

[Open Peer Review on Qeios](#)

Unraveling Populism: Senator Fraser Anning and the Australian Political Landscape

Adrian David Cheok¹

¹ iUniversity Tokyo

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract

This chapter delves into the intriguing political journey of Senator Fraser Anning, a pivotal figure in Australian politics, renowned for his staunch advocacy of populism and economic nationalism. Anning's emergence as a populist leader is contextualized within the broader canvas of Australia's evolving political discourse, highlighting his unique approach and the resonant impact on the national stage. The chapter meticulously examines Anning's ideological stances, from his early political awakening to his tenure in the Senate, offering insights into the complexities of his policies and public perception. Through a detailed analysis of Anning's speeches, legislative initiatives, and the ensuing public and media reactions, this study provides a critical evaluation of his influence on Australian political dynamics. Furthermore, it juxtaposes Anning's approach with global populist trends, offering a comprehensive understanding of his legacy and the future trajectory of populism and economic nationalism in Australia.

Senator Fraser Anning: The Emergence of a Populist Leader

Early Life and Political Awakening

The trajectory of Fraser Anning into the realm of Australian politics (Cheok, 2021) serves as a compelling illustration of the interplay between personal experience and broader societal shifts toward populism and economic nationalism. Anning's foray into politics was, in many ways, unanticipated, and his rise underscored a spontaneous alignment of personal conviction and the opportune political tide.

Early Life and Political Engagement

Born into a socio-political landscape shaped by Australia's longstanding democratic traditions and economic challenges, Fraser Anning's early experiences were largely removed from the political sphere. Occupied with pursuits in agriculture, aviation, and hospitality, Anning's early career was rooted in the quintessential Australian industrious spirit (Cheok, 2021). However, these investments of labor and enterprise bore a political dimension, as Anning navigated the difficulties of tax burdens and governmental policies that affected the sustained viability of such ventures.

Operating within the spheres of agriculture and business instilled in Anning an appreciation for self-reliance and the sanctity of private enterprise. Bearing witness to both the fruits and follies of government policies, Fraser Anning developed a critical perspective on state intervention and bureaucratic reach. It was this foundational understanding of both the facilitative and obstructive potential of government that steered Anning toward political engagement.

The Political Awakening

The nexus of Anning's political awakening revolved around his encounters with the then-emerging figure of Pauline Hanson. The alignment of their views on economic self-determination and skepticism toward unchecked immigration marked the beginning of a cooperative relationship that would later evolve into pivotal political involvement (Cheok, 2021). This relationship was instrumental in shaping Anning's political consciousness, aligning him with a set of ideals poised to challenge established economic and political norms.

The political camaraderie with Hanson, and the subsequent kinship with the One Nation party, became the crucible within which Anning's political identity was honed. Despite initial reticence, Anning became progressively entrenched in the political landscape, embodying the nascent attributes of a populist leader with a firm lean toward economic nationalism.

Anning's transformation from citizen to Senator was not merely a personal evolution but a microcosm of the populist surge that gripped Australia and mirrored international currents. His political emergence reflected broader patterns of profound disenchantment with mainstream politics and a fervent clamor for decisive leadership that echoed the collective sentiments of economic sovereignty and national integrity.

In analyzing Fraser Anning's inception and conduits into a significant political role, it becomes evident that his trajectory was not an aberration but a confluence of historical underpinnings and the ruling zeitgeist. Anning's political ascension, recounted in "Populism and Economic Nationalism: Australia's First Populist Politician, Senator Fraser Anning," provides a narrative that is emblematic of populist leaders' climb to prominence in the contemporary political theater (Cheok, 2021). Through this lens, Anning's journey is emblematic of the complex and potent forces that drive the emergence of populist

leaders on the global stage.

Rise to the Senate: A Political Journey

Senator Fraser Anning's entry into the Australian Senate may be seen as a convergence of personal resolve and political contingency. Anning's ascension follows a narrative arc that is both unexpected and emblematic of certain populist trends within Australian politics. Prior to his surprise induction into the Senate, Anning was involved in various pursuits, indicative of a man connected to both the land and entrepreneurial spirit of the country. His hands-on involvement with the Snowflake Café in America and adherence to stringent business standards demonstrate an individual grounded in pragmatism and personal accountability.

It is within this context that Anning's political career must be understood. Despite his initial reluctance to embrace a life in politics, his trajectory changed considerably when, due to the dual citizenship crisis that plagued the 45th Parliament of Australia, a seat became serendipitously available. Anning found himself assuming the responsibility of representation, riding the crest of a moment in time when populism and economic nationalism began to reverberate through the corridors of power in Australia.

His close association with Pauline Hanson's One Nation Party provided him with a platform that was both contentious and compelling. Anning's philosophical alignment with the party was anchored in a shared disdain for political correctness, a mistrust of globalist agendas, and a staunch defence of what they perceived to be Australian values under threat from immigration policies.

However, the fissure between Anning and Pauline Hanson's One Nation points to the tumultuous nature of political alliances within populist movements. Anning's subsequent stance as an independent, and later alignment with Bob Katter's Australian Party (KAP), illustrates the fluidity within populist circles and the challenges of presenting a united front. Nonetheless, his commitment to key issues such as immigration reform, resource management, and upholding Christian values echoes broader populist themes that have gained traction within Australia and globally.

The convergence of Anning's personal principles with the populist narrative is most apparent when considering his stance on issues such as the role of Islam in Australia. His remarks, deemed incendiary by many, positioned him as a figure willing to eschew diplomatic niceties in favour of blunt discourse. His calls for a plebiscite on Muslim immigration and advocacy for the plight of South African farmers not only generated controversy but solidified his reputation as a politician unafraid to court polarisation for the sake of principle – a hallmark of certain streams of populism.

Throughout his tenure, Anning's legislative agenda and public commentary were punctuated by the same motif: a perceived need to protect Australian sovereignty from the diluting effects of uncontrolled immigration and the imposition of external values. As the most Googled person in Australia in 2019, Anning's impact on the populist narrative is undeniable, and his political career serves as a case study for the complexities of economic nationalism in contemporary society.

In his time in the Senate, Anning's proposals and discourse embodied the clash of nationalist sentiments with the inertia

of established political structures. His advocacy for positions such as the cessation of government funding to the Palestinian Authority and the refutation of socialist policies highlighted his broader concern for the sustenance of an idealised Australian ethos.

Anning's philosophies and advice, steeped in anti-socialist and nationalist rhetoric, culminate in his call for vigilance against what he views as the trio of threats to Western civilisation: socialism, China, and Islam. His approach, embedded in the ethos of individual responsibility and personal freedom, betrays both nostalgia for a bygone era and concern for future generations.

