We are obliged to confront it.

Australia First Party aims not be to some sort of 'voice of the people' at election time, or even a parliamentary party wheeling like all the rest, or even a 'government' based upon an electoral majority. *Our ultimate and only possible aim is to acquire the state power and remodel our country.*

Arthur Calwell, towards the end of his career in 1972 and after looking at the internationalising and multiracial society then arising in Australia, said that it was "revolution" that was needed in our country. By that he meant real and fundamental change as profound as any revolution in human history. That means for us *that our struggle is ideological and cultural, community-based and electoral, all combined in a single methodology*. Because we confront a system, we answer the system's false-politics at all levels. Those who consider that a multi-layered struggle irrelevant to bread and butter politics and that their aim is making the lives of Australians 'better' – are welcome to go somewhere else; or if they have a true patriotic disposition, they should stay and learn why a people's movement must still be equipped with a world-view to fight the in-power globalist world-view. The enemy's politics, as this pamphlet has shown, is not really about 'bread and butter' either. It is about higher things. So our struggle must be too.

We say: *only independence for Australia can answer the day to day issues raised by the people* and it for that independence that we will fight. In winning that independence, we must change much that Australians have known as 'normal' in their country – economic system, legal arrangements, lifestyle and much, much, more. Lines in the sand are drawn and enemies defined. It is because this is the mission of Australia First and other genuine nationalists and patriots that the system fights so hard against us. And that was why the satellite system arose and has been perfected.

Conclusions

We are sure that the current Liberal's satellite arrangement will persist for some years. It is a key method of the political management of patriotic dissent in Australia. The groups that serve as satellites must be, can only be, targeted by the nationalists, raided for their best members (who can be persuaded to break free of the arrangement) and destabilized and beaten back. There can be no 'friendly' discourse with

agencies that are there to bring us down. Quite the contrary. The sharpening of the cutting edge of the Australia First Party and the whole patriotic movement generally, has become an urgent task.

Some people do not like the forthright stand of Australia First. They might even suggest that it is our 'radical' position that holds back activists, voters and other resources from flowing into their satellite politics and the mass mainstream movement they say they are about to create.. If there is any force that holds us all back it is sincere people, those who should be with us, who are beguiled by the pretty lights of the satellites. We invite them to look into the mirror and look at themselves. It isn't pretty. They are tainted by the company they keep. They fool themselves. As for the satellite leaderships, we have stated the obvious: it will be a struggle to the end.

This fight will be won. People beguiled by the satellites will fall away and take the road of the new Australian Nationalism upheld by the Australia First Party. *As we have said elsewhere: party members know that this is the most selfless of service; we will surmount all obstacles and win victory.*

We reprint an article of background value to this discussion.
Hodges NSW APP A Right Wing Branch Of The Liberal Party?

On December 12 2009, the Australian Protectionist Party (APP) invited a certain Mr. Michael Darby to its new speaking 'club' in Sydney. Darrin Hodges NSW spokesperson and Mark Wilson ex BNP and APP leader were there. Was Darby's attendance a random thing? Not at all – because the APP leadership has long promoted as an "ally" the pool from which Mr. Darby springs. In fact I suggest this source pool may have spewed forward the APP.

The door has opened for the APP to move on as the Australians For Honest Politics chosen vehicle, the Clayton's Nationalist Party. The Nationalist Party you have when haven't got a Nationalist Party!

Michael Darby is no small player in Sydney's shadow world. Expelled from the Liberal Party a year and a half ago for "breaches" of the party rules, Darby went straight over to Hodge's favourite Zionist Christian Party and pal Fred Nile's Christian Democratic Party (CDP) as the good reverend's chief of staff. He is now going to integrate the CDP with the so-called "right-wing faction" of the Liberal Party directed by David Clarke.

Darby and Clarke have been close mates for 40 years when they were first in the conservative forum, the Fifty Club, based in Kings Cross. They have co-operated a so-called conservative faction in the Liberal Party from that time right through until about 1991 when it dissolved. Its main bag was anti-communism and when the old Red Empire died about then, it had run out of steam. The faction went into hibernation until Tony Abbott (yes, Tony Abbott) revived it in August 1996 – one month before Pauline Hanson set off an explosion via a speech in Federal Parliament. In December 1996, the faction was up and going – and that was 4 months before Pauline actually set up One Nation. Is that planning or what? Then Tony disappeared and left the group to get on with it.

Mark Wilson APP Leader (Saxon on the App web-board) knows all about them. When he was in Australia First, he discussed with other members the workings of this faction and how it played a vital function in putting up the barrier to Pauline Hanson bleeding away further Liberal Party support and to act later as the patriotic rope to pull them all back in once Pauline's tide had ebbed.

What Are These Liberals??

The new conservative faction would promote itself as a family, Christian and free enterprise thing which was in favour of a strong alliance with the USA and which saw Israel as a pivotal reality for a new conservative world view. It waves the flag about and says it wants everyone to integrate into Australia as English speaking "citizens" who believe in these values. Perhaps this echoed its 1980's spokesman Major Ashley-Riddell who used to say: "I believe in God, the Queen, the Judiciary and the Services". He did. And his Vietnamese wife did too. It was what nationalists call a civic nationalist outfit and not an appetising one at that.

Because communism was dead by 1996 as a bogeyman to suck in patriots, a new bogeyman was needed. The faction adopted the neo-con position that saw Islamism as the number one enemy of Western

Christian Democratic Civilisation. Anyone not willing to go a Waltzing Matilda with the neo-cons in Washington to attack every Moslem country etc. was some sort of goddam Muzzie-loving Israel-hating bad guy. Just like 30 years back: if someone questioned US motives, then he was a "commie".

The faction has always been smart at what it did. When it was an anti communist thing, it would work with all sorts of folks. There was the Asian People's Anti Communist League (APACL) which senior Liberal politicians supported as did Darby's father, Douglas Darby MP. This later became the World Anti Communist League which was sponsored by Taiwan and South Korea. This group organized Captive Nations Weeks and Freedom Rallies which even Malcolm Fraser attended. It was a big happy family kicking the commo can. Yes, we know communism was bad, but were our allies and the cause of liberal capitalism better?? They have proven not to be!! So these Liberals were supporting the system? Obviously!

Douglas Darby met regularly with Asian communities in Australia and told them immigration from Taiwan should be increased. Try and think of the last time Hodges or anyone from APP spoke about Asian Immigration? A real and ever increasing problem. They spend more time attacking White Australians and labeling them NAZIs or Pro Islamic.

These Liberals were never big on White Australia. That was shown after 1976 when, despite some rhetoric dished up for the sucked-in-ones, they sponsored in through the voice of leading member Lyenko Urbanchich, anti-communists (??) from South Vietnam. These Viets were recruited into the Liberal Party. That was Michael's position too and it was certainly always David Clarke's position. In fact, David Clarke convinced Bob Clark of the great activist Immigration Control Association to shut down in 1975 – "because Malcolm Fraser will do it all". They even held unity meetings in 1975 with every nationalist and anti immigration group known to convince them to support Fraser. It was a con job.

And Nazis Too

Interestingly, in the context of the APP's ranting at nationalists that they are "Nazis", the Liberal anti communists knew how to play with so-called Nazis. In 1966, Urbanchich actually chauffeured Nazi leader Arthur Smith to a rally being addressed by a so-called communist so he could assault him. John Howard of the Young Liberals cheered Smith on. In 1975, a campaign worker with Michael Darby's team in Gough Whitlam's seat privately paid the Nazis to appear at a rally addressed by Darby so he could condemn them – thus supposedly robbing Whitlam of some point or other stemming from Darby's wide contacts with all sorts of loud anti communists. It probably didn't really help. In 1979, someone close to David Clarke paid Nazis to paint slogans attacking a nationalist leader with the false allegation he was a "Duntroon poofta".

Pretending they are extremists, even Nazis, is a game some of these Liberals will play if it leads to some group being integrated into their workings, neutered or used somehow. It's a little like Darrin Hodges telling nationalists "I am Nazi". In fact, one of these Liberals told members of the Patriotic Youth League in 2004 that they were really a type of militant nationalist group and that they had the support of "someone who was in the SS". These Liberals will say just about anything to advance themselves.

Darrin Gets In Touch

It's pretty much well known that Darrin Hodges set up a parallel group inside Australia First in 2006. It wasn't long before these Liberals and Darrin were in touch. When he held a meeting that Australia First wasn't supposed to know about in early 2007, a meeting all about Islam, members of the Liberal Party turned up. It seems they were part of the group that tried to impose a Lebanese candidate for the Shire on the party in the 2007 poll. Members of Australian Christian Nation Association came (they were recently addressed in the Shire by David Clarke) and they stand openly for Israel and are Christian Zionists. Former members of the South Lebanon Army, a criminal mercenary group used by Israel, were there too. There was Jackie, Fred Nile's secretary, a Jewish lady who converted over to Christianity, but still a fervent supporter of Israel. With all these folks, Hodges conducted innumerable meetings afterwards.

In other words, the secret meeting looked like what the David Clarke / Michael Darby Liberals look like. Except a mass of Assyrians (Christians) was missing!!!

Darrin Hodges accepted all this as part of building a great anti Muslim front. Clarke and Co will throw you a few anti Islamic bones in their press statements etc. and seek to get you in.

Basically, the Liberal 'Right' and the CDP are not in any way nationalists. They are high immigrationists. Nile wants to increase immigration massively. David Clarke wants masses of "Christians". Darrin Hodges was told all that by Australia First in 2006-7 but obviously doesn't care too much.

So what now? The APP will increasingly get together with the Liberal Right. Mainstream, here they come. Sooner or later, APP will tone down even the rhetoric about alien immigration, rant on further about striking down all who question Zionism and attack any nationalist group as outside the mainstream. Yet it will keep up just enough of the pretence to draw in people so they can get gelded and water down Australian White Nationalism.

Michael Darby will continue to do what he has done for over 40 years. It's just one big honey trap for all.