

## **Asianizing Australia – An Elite’s Long-Term Project**

Denis McCormack  
Melbourne, Australia

### **Abstract**

The author has long pointed to what he calls a “grand plan” by an Australian elite to Asianize Australia. This change is now well advanced, promoted by the mainstream media and both major political parties even though most Australians naturally prefer to live within a European-centered society. The elite’s program, the author says, is not properly called a “conspiracy” *per se*, but has reflected a broad consensus among the influential minority who form policy. In this article, the author gives the origins and history of the demographic shift introducing ever-more Asians into Australia. The article includes a republication of his paper on this subject presented at a conference of the prestigious Asian Studies Association of Australia in 1996, thus placing it before an international readership for the first time.

### **Asianizing Australia – An Elite’s Long-Term Project**

The author’s 1996 conference paper entitled “The Grand Plan: Asianization of Australia – Race, Place and Power” has become a historically significant document. It brought to the attention of the most relevant peak academic body the roots of today’s now decades-old Asian mass immigration policy. Repeated polls<sup>1</sup> verify findings that approximately 70% of Australians remain concerned about immigration policy in relation to both numbers and origins.

This anxiety has continued during the years since the 1984 attacks on Australia’s pre-eminent historian Professor Geoffrey Blainey AC who, in *All for Australia* (1984), criticized the high Asian immigration which was already known to be running ahead of public opinion (it was in 1983/4 that Asians first outnumbered British immigrants), and also condemned Australia’s multicultural policy. Blainey’s criticisms produced no policy change, however, and since then the traditional, white Australian demographic majority has been declining, although it still remains predominant.

The paper “The Grand Plan” was researched and written from the same traditional, predominantly white Australian nationalist perspective. It builds on earlier research by the author (1991; 1992). It quoted mainstream press and academic sources to make the case that a long-range “grand plan” was nurtured by Australia’s elites for the Asianization of Australia. The paper was presented by the author to the 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Conference of the Asian Studies Association of Australia, La Trobe University, Melbourne, July 10, 1996. Significantly, police protection was needed from young leftists.

At the conference, the plenary session keynote address was given by the distinguished, multi-

---

<sup>1</sup> Links to information about Australian views on immigration are available on the website <http://reduceimmigration.wordpress.com>

award winning author Christopher Koch<sup>2</sup>. During the question period that followed, the author of the present article asked Koch whether, given the fact that the immigration policy undemocratically induced an inevitable drift towards the Asianization of Australia, he would welcome such a huge change to the Australia he had known and loved. Koch gave a clear “No” in response.<sup>3</sup>

Subsequently, the paper was presented by Graeme Campbell (as Member of Parliament for Kalgoorlie) to Australia’s House of Representatives on October 28, 1996 and is reported in Hansard for the same date. Before the 1996 paper’s appearance,<sup>4</sup> analysis of the historical evidence for the deliberate increase of Asian migration into Australia, and identification of some of the prominent players behind this process, had never before been drawn together for chronological exposition. The 1890s founders of the Australian military and Labor movements, the Fathers of Australia’s Federation, literary folk heroes such as Furphy, Lawson and Patterson, along with countless other Australians – had warned about the future dispossession and eventual disappearance of all things traditionally Australian if mass Asian immigration were ever sanctioned. Those warnings from the past are today not only officially ignored and suppressed, but are being systematically erased from Australians’ common national memory through manipulation of immigration policy, multicultural policy, education, trade, foreign affairs, defense, and industrial relations as well as financial and economic management policy in relation to globalization, privatization, deregulation, foreign ownership and foreign investment. Australia is being demographically and economically recolonized through gradualist bipartisanship against often-demonstrated public opinion. Even today, the Australian public is still largely uninformed about the deception documented in the 1996 paper, let alone about the irreversible long term ramifications for their collective future.

Australia has at present the fastest growing population in the developed world. In 2009, it grew by an additional 488,000 people. In the 12 months to March 2014, it increased at the annual rate of 1.7% (388,400 people), with net overseas migration contributing almost two thirds (231,500 people) and natural increase (the excess of births over deaths) contributing the remainder of the growth (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2014). At 30 June 2011, 27% of the estimated resident population was born overseas – meaning that six million people are immigrants. This was an increase from ten years earlier when 23.1% (4.5 million people) declared that they had been born in countries other than Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012).

In 2008 the then Prime Minister Kevin Rudd increased immigration by 80,000. This followed the legacy of his predecessor Prime Minister John Howard who himself had doubled immigration from 1999 until he was defeated by Rudd in November 2007. Rudd conducted Australia’s largest immigration program since the end of World War II – or at any time. He thus triggered the still ongoing round of the recurring “Big Australia – or not” immigration and population “debate”. It is a debate in which race and ethnicity get less mention than ever.

During the Howard years (1996-2007) the intake from Asia averaged around 65 percent of the annual immigration total (Wilkinson, 2007, p. 16). It is very difficult to gather specific racial data about

---

<sup>2</sup> Christopher Koch AO died in September 2013 at the age of 81.

<sup>3</sup> Those readers who have attended academic conferences will appreciate the pin-drop moment after Koch’s response – followed by a low-pitched momentary murmur and the shuffling of many surprised, politely unhappy feet.

<sup>4</sup> Denis McCormack, *The Grand Plan: Asianisation of Australia – Race, Place and Power*, 1996.

immigration, but low estimates suggest that the number of Asian-born residents in Australia (not including the ever increasing numbers of Australian-born Asians) rose from 1.39 million in mid-2006, to 2.05 million of the total 22 million population in mid-2010<sup>5</sup>. These Asians have come from a variety of places formed by the enormous triangle that runs from Turkey to Tokyo to Timor. The national census in June 2011 (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012) revealed rapid increases in immigration from Nepal (average annual growth rate of 27% from 2001 to 2011), India (12.7%), Bangladesh (11.9%) and Pakistan (10.2%). The 2011 census also revealed that Chinese-born immigrants now comprise 1.8% of Australia's total population, and India-born immigrants 1.5%. These proportions can be compared with immigrants born in the United Kingdom (5.3%) and New Zealand (2.5%).