In conclusion, Senator Fraser Anning's emergence as a political figure and populist leader represents a confluence of his lived experience, personal conviction, and a moment in time when Australia's political landscape was receptive to such a voice. Regardless of one's stance on his views, Anning's influence on the discourse surrounding populism and economic nationalism encapsulates the dynamic and often discordant nature of these ideologies within the framework of Australian politics.

Political Ideology and Public Perception

Anning's Political Ideology: An Analysis

Senator Fraser Anning emerged as a contentious figure in Australian politics, known for his unapologetically nationalistic and populist rhetoric. Anning's political ideology was primarily characterized by a strong stance against immigration, particularly Islamic immigration, which he perceived as a threat to Australian cultural and national identity. This perspective aligned with nationalist and populist movements that were gaining momentum globally, reflecting a broader sentiment of discontent with conventional politics and the perceived erosion of national sovereignty.

Anning's political journey was marked by various alignments, beginning with his association with Pauline Hanson's One Nation Party, which is known for its populist and anti-immigration policies. Despite initial alignment with One Nation, Anning's relationship with the party deteriorated due to disagreements that culminated in his exit and subsequent tenure as an independent senator. This schism underscored the dynamic and often unpredictable nature of populism as a political force, where internal coherence may be challenged by strong personalities and divergent agendas.

Throughout his time in the Senate, Anning was unwavering in his narrative, which often revolved around the protection of Australian values and the rejection of multiculturalism, which he believed led to division rather than unity. His stance attracted supporters who shared his concerns about immigration and Australian identity, as evidenced by his engagements during rallies and speeches elsewhere, as well as social media interactions.

Anning's time in office raised several questions about the boundaries of free speech and the responsible dissemination of political viewpoints. His controversial maiden speech in the Senate, where he referenced a "final solution" to what he claimed was an immigration problem, drew widespread condemnation, demonstrating the intersections of ideology,

language, and public perception in the bubbling cauldron of populism. His use of this highly loaded phrase, whether intentional or not, highlighted the critical role of language in political discourse and the potential repercussions when historical context is evidently overlooked or dismissed.

Another major theme in Anning's political stance was his criticism of economic nationalism, which he linked to issues of governmental overreach and regulation. He strongly advocated for the interests of various groups, including farmers and miners, reflecting his economic nationalist views, which espouse the minimization of foreign influence and the promotion of domestic industry to nurture the national economy.

On the global scale, Anning's political ideology and perception can be understood within the pattern of rising nationalism and populism. Groups within the populace perceived him as embodying the very essence of a reactionary movement against globalization, liberalization, and the perceived dilution of national culture.

Although Anning's political career was relatively brief, it was undoubtedly impactful, provoking a dialogue about the issues at the forefront of Australian national discourse. His approach resonated with many who felt left behind by the political establishment and whose grievances went beyond economic disenchantment to encompass cultural and national identity concerns.

The exploration of Anning's political ideology and public perception reveals the intricate and frequently polarizing nature of populism and economic nationalism. It underscores the vital importance of historical context, responsible rhetoric, and the continual negotiation between national sovereignty and global integration. Anning's political narrative serves as a reminder of the potency of populist politics and the profound resonance that nationalist sentiments hold for many individuals—a contemporary reflection of time-honored debates on national identity, immigration, and the manifold implications of global interconnectedness on domestic politics.

Public and Media Perception: A Dual Narrative

The public and media perception of Senator Fraser Anning's political career is a story of dichotomy—a dual narrative marked by moments of both widespread support and vehement criticism. This polarizing perspective is emblematic of the populist wave that Anning rode, and it reflects the broader discourse on economic nationalism within Australia and beyond.

Anning's entry into the political limelight followed his support for issues that resonated with a segment of the Australian population who felt underserved by the established political parties. His tough stance on immigration and his advocacy for Australia's sovereignty in economic matters appealed to voters who longed for a return to policies that prioritized national interests. Anning tapped into the undercurrent of discontent that stemmed from concerns over globalism and its perceived erosion of local industries, job markets, and cultural identity.

Yet, this same candor and unfiltered approach to politicking, which endeared him to his supporters, also positioned him as a contentious figure within the media landscape. He was no stranger to controversy, particularly with his infamous "final solution" comment, which triggered outrage and was widely perceived as an inappropriate reference to the Holocaust by

the media. However, Anning and his supporters deemed this backlash as an example of media bias and the misrepresentation of his words, fuelling a narrative of mistrust towards mainstream media outlets.

The public perception of Anning hence oscillated between those who saw him as a necessary disruptor to the political status quo and others who viewed him as a figure promoting divisive and exclusionary policies. This dual narrative underscored Anning's political journey, as he continued to garner support by embracing policies that were both nationalist in their economic implications and populist in their approach to sovereignty and social cohesion.

In the end, Anning's time as a Senator was encapsulated by the duality of acclaim and animosity—two sides of the same coin that reflect the complex and often confrontational nature of populist and economic nationalist rhetoric in contemporary politics. Understanding this duality is key to grasping the undercurrents that drive public sentiment and the role of the media in shaping or challenging political narratives. Senator Anning's impact on populism and economic nationalism in Australia cannot be overstated, as it provides a clear illustration of how these ideologies resonate with a portion of the electorate, while simultaneously generating significant controversy and debate.

Key Speeches and Policies

Notable Speeches: Setting the Tone

Senator Fraser Anning's political trajectory is marked by a series of key speeches and policies that have profoundly influenced the contours of populism and economic nationalism within Australia. Anning's oratory skills have played a pivotal role in disseminating his political ideas and setting the tone for his legislative and political actions.

Notable Speeches

A cornerstone speech that garnered both domestic and international attention was Anning's maiden speech in the Senate. This speech brought Anning into the political spotlight, not least because of content considered by many as controversial but reflective of his forthright approach to politics. Anning's speech touched upon themes central to his political stance: a staunch opposition to immigration, promoting economic nationalism, and preserving traditional Christian values. The speech also infamously included a reference to the "final solution" in relation to immigration, a term fraught with historical connotations of the Holocaust. Despite backlash and widespread criticism for the use of this term, Anning vehemently refused to apologize, maintaining that the words were taken out of context (Cheok, 2021).

Anning's appeal to populism was often crystallized through these speeches, wherein he spoke directly to the concerns and frustrations of Australian citizens who feared the dilution of cultural identity and economic security. His addresses would frequently underline the perceived failures of mainstream politics and the threat of globalization, which he argued undermined Australian sovereignty and workers' rights.

Policies

Turning to policy, Anning's tenure was characterized by an unapologetic push towards stringent immigration control. His propositions—such as the call for a plebiscite on immigration to empower Australians to directly influence immigration policy—gave substance to his populist rhetoric. He advocated for a moratorium on Muslim immigration and a denial of entry to refugees from certain regions, which Anning perceived as incompatible with Australian values.

Anning also directed his focus toward economic policies. He privileged economic security and independence, positioning himself as a protector against foreign control and a promoter of local industry and jobs. He passionately defended sectors such as coal mining, pushing against renewable energy initiatives that he believed harmed the Australian economy and workers.

On social policy, Anning's opposition to gay marriage and abortion aligned him with conservative Christian constituents. In the Senate, he would often stand as a solitary figure or in a small alliance against legislation that he believed undermined family values.

Anning's legislative conduct demonstrated a clear adherence to a populist and economic nationalist template. Through his speeches and policies, he sought to mobilize a base that felt alienated by mainstream politics, harnessing their collective sentiment for his political agenda.

Through his performance in the Senate and the public sphere, Anning crafted an idiosyncratic brand of politics that combined strident economic nationalism with social conservatism. His key speeches and policies reflect a deliberate strategy to shake up the political status quo by directly challenging the prevailing social and economic orthodoxies. This chapter highlights how Anning's approach to politics is emblematic of broader global trends towards populism and economic nationalism. Such movements thrive on the promise to recapture lost national greatness and societal purity—a promise that resonates with a significant cohort of the electorate.

Fraser Anning's role in Australian politics, as depicted in this discourse, serves as an influential case study in the efficacy and impact of populist strategies in contemporary political arenas. Ultimately, Anning's political career has left an indelible imprint on the fabric of Australian political dialogue and is illustrative of the rising currents of populism and economic nationalism that persist in the global landscape.

Policy Proposals and Their Impact

Senator Fraser Anning's political career is marked by a series of key speeches and policy proposals that have solidified his position as a pivotal figure in the discourse on populism and economic nationalism in Australia. Anning's approach and rhetoric are deeply embedded in the populist tradition of appealing to the "common people" and critiquing the established political order (Cheek, 2021). His speeches often highlight a sense of disillusionment with mainstream politics and a desire to return power to the people, resonating with populist movements worldwide.

One of Anning's most notable speeches was his maiden speech in the Senate, which drew significant media attention and

controversy. In his address, he touched upon themes of national identity, the preservation of a "European-based" Australian society, and strong opposition to immigration, particularly from Muslim-majority countries. His use of the phrase "the final solution" in reference to a plebiscite on immigration was widely criticized, though he and his supporters argued that the response was taken out of context and represented a broader discontent with the status quo regarding immigration policy (Cheok, 2021).

Policy Proposals and Their Impact

Senator Anning's policy proposals have been diverse, yet they consistently reflect his economic nationalist and populist stances. These proposals often emphasize the protection of Australian industries, stricter immigration controls, and a focus on traditional Australian values.

One of his economic nationalist positions included support for coal mining and skepticism towards renewable energy, aligning with a belief in the primacy of Australian resources and industry. Anning argued for the economic benefits of coal, positioning himself against the globalist attitudes towards climate change and renewable energy mandates, which he perceived as damaging to the Australian economy and workers' livelihoods.

On immigration, Anning proposed plebiscites to give Australians a direct vote on immigration policies, demonstrating his commitment to populist ideals of direct democracy and the sovereign will of the people. He argued for a decrease in immigration levels, pointing to concerns about integration, cultural cohesion, and economic strain on public services. Anning's stance on immigration reflects a broader trend in populist movements that associate national identity with a particular cultural or ethnic makeup, coupling this with economic nationalism that seeks to protect local workers and industries from perceived threats posed by newcomers (Cheok, 2021).

The impact of Anning's policy proposals has been to amplify the voice of a segment of the Australian population that feels unrepresented by mainstream parties and concerned about the direction of national policy, particularly on issues of immigration and economic sovereignty. While his policies have sparked significant debate and at times backlash, they also represent a significant undercurrent in Australian society and politics, one that is navigating the tension between globalization and national identity.

Senator Fraser Anning's political career and his contribution to the discourse on populism and economic nationalism demonstrate the complexities and nuances of these ideologies in contemporary politics. Anning's speeches and policies have garnered significant attention and have been a catalyst for public debate on issues central to the intersection of national sovereignty, identity politics, and economic management. While his time as a Senator was marked by controversy, it also highlighted the existence and potency of nationalist populist sentiments within Australia. Anning's political journey thus serves as a critical case study in understanding the rise of populism and economic nationalism not just in Australia, but as part of a global trend responding to the challenges and uncertainties of a rapidly changing world (Cheok, 2021).

Populism in Practice: Case Studies

Legislative Initiatives and Debates

Senator Fraser Anning's tenure as a senator in Australian politics serves as an intriguing case study for populism and economic nationalism in a contemporary political setting. Drawing from Cheok's (2021) extensive examination, we analyze Anning's legislative initiatives and his involvement in debates that fervently reflect his populist and economically nationalist views.

Being propelled into the Senate unexpectedly after a fellow party member's disqualification, Anning seized this opportunity to advocate for policies he firmly believed would serve Australia's national interest. His legislative proposals often centered on stringent immigration controls, advocating for plebiscites on immigration policy to reflect the will of the Australian people directly, a call echoing populist desires for greater public influence over governmental decisions.

Anning's maiden speech in the Senate illuminates his commitment to these ideologies, despite its notoriety due to controversial terminology. His focus was on revitalizing industries he believed were foundational to Australia's economic prosperity, including mining, agriculture, and fishing. This approach positions Anning within the economic nationalist camp, advocating for the protection and advancement of domestic industries from globalist policies he perceived as detrimental to the national economy.

However, the senator's rhetoric and policies also stoked significant debate within Parliament and the wider public domain. He clashed with figures across the political spectrum, from fellow populists like Pauline Hanson to members of the Greens and the Labour Party. His direct, often confrontational, style hallmarked a tenure unafraid of discord, reflecting both a populist disdain for political correctness and a conviction in the righteousness of his economic nationalism.

Anning's eagerness to sponsor motions investigating alleged corrupt practices within Australia's banking system illustrates his alignment with the sentiment of battling the "elites," a core facet of populist ideology. This proposed inquiry intended to scrutinize the mishandling of ordinary Australians' finances, positioning him as a challenger to institutional power.

His political career, albeit brief, was marked by unwavering attempts to inject his form of populist and economic nationalist thinking into the legislative conversation. Anning sought to not just highlight but address what he perceived as the fundamental issues afflicting Australia, from immigration to economic independence.

Senator Anning's political activities encapsulate the core attributes of populism and economic nationalism. His case demonstrates the potential resonance these ideologies can have within certain segments of society and their substantial impact on political discourse. His influence on the legislative process and debates serves as a potent reminder of the efficacy of such ideologies within a democratic framework. However, the evocative nature of his proposals also highlights the divisive potential intrinsic to these ideologies, posing continual challenges for societal cohesion and political stability.

Comparative Analysis with Global Populism

Populism, a political doctrine that pits the common people against the elite, has become a significant force in contemporary global politics. It capitalizes on the grievances of the public, often claiming to provide a voice to those who feel unheard by the established power structures. In Australia, Fraser Anning represents a vivid example of this phenomenon, having garnered attention for his populist and economic nationalist stances during his brief tenure in the Australian Senate. This section will explore Anning's populist strategies, how they align with or diverge from global tendencies, and their implications for economic nationalism within the Australian context and beyond.

Populism and Its Resonance with the People

Fraser Anning's career offers an insightful case study into the mechanisms of populism. His political discourse, as depicted in Cheok's work (2021), displays classic populist characteristics—appealing to the common people by delineating a clear us-versus-them dichotomy, where the 'us' signifies the ordinary Australians affected by the policies imposed by the 'them' elites or outsiders who threaten their way of life. His reactionary stance on immigration and his direct manner of addressing sensitive cultural and social issues have positioned him as a defender of the 'forgotten Australians.'

Populism in the Australian Context

Anning's populism must be understood in Australia's multicultural and socio-political context. His call for a return to a 'White Australia' policy resonates with a certain faction of the populace that perceives inclusivity and progressive immigration policies as detrimental to the social fabric and cultural identity. Such rhetoric reveals the fault-lines in Australian society similar to those exploited by populists globally, exemplified by Trump's America and Brexit in the UK.

The Global Tide of Populism

Globally, populism has manifested in the rise of leaders who claim to represent the 'silent majority' in the face of globalization and supranational entities. Figures such as Donald Trump in the United States, Viktor Orbán in Hungary, and Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil exemplify this trend. Like Anning, these leaders tap into economic anxieties and cultural fears, promising to recalibrate trade, immigration, and foreign policy in favor of national interests.

Economic Nationalism as a Pillar of Populism

Anning's economic nationalism, with its anti-globalization slant, underscores his populist approach. His vocal criticism against foreign aid, foreign ownership, and free trade agreements positions him similarly to other economic nationalists who advocate for protectionist policies. Such policies are often proposed as a panacea for preserving national jobs and sovereignty, mirroring the sentiments echoed in the trade policies championed by leaders like Trump.

The Sustainability and Future of Populism

The future trajectory of populism is difficult to gauge. As a political strategy, it shows remarkable resilience and adaptability, thriving upon social discontent and economic crises. However, the sustainability of populism is questionable—a point illustrated by Anning's brief flirtation with the Senate and subsequent failure to secure re-election. The volatile nature of populism, fueled by charismatic leadership and incendiary rhetoric, often precludes the establishment of long-term agendas.

Fraser Anning's foray into politics encapsulates the essence and complications of populism and economic nationalism. While Anning himself did not maintain a prolonged political career, his ideologies and approaches typify the features of global populism.

As chronicled by Cheok (2021), Anning's impact lies not in longevity but in the potency of the populist message and its capacity to disrupt the political status quo, rallying disenchanted voters under a banner of economic nationalism. In comparing Anning's approach to global trends, it is evident that populism flexes to accommodate national idiosyncrasies but retains its core: a challenge to the established order in the name of the ostensibly neglected populace.

Through this comparative analysis, we discern that while populism's rise may be a response to immediate socio-economic challenges, its imprint on policy and national discourse is indelible, with profound implications for governance, policy-making, and international relations.

Economic Nationalism: Anning's Approach

Economic Policies and National Interests

Senator Fraser Anning's political career was marked by a staunch advocacy for economic nationalism, a philosophy which prioritizes the nation's economic interests and argues for the protection of domestic industries from foreign competition. Anning's approach to economic nationalism was multifaceted, encompassing a wide range of policy positions and public statements that sought to foreground Australia's national interests in the global economic arena.

Anning's economic policies were framed within the broader context of his populist stance, which emphasized the need for political and economic systems to reflect the will and benefit the average citizen. This perspective was evident in his calls for a reduction in immigration, particularly from Muslim-majority countries, which he argued was necessary to preserve cultural integrity and economic stability. Anning's views on immigration were often conflated with his economic nationalism, as he posited that unchecked immigration could lead to job competition, social strain, and cultural disintegration (Cheok, 2021).

In his time as a senator, Anning was a vocal critic of globalist economic policies and international agreements that, in his view, undermined Australia's economic sovereignty. He expressed skepticism over multilateral trade agreements, positing that they often advantaged other nations at Australia's expense. Anning's tenure was characterized by a consistent pushback against economic policies that favored multinational corporations and foreign interests over those of Australian

businesses and workers.

Anning's economic nationalism also manifested in his support for industries he deemed essential to Australia's economic success and national identity. He advocated for the mining industry, emphasizing its role in job creation and economic growth. His stance was particularly pertinent in the context of debates over renewable energy and climate change, where Anning frequently sided with pro-fossil fuel arguments, positioning the industry as a key component of Australia's economic backbone (Cheek, 2021).

In his maiden speech and throughout his political career, Anning's articulation of economic policies was imbued with a nationalistic fervor, suggesting that the true measure of policy success was the extent to which it benefited the Australian people. He couched his economic positions in terms of realism and pragmatism, often dismissing environmental concerns and social progressivism as secondary to immediate economic and national interests.

Anning's economic nationalism extended to proposals to limit foreign ownership and control over Australian assets and resources. He underscored the importance of maintaining Australian control over its land, infrastructure, and significant enterprises. This was framed not only as an economic concern but also as an issue of national security and sovereignty (Cheek, 2021).

Senator Fraser Anning's foray into economic nationalism was emblematic of a global wave of populist sentiment, which saw economic policy as inseparable from national identity and sovereignty. His proposals and rhetoric resonated with a segment of the Australian populace that felt left behind by globalization and threatened by changing demographic and cultural landscapes. Although controversial and often met with substantial opposition, Anning's approach to economic nationalism underscored the nuances and complexities of integrating national interests within an increasingly interconnected global economy. His legacy in this regard serves as a testament to the potent force of economic nationalism within the populist toolkit and its impact on the discourse surrounding national economic policies.

Impact on Australian Economy and Global Relations

Senator Fraser Anning's tenure as a public official and his engagement with economic nationalism can be encapsulated by his adherence to principles that prioritize the interests of the nation-state and its citizens. His approach to economic nationalism is rooted in the belief that Australia's economic policy should be crafted with the primary intention of benefiting the Australian people and safeguarding the nation's economic sovereignty (Cheek, 2021).

Anning's advocacy for economic nationalism was heavily interwoven with his views on populism - a political doctrine that he harnessed to gain support from Australians who felt disenfranchised by the policies of mainstream parties. Throughout his political career, Anning capitalized on a growing sentiment amongst certain segments of the Australian population that globalization and liberal economic policies were not serving their best interests.

Anning's economic policy proposals often aimed to reverse the perceived damages of globalization, including campaigning against free trade agreements that he argued harmed Australian industries and workers. He was also a proponent of reducing foreign investment and ownership within critical Australian sectors, advocating for tighter controls

that would ensure Australian ownership and control of assets deemed vital for the nation's interests (Cheok, 2021).

One of the key aspects of Anning's economic nationalist approach was the stringent stance on immigration. He tied economic prosperity directly to immigration policy, propagating the notion that limiting immigration was imperative for maintaining Australian jobs and wages. This perspective had a considerable impact on local economic policy discussions and stirred debates on global relations, especially concerning humanitarian commitments and international agreements.

At the heart of Anning's economic nationalism was also a deep concern for rural and regional Australia. He brought attention to economic disparities between urban centers and the countryside, advocating for policies that would bolster agricultural sectors and support rural economies. His recognition of the hardships faced by farmers and rural communities echoed the calls for a more equitable distribution of wealth and resources within the nation (Cheok, 2021).

On the international stage, Anning's economic nationalism presented a complex challenge. His views often brought him into conflict with the policies of Australia's major allies and trading partners. The promotion of an inward-looking economic agenda raised concerns about Australia's role in international trade, alliances, and its commitments to global cooperation and aid.

In conclusion, Senator Fraser Anning's economic nationalism was a multifaceted doctrine that sought to upend traditional economic policies in favor of an Australia-first approach. While Anning's views resonated with certain portions of the populace, his contentious policies and propositions also sparked considerable controversy and highlighted the tensions inherent in balancing national self-interest with global engagement. The long-term implications of Anning's economic nationalism on Australia's economy and its relations on the world stage remain a topic of significant scholarly interest and public debate.

Controversies and Criticisms

Major Controversies and Public Reactions

Throughout his career as a politician, Senator Fraser Anning has been central to a number of controversies that have polarized public opinion and amplified his association with populism and economic nationalism in Australia. In contemplating Anning's career, it is essential to comprehend the various instances and statements that have garnered widespread attention and even condemnation, shaping his public persona.

The crux of the controversy surrounding Anning lies in his unyielding stance on immigration, multiculturalism, and Islam, which he often presented in a manner that many perceived as inflammatory. His espousal of socially conservative policies and often brash public declarations set the stage for polarizing debates on national identity, cultural cohesion, and economic sovereignty.

Anning's maiden speech in the Senate ignited a firestorm after he called for a "final solution" to the immigration issue—a

phrase that carries with it the indelible taint of the Holocaust. Despite the immediate outcry that followed, including from Prime Minister Scott Morrison, who condemned the remarks, Anning refused to apologize and maintained that his words were taken out of context (Cheok, 2021). This event would encapsulate the enduring public reaction to Anning's rhetoric: a division between those vehemently critical of his statements as reckless and divisive, and a faction of the populace that lauded him for candidly voicing concerns over immigration and cultural integration.

Anning's blunt critiques on Islam and the framing of Muslims as a threat to Australian society and values compounded the controversies, situating Anning as a figure emblematic of the tense global discourse surrounding Islamic immigration and terrorism. His statements post the Christchurch mosque shootings were particularly contentious, as he suggested a causal link between immigration policies and the attack, prompting further backlash but also rallying a segment of the electorate who shared his concerns, however controversial.

Furthermore, Anning's political strategies and affiliations have come under scrutiny, such as his alignment with minor parties and independent movements. His relations with populist figures, including Pauline Hanson of One Nation, underscored broader themes within Australian and global politics where disillusionment with established parties spurred the rise of alternative political actors and voices. Anning's eventual estrangement from Hanson and the formation of his own party showcased the dynamic and often tumultuous landscape of populist politics.

Anning's actions and sentiments, particularly those deemed starkly nativist or exclusionary, cast a spotlight on the friction within Australian society regarding the balance between welcoming diversity and preserving national character. The reactions he elicited from constituents, political peers, and international observers indicate the powerful undercurrents of populism and economic nationalism that Anning adeptly tapped into, notwithstanding the overt criticisms and controversies that consistently shadowed him.

Conclusively, Anning's political career, marked prominently by controversy and critical reactions, offers a lens into the Australian expression of global phenomena: the dialectic between populist appeals to protect the national ethos and the contentious discussions regarding diversity and social integration. His trajectory paints a portrait of a political actor steered by conviction in a divisive context, serving as a bellwether for the perpetual debates that shape modern national discourse.

Criticism from Political Analysts and Scholars

Senator Fraser Anning, a former member of the Australian Senate, has been a polarizing figure in the political arena. His political career, characterized by staunch advocacy for populism and economic nationalism, has attracted substantial criticism from political analysts and scholars. This criticism centers on several of Anning's public stances, ranging from his immigration policy proposals to his comments following the Christchurch mosque shootings.

Political analysts have scrutinized Anning for what is perceived as capitalizing on divisive issues to garner support, a strategy typical within populist frameworks (Cheok, 2021). Anning's rhetoric—including the use of the historically loaded phrase "the final solution" in reference to immigration policy—has been condemned as provocative and insensitive. Furthermore, scholars of political science argue that Anning's brand of populism does not offer constructive solutions to

complex issues but instead relies on generating and exploiting societal tensions.

From an economic nationalism perspective, Anning's focus on the reinvigoration of Australian industries has been critiqued for its simplicity and for overlooking the complexities of global trade and economic integration. While economic nationalism can resonate with voters who feel left behind by globalization, some scholars criticize such policies for the potential to create retaliatory trade practices and hinder international trade relations.

Critiques from academics often emphasize the need for evidence-based policy-making, pointing out that many of Anning's more controversial proposals lack a robust evidentiary foundation. The criticism extends to his proposed plebiscite on immigration, which critics argue would foster divisiveness and could exacerbate xenophobia, contravening the values of a multicultural and democratic society like Australia.

Ultimately, Anning's short tenure in the Senate was marked by controversy and opposition from many in the political establishment. Despite the criticism, his political activities have shed light on the growing appeal of populism and economic nationalism in contemporary politics. This trend necessitates closer examination by scholars and policymakers alike to understand its implications for democratic governance and international relations.

By examining Anning's political career and the scrutiny it engendered, this chapter has laid out the core challenges and critiques associated with his particular brand of populism and economic nationalism. While his political strategies arguably tapped into public sentiments of disenchantment and protectionism, they also incited significant backlash and highlighted the contentious nature of populist policy rhetoric. The balance between national sovereignty and global cooperation remains a central debate in the modern political landscape—one that Anning's controversial perspectives have brought to the forefront of Australian and global political discourse.

The Senate and Populism

Functioning of the Senate in Anning's Tenure

An analysis of Senator Fraser Anning's time in the Australian Senate reveals a sharp focus on populist strategies and economic nationalism that resonated with a significant segment of the Australian population. Anning's populist approach materialized in his emphasis on addressing the concerns of ordinary Australians, particularly those feeling disenfranchised or left behind by the political establishment. The economic nationalist aspects of his platform were evident in his staunch opposition to globalization policies, such as the Lima declaration, which he believed harmed Australian industries and workers (Cheok, 2021).

During his tenure, Anning utilized the Senate as a platform to voice his controversial stances, including stringent immigration policies, criticism of social progressivism, and the importance of maintaining Australia's Christian cultural identity. Anning's contributions on the Senate floor were polarizing, catapulting him into the national spotlight and making him the subject of significant discourse, both domestically and internationally.

In understanding Anning's impact within the Senate, one must consider how his forthright style and often abrasive oratory, such as his infamous reference to "the final solution" in the context of immigration, were both a manifestation of and a catalyst for the populist sentiments brewing within certain demographics. His language and propositions struck a chord with Australians who felt that their cultural and economic concerns were being ignored, validating their grievances in the political arena.

The Senate's reaction to Anning's pronouncements was mixed. While he found support among like-minded senators who shared his vision of conservatism and a return to traditional values, he was largely rebuked by the wider parliamentary community, including his former allies in the One Nation party. The tensions between Anning's advocacy for a conservative populist agenda and the broader legislative body underscore the divisions within Australian politics regarding how best to navigate the country's future amidst globalization and social change.

In essence, Anning's presence in the Senate brought to the fore the ongoing debate over populism and economic nationalism within Australia, highlighting the complexities and divisions that remain in grappling with these potent political forces. His advocacy for referendums on immigration and his interactions with constituents during his term point to a broader movement of anti-establishment sentiment and the desire for direct citizen engagement in political decision-making (Cheek, 2021).

Senator Fraser Anning's tenure in the Australian Senate demonstrated how populism and economic nationalism could be leveraged to capture the attention and support of a disillusioned electorate. While his methods and messages were contentious, they undoubtedly contributed to the national conversation about Australia's political identity, sovereignty, and the balance between inclusivity and preservation of tradition in a rapidly changing world.

The Role of the Senate in Shaping Populist Policies

The Senate, as a legislative body, often serves as a platform where populist leaders articulate their policy preferences and where such policies can gain visibility and traction. It is in the Senate where the narratives of "us versus them" and the championing of the "ordinary people" against the "corrupt elite" can transition from rhetoric into actual legislative proposals. The Senate thus becomes a key battleground for populists like Senator Fraser Anning, who seek to influence the political agenda and reshape public policy in line with their ideologies.

Senator Fraser Anning's tenure in the Australian Senate was marked by his vigorous promotion of populist and economic nationalist ideals. He used his position to advocate for policies that he believed would serve the interests of the "silent majority," often using provocative language and stoking controversy to draw attention to his causes. Consistently framing his advocacies within the broader movement of populism sweeping across the globe, Anning positioned himself as a stalwart defender of the "people," who, in his view, have been let down by the establishment and the prevailing political system.

In shaping populist policies, Anning used both his speeches and his actions in the Senate to highlight what he perceived as the key issues facing Australia, often focusing on contentious topics such as immigration, national sovereignty, and the

protection of Australian industry and jobs. By insisting on the Australian people's right to vote on immigration policies through a plebiscite, Anning sought to amplify the populist voice within the legislative framework.

Anning's approach within the Senate was illustrative of how populists operate within democratic institutions. Not content with simply voicing discontent, Anning actively sought to direct policy discussions towards the themes central to populist politics: anti-establishment sentiment, national sovereignty, and a perceived need to protect and prioritize the native citizenry. His focus on economic nationalism, manifested through his objections to certain trade agreements and globalization, showcased his commitment to using the Senate as a platform to resist what he saw as the 'globalist agenda.'

Anning's proposals, such as those seeking to limit or reverse immigration from Muslim-majority countries or to defund certain government programs, were often met with considerable opposition from his Senate colleagues. This opposition served to reinforce his populist position as an outsider fighting against a resistant political establishment. He was able to utilize instances where he felt marginalized or silenced within the Senate as evidence of his divergence from the 'elite' and alignment with the 'true' sentiments of the Australian populace.

While Anning's time in the Senate did not yield substantial legislative successes regarding his proposals, his role was significant in shaping populist discourse in the country. By so prominently and unapologetically articulating populist and economic nationalist policies, Anning contributed to the broader narrative of populism within the Australian political landscape, asserting the Senate's role not just as a place for policy-making but also as a stage for populist ideology.

Examining Senator Fraser Anning's career provides an insightful window into the impact of populism and economic nationalism in contemporary politics, highlighting both the potentials and limitations of such ideologies within modern democratic institutions. While Anning's tenure was marked by controversy and debate, his use of the Senate platform reflected how populist leaders can endeavor to translate public sentiment into public policy and underscored the Senate's potential role in the broader populist movement.

Legacy and Influence

Anning's Legacy in Australian Politics

Senator Fraser Anning's political career, albeit brief, was marked by controversy and his unabashed approach to politics. His tenure in the Senate saw him carve a niche as a populist politician who was not afraid to contend with established political norms. Anning's legacy in Australian politics is multifaceted and complex, closely tied to the themes of populism and economic nationalism.

Populism, as a political approach, seeks to appeal to ordinary people who feel their concerns are disregarded by established elite groups. Anning perfectly embodied this aspect, positioning himself as a voice for "the silent, hard-working, generally Christian type Australians" (Cheok, 2021). His direct and often confrontational style resonated with a

segment of the population that felt marginalised in a rapidly changing economic and social landscape.

Anning's economic nationalism was evident in his strong advocacy for policies that favour domestic production and workers. His stance against globalization—viewed by him as detrimental to Australian industries—echoed the sentiments of those who have felt left behind by the shift towards a global market economy. Standing against international agreements that he felt undermined Australian sovereignty, Anning was a proponent of reinvigorating domestic industries, such as mining, agriculture, and manufacturing.

The case of Anning showcases the potential for populism and economic nationalism to disrupt the traditional political landscape. His maiden speech, filled with polarising content and delivered with confidence, was indicative of how political discourse can swiftly shift public conversation and stir national debate.

Anning's tenure was not without its controversies, particularly his sharp stance on immigration and his use of inflammatory rhetoric concerning Muslims. These positions, while isolating him from many mainstream viewpoints, galvanized a certain faction that shared his apprehensive view towards multiculturalism and integration. The reverberations of his comments following the Christchurch massacre serve to highlight the divisive potential of Anning's populism — appealing to a particular cohort while simultaneously repelling another.

During his time as a senator, Anning attempted to shape legislative debates through his proposals on immigration, advocating for referenda to gauge public opinion on these issues. His push for a plebiscite reflects the populist belief in direct democracy, positioned in opposition to what he perceived as the dominance of party elites over such decisions.

Furthermore, his proposal for an inquiry into the banking system, in collaboration with other senators, signifies his commitment to the economic nationalist agenda. Advocating for greater transparency and accountability within the financial sector resonates with economic nationalist ideas of conserving the national economy's integrity and its institutions' accountability.

Although Anning's political career was short-lived, the significance of his contributions to populism and economic nationalism cannot be underestimated. His candidacy and eventual establishment of the Fraser Anning Conservative National Party symbolized a bid for continued relevance in the political field. It attempted to structure the disparate elements of populism into a cohesive political platform.

In conclusion, Senator Anning's influence on the populist undercurrents within Australian politics exemplifies the volatile interplay between societal discontent and responsive political rhetoric. His approach shone a light on how economic nationalism and populist strategies could appeal to segments of the population concerned with cultural and economic changes. Anning's legacy, viewed through the lens of populism and economic nationalism, serves as a case study on the potential impact such narratives can have, even within a relatively brief political tenure.

Influence on Future Populist Movements

Senator Fraser Anning's political career, although brief, had a marked influence on future populist movements in Australia.

Anning's tenure as a senator crystallized the confluence of populism and economic nationalism, reviving nationalist sentiments that had previously manifested in Australian politics. His approach resonated with a portion of the electorate that felt marginalized by conventional political discourse, which they perceived as being dominated by elitist interests and globalist policies that neglected local concerns.

Anning's populist rhetoric hinged on the protection of Australian national identity, sovereignty, and the economy, challenging the prevailing norms of multiculturalism and diversity. This was evident in his push for policies such as a plebiscite on immigration, particularly focusing on limiting Muslim immigration, which he argued was not compatible with Australian values. Anning's stance, while controversial, tapped into the underlying anxiety among certain voter demographics about cultural dilution and economic competition stemming from immigration.

The senator's influence on future populist movements is two-fold. On one hand, his explicit rhetorical style and policy positions emboldened similar-minded individuals and groups, providing them with a more pronounced voice in political conversations. Anning's unfiltered expression of his views, regardless of backlash, set a precedent for future populist politicians to openly articulate their often-controversial stances without equivocation. On the other hand, his career also served as a cautionary tale due to the electoral backlash and accusations of fomenting divisiveness. This dichotomy presents an ongoing challenge for populist movements, which must balance boldness with the potential for alienating mainstream support.

Economic nationalism, another key facet of Anning's political philosophy, advocated for prioritizing Australian businesses, labor, and resources. Anning's resistance to international agreements like the Lima declaration and his support for local industries struck a chord with those who felt that the Australian economy was at risk of being exploited by foreign entities to the detriment of ordinary Australians.

The reverberation of Anning's ideals in subsequent populist movements signaled a broader shift towards economic protectionism and skepticism of unbridled globalism. His tenure illustrated the potency of economic nationalism as an electoral strategy within populist politics, construing globalization as a zero-sum game where national interests are seen as being at odds with international ones.

Senator Fraser Anning's political trajectory, though contained, left an indelible mark on the fabric of Australian populist and nationalist politics. His influence is observed in the increased visibility and assertiveness of politicians and movements that share his skepticism toward multiculturalism and global economic integration. Despite the contentious nature of his policies and remarks, Anning managed to galvanize a segment of the population, suggesting a persistent undercurrent of populist and nationalist sentiment that could shape future political dynamics in the country. Anning's career serves as a reminder that while populist and nationalist ideologies can resonate with certain voters, they also have the capacity to polarize the citizenry, underscoring the delicate balance between voicing legitimate concerns and fostering unity in a diverse society.

Global Context and Comparative Analysis

Senator Fraser Anning's brief but impactful political career serves as a testament to the rise of populism and economic nationalism both within Australia and in the wider global context. Populism, characterized by a rhetoric that champions 'the people' against 'the elite,' and economic nationalism, which advocates for protecting domestic labor and industry, appeal to wide segments of populations feeling disenfranchised by globalization and changing demographics.

Anning's ascent to the Australian Senate, and his subsequent actions and statements, exemplify a broader resurgence of right-wing populism witnessed across different continents. The common thread binding populist leaders, like Anning, with others such as Donald Trump in the United States, Viktor Orbán in Hungary, and Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil, is a staunch opposition to perceived external threats to national sovereignty, economic well-being, and traditional social structures.

Economic nationalism, another motif in Anning's political positioning, shares similarities with the protectionist policies of the Trump administration, most notably the America First agenda. Anning's rhetoric on immigration, trade, and foreign policy echoes a sentiment that prioritizes Australian jobs and industries, resonating with economic nationalists who feel left behind in an era of free trade agreements and multinational corporations.

Anning in the Context of Global Populism

In analyzing Senator Fraser Anning within the realm of global populism, it is evident that his narrative resonates with the collective sentiment of nationalist movements worldwide. Anning, much like other populist figures, cites a decline in traditional values and socioeconomic inequalities as reasons for the need for a nationalistic redirection of public policy. This "us versus them" narrative is a hallmark of populist rhetoric, effectively tapping into a sense of loss of control among voters.

The global rise in populist leaders has often been attributed to a backlash against the political establishment. Anning, through his disregard for political correctness and his critique of establishment policies, aligns with this global pattern. His ability to garner attention, despite not having a longstanding political career, underscores the power of populist messaging in contemporary political landscapes.

Anning's career is especially indicative of the fluid nature of affiliation within populist realms. His association with multiple right-wing parties before eventually forming his own is reflective of the often-unstable alignments within populist factions, emphasizing personality over party policies. This trend is not isolated to Australia but can be observed in other nations where political figures have exploited populist waves to ascend to power, often resulting in new political movements or the rebranding of existing ones to align with the populist agenda.

In conclusion, Senator Fraser Anning's time in the Australian Senate, while short-lived, encapsulates the key themes of populism and economic nationalism that are increasingly prevalent in global politics. His approach to politics echoes the sentiments of similar movements worldwide that seek to reclaim national interests and curb the influence of both foreign and domestic entities perceived as threatening. As the world grapples with polarized political arenas, the study of figures like Anning becomes crucial in understanding the complex dynamics and potential consequences of the populist phenomenon.

Comparing Anning's Approach with Other Populist Leaders

Populism has emerged as a significant political force across the globe, marked by leaders who claim to represent the voice of the "common people" against the elites and the establishment. Senator Fraser Anning's political career in Australia is a manifestation of this rising trend. Populist leaders often capitalize on societal frustrations, offering straightforward solutions to complex problems, and Anning's approach was no different.

Anning's political narrative was crafted around the defense of national values and the interests of Australians against what he perceived as the threats posed by immigration and globalization. This stance is characteristic of economic nationalism, which prioritizes national interests, advocates for protective trade policies, and emphasizes job creation for citizens. These views align closely with other contemporary populist leaders who focus on sovereignty, border control, and economic self-sufficiency.

When comparing Anning's approach to other populist leaders, there are clear parallels with figures such as Donald Trump in the United States and Marine Le Pen in France. Like Anning, Trump based his campaign on strong anti-immigration rhetoric, the promise of job protection, and an "America First" agenda. Le Pen, much like Anning, appeals to French nationalism, proposing policies to curb immigration and reduce the influence of the European Union on French affairs.

However, Anning's approach was also marked by controversies, most notably his use of the phrase "the final solution" in his maiden speech—a term historically associated with the Holocaust. This choice of words starkly contrasted with the communication strategies of other successful populist leaders, who, while often inflammatory, tend to avoid explicit references that evoke such universal condemnation. Anning's remark provides a stark example of how rhetoric can serve as a double-edged sword in populist politics, attracting a certain voter base while repelling the wider public.

In the broader spectrum of populism, Anning's advocacy for a plebiscite on immigration reflects the populists' preference for direct democracy mechanisms that supposedly empower ordinary citizens. Populist leaders champion these approaches as purer forms of democracy that bypass the filters of representative politics, which they argue are corrupted by vested interests and out-of-touch politicians.

Moreover, Anning's economic nationalism can be contextualized within a global backlash against economic liberalization. Populist leaders often criticize free trade agreements and multinational corporations for disadvantaging domestic workers. This critique creates an intersection of left-wing economic critiques with right-wing nationalism — a political space that many populists, including Anning, occupy.

Fraser Anning's political philosophy and career follow the contours of global populism and economic nationalism. His political strategies and rhetoric resemble those deployed by populist leaders worldwide, with a local focus on issues pertinent to the Australian electorate. While his approach has drawn criticism and resulted in his failure to secure re-election, Anning's brief tenure offers a lens through which to examine the mechanics of populism and economic nationalism within the Australian context and the global rise of similar ideologies.

Conclusion

Summarizing Anning's Impact and Legacy

Senator Fraser Anning's brief yet provocative tenure in the Australian Senate left an indelible mark on the political landscape, particularly in the realms of populism and economic nationalism. His political career, characterized by outspoken rhetoric and controversial policy stances, particularly against Islam and immigration, positioned him as a polarizing figure within Australian politics and a talking point in international discourse on right-wing populism.

Anning's embrace of populism was apparent in his direct appeals to the 'ordinary Australian' and his criticisms of established political elites. He portrayed himself and his party as the true defenders of the Australian 'everyman,' promising to preserve the national identity and economic welfare against perceived threats from outside forces, especially immigrants and international bodies. His discourse tapped into a vein of discontent among a section of the population who felt overlooked by the liberal policies of the major political parties.

Economic nationalism was a staple in Anning's approach, with frequent calls to protect local industries and jobs from global competition and influence. In this regard, his policy preferences aligned with a broader global trend where protectionism and skepticism about free trade and globalization have re-emerged in political narratives. The rise of economic nationalism under Anning's banner was rooted in a desire to return to an Australia that prioritizes domestic production, self-sufficiency, and control over its economic future.

The global context in which Anning's political life unfolded cannot be ignored. His rise mirrored similar movements and figures across the world, such as the election of Donald Trump in the United States, Brexit in the United Kingdom, and the proliferation of right-wing parties in Europe. This worldwide wave of populism and economic nationalism has sparked a wide range of academic interest and political debate, with Anning's career offering a critical case study in the Australian context.

Anning's legacy is multifaceted. On one hand, his ideological leaning and controversial statements drew criticism and alienation, contributing to his eventual loss in the elections. Consequently, his direct impact on legislation and mainstream policy was limited. On the other hand, his capacity to mobilize a certain segment of the population indicates the presence of a constituency that resonates with his views. Anning has intensified the debate around immigration, multiculturalism, and Australia's place in the global economy—issues that remain at the forefront of national discourse.

As populism and economic nationalism continue to shape political discussions in Australia and beyond, the importance of critically examining figures like Anning grows. Future movements and politicians may draw lessons from his rise and fall, indicating that while his time in the Senate was brief, the currents he stirred are far from ephemeral. Understanding Anning's impact may prove vital in anticipating and responding to the populist and nationalist trends that seem entrenched in modern political landscapes.

The challenge moving forward is in navigating these complex and often divisive ideas that figures such as Anning have

brought into the public sphere. While populism and economic nationalism have certainly been met with enthusiasm in certain corners, they have also prompted deep reflection on issues of inclusion, economic policy, and the nature of democracy itself. Deciphering Anning's impact and legacy, therefore, becomes an exercise in understanding the broader socio-political forces at play and their implications for the future of democratic governance.

References

- Cheok, A. D. (2021). *Populism and Economic Nationalism: Australia's First Populist Politician, Senator Fraser Anning*. LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.