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Constructing Hansonism: A Study Of Pauline Hanson’s Persona In Australian Press

This article discerns the extent to which the presence of controversial Australian politician, Pauline Hanson, in the public sphere has been mocked and shaped by the media. Based on a textual analysis of a month’s coverage of Hanson in the broadsheet metropolitan dailies, it suggests that the one-dimensionality in which Hanson was reported tells us more about Australian journalists and their practices than about Pauline Hanson herself. Journalists allowed the elements of ‘political correctness’ to set the parameters of how they dealt with Hanson. It concludes that since journalists are the product of journalism training programs, some self-reflection on the part of journalism educators of their reaction to Hanson is called for.
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The usage of particular words and phrases has a peculiar connotative power. In the 1970s, the word “Watergate” became a powerful symbol for political corruption to the extent that “-gate” has since then been variably suffixed by the media to connote governmental misdemeanour — “Contra-gate”, “Iran-gate”; and recently in the Australian media context, “Travelgate”. Since September 1996, the Australian media has constructed another powerful symbol of political deviance - “Hansonism” to symbolise political myopia, outback bigotry and small-minded racism. “Hansonism” became an extraordinary media construct which seemed to become an almost free floating signifier — virtually autonomous of the One Nation Party and Hanson herself. It became almost a self-enclosed discourse within which many of the Australian intelligentsia (academics, journalists, and miscellaneous cultural producers) could confront the darker side (real or imagined) of their own community.
Being unencumbered by party allegiances, the Independent MP for Oxley, Pauline Hanson has consistently being framed as a racist and a political liability in relation to Australia's image in Asia as a nation tolerant of racial and cultural diversity. Being a media-instigated phenomenon, she is imprinted into the public conscience as a racist who spews simplistic answers to fundamental issues of economic equity and cultural diversity. Thus, the Hanson construct continually embarrasses the government and to an extent offends Asian residents in Australia and overseas.

However, in transcribing Hanson's narrowed views on ethnic minority groups with little regard to the contexts in which those views were uttered, journalists have effectively defined the perceptual boundary in which the public could look at Hanson and how they would react to her. What is it in the Hanson persona that transfixes journalists into giving her such a prolonged presence in the news pages? The construct "Hansonism", and the way in which Hanson has been reported, tells us more about Australian journalists and their practices than about Pauline Hanson herself.

This study aims to discern the extent to which Hanson's presence has been shaped by the media within the dominant news paradigm of "us against them" and explores whether Hanson's statements have been critically reported in relation to their varied contexts. Two questions implicit in our inquiry are — what form of interpretive framework has been used by journalists to firstly strike a chord with their external readership, and secondly, to strike a cord with 'themselves', that is, a section of the Australian intelligentsia. The premise of our study is that there is no escaping from subjective perspectives in creating meaning in the world as phenomenon are explained through some form of "cognitive maps" (Bennett, 1985) — in the case of journalists, events and issues are gauged by a ritualised process of selection and reconstruction based on acculturated values and assumptions of popular tastes.

Our textual analysis will, firstly, establish a critical framework for understanding why journalists would even bother to transcribe Hanson's often baseless opinions. Secondly, we will suggest an interpretive framework for understanding the context of the high media presence and newsworthiness commanded by Hanson despite her consistently vacuous statements. Our assertion is that by mocking and bedevilling Hanson, journalists are compromising their responsibility as a public investigator and are thus failing their readers in providing a contextual account of Hanson's simplistic solutions to fundamental concerns, as reflected in her press releases. Thirdly, we will discern how Pauline Hanson as a person of ambivalent news significance could have been regarded and reported by the media.
Since Pauline Hanson’s maiden speech in Parliament on September 10, 1996, various studies have reiterated the common predisposition by mainstream journalists to frame Hanson’s popularity in the public sphere as a manifestation of bigotry and xenophobia presumably inherent in the national consciousness. (cf. Bell, Jakubowicz, Putnis, Meadows, Lewis, 1997). The ‘Hanson debate’ is consistently being constructed by the media to be a fundamental conflict between racist right-wing extremists on the periphery and supporters of ‘multiculturalism’ in the centre. This ‘ideological binary’ (Bell, 1997) has since guided the Australian journalistic construction and, thus, the public perception of Hanson’s identity.

Hanson’s vacuous political rhetoric, and provincial world view, was exposed in a critical evaluation of her maiden speech by political commentator Laura Tingle of The Age (2 August, 1997) in Melbourne. Tingle identified a total of 13 factual errors implicit in Hanson’s sweeping attack on national issues ranging from excessive Aboriginal handouts and unnecessarily high Asian immigration, to the government’s divisive multicultural policies and sell-out of Australian companies to foreign stockholders. Our concern, however, is not with the salient factual errors variously peddled by Hanson and, subsequently taken on board by the media. We are more concerned with the journalistic rationale and ideological values used by the media to transcribe, interpret, relay and even to create the events out of Hanson’s array of populistic public utterances.

Pauline Hanson, being an overnight figure of public significance, has become embedded in the collective consciousness as a symbol of pre-war racism and outback small-mindedness. Selective perception of Hanson’s agenda in news stories, features and commentaries has perpetuated her as an ‘Aussie battler’ and a thorn in the sides of mainstream politicians. Resting on the assumption that a journalist’s cognitive prejudice against Hanson is manifested in the journalist’s reporting, we suggest that journalists’ “cognitive maps” (Bennett: ibid) of Hanson can have a critical influence on how they view her public significance.

Stocking and Gross (ibid), in their analysis of journalists’ construction of reality have noted that this process could be looked at from the viewpoint of cognitive biases and errors frequently read in news reports. They argue that like everyone else, journalists understand events through the interaction between their experience and prior knowledge from memory, or their uniquely individual cognitive maps. Thus, a single event can be reported in as many different versions of the observed event or circumstance as there are people observing it. If journalists could better
understand the potential biases they may share, though not wilfully, with their readers, then they will probably be better equipped to report Pauline Hanson in a more realistic context. Henningham (1993) in a demographic study of Australian journalists’ noted that they tended to be more liberal rather than conservative in their political values and thus were more inclined to be sympathetic to and supportive of minority groups’ aspirations rather than being explicitly prejudiced against ethnic minorities as they were over a century ago. However, it is uncommon for journalists to acknowledge the subjectivity and value-laden process of news-making and the extent to which their latent personal prejudices, political values and professional norms could influence their reporting.

Since Hanson became a significant public figure, no studies have yet been done on how journalists’ personal perceptual bias of Hanson may manifest itself in their stories. What has been commonly concluded by impressionistic reading of news reports (Bell, et.al, 1997) is that Hanson is widely read as a political menace in the news, caricatured as a quirk in cartoons and parodied as a “Please Explain” ignoramus in the commercial network comedy program, Full Frontal, on Channel 9.

The exaggeration and distortion commonly applied in line-art cartoons and televisual parody of Hanson could be symptomatic of the media’s disposition to reduce complex issues into digestible and recognisable narrative capsules. The drama inherent in social conflicts and political deviance, for instance, is often over-reported with the use of melodramatic vocabulary, sensational headlines and imageries (cf. Loo & Sankaran, 1995; Loo & Hirst 1995; Bell 1987, 1993). News stories of this genre tend to capitalise on negative stereotypes of, for instance, protesters at One Nation party branch launches and often concentrate on harm or damage done to victims or the general public by One Nation party supporters.

In some instances, news coverage of deviancy actually assumes future harm or public inconvenience. This is quite evident in the sub-text of stories on the growing grassroots support for Hanson as foreshadowing Australia’s fall from grace in Asia; as indicative of inherent racism rearing its ugly head; or as predecting a shift of popular support away from the Liberal-National Party Coalition government to minor parties such as One Nation. Where such presumptions do not unfold as predicted, their non-occurrence may even then become the fuel for further news follow-up to fulfil the journalists’ speculations — thus the consistent trap of Hanson in the negative frame vis-a-vis the journalists’ choices of news angle, reactive interpretation of Hanson-related events, and linear organisation of the information along the cause-and-
This subjective processes of interpretation and re-interpretation commonly occurs throughout the news production chain, right from journalists’ input to the sub-editors’ rewriting, and finally, the readers’ decoding of the text.

Working from the platform of free market-oriented media system, journalists tend to focus on the attributes of amusement, conflict, human interest, or a combination of all the criteria to appeal to a mass audience (McManus, 1994). Given how little space is available for the newspapers to publish news which appeal to mainstream readers, journalists inevitably have to make a choice and rely on one or two primary news criteria. Since an event’s newsworthiness is related to its departure from what is considered to be “normal” as defined by the journalist and their primary sources, and considered to be “real” by the public, Hanson’s public persona as constructed by journalists can be seen to be largely influenced by this multilateral relationships between journalists and their mainstream primary sources and audience. By concentrating on Hanson’s deviance from “normal” politics, the news coverage of Hanson can be argued to be implicitly supporting the dominant norms and values of society.

Of significance to our inquiry is the informal value judgement that journalists, despite their mixed allegiances and politics as individuals, apply to events which they hope will help them make a reliable assessment of what will capture the widest attention in the market place. In this context, “news values” operate to produce a relatively standard product. The obsession with competition, speed and deadlines tends to elevate the importance of exclusiveness, conflict, deviance, timeliness and novelty in news judgements. This obsession results in identical Hanson-related texts as our discursive analysis of the broadsheet dailies, Sydney Morning Herald (SMH) and The Australian indicates.

Methodology

Our inquiry involves a comparative discursive analysis of prolonged journalistic interest in Pauline Hanson by SMH and The Australian in May 1997 — eight months after her maiden Parliamentary speech on September 10, 1996. The period of May was chosen because of the currency during the month of two national issues related to concerns Hanson cited in her maiden speech — unemployment, as in relation to the closure of BHP in Newcastle; and protection of home grown industries, as in relation to the freezing of tariffs in the automotive industry. The subject matter of the news stories were compared to those cited in her press releases issued in the same month by Pauline Hanson One
Nation party office in Manly, New South Wales. The comparison aims to locate the positioning or omission by journalists of Hanson’s concerns with mainstream issues as reflected in her press releases.

All stories on Pauline Hanson published by SMH and The Australian were searched by the SMH Quarterly CD-Rom and Presscom Illanet databases respectively using the keyword “Pauline [AND] Hanson”. The Australian published a total of 61 stories: News (40); Commentary (12); Features (5); Editorial (3); and Howard’s speech (1). SMH published a total of 52 stories: News (39); Commentary (9); and Editorial (4). The stories were read and categorised according to the following: Headlines; Subject Matter; Story Intro; Textual Location of Hanson; Textual Representation of Hanson. (For details of definitions and categories please refer to Notes)

Out of the total of 61 stories published in The Australian, slightly more than half (N=34) were weighted against Hanson, 29% (18) attempted to balance the scale by way of speculating on the background to Hanson’s apparent lack of policies. Only 1 story, a feature about her One Nation Party (Pauline’s People, 17/5), was explicitly weighted in Hanson’s favour by way of detailing the thrust of her party and profiling her advisers, Etteridge and Oldfield.

More than half (54%) of all The Australian stories had a news intro which were slanted against Hanson where she was consistently painted as an “empty populist” of “Stalinist ruthlessness”. Hanson was mainly located as a secondary actor, someone consistently subject to public scrutiny and acted upon by mainstream politicians. Hanson’s narrative was often threaded into the story as a defensive reaction to what others have said about her. For instance, out of a total of 164 direct quotes related to Hanson, 71% were attributed to mainstream politicians and other public figures. Hanson was only directly quoted in 28% of the stories. Hanson’s personal quotes were mainly to defend herself against ‘unfair reporting’ by the media and judgment by mainstream politicians. (Refer to Tables 1 & 2 next page).

The pattern in the SMH was even more anti-Hanson. Of 52 stories published by the SMH 75% were weighted against Hanson, while 19% attempted to balance the scale by presenting some multi-perspectivism. Interestingly, although 75% (39) of SMH stories were weighted against Hanson, only 56% (29) of stories had introductions that were slanted against Hanson. This difference is accounted for by the fact that generally, when SMH
Table 1: HANSON IN THE AUSTRALIAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Stories</th>
<th>Story Intro</th>
<th>Textual Location of Hanson</th>
<th>Textual Representation of Hanson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ve Slant</td>
<td>- +ve Slant</td>
<td>Direct Quotes About Hanson (Paragraphs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op-Eds/Commentaries</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard News, Features, Editorials</td>
<td>Commentary (12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature (5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard's Speech (1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (61)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF STORIES</td>
<td>STORY INTRO</td>
<td>TEXTUAL LOCATION OF HANSON</td>
<td>TEXTUAL REPRESENTATION OF HANSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ve Slant</td>
<td>+ ve Slant</td>
<td>Direct Quotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>About Hanson (Paragraphs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op-Eds/Commentaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard News, Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorials (4)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary (10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial (4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (52)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stories started by being balanced or pro-Hanson, they would switch at about the half-way point into a negative slant. Only three SMH stories could be characterised as being weighted in favour of Hanson.

An interesting feature of the SMH’s coverage was that Hanson was seldom allowed to speak for herself. Fifty-eight percent (30) of SMH stories involved the negative perceptions that ‘Other’ actors had of Hanson. Often the other actors were mainstream politicians effectively competing with One Nation for the same constituency. The SMH continually peddled a portrayal of Hanson as a simplistic narrow-minded racist who was dangerous — because she caused social division and damaged Australia’s image in Asia.

During May, the SMH carried two portrayals of Hanson supporters: in 24 stories (46%) they were portrayed as ‘beyond the pale’ extremists; a backward half-educated rabble who were selfish and misguided. In 15 stories (28%) they were presented as the fearful battlers forgotten by the main parties. The SMH stories suggested on a number of occasions that Hanson supporters were disaffected Coalition supporters. These views were presented as factual news, rather than as opinion. And a feedback-loop set in, with new stories feeding off past comments rather than reporting what Hanson or One Nation were saying.

In all, Hanson/One Nation were only directly quoted in 21% of SMH stories, but were seldom depicted to have the last word. Usually, when One Nation’s own voice was heard, it was counterbalanced by a negative quote, or by a journalistic qualification. The SMH only allowed Hanson/One Nation’s voice to be clearly dominant in two stories, both about the number of supporters One Nation was attracting. If there was a theme in the SMH’s and The Australian’s Hanson-reportage, it was the call to the Prime Minister, John Howard to act quickly to crush Hanson before her rhetoric reawakens the racist demon hidden in the Australian public conscience.

This finding aligns with Soloski’s (1989:214) study of news professionalism where he noted that journalists tend to report the news according to an ideological perspective that is consciously shared by members of the profession. Research literature has also theorised that the natural place to find newsworthy sources will be in the power structure of society because journalists see the current politico-economic systems as a naturally occurring state of affairs (Tuchman, 1978; Gans, 1979). Gans (1979:283) noted that journalists would inevitably cope with the realities of power by incorporating it into their news judgements. Tiffen (1989:ibid) likewise noted that Australian journalists’ sensitivity to their (mainstream) sources’ public statements and to their private
concerns and priorities helps to shape the definitions of news importance. The general agreement is that news sources, then, are normally drawn from the existing power structure; therefore news tends in most cases to support the status quo. Thus, in many ways the media agenda is initiated, shaped and sustained by mainstream sources’ agendas.

The textual submergence of Hanson points to a journalistic communication strategy of pegging a story onto a figure of controversy to drive another story of broader socio-political implications. For instance, Hanson was used to drive stories on unemployment, Asian immigration, Asian crime, multiculturalism, mismanagement of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC), plights of the Aussie battler in the outback, and Australia’s political and economic position in Asia. Features and commentaries used her as a referent point for other mainstream issues. Hanson was a mere trigger for other images of narrowmindedness, ignorance and right-wing extremities. For instance a columnist noted that “there should be no buts muddying our rejection of Hanson’s views as racist, bigoted, wrong and evil”. (Katte Legge, The Australian, 30/5).

The consistent appropriation of Hanson within the text as symbolical of a malaise and uncertainty felt by the grassroots seemed to create a degree of believability in the situation, some sort of a collective consciousness, to the extent that the difference between speculation and facts became somewhat blurred. Hanson was also located in the narrative in the context of being an agent for future adverse events, such as affecting Australia’s trade with Asia; reduction of Asian students coming to Australia; and undermining the efforts of the country’s policy of multiculturalism.

SMH stories commonly located Hanson as an embarrassment for Australia because, it was said, she would make Australia into a “pariah” nation (a new Australian form of ‘the cultural cringe’); or she would somehow open a Pandora’s box of evil passions and bigotry. The tone adopted in the Hanson-stories seemed to indicate that SMH staffers appeared to have a low opinion of their fellow-Australians — believing (fearing?) that a deep-seated undercurrent of racism existed in mainstream Australia, which was just waiting to be unleashed by someone like Hanson.

There were five press releases issued by Pauline Hanson’s One Nation Party in May with a significant comment on the closure of BHP in Newcastle, deportation of Korean permanent residents who commit crime in Australia, and Hanson’s reactions to Howard’s criticisms of her party. While journalists do have discretionary powers over what releases to use, it is common for journalists to rewrite, follow up, or totally ignore news releases.
PRESS RELEASES BY PAULINE HANSON'S ONE NATION PARTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headlines</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Angle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/5: Big Australian slams little Aussie</td>
<td>BHP Newcastle closure</td>
<td>BHP abandoning its workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5: Howard's gang show true colours</td>
<td>One Nation will grow despite political attacks</td>
<td>Hanson victimised, not a racist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5: Send them back</td>
<td>Deport Korean crims</td>
<td>Australian jails too good for criminals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/5: Howard a hypocrite</td>
<td>Reaction to Howard's criticism of One Nation</td>
<td>One Nation common sense policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/5: Anti-Hanson rally peaceful, thanks to us</td>
<td>Don't disrupt One Nation meetings</td>
<td>One Nation supporters tolerant and peaceful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is quite routine for journalists to believe that good practice requires them to obtain countervailing views to balance stories prompted by press releases. However, in Hanson's case, none of her releases were reported despite the generous news space she commanded in May. Similarly, when her political meetings were covered in the SMH, for example, more time was spent 'commenting' on Hanson and Hansonism than on actually reporting on the context of what Hanson said at the meetings so that readers could interpret these gatherings 'appropriately'.

Sixty-seven percent of the 40 news stories on Hanson in The Australian and 65% of the 52 stories in the SMH were focused on government criticisms and public protest against Hanson, or to blame Hanson as a menace and a cause of domestic economic problems. There seems to be a common suggestion of blame laid on Hanson for the country's problems ranging from the nation's economic position in Asia to domestic race relations. Her reactions and comments on public issues accounted for only 10% of the stories in The Australian and nil percent in the SMH. This underlines a news paradox where Hanson is treated as a significant news peg for mainstream issues but relegated to an insignificant position as far as a credible news source is concerned. (For details on findings of the content analysis, please refer to Notes).  
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Hansonism became far bigger than either Hanson herself or the One Nation Party. When “Hanson” was keyed into the databases it threw up an enormous number of “hits” because ‘the Hanson phenomenon’ got encoded into a variety of stories not directly related to Hanson at all. Hanson became a convenient scapegoat: an easily employable code that writers mobilise when seeking reasons for a wide range of Australia’s internal or external problems. She was picked on by organisations trying to excuse their failure to drum up overseas business; blamed for an increase in race-related altercations; or just used as a general ‘hook’ upon which to hang the general ‘unease’ felt by some people following the 1996 federal election results.

Ultimately, public discourse on Hanson and her supporters were created and framed by habitual journalistic capitalisation on social and political deviance as the driving force for breaking stories. Hanson’s concerns are run-of-the-mill issues that were articulated by dominant figures such as Graeme Campbell and Geoffrey Blainey in the mid-1980s, and political fringe parties like the Australians Against Further Immigration in the 1990s. Our interest is in trying to discern a rationale for the endemic journalistic obsession with Hanson since September 1996. In trying to locate a lead, it requires a speculative mapping out of journalistic attitudes towards Hanson as a political player, and their reading of grassroots’ sentiments. Four intuitive themes will now be explored in this regard.

The descriptor “Hanson” has slipped into a short-hand code for sloppy journalism. “Hanson” graduated from a Liberal ‘cast-off’ at the height of the Federal election campaign, to a spunky red-haired fish-and-chip shop owner and an “Oxley-moron”. She embodies the ‘deviance’ from what Australian ‘mainstream’ politicians would see as ‘acceptable’ political behaviour and speech. Thus, understanding Hansonism as a discourse would require examining ‘mainstream-ness’ in mid-1990s Australia. This means grappling with the angst, as evident from the concerns of the One Nation supporters, that permeates Australian grassroots as the effects of globalization and post-Fordism hit home.

The 1980s saw Australians turn their backs on what Paul Kelly has called the protective shields of the Deakin Settlement and instead opt to enter into the economic and cultural uncertainties of globalization (Kelly, 1994). The 1980s were consequently a period of “creative destruction” (Kelly, 1994: 13) during which Australians began the (painful) process of restructuring their economy and re-tooling and re-skilling...
themselves for a post-Fordist globalized future. The new 'national' goal was to become “the clever country” — a highly skilled, wired-up population, able to find and exploit market niches thrown up by a globalizing world (especially in Pacific-rim Asia). So Australians — under the Hawke-Keating governments — turned their backs on modernist, isolationist white-Anglo nationalism and immersed themselves into a world awash with postmodern significations.

Australia’s “creative destruction” has gone through a number of stages. The first phase was initiated by the 1983 Accord deal — which involved the creation of a de facto corporatist state-trade union-business alliance. The Accord set in motion the destruction of Australia’s old economic order built upon tariff and labour protections. Having created this corporatist settlement, the Australian Labor Party (ALP) then deregulated the financial market beginning with the 1983 removal of exchange control. This had the effect of dumping Australia into a global post-Fordizing economy. The shift initiated a new economic discourse: “Asianising” Australia’s economy; “international competitiveness”, creating a “productive culture” (and “productivity-linked wages”), “working smarter” (and the “clever country”), “globalization”, “export-orientedness”, “privatising state assets”, “small government”, “industry deregulation”, getting on board the “information superhighway”, and “lower taxation” (so as not to chase away investors and skills).

The second phase of ‘creative destruction’ saw the ALP government systematically attack the symbolic underpinnings of modernist white nationalist Australia, and attempt to create a new Australian vision more in keeping with the ‘needs’ of a globalizing economy. Amongst the symbolic elements of reconstructing Australia were the promotion of a multicultural discourse and an Aboriginal-rights agenda; and attacking Australia’s “imperial” heritage by promoting the image of Australia as a part of Asia and wind back the trade union movement, and intensify the impact of managerialism and economic rationalism.

The point about these socio-economic changes is that they are producing in Australia a new set of protagonists and antagonists of globalisation. By-and-large, Hanson and the One Nation Party have come to represent the antagonists, those employed in the old Fordist-industries and working behind tariff-barriers and most threatened by globalization, de-industrialisation, de-regulation and “Asianisation”. This is one half of the Hanson-phenomenon. The other half can be found in the motivations of the protagonists whose power positions and interests are being bolstered by the ‘globalization’ of the Australian economy.

Effectively, the demonisation of Hanson involved a de facto
alliance of all the protagonists. Three categories suggest themselves: businessmen engaged in the global economy; those administering the policy-shifts required to globalize Australia (i.e. both the ALP and Coalition have effectively been engaged in a bi-partisan management of this process); and those involved in the emergent (post-Fordist) 'symbolic economy' (including academics and journalists). 'Mainstream-ness' in 1990s Australia involves a de facto alliance among these three categories of people — each has been involved in promoting the re-jigging of Australia's economic and political culture.

A uniform 'mainstream' discourse emerged after 1983 which excluded the concerns of the antagonists — thus creating a sentiment of being excluded, disfranchised, and abandoned (a battle cry of One Nation supporters). In September 1996, Hanson came along and upset the apple-cart by articulating views that resonated with these 'silent majority'. Hanson shattered the discourse-closure ('political correctness' to Hanson) that the mainstream had been so effective in creating. In a very real sense "Hansonism" is thus a construct that involves the demonisation of Hanson by the protagonists of globalization. The shrillness with which Hanson has been attacked seems to indicate that One Nation is indeed an insidious threat — at least to those involved in the ALP-Coalition bi-partisan process of re-jigging Australia without due regard to the economic, cultural and social costs for sections of their constituencies.

Likewise, journalists as a social group have their own agenda. As key players in the symbolic economy journalists are part of the 'New Class' (Disco, 1987) — they have been centrally involved in framing the discourses on the realities of globalization. A globalized cosmopolitan and information-based society is more likely to suit the interests of an intellectual (journalist or academic) than is an industrial and 'closed' Anglo-nationalist society. Consequently, as a social category, journalists would be more inclined to empathise with those in Canberra attacking Hanson, rather than with the One Nation's vision of a homogeneous white Anglo society. This produced a symbiotic relationship in which key journalists/editors formed a working relationship with Canberra politicians (and academics and global business-players) to steer the Hansonite discourse towards the negative linkage of Hanson to 'racist bigotry' and 'a threat to Australia'. Hansonism was consequently a discourse that resonates comfortably with the dominant ideology of journalists (and other members of the New Class). Being seen to be a protagonist of globalisation would seem to be a more acceptable professional attribute than one that reeks of Hanson's insular worldviews.
Both racism and Anglo-ethnocentrism have featured strongly in Australia's past. Terms used by journalists to describe Aborigines have ranged from "murderous wretches" and "black animals" to "filthy, brutal cannibals" while the Chinese have been variously referred to "worthless hordes of idolatrist barbarians, destitute of religion and morality" (Hornadge, 1976). The Bulletin magazine, for more than 80 years since its inception on 31 January 1880 summed up the general public sentiments at that time under its masthead: "Australia for the White Man" until it was changed by Donald Horne in 1960 to "Australia for Australians". Up until the 1970s, newspapers had portrayed Chinese (and Asians in general) as an aberrant class tolerated (rather than accepted or appreciated) by mainstream society. The "Asianisation" threat (Blainey, 1984) and its racist predicates, whether factual or fictional, is continually resuscitated by fringe political parties and lately by Hanson, transcribed by the media, and challenged by academics.

The symbolic deconstruction-reconstruction of Australia since the 1980s can be seen as an attempt to shed the Anglo-racism and re-invent Australia as a 'multicultural' and 'racially tolerant' society. To Hanson, those supporting the "multiculturalism industry" are the "fat cats, bureaucrats and the do-gooders... (who) screamed the loudest because they stand to lose the most - their power, money and position" (10 September, 1996) if multiculturalism as a national policy is shelved. Many of Australia's intelligentsia who were involved in this symbolic reconstruction appear to share two traits: firstly an embarrassment at their country's blatant racist past; and secondly a guilt that many of their fellow citizens still harbour Anglo-racist sentiments. Hansonism seems to have been as much a reflection of the cultural cringe of the intelligentsia as to do with the hollow ideology and caricatured peculiarities of Hanson herself.

Essentially Hanson seems to have become a 'mirror' for the intelligentsia. Hanson was effectively not looked at as a legitimate political entity. Rather she became a means of reflecting a picture of the 'darker side' of one's own community, perhaps even the 'darker side' of one's own (repressed?) personal ethnocentrism. Hanson was like "the other" within. Journalists do not see Hanson for her political concerns — they see a stereotype of what they have constructed out of Hanson. This stereotype is what is presumably reflected back and relegated to the shame file. That is what Hansonism as a discourse seemed to capture — she became the caricature of redneck bigotry. In many ways she became a mirror for the intelligentsia's own angst and, ultimately, a form of self-flagellation and 'guilt'.

Hanson, of course, could serve the role of this sort of 'mirror' very well. Because she did not behave like a street-wise politician,
she effectively 'allowed' herself to be caricatured — to be made into the (demonised) "other". For any journalists seeking a stereotype to fit into a simplistic formula, Hanson was a godsend. Certainly at the start of the process of inventing the Hansonite discourse, she became a partner in constructing the 'mirror'. Once constructed, however, Hanson became almost irrelevant to the pictures being reflected back.

Complex societies create an intelligentsia that revels in multiple layers of experience and meaning. Complex societies tend to fragment into 'tribal' loyalties. (Such 'tribes' can congeal around various identities, for example: ethnicity, class, gender, 'historical commonality'). In such societies, the intelligentsia expect conflict and passion: 'truth' is effectively relativised. Despite claims to being a 'multicultural' and complex society, Australia is actually a remarkably (Anglo-derivative) homogenous society given the enormous geographical distances separating population centres. Australia is ultimately much more akin to the sort of 'one-dimensional' society identified by Herbert Marcuse (1964) wherein any 'differences' are carefully managed and homogeneity encouraged. As a liberal-pluralist society the 'extremes' are shunned in favour of the appearance of competition at the 'centre'. Hence, the ALP and Coalition government — who share a bi-partisan approach to some issues — effectively engage in a tweedledee and tweedledum 'conflict'. Within this scenario the intelligentsia becomes partisan — they are overwhelmingly in favour of the 'sensible' centre. Views deviating from the mainstream consensus are unacceptable and hence become legitimate targets for attack. If the Hanson phenomenon is anything to go by, Australian journalists appear to believe that they have a 'right' or even a 'duty' to work against the 'tribalisation' (ie. de-homogenisation) of Australia. (Only officially sanctioned and stage-managed 'multiculturalism' — which actually serves to confirm the 'homogeneous centre' — is permissible).

The reactions of journalists towards Hanson reflected an anti-complexity, (and even anti-democratic) worldview — ie. an 'anti-Hanson' dogmatism was warranted because being partisan in favour of the 'sensible centre' was viewed as acceptable. This journalist behaviour is in many ways merely reflective of mainstream Australian worldview that ironically serves to confirm the very sort of 'homogeneity' that Hanson herself appeared to favour. If Hanson was 'anti-difference', so too was the journalistic intolerance displayed towards Hanson's constituency. Both Hanson and her journalist detractors ironically seemed to operate
within a rather similar (Australian-homogenising) cognitive map — one that shuns multiple layers of experience, and one that views 'difference' as a liability rather than as an asset. The so-called "Hanson debate" was thus, if anything, symptomatic of an anti-debate culture — instead of a multi-dimensional debate one had a one-dimensional diatribe which seemed perfectly content to feed almost entirely of itself within a self-enclosed, self-referential bubble.

Journalists manufacturing Hansonism also demonstrated an extraordinary elitism — there was an underlying disposition of self-congratulatory arrogance at being part of the educated and 'informed' Sydney-Melbourne-Canberra triangle. Seemingly, for journalists operating within the dominant triangular discourse, there was an unquestionable 'correctness' to their own world view. Linked to this was a condescending tone towards Hanson and her constituency for being outside the educated elite. This was especially the case in the SMH's coverage of Hansonism. Hanson's supporters were simply dismissed as rednecks and/or as the ignorant masses. Consequently, their views therefore did not have to be taken seriously because they were 'beyond the pale' of mainstream ('triangle') 'correctness'.

It is possible that this condescending attitude towards the 'masses' by the Press could actually have served as a source of recruitment for the One Nation Party. For those already feeling unsettled by the globalization spirit of the Sydney-Melbourne-Canberra elite, this journalistic tone would have only served to confirm their sense of being 'marginalised'. And it was 'victimhood' borne out of being demonised by mainstream politicians and the media that Hanson played on so effectively in drawing supporters to herself. She appealed to her constituency precisely because she was seen as not being part of the Sydney-Melbourne-Canberra elite, and to be standing up against the very sort of closed discourse mobilised by the elites through the media (like the SMH, The Australian, and Australian Broadcasting Corporation, ABC) or in Parliament. Ironically, the media discourse of Hansonism may well have been one of Hanson's best assets. Journalists, by being seen to identify so closely with the dominant discourse, may have helped to mobilise the very phenomenon they came to despise.
Journalists are known to play a key role in conveying public knowledge about social groups and events that most mainstream group members have little direct knowledge. In this light, journalists also construct an ideological framework for their audience's interpretation of events. This framework acts to legitimise social prejudices and discrimination against groups deemed to be deviant. In the case of Hansonism the media placed Hanson (or a particular discourse about Hanson) onto the public agenda and kept it there for about a year.

Hansonism took on some of the characteristics of crime wave reporting as discussed by Fishman (1981). It took on a life of its own in which a sense of menace and public concern fed upon itself. Journalists initially manufactured a picture of Hanson, focussing in particular on her racist remarks as they made good sensational headlines. In addition, she was portrayed as a menacing phenomenon. This portrayal created fear in some sectors — especially in the immigrant communities and amongst those whose futures were tied to the post-Fordist globalizing economy. These sectors, naturally enough, began criticising Hanson as a political figure and then graduated to criticising “Hansonism” as she became increasingly 'marginal' to the media discourse.

The criticisms were, of course, then picked up by journalists and fed into the system where they served to re-confirm the stereotyping, denomination and fear that were integral elements of the Hansonite discourse which increasingly grew into a spiral of meta comments, thus cutting out alternative interpretation of Hanson which her public would have liked journalists to consider. The discourse became a self-contained, self-referential media-made phenomenon. It appeared to become routinized within the media institutions — Hanson became an "eternal recurrence" within the Australian news media (Rock, 1981). As with the reporting of a crime wave, 'Hanson' became an entrenched feature of a news-gathering bureaucracy locked into reporting a '(racist) menace' which was, in part, a 'menace' manufactured for consensual validation by the media itself.

In his study of racism in the media, Van Dijk (1987) notes that readers' personal views and attitudes are acquired through processes of socialisation, education, communication, and interaction. This process of social information processing is traditionally communicative and discursive. People hear and read about issues and form their opinions within this discourse. This is reminiscent of media audience's habitual dependency on conventional mass media for legitimisation of their views and prejudices (DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach, 1989), and to an extent establish and maintain a communal solidarity and oneness.

As public discourse on Hanson is being dominated by
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journalists, who see Hanson as a gendered political oddity, journalists have effectively worked towards the alienation of sections of the population, such as Hanson and her supporters, thus simplistically bifurcating the media audience between pro-Hanson and anti-Hanson camps. This places in doubt the adequacy of the dominant consensual news paradigm in the reporting of Pauline Hanson. The internal culture of the news-gathering process, and the socialisation of journalists in the news organisation seems to produce results that are highly similar with a common sense of what Pauline Hanson is all about across both the SMH and The Australian.

While Hanson did make those offensive anti-Asian remarks, she has other political and social issues on her agenda which were overlooked by mainstream reporters. The arguments of mainstream media in the prevalence of Hanson in the news pages is that her views on Asians and Aboriginal Australians are of “public interest”. Likewise, Hanson seems to subscribe to the same principle of “public interest” in repudiating political correctness by latching on to her views about Asian immigration, Aboriginal welfare, and nationalisation of local industries. “Public interest” was used as a broad and vague vindication for condescending remarks both by the press of Hanson, by Hanson of Asians, and by the Others who disagree with her.

Hanson’s right to communicate her views and the citizens’ right to be informed of the contexts of her views were being limited by the private interests, value judgements and, in some cases, the personal biases and prejudices of journalists and their sources. There may be an imbalance between what the journalists and their sources want to say and what others want to hear. Whether the information and opinions communicated created a broader context for understanding the poorly articulated concerns of Hanson and her supporters is harder to enunciate. If journalists are to balance their reports on Hanson within their contexts, the reasons for her growing grassroots’ support and loathing by mainstream politicians of Hanson need to be further explored.

Hanson herself may go away, but the constituency she has come to represent is likely to remain, and even grow, as the post-Fordist shakedown of Australian society gathers momentum. Postfordism and globalization will have its share of antagonists and protagonists. If democracy is taken seriously, then the antagonists, as an emergent constituency, have as much a right to be heard as the protagonists. And they have a right to be heard speaking in their own voices — not as interpreted by opposition politicians, academics or journalists. At the moment Hanson does not appear to represent a particularly large constituency. But no matter how big, or small, this constituency becomes, their concerns,
their fears, their anger, and even their bigotry, have to be seen as a legitimate part of Australia’s democratic process.

Our limited study of Hansonism provided a convenient reference point from which to view Australian journalistic practices. Simply focussing on one month’s reportage of Hanson in The Australian and SMH revealed some serious shortcomings in these practices. For one thing journalists painted Hanson as a one-dimensional figure. “Hanson” became a mere peg upon which journalists relayed their own prejudices and phobias (such as their fear of ‘racism’; and their ‘cultural cringe’ about what ‘others’ might think of Australia). This may indicate that journalism training programs need to spend some time on examining the ethical and political implications of journalists using their position to promote a particular consensual worldview.

The reporting of Hanson also revealed a tendency to rely on officialdom, oral statements and reactions by the ‘intelligentsia’ to Hanson as a basis for their running stories. Assertions were taken to be “true” or “factual” rather than as mere “hypotheses” to be examined within the context of Hanson’s real concerns. This raises a second question related to journalism training: How can journalists be taught to expand on their journalistic “control” and “autonomy” in terms of being less dependent on the “official” interpretation and “officialdom” for news?

Thirdly, journalists involved in constructing the Hanson discourse appear to believe in their own preferred discourse, despite the lack of sustained analysis, as providing some form of self-evident ‘truth’. In this regard, perhaps aspirant journalists need to be (taught to be) more self-reflexive about their own cognitive maps — particularly in relation to the full spectrum of cognitive maps in society — so that journalists may rise from an ethnographic and descriptive style (at worst a perspective of systematic distortion) to one allowing sustained analysis. Only when journalists become aware of the forces acting on and influencing over their perception of news can a sense of ‘objectivity’ and fairness be claimed in news practices.

Fourthly, journalism training programs may also need to engage with their students about the role of journalism in a democracy — that is, should journalists be facilitating debate/dialogue or should they be merely engaged in helping to manufacture a social consensus. Journalists need to consider whether by being too enmeshed in the dominant discourse (of the liberal-pluralist centre) it ultimately does democracy a great disservice by helping to create a discourse-closure. Hanson’s views offered the possibility of generating a REAL multi-perspectival debate. Instead a one-dimensionality was evident because journalists allowed the elements of ‘political correctness’ to set
the parameters of how they dealt with Hanson. The failure to help facilitate a real debate seems indicative of a journalistic disrespect for diverse public opinion formation.

Lastly, the way in which Hanson was caricatured and One Nation's platform simplified down to 'racism' alone did Australian journalism a great disservice. Since journalists are the product of journalism training programs, some self-reflection on the part of journalism educators of their reaction to Hanson and her media representation is perhaps called for. What are the ethical and professional ramifications of training journalists who believe it is acceptable to mock those one does not like; to use the media to 'push a line'; and to be disrespectful of one's audience by not giving them the varied contexts in which the information was gathered, transcribed and relayed?

Our limited study of the press reporting of Hanson would seem to indicate that a critical inquiry into this phenomenon of media construction of consent (Chomsky, 1987) is called for. "Hansonism" as a journalistic construct could conceivably lend itself to a number of future research projects. Firstly, instead of looking at only two metropolitan newspapers over a one month period, a much larger study would seem to be in order. Hansonism as a media phenomenon seemed to run for just over one year — from September 1996 until the start of South East Asian economic crisis in October 1997. A study of this entire period, across a greater range of the Australian media would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between Hansonism and the dominant news paradigm. It may for example be interesting to see what, if any, differences there were between the reportage of Hanson in the Sydney and Brisbane provincial press.

Secondly, even our limited study threw up a number of interesting questions about journalist's professional/personal attitudes, self-definitions and news practices. A proper examination of journalistic attitudes (in part to test the sort of speculative ideas raised in this article) is proposed. This would involve interviewing those journalists, columnists and editorial writers who have produced the Hanson-related materials.

Thirdly, a study of the way in which Australian reportage of Hanson has influenced the foreign press would be a logical next step. This would necessarily be a multi-dimensional project which would, in part build upon the mapping of Hansonism in the Australian media as proposed above. Three separate features of the foreign coverage of Hanson suggest themselves: (a) the way
in which Australian-produced stories have been picked up by wire services, put into the system, and used in other contexts. The Hanson phenomena provides a useful peg upon which to hang such a study of news-flows out of Australia; (b) foreign correspondents based in Australia could be interviewed to ascertain the various influences on their reportage of Hanson; (c) foreign editors could be interviewed about their usage of Hanson material.

The point is the Hanson phenomenon has thrown up a number of issues pertaining to the creation and circulation of political discourses and the role of journalists in this process. It is a phenomenon worthy of much more study, even if Hanson herself fades out and dies as an issue.

NOTES

1. All headlines were transcribed and their syntax coded for whether Hanson is the signifier of the news event or the signified. The story intro involves a reading of the first three paragraphs of each story on the premise that the leading news elements would according to conventions be located up front in an inverted pyramidal structured narrative, thus setting the tone of the story. The textual location of Hanson involves the identification of direct quotes about Hanson by a third party in respective paragraphs; and quotes by Hanson herself. Indirect speech and paraphrases about Hanson were omitted on the assumption that direct quotes are more reflective of the sentiments of the speaker than that which are re-interpreted through the journalistic process of paraphrasing. Contextual location of Hanson refers to the impression of Hanson created by the overall narrative of the story and the extent of backgrounding provided by the story in placing Hanson in the context of mainstream political concerns. Textual representation of Hanson refers to whether the overall story has been weighted against or for Hanson, or whether it shows any evidence of trying to balance the discourse. The detailed definitions are:

**Headlines:** divided into News; Op-eds/Commentaries; Features; Editorials.

**Story Intro:** The first three paragraphs of the story were coded in three categories - "-ve Slant", "-+ Slant" (i.e. mediatory) or "+ve Slant". "-ve Slant" are stories which start with for instance - "McDonald's restaurants dumped Independent federal MP Ms Pauline Hanson from a planned appearance at their outlets in Perth today because of fears for customer safety". (The Australian, May 3-4).

**Textual Location of Hanson:** This is to find out whether Hanson is the primary definer in the story, or whether she is being defined by another principal actor, such as Howard, Kennett, and other public figures. This will involve a count of the number of paragraphs of direct quotes
Hanson by others or direct quotes by Hanson. Indirect speech and paraphrases of what Hanson said is omitted based on the premise that direct quotes are theoretically more reflective of what Hanson actually said rather than what the reporter or others think Hanson said.

**Contextual Location of Hanson:** This is to locate the positioning of Hanson within the story. Is she placed against the background of previous events which led to her construction as a significant political player; or is she placed against what others say will happen if her rhetoric goes unchallenged.

**Textual Representation of Hanson:** The representation of Hanson is coded in three categories: Weighted Against Hanson; Balancing the Scale; and Weighted For Hanson. Where for instance Hanson is criticised as a moron, a racist, etc, it is coded as Weighted Against Hanson. Where Hanson’s advisers eg. Etteridge, Oldfield, et.al. defend Hanson and explain what she is really all about, it is coded as “Weighted For Hanson”. However, if commentators like Frank Devine and Geoffrey Blainey explain Hanson’s position but do not condone her racial policies, it is coded as “Balancing the Scale”.

2. **CONTEXTS OF NEWS REPORTS IN THE AUSTRALIAN**

* People’s anxiety caused Hanson rise to fame.
* Hanson’s exploitation of people’s anxiety similar to Howard’s strategy.
* Hanson is a catalyst for growth of right-wing extremist groups.
* Hanson appeals to “dysfunctional people” and motivated by racial intolerance, xenophobia and misinformation.
* She would make Australia a “pariah” nation.
* Her cure would be worse than the disease.
* Hanson is a mouthpiece for the intolerant, angry and right wing youths.
* She is playing to the dark side of human nature.
* She is scheming and manipulative of our hidden appeal to prejudice.
* She is resurrecting Australia’s racist past.
* Hanson is chronically anti-Asian and anti-Aboriginal.
* Hanson is confused about her own policies and statements.
* She lacks substance but is still a popular figure with the battlers.

**Subject Matter:**

**News:** Domestic economic issues
* PM laments age of uncertainty (1/5)
* Fears rise for foreign student market (2/5)
* Tourists ignore racism debate (8/5)
* PM cuts family reunion migrants (22/5)
* Migrant cuts tied to jobless, says PM (23/5)
* Hansonism hurts tourism industry (23/5)

**News:** Government criticism, public protest of Hanson
* Downer rejects the Hanson vision (2/5)
* Business urged on to anti-Hanson role (2/5)
* McDonalds drops Hanson speech off menu (3-4/5)
* Ministers lash Hanson (5/5)
* Tomatoes fly in Wild West (5/5)
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* Hanson not welcome, Asians say (5/5)
* Critic invokes memories of Nazis (6/5)
* Howard says protests act to help Hanson (6/5)
* Protests help Hanson: Howard (7/5)
* Asia hails cabinet attacks on Hanson (8/5)
* PM declares Hanson wrong and wrong again (9/5)
* Asianise or perish (10/5)
* Protest aborts Hanson launch (10/5)
* Hills alive with sound of hatred (12/5)
* PM cold on plans to beat Hanson (13/5)
* Asian paper attacks MP (17/5)
* PM denies Libs will back Hanson (17/5)
* Hansonites outdone by ethnic celebration (20/5)
* Hanson takes my rejects: Campbell (23/5)
* Hansonism reaches far horizons (24/5)
* Thousands turn out to praise or heckle Hanson (31/5)

News: Opinion poll/election
* Hanson surge spooks MPs (6/5)
* One Nation up, Coalition down (6/5)
* Hanson has hotline to Joh (12/5)
* Filing basks in the Hanson spotlight (12/5)
* Hanson rolls on as PM’s support falls (13/5)
* Hayden goes for Hanson head on (17/5)
* Hint of Hanson in by-election result (26/5)

News: Hanson direct involvement with public issues
* Hanson backs Bryant gun (6/5)
* Assimilation saved lives: Hanson (22/5)
* Cultural diversity costs $1bn a year, Hanson claims (26/5)
* Hanson retreats on Asians and blacks (31/5)

News: Miscellaneous
* Author drops cover to claim Hanson book (9/5)
* Jull queries Hanson travel claims (21/5)

Commentary:
* Anxiety highlights Howard’s failure (1/5)
* A little leadership could help dispel this dangerous bigotry (6/5)
* Hearts must guide response to Hanson (7/5)
* Rebuttal, but it’s months too late (9/5)
* Hanson’s words should be heard (9/5)
* At last, a clear rejection of politics of prejudice (9/5)
* Hanson’s words should be heard (17/5)
* I don’t agree with the Member of Oxley on everything, but ... (17/5)
* Coalition’s quiet Hansonism undermines Pauline’s pitch (17/5)
* The target is ‘Hansonomics’ (19/5)
* Howard’s flip-flops put his credibility at risk (20/5)
* You can’t split the Hansonite agenda (20/5)
* Howard’s Speech to Australian-Asian Society in Sydney (9/5)
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Features:
* Messiahs of the Right (3&4/5)
* The Asian Imperative (10/5)
* Pauline's People (17/5)
* The Immigration Puzzle: Migrants take jobs? (24/5)
* Pauline Hanson: Fellow Travellers (31/5)

Editorial:
* Race has no place in migrant plan (5/5)
* PM faces more work on race (10/5)
* PM's mixed messages on Hanson (15/5)

CONTEXTS OF NEWS REPORTS IN SYDNEY MORNING HERALD
The key issues were:
* Howard needs to display leadership and act to crush Hanson
* Hanson's support is growing (at the expense of the coalition)
* Hanson is causing conflict in Australia
* Hanson is wrecking Australia's overseas image which is bad for the economy.

News: Criticism of Hanson
* PM ignores warnings of Hanson furor (1/5)
* Downer's call to fight and destroy Hanson's views (2/5)
* Stop the division: Kennett (3/5)
* Top guns turned on Hanson (5/5)
* Race fears may hurt overseas uni trade (6/5)
* Judge hits at hurtful Hanson views (6/5)
* Bangkok press attacks PM on Hanson (8/5)
* Sour, bitter Hanson exploiting fear says MP (9/5)
* Farmers say future markets put at risk (10/5)
* Hanson's back-door accusations slammed (10/5)
* Relations hurt by new party (10/5)
* Plea for a honey-coloured society (10/5)
* Hanson backlash (15/5)
* University Chiefs condemn rise of politics of division (26/5)
* Hanson seen speaking for Australia warns Hawaiian leader (26/5)

News: Backlash and/or protest against Hanson
* Small firm owners ask Hanson for payments (3/5)
* Protesters hurl tomatoes, eggs and insults (5/5)
* Hobart protesters silence Hanson (10/5)
* One Nation under siege (14/5)
* Clans claim the Corso in Hanson protest (19/5)
* 1200 supporters 400 protesters and 350 police. Is this One Nation? (31/5)

News: One Nation gains support
* One Nation gets 9000 inquiries (1/5)
* One nation, two staff and lots of callers (3/5)
* Howard unable to derail the Hanson roller-coaster (8/5)
* Liberal MP's staffer defects to Hanson
One Nation is thriving on adversity as a disenchanted grassroots lifts its popularity (13/5)
* Hanson support forces back down (17/5)
* Extremists not welcome, says One Nation party chief (26/5)

News: Opinion poll/election
* Aging warrior may lose the fight (5/5)
* Hanson boost for Labour (6/5)
* Hayden out to stop Hanson (17/5)

News: Miscellaneous
* Book’s sinister link (5/5)
* No-names book that no-one wants to call his own (5/5)
* Hanson backers vow to make her book a never-ending story (7/5)
* Immigration intake may be cut further (7/5)
* Beyond the pale with Pauline (12/5)
* Abolishing ATSIC my top priority, reveals Hanson (12/5)
* Liberal vote to bolster Hanson (14/5)
* PM denies bowing to Hanson on migrant cuts (23/5)
* Hanson left isolated (28/5)

Commentary:
* Hanson’s populist propaganda feeds on pain (1/5)
* Time to hammer Hanson (2/5)
* The horse has bolted (3/5)
* Hiding from Hanson (3/5)
* Debating the politics of hate with positive, tolerant actions (7/5)
* Listen to the real message (15/5)
* Political intolerance is not the right ticket (17/5)
* One message for One Nation (27/5)

Editorial:
* Leadership (1/5)
* Hanson: PM has a duty (6/5)
* Howard nails Hanson lies (10/5)
* No Preference (19/5)

3. The term “mainstream” refers to a collective group of people who are numerically, socially, economically, culturally and politically central to the media reporting of public issues and events. It applies specifically to people who constitute part of the ruling elite which does not preclude Hanson and her constituencies. From a historical context, “mainstream” Australians, seen by the media and Hanson thus refers to white Anglo Australians.

4. This was the year Hawke/Keating started Australia’s postfordist revolution by deregulating the financial sector. It was a move that had bipartisan support. That moment marked the beginning of a gradual move away from “fortress australia” because once the financial sector was globalized, the rest had to follow. That is, of course, what Hanson and her followers overlook (and what journalists should understand).
5. The belief that journalistic partisanship was acceptable would have been dramatically enhanced by the belief that Hanson represented 'racism'. The dominant discourses within which the overwhelming majority of 1990s Australian intelligentsia operated would have viewed even a hint of 'racism' as so completely unacceptable, that attacking Hanson would have been automatically legitimated as a pro-democracy (rather than an anti-democratic) action.
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