Along with their clear commitment to increasing immigration as a whole, the Labor governments from 2007 to 2013<sup>6</sup> essentially dismantled key border protection measures that the Howard government had legislated in 2000-2001, creating the current "refugee" issue, whereby unauthorized arrivals by boat have reached Christmas Island (an Australian territory) and the western coast of mainland Australia – mostly via Indonesia, bearing asylum-seekers from distant nations such as Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon and Turkey, and also from Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Vietnam, Cambodia, and China. The Labor government under Prime Minister Julia Gillard justified high immigration to meet an alleged skills shortage in the mining industry, an argument that has been cogently criticized (Birrell et al, 2011).

At the 2010 election, the Liberal-National campaigned for "Real Action on Sustainable Population Growth", promising to:

... reduce Australia's annual rate of population growth from more than 2 per cent under Labor, to our historical long-run average of 1.4 per cent within our first term.

This will require reducing our annual rate of net overseas migration from 298,924 in 2008/09 to no more than 170,000 per year by the end of our first term.

Unfortunately, they were not elected then. When the time came for the 2013 election, the Coalition's platform had become blurred. It avoided mentioning reduction, or any numeric targets. Australians elected a conservative government on September 7, 2013. Since then, Prime Minister Tony Abbott and his Liberal-National Coalition have studiously avoided any reduction and have maintained the same overall immigration targets as their Labor predecessors.<sup>7</sup>

Abbott himself has not always favored population growth, and is on record as disagreeing with multicultural policies. Prior to entering parliament (in 1994), he worked as a journalist. In 1990 he wrote "The Real Issue is the Changing Face of Our Society" for *The Australian*, the only national daily

---

<sup>5</sup> See: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immigration\\_to\\_Australia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immigration_to_Australia) (viewed January 21, 2015).

Access to the maze of primary source data can be attempted via these websites:

*Australian Bureau of Statistics*: <http://www.abs.gov.au>

*Australian Parliamentary Library*:

[http://www.aph.gov.au/About\\_Parliament/Parliamentary\\_Departments/Parliamentary\\_Library/pubs/rp/rp1314/BoatArrivals](http://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/rp/rp1314/BoatArrivals)

*Australian Government: Department of Immigration and Border Protection*:

<http://www.immi.gov.au/media/statistics/>

<sup>6</sup> Labor Prime Ministers who followed the conservative John Howard were Kevin Rudd (December 2007 – June 2010); Julia Gillard (June 2010 – June 2013); Kevin Rudd (June – September 2013).

<sup>7</sup> See <https://reduceimmigration.wordpress.com/links/historic-information-about-immigration-policy/> for the latest analysis of Australia's immigration policy.

broadsheet. This article called for a debate on “the sort of Australia we want our children and grandchildren to inherit”. Referring to academic projections of Australia becoming “20 per cent Asian in 40 years” and “about 10 per cent Asian within about 15 years”, Abbott said:

Even in a colour-blind world, this would matter. In a world where colour and physiognomy differences often denote cultural differences too, a multi-racial society (at least under policies that encourage migrants to keep their identity) means a much changed society.

He also stated:

The argument is not over which national groups have made better migrants in the past. It is over the type of immigrant who is likely to ensure that Australia remains a happy society for all her existing citizens far into the future. The argument is not whether Australian culture is superior or inferior to others. It’s just that one is ours and others are not.

Abbott has, however, subsequently changed his view on these issues. In January 2010, Abbott expressed his commitment to a Big Australia (Hudson, 2010) and this was echoed in the Coalition’s pre-election policy statements in 2013: “We will carefully manage the issues of population, citizenship and settlement to foster stronger economic growth and enhance Australia’s social fabric”, and “We will ensure that our non-discriminatory immigration programme helps those in need and serves our national interest” (Liberal Party of Australia, 2013, p. 42). The Coalition made firmer pledges, however, in relation to border security: “We will take immediate action to protect both the integrity of our borders and Australia’s immigration program. We will not allow illegal boat arrivals and people smugglers to either determine Australia’s immigration programme, or undermine the Australian people’s confidence in the programme” (Liberal Party of Australia, 2013, p. 47). As a new government, they are taking firm steps to implement these promises.

Abbott in 1990 was able to point to historical decisions that at first (from 1901) had restricted Asian immigration but then later (from 1956) had begun to loosen those restrictions. He lacked, however, the extensive evidence compiled for the 1996 paper that is now reproduced here. That paper, “The Grand Plan: Asianization of Australia – Race, Place and Power,” argues that a demographic replacement of white Australians by Asians, as part of a “grand plan” by the elites, is the most plausible explanation of Australia’s current high immigration “revolution”. This paper made the case (in consonance with Huntington’s later *The Clash of Civilizations*, 1996) that Australia is essentially and deliberately defecting from the West. This forfeiture of Western identity also appears to be well underway in all countries of European origin, not only in Australia.

The original paper concluded with a Postscript and 12 Appendices which provided additional incontrovertible evidence from newspapers and other sources on the public record. In the following text of the 1996 paper, the Appendices are not reproduced, but they can be found in the scanned copy that is available online via the link given in the References section at the end of this article. Footnotes to the text represent the author’s voice in 2015. After the paper, there is a new Afterword by the author.

Here is the 1996 paper:

## **The Grand Plan: Asianization of Australia – Race, Place and Power**

Until relatively recently, power elites in Australian business, journalism, and politics would steadfastly deny, or refuse to discuss seriously, the grand plan for the long-term Asianization of Australia. Now, however, one cannot escape these same peoples' self-congratulatory writings which boast so openly of their treason<sup>8</sup>. Prime Minister Paul Keating, in a speech to the Australian Chinese Forum in Sydney on October 12, 1995, said:

Asia is emphatically where this country's security and prosperity lie. It is where an increasing number of our people come from. And – unambiguously and wholeheartedly – it is where we want to be... Our efforts on free trade, multiculturalism, and education and training are all part of the same strategy.

The Prime Minister's uncritical embrace of Asia is matched only by the opposition leader, John Howard's, similar behavior. To some they are a national embarrassment in their relentless sycophancy.

Crucial to the Federation of Australia in 1901, and to the foundation of the Australian Labor Party in the 1890s, was the notion that, predominantly, Australia was racially and culturally European in its roots, British in its institutional base, and that it should stay that way – forever. The first Act passed by the new Federal Parliament in 1901 was the *Immigration Restriction Act* which was unashamedly, but not offensively, designed to maintain Australia as ethnically, culturally and commercially European. In 1995, with a Labor Party Government in office since 1983, the pendulum has not only swung, but is airborne and out of control in the opposite direction. This is due to decades of political bipartisanship not only on immigration and multiculturalism, but on a whole clockwork mechanism of related federal, state and local government policy cogs which simply had to produce today's chimes heralding the accelerating pace of Asianization against the demonstrated majority opinion. In May 1993, ex-Prime Minister Bob Hawke (Labor) at a government-sponsored immigration conference publicly admitted what all serious observers knew. According to a report in the Melbourne *Herald-Sun* (May 25, 1993: 4), Hawke said that:

...he found it difficult to resist a contention in a new book that the major parties had reached an implicit pact to keep immigration off the political agenda.

He said it was "quite unique" in Australian politics that for most of the post-war period, the parties had maintained bipartisan support for immigration in the face of public opposition.

Mr Hawke said the ALP<sup>9</sup> and the Coalition<sup>10</sup>, with ACTU<sup>11</sup> support, had been prepared to advance the national interest ahead of public opinion, which indicated widespread unease over immigration.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> The original text incorporated a definition of "treason" from Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition, 1988: "betrayal of trust or faith".

<sup>9</sup> The ALP is the acronym for the Australian Labor Party.

<sup>10</sup> The "Coalition" consists of the conservative Liberal and National parties.

<sup>11</sup> The ACTU is the Australian Council of Trade Unions.

<sup>12</sup> The *Sydney Morning Herald* (May 26, 1993: 18) editorialized strongly against Hawke's comments: "Bipartisanship is not necessarily a good thing and even when it is there are limits to how far bipartisanship should be taken. This is as true for immigration as it is for any other public policy issue."

I favor the term “grand plan” to describe the phenomenon outlined below in preference to “conspiracy”, because the latter is too rigid and confining. In the popular mind, it implies that secret detailed agendas, designs, and time frames are set for predetermined outcomes by particular people or groupings at certain times and places. This is clearly not the whole story, but nor is the “it just happened” historical accidentalist theory a satisfactory explanation. The following quotes indicate a path towards radical change which was trod by many elites who considered themselves and their world view “progressive”. They entered into long-term co-operative networking and planning on a whole constellation of internationalist economic and social issues which they hoped would bring about the radical changes they desired. They accurately identified the destruction of Australia’s traditional immigration restriction policy as their top collective priority, which would prove pivotal in the quest for much other social change which was to follow. Although this particular study is by no means exhaustive, I believe it adequately makes the case for the existence of a sort of grand plan for the Asianization of Australia in the medium/long term. The “who”, “when”, “where”, “what” and “how” are recognizable through research, but the definitive “why” is as slippery as ever. Perhaps the answer was best given by James Burnham back in 1941 when in *The Managerial Revolution* he accurately predicted the outcome of World War II along with the three global trading blocs which would evolve thereafter to manage global trade and politics. Does the following quote from Burnham<sup>13</sup> foreshadow EU, NAFTA, APEC?

I have predicted the division of the new world among three super-states. The nuclei of these three super-states are, whatever may be their future names, the previously existing nations, Japan, Germany, and the United States.

It is of great significance to note that all three of these nations began some while ago their preparations for the new world order.

What will be actually accomplished by these wars will not be a decision as to who is to rule the bases ... but decisions as to what parts and how much of the *rest* of the world are going to be ruled by each of the three strategic centres. It might be thought that a “rational” solution could be worked out along “natural” geographic lines, dividing the world into three parts ... to the United States in the northern two thirds of the two Americas; to the European centre in Europe, the northern half of Africa and western Asia; to the Asiatic centre in most of the rest of Asia and the islands nearby. But there is much left over, and, besides, the rivals will not be willing to admit any “natural” geographic right.

The backward areas, which include a majority of the territory and people of the world, are not going to line up automatically behind one or another of the three centres or merely stand aside while the three fight over them. In the dissolution of the capitalist world political structure and during the internecine conflicts of the great managerial states, the backward peoples will attempt to break free altogether from domination and to take their destiny into their own hands.

Mountains of documentary evidence exist which show the tracks of those involved, and how they have achieved such a dramatic series of policy reversals over the last forty-odd years. The quotes below,

---

<sup>13</sup> These quotations can be found on pages 169-171 of Chapter XII, “The World Policy of the Managers”, in the UK edition (1942).

however, show conclusive evidence of the grand plan from the establishment's own primary source books, which are widely recognized, available and mainstream library fare, and which bring you right up to the present. Square brackets [...], with italics, denote my explanatory or bridging remarks in the context of the quotes and sources. The sources will be fully cited ahead of the quotes from them.

**Woodard, G., 1995, "Macmahon Ball's Goodwill Mission to Asia 1948". *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (May 1995), pp. 129-134.**

Burton's [*External Affairs Department Secretary 1940s*] vision of a Northern Australia economically integrated into neighboring South-East Asia is just beginning to approach fruition. (p. 133)

In 1949, an election year, the Secretary of the Department of Immigration, Heyes, at Burton's invitation met with Asian Heads of Mission in Canberra in the Department of External Affairs and spoke to them of prospective flexibility in Australia's immigration policy, that is, he repeated the theme which had proved so controversial for Ball in 1948 [*in Malaya and Singapore and elsewhere around Asia!*]. 1949 was an election year and Calwell [*Labor Government Immigration Minister, later Labor Leader, and renowned upholder of the traditional Immigration Restriction policy*] was strongly defending his conduct of his portfolio, keen to make it an election issue. There would have been maximum embarrassment for him if Heyes' remarks had been leaked to the press [*because traditional government, opposition, and public support for immigration restriction against mass Asian immigration was so strong*], but confidences were kept. (p. 134)

It would seem that there was some extraordinary duplicity and deceit practiced at the highest levels in 1949 and that "confidences were kept" so effectively that even the Prime Minister, Ben Chifley (Labor), did not know what his bureaucrats were planning as evidenced by the following editorial from the Melbourne *Age* newspaper:

**"National Ideal of White Australia", Editorial, *The Age*, May 31, 1949**

In a few plainly expressed homely paragraphs, the Prime Minister, in his Sunday night "weekly broadcast", re-stated the basic factors behind our national policy of vigorous but selective immigration. These, as Mr Chifley pointed out, are as valid today as when the statutes of the respective states were incorporated in a federal law early in this century.

There is no ideal in which national agreement so nearly approaches unanimity as the desire for homogeneity, colloquially expressed in the terms "white Australia." Any tampering with this policy for economic gain on the part of some small, affluent minority who would welcome a flood of cheap, coolie labor, or by a few impractical sentimentalists, would arouse wide spread indignation. Australia asks only the same right as that recognized and practised by every other nation - the right to determine how her population shall be composed. This generation of Australians recognizes a duty to preserve the heritage passed on by the pioneers who developed this continent and made it habitable.

It is to be hoped that Mr Chifley's clear disclaimer will dispose of the false and mischievous notion

that any sense of racial superiority is expressed or implied in our national policy. The blare of publicity which has attended the routine carrying out of the law in a few exceptional cases arising from the peculiar circumstances of the war, is to be deprecated. If traced to its source, this clamor will be found to be motivated, not by any mass urge of Asians to gain unrestricted right of entry into Australia - a right which they themselves do not accord even to other Asians - but by the strong desire of critics prepared to discredit the government by any propaganda device.

The peoples of Asia, toward whom in their upsurgent consciousness of nationality Australia adopts good-neighborly attitude, would not find in this continent with its own problems of light rainfall over wide semi-arid areas and liability to droughts, any appreciable relief from their population pressures. Their leaders who are well informed on the subject will endorse Mr Chifley's words that, "the only way for Asians to achieve peace and prosperity for all their nations, was through strenuous efforts in their own lands, and not through emigration." To this end they can rely on the good will, cultural friendliness and the material benefits of mutually advantageous trade with Australia.

**Immigration Reform Group, 1960; expanded edition 1962, *Immigration: Control or Colour Bar? The Background to White Australia and a Proposal for Change*. Edited by Kenneth Rivett<sup>14</sup>. Parkville, Vic: Melbourne University Press.**

All we ask for at this stage is a small annual intake (1,500) ... [of "non-Europeans" for an experimental period of 3 to 5 years]. (1962, p. 126)

**Greenwood, G., Harper, N. and Australian Institute of International Affairs, 1968, *Australia in World Affairs: Vol. 3, 1961-1965*, Melbourne: F.W. Cheshire.**

The Association for Immigration Reform ... the first of these associations had its origin in Melbourne University ... Similar bodies came into being in other Australian states, while their membership was not large, they were extremely active in their efforts to influence community attitudes generally, the more significant organisations such as trade unions and churches and, above all, the political parties. ... the Australian Labor Party, which in one aspect represents an intermingling of domestic nationalism and international idealism, for the first time in many years began, through its conferences, to debate seriously if cautiously the form of immigration policy to which it should give its support. The established platform had, in fact, used the term, "White Australia" policy, a term which had never been employed in any immigration legislation. In 1959 the platform was strongly restrictive, though the emphasis was placed upon the assistive side, upon the encouragement of suitable immigrants which shall be strictly regulated so as not to impose any undue strain on the Australian economy or to imperil full employment or Australian industrial conditions through over-competition for available work.

It was not, however, until the Sydney conference of 1965 that any significant change was made. The offensive term "White Australia" was dropped from the party's platform, and formally at least the way

---

<sup>14</sup> Co-founder in 1959 of the Immigration Reform Group.



was open for a restricted number of Asian migrants to enter Australia should a Labor Government be returned. The new definition of policy should be placed on record:

#### XVI: IMMIGRATION

Convinced that increased population is vital to the future development of Australia, the Australian Labor Party will support and uphold a vigorous and expanding immigration program administered with sympathy, understanding and tolerance.

The basis of such policy will be:

- (a) Australia's national and economic security.
- (b) The welfare and integration of all its citizens.
- (c) The preservation of our democratic system and balanced development of our nation.
- (d) The avoidance of the difficult social and economic problems which may follow from an influx of peoples having different standards of living, traditions and cultures.

Despite the gains from the new wording, too much should not be made of the change; Mr. D.A. Dunstan, the then South Australian Attorney-General, who moved the new policy statement, was insistent that the Australian Labor Party did "not propose to open the floodgates to Asian immigration." *[Note the similarity of Senator Edward Kennedy's comments in the very same year of 1965 on U.S. immigration law changes, "... the ethnic mix of this country will not be upset ... S500 will not inundate America with immigrants from any one country or area or the most populated ... of Africa and Asia ... the ethnic pattern of immigration under the proposed measure is not expected to change...". He went on to describe the critics as "bigots", "irrational" etc. Sound familiar?]*

The Government, for its part, did not introduce any alteration in its basic policy during these years, apart from the changes in administrative practice already mentioned. But it was anxious to make plain to the world that it had no sympathy with any form of racial discrimination, and that Australian immigration policy was not an expression of racial superiority, but simply the application of the well-established right of all national communities to determine the composition of their own societies in the light of the existing values of those societies. *[which is more or less what was expressed by the Immigration Restriction Act in 1901].* (pp. 84-85)

... as the reception given to Asian students has shown, there is little active racial hostility, perhaps because of the remarkably homogeneous character of the Australian population and the absence of the problem of significant racial and cultural minorities. *[i.e. no threat, no problem]*

... because of the aggressive attitudes towards race problems by some of the leaders of the newly independent states, and partly because of the tensions observable in Britain, and indeed elsewhere, leading in the British case to regulations restricting the flow of immigrants which in practice severely reduced migration from the West Indies, India and Pakistan. The outlook by the end of 1965 would appear to have been one of majority approval for permitting the entry of a limited number of non-European migrants who for educational and other reasons could fit into the pattern of Australian life. There was, if anything, a hardening of attitude against a large-scale influx of non-Europeans of low educational and economic standing, which might introduce the social tensions existing elsewhere. (p. 86)

Australia was not seeking to become an Asian nation, nor did the Government conceive Australia to be a part of Asia; what the Government was attempting to do was to work out a partnership with a number of Asian countries in which Australia could fulfill a useful contributory role... (p. 120)

The above authors clearly hadn't picked up the profoundness of the ideological changes within both the major parties in Australia, which incidentally coincided with identical phenomena in other two-party tweedledum-tweedledee democracies around the Western world at the same time on the same issues ... but that's another story. The authors dismissively mention "changes in administrative practice" instituted by the government. In announcing these changes in March, 1966, Prime Minister Harold Holt (who took over only two months previously from Sir Robert Menzies, founder of the Liberal Party and Australia's longest serving PM, who stood firmly for Australia's traditional immigration policy) said in parliament that:

The Government has been making a review of the restrictive aspects of our immigration policy. Australia's increasing involvement in Asian developments, the rapid growth of our trade with Asian countries ... the expansion of our military effort, and the scale of diplomatic contact, the growth of tourism to and from the countries of Asia combine to make such a review desirable in our eyes.

**Rivett, Kenneth (ed. for the Immigration Reform Group), 1975, *Australia and the Non-White Migrant*. Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press.**

Australia's intake of non-Europeans ... should rise to say, 20,000 a year. (p. vi) [*Remember? the same man from the same organization only 13 years earlier in 1962 was asking for a mere 1,500 "non-Europeans" – the wedge and the plot thicken quickly.*]

...under the Immigration Restriction Act, Asians who were here already were allowed to bring their wives and children. Then, alarmed by the numbers entering, the government withdrew even that small "concession" and faced Asian men with the choice of either leaving Australia or else separating permanently from their families. It would have been better not only for the victims of Australian policy but also, in the long run for white Australians if, at that stage, we had been called to account before a world assembly. Instead, we were able to shelter behind our membership of the British Empire and a balance of power which, for a little while longer, was to stay tilted absurdly in favor of the European. And on the first occasion when the racial aspect of our immigration policy did come to the notice of an international conference, we used our small bargaining power foolishly and with a degree of selfishness which, even by the standards of the time, can never be excused. (p. 20)

[*After Prime Minister Holt drowned in 1967, John Gorton took office as Prime Minister. He said approvingly whilst in Singapore in January 1971:*] "I think that if we build up gradually inside Australia a proportion of people without white skins, then there will be a complete lack of consciousness that it is being built up and that we will arrive at a state where we have a multicultural country". Here Gorton directly contradicted the earlier statements of Snedden, who, when Immigration Minister [*under Gorton*] had said more than once, that Australian immigration policy was "certainly not a policy which is directed towards the creation of a multi-racial society". (pp. 31-32)

In immigration matters, an element of gradualism is not only inevitable but desirable. (p. 40)

We are ranked after South Africa and Rhodesia as Racist Enemy Number Three. (p. 98)

In August 1980 a conference titled “Future Directions” was held at La Trobe University, Melbourne. A book of the proceedings was later produced (Henry & Thomson eds, 1980). The conference was sponsored by many of Australia’s largest companies (mining, oil, brewing, retailing, building, transport, media) and, of course, the churches. Many who were then little known rising stars of state and federal politics, academia, big media, government bureaucracy, union leadership, aboriginal and ethnic activists attended: e.g. Gareth Evans (Foreign Minister), Joan Kirner (recent Premier of Victoria), Bob Brown (now Tasmanian Greens parliamentarian), Julian Disney, Ranald McDonald et al.

The following coverage in *The Age*, a Melbourne newspaper, gives many pointers to policy now in place:

**“Move Closer to Asia or Face Isolation”, *The Age*, August 18, 1980, p. 3.**

Australia faces growing isolation if it does not move closer to South-East Asia, the conference “Austrasia” group said.

It said such a future would not be comfortable and envisaged a new, multi-national regional grouping.

The task of the group was to investigate the impact of closer integration – economic, social, and cultural – between Australia and the countries of South-East Asia

.... The assumption behind changing Australia into Austrasia was that, by 1990, 10% of the Australian population would be Asian in origin.

“There is a further assumption that a multi-cultural Asianised Australian society, with a growing diversified economy which takes account of regional needs, is preferred despite the stresses which will accompany its emergence. ...”

The group’s initial reaction to the “difficult area of defence” was to abandon the ANZUS pact and forge new defence ties within the region.

... they dealt with five main areas, trade and investment, cultural and social, migration, knowledge base and “adaptive mechanisms”.

**Trade and Investment:** Trade links with Asian nations were increasing. But, as mutually beneficial economic links brought more understanding, it was important that two way trade and investment be accelerated.

Restrictions on the flow of capital should be freed, allowing more Asian investment in Austrasia and more Austrasian investment in Asia.

**Cultural and Social Changes:** This area presented possibilities of great enrichment, but also stress of individuals because of challenges to values...

The group advocates a “soft” approach in this area. Among the actions which should be taken are the promotion of exchange tourism; the acceleration of Asian-languages teaching in schools from primary level; the establishment of an Austrasia Council to encourage cultural exchanges; ...

**Migration:** “To encourage the development with minimal stress in Austrasia, the initial emphasis in

settling Asian immigrants should be wedded to decentralisation.”

... It recommends encouragement of voluntary Asianization on a regional basis using local opinion polls and similar consultative mechanisms to achieve community agreement before new settlers are introduced.

“Existing community refugee resettlement schemes provide a model. These should be underpinned by financial support to facilitate the adaptation process.

“The group further recommends that special entry conditions for Asian immigrants should apply. They would include dual citizenship and family reunion.” ...

**Adaptive Strategies:** If the suggestions in the other areas including trade and cultural exchange were “sensitively and courageously” implemented, these themselves would be positive forces for change to the new Austrasian direction.

Other actions which should be taken specifically to ease change and conflict were the encouragement of individual family hosting schemes and the development of multicultural resource centres.

The next document is the product of a symposium held with the intention of getting the inside story from the founders of the Immigration Reform Group who are still alive and very influential in their various reincarnations.

**Viviani, N. (ed.), 1992, *The Abolition of the White Australia Policy: The Immigration Reform Movement Revisited*. Australia-Asia Papers, No. 65, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia, June 1992. Nathan, Queensland: Centre for the Study of Australian-Asian Relations, School of Modern Asian Studies, Griffith University.**

*[The extracts below come from Viviani’s Preface (pp. iii-iv) and Afterword (pp. 41-43), and from three separate chapters of the book:]*

“Slaying the White Australia Dragon: Some Factors in the Abolition of the White Australia Policy” by Sean Brawley (pp. 1- 9).

“The Immigration Reform Group: Some Recollections” by James Mackie (pp. 21-31).

“Intellectuals and the abolition of the White Australia Policy” by Nancy Viviani (pp. 33-39).

[Viviani’s] paper seeks to place the work of the Immigration Reform Movement in a wider context - and their relevance for contemporary debates on Asian migration. (Viviani’s Preface, p. iv)

... remember Sir Keith Hancock’s view that White Australia was the indispensable condition of every other Australian policy. (Brawley, p. 1)

Another social change of relevance was the impact of the post-war immigration program. *[It hasn’t stopped.]* In parts, the program was instituted to protect White Australia [*“Populate or perish” was the slogan*], but as H.C. Coombes notes, it in fact “paved the way for the abandonment of the racist White Australia Policy” ... north-western European sources quickly exhausted ... Australia was forced to accept southern and eastern European immigrants [*then middle Easterners, etc.*]. ... It is hard to believe that the White Australia policy would have been challenged successfully but for this major development during the early post-war period. (Brawley, p. 2)

... expressed their concerns about the policy in a post-war world which would supposedly be based on the tenets of racial equality as expounded in the Atlantic Charter. (Brawley, p. 5)

The “modification by stealth” aspect of the LCP [*Liberal Country Party coalition*] government’s strategy between 1958 (or thereabouts) and 1966 deserves closer scrutiny ... it entailed bowing before the winds of change to some extent (but not too much), and achieving a kind of “inoculation effect” of letting several thousands of Asians into Australia, but without getting into a head-on fight... (Mackie, p. 31)

That in turn helped to pave the way for the changes in political attitudes and bureaucratic thinking which made it possible for Hubert Opperman, the then Minister for Immigration, with Prime Minister Holt’s support, to introduce major reforms in March 1966, soon after the retirement of Sir Robert Menzies. (I have been told that Opperman had proposed the changes to Menzies some time before, not long after an Immigration Reform Group-Victorian Association for Immigration Reform delegation had lobbied him on the matter, but had been rebuffed with words more or less to the effect that “I know such changes have to come sooner or later, but not in my time...”). (Mackie, p. 22)

*[Regarding the formation of the Immigration Reform Group in the late 1950s]* I suppose I had in mind something like the (early) Fabian Society role in Britain as an opinion-forming think tank. (Mackie, p. 26)

The abolitionists proposed a minimalist start to Asian migration and a gradualist program. They knew that a century of entrenched anti-Asian sentiment (revived in the 1950s by the Chinese communist threat) would not change quickly, that a small beginning would be acceptable and that experience should be a guide to future liberalization. By this stance, they cut the ground from beneath the image of “floods of Asians” so effectively used by their opponents.

... it’s also worth noting three other things about these people: first, they were idealists but a more pragmatic, realist bunch you’d travel far to find. This, I think, was one secret of their success. They did not present their case as a great struggle between good and evil, but as part of Australia changing to meet the post-war challenges of being located in Asia, as part of a necessary change in social values also being undertaken elsewhere (Canada and the United States, but not in South Africa, for example), as a need to retrieve and recreate Australia’s damaged image in the world from being that of an irremediably racist country. Second, they were internationalists... (Viviani, p. 34)

It is the acting on these ideas that sets this group apart, and makes them a prime example of intellectuals helping to change policy and, in this case, history. (Viviani, p. 35)

The most profound effect of the abolition for “recreating Australia” internally was, I suppose, the bifurcation of identity: the intertwining of whiteness and Australianess in our nationalism was rent asunder, as they say, - in about a decade as Asian migration reached close to half of our total migrant intake by the end of the 1980s. In this age of nationalism and ethnicity, this, along with the assertion of migrant rights, has turned us to this occasionally passionate, but more often desultory, search for a “new

identity”. It is ironic, but unsurprising, that just in this period of the assumed triumph of internationalist and cosmopolitan ideas, the ideas of closer communities of nations and ethnic groups should be simultaneously contesting the high moral ground. I suspect it was rather like that for our abolitionists a couple of decades ago.

But the abolition of White Australia also has some powerful direct and indirect effects, through Asian migration, in recreating Australia. It has partly redefined what we mean by rich and poor, how we look at ethnic rights and equality of opportunity, what we mean by multiculturalism and how our economy operates. It has important implications for the hold on power structures of the old white male elites. We are only now beginning to see our way through this actual recreation of Australia.

But the abolition had a more profound impact externally. The White Australia Policy had been the core of all our foreign relations – the alliances, the trade patterns, our defence and the defining of “we” as Western European in the international system. From Billy Hughes at Versailles to Vietnam and the UN, it underpinned it all. Without the White Australia Policy, new thinking about all our motives for dealing with region and the world was needed. Much of the struggle in our foreign policy since 1973 had been about that. Thus we are in the process of being recreated by others. (Viviani, p. 38)

How much was the abolition to do with the “spirit of the age”? It happened in the middle 1960s, after all, though its origins were much earlier. What did it have to do with that 1960s political ferment of ideas regarding race, ethnicity, Aborigines, peace movements, Vietnam and feminism? Or is it really the product of earlier intellectual streams – left liberalism, conscience radicalism?

How much of the abolition had to do with shifts in norms in the international arena? Canada and the United States removed their restrictions about the same time, so we need to ask about the influence of international instruments (Declarations of Human Rights, instruments against racism, decolonisation, etc.) and their use in diplomatic pressure on restrictive states. (Viviani’s Afterword, p. 41)

**F.A. Hayek, 1949, “The Intellectuals and Socialism”, *University of Chicago Law Review*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 417-433.**

The character of the process by which the views of the intellectuals influence the politics of tomorrow is therefore of much more than academic interest ... What to the contemporary observer appears as the battle of conflicting interests had indeed often been decided long before in a clash of ideas confined to narrow circles. (p. 418)

I could expand greatly on the preceding, however, my conclusions are:

1. The intended changes to Australia and its people were brought about through skilful networking, manipulation, and infiltration of elite power structures over decades, with great patience and subtlety, going well over the head of John Citizen, his wife, their kids, and majority opinion. John and his family rarely blame the migrants – they know the politicians, businessmen, and journalists are the real problem.
2. Their intellectual opponents of the day did not take them seriously enough – the complacent majority phenomenon prevailed. The few public intellectuals who today are occasionally writing and speaking

out have so far displayed neither the cohesion, courage, nor charisma to politicize the issue in the manner required, although the means are at their disposal. Graeme Campbell, Federal Member for Kalgoorlie, is the only Parliamentarian representing the majority point of view. He cannot do what is required on his own.

3. Given the massive changes under way as a result of such thorough indoctrination of propaganda throughout the education system for decades now, it is doubtful that any meaningful brake remains to be applied to achieve a sustained and significant slow-down, let alone reversal of current trends (unless the tooth fairy delivers on 2 above).
4. Of Australia's 18 million population today<sup>15</sup>, over one million are of Asian background. With the Asian component of the immigration program running at over 50 percent, and the higher fertility/birthrates of Asian migrants, it is hard to see the traditional public opinion against Asianization, and all it entails, remaining at majority level in opposition to the status quo; it must erode over time. The demographics dictate that Australia's population will be 27% Asian in 25 years, and it won't stop at that. Phil Ruthven, a big business futurologist, happily forecasts that Australia will be two-thirds Asian by late next century. He hopes for an Australian population of 180 million by that time. Mr Ruthven is often invited to repeat his message at Government Immigration conferences.
5. Tri-partisanship whereby the media support political bi-partisanship against majority opinion is a very tough nut to crack.
6. On the current trend of policy, the future management of the continent is going to change hands with the inevitable demographic swamping now under way and predicted to continue. It will no longer be Australia, it will be something else.

“Australasia” is an old term that is acquiring a whole new meaning. This is the reason the pro-Asianization lobby is now well and truly out of the closet, as evidenced by the opening two paragraphs of *Living with Dragons: Australia Confronts its Asian Destiny* (1995) This volume of 12 essays from specialist insiders is edited by Greg Sheridan, Foreign Editor and leading pro-Asianization spin-doctor for the only national newspaper in Australia (Rupert Murdoch's *The Australian*). By Mr. Sheridan's own admission (*Weekend Australian*, August 19, 1995) in an article explaining his 1979 conversion experience to all things Asian (through reading a book, *The Year of Living Dangerously* (Koch, 1978), about political turmoil in mid-1960s Indonesia) he “had no particular South East Asian connections and as a grade D journalist, no professional mandate or opportunity to go there. I did instead two things. I read Koch's other books and I realized that while I couldn't for the moment go to South East Asia, South East Asia had come to Australia. In 1979, Malcolm Fraser [Prime Minister, Leader of the Liberal Party] had made the momentous decision to accept large numbers of Vietnamese boat people. This decision changed Australia forever.” Given his uptake on this, hence Sheridan's record rapid rise from D Grade journalist to A Grade spin-doctor which he has been for some years now at *The Australian*. Sheridan dedicates the book to his wife, Jasbir, and their three sons, Ajaypal, Lakhvinder, and Jagdave.

**Sheridan, G. (ed.), 1995, *Living with Dragons: Australia Confronts its Asian Destiny*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin in association with Mobil Oil Australia.**

<sup>15</sup> The reader is reminded that this paper was written in late 1995.

A revolution is sweeping across Australia. The nation is changing fundamentally and irreversibly. The old order is gone, a new order is taking shape with astonishing speed and force. An old mental universe has died, a new universe has come into being. A comprehensive set of attitudes and aspirations and material circumstances has been left behind. A new pattern is emerging. Unlike most revolutions, this one is bloodless, but is no less profound and consequential, shattering to some, liberating to most; the one thing that can be said for certain is that nothing is unaffected; the old order can never be restored.

This revolution is occurring within the Australian psyche and also within Australia's material circumstances. That is why it is so comprehensive a revolution - it is a transformation of the spirit and the body. I speak of the Asianisation of Australian life. (p. 3)

Paul Kelly [*Sheridan's simpatico pro-Asianization editor-in-chief at The Australian*], in his seminal book on the 1980s, *The End of Certainty*, described the pattern of decisions, policies and institutions which emerged in the first years of Federation and which became known as the Australian Settlement. The Australian Settlement, he said, had five fundamental pillars. They were: white Australia, industry protection, wage arbitration, state paternalism and imperial benevolence (with the United States later replacing Britain as the relevant imperial power). The politics of the 1990s, he argued, was a politics of creative destruction, in which all five pillars were torn down. At the end of 1994 it is easy to see that Kelly's essential thesis was right. White Australia has given way to perhaps the most authentic racially non-discriminatory immigration policy in the world. Tariffs were torn down and by the turn of the century Australia will have virtually no significant industry protection. [*Or industry!*]

Kelly's thesis was thus right, but incomplete in two critical respects. It failed to recognize how all of the crucial policy changes of the 1980s led directly to the Asianization of almost every sphere of Australian life. Similarly, it failed to recognize just how totally the relationship with Asia has defined Australia from its earliest days, so that the embrace of Asia which accelerated so greatly in the 1980s was not just something new for Australia, but the total reversal of the means of national self-identification throughout our history. This is the stuff of revolution. (pp. 4-5)

... in education, as in so many other areas, internationalization for Australia has meant, Asianization. (p. 16)

In Australian foreign policy, Asia is now nearly totally dominant. (p. 17)

I have often run into views among writers and artists and others in China that are similar to those expressed in the following passage. The passage comes from a forthcoming book by the Brisbane-based Chinese writer Sang Ye, *The Year the Dragon Came*, a collection of oral histories of Chinese people newly arrived in Australia:

My landlord is an old man who's seen a lot of the world. He thinks of Asia as a filthy place, contaminated both spiritually and materially. I agree. He also thinks Africa's a mess and Europe is too old, and he's right there too. But I don't agree with him when he says Australia's the best. That's bullshit. In the eyes of the Chinese, you're a second or third-rate country. It's just that you've opened your doors a bit wider than the rest and we've all crowded in. The first-rate countries are America, then France and West Germany, in the second tier are Northern Europe and Japan and only then Canada and



Australia. Canada's a bit better than Australia because it's closer to America. To put it more bluntly, Australia's become a refuge for drifters, a dumping ground for the world's garbage. (p. 154)

It is to cast our minds forward – say, 50 years – to a time when we are totally cheek by jowl with our Asian neighbors, when every facet of Australian life, from entertainment to industrial relations to political party platforms, will be affected by Asian societies and cultures, because we will be part of an Asian political confederation in fact, even if not by way of a European model of a Treaty of Maastricht. (p. 164)

I am a constant champion when I am in Asia for Australia and for the great success of Asian immigration and the many other things which make this a lovely, honey-coloured society. (p. 171)

Australians have never before been given the message so plainly, clearly, and matter-of-factly in a mainstream paper-back edition.

Will it create any backlash? I doubt it! Australian intellectuals and academics who work in the system on immigration problems have been so thoroughly intimidated and subdued over time that many won't even admit the word "Asianization" to their vocabulary for fear of attracting flak – understandable, but pathetic.

On October 17, 1995, I had a chat with Rupert Murdoch face-to-face at the Los Angeles airport. I told him what I thought of the totally corrosive, corrupting and all-pervasive pro-Asianization line pushed daily in his down-under flagship *The Australian*, and that Kelly and Sheridan were the cheer squad leaders. After speaking about Peter Brimelow's *Alien Nation* (1995), he told me that Brimelow and he were acquainted and he knew the book. I then asked him point-blank if he agreed with and was happy about the obvious long-term demographic implications regarding racial, ethnic and cultural swamping that must occur if Labor/Liberal bi-partisanship policies on immigration, multiculturalism and Asianization are not changed. Mr Murdoch's response: "No, I think it's gone too far, and we risk balkanization of Australian society in the future ...". He undertook to read and listen to the materials I gave him. Wouldn't it be good to be able to make a difference! In his case, the mega power of one, but will other factors intervene?<sup>16</sup> And what will they be?

Denis McCormack, spokesman, political researcher  
Australians Against Further Immigration  
November 1995

---

<sup>16</sup> Unfortunately, it appears that Murdoch has subsequently opted for a liberal approach to immigration, calling for immigration reform in the US and urging Congress leaders to clear the way for skilled workers to gain visas and citizenship. See, for example, this evidence from 2010:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/world/rupert-murdoch-advocates-us-migrant-rights/story-e6frg6so-1225933000741>

In 2013, he was vocal in his praise of the current Australian situation: "Having a diverse immigrant population is also a precious resource as we engage the world"; see:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/lets-learn-to-thrive-on-disruption/story-e6frg6zo-1226750822326>

### **Postscript, June 25, 1996**

A brief bridging account of events concerning Graeme Campbell MHR Kalgoorlie, (see point 2 of the conclusions I listed above, following the quotation from Hayek), and his current efforts to establish a new centre ground political force, “Australia First”, is required. The reader will note that this paper was prepared in early November 1995.

I was personally involved in the circumstances surrounding Mr Campbell’s having being jettisoned by the Labor Party in early December 1995 for his support of Australians Against Further Immigration. On Australia Day, January 1996, I organized a rally at the Heidelberg Town Hall, Ivanhoe, Melbourne, at which Mr Campbell, after citing the need for a new political party to break bipartisanship, addressed some specifics on the Australian nationalist agenda, which, when understood as a core cluster or constellation of policies adequately covered the sensible, intelligent nationalist perspective.<sup>17</sup>

The daily papers demonstrate that Australia’s national survival, independence, and sustainability, be they measured in social, cultural, environmental, economic, or demographic terms, are under threat. It is essentially a struggle to mobilize politically the hearts, minds and votes of middle Australia, whose polled opinions on the key issues always reflect the nationalist perspective in preference to what they are forced to live under – an increasingly damaging bipartisan internationalist orthodoxy, as orchestrated by an unrepresentative managerial elite. Those who dominate in parliamentary politics, industry, business, unions, media, academia, churches, etc., are still largely in denial about this, although cracks are appearing.

The rising popularity of Campbell’s nascent, “Australia First” folk movement is a promising sign of heightening awareness of, and apprehension about, the direction in which Australia is heading. Australians Against Further Immigration, with Graeme Campbell’s endorsement, have greatly contributed to the creation of the current political climate – the immediate forecast is for a period of less predictable political atmospherics. A front is developing with some high-wind warnings hopefully to be followed by fine, stable conditions. Stay tuned.

### **Afterword, January 2015**

The release (on January 1, 1997) of the Australian Parliament’s 1966 Cabinet papers confirmed the central thesis of “The Grand Plan”, that “the only way the White Australia Policy could be substantially modified was by denying the real scope of the change” and that this change “came through stealth” (Kelly, 1997).

The 1996 paper “The Grand Plan” has influenced subsequent writers and thinkers. It was favorably reviewed by Evonne Moore for *The Social Contract* (1997):

To date, this paper is the only document on the history of the attempt to integrate Australia into Asia, which has been placed firmly on the public record. ... While

---

<sup>17</sup> Media coverage included a segment on the Australian Broadcasting Commission’s influential TV program, *7.30 Report*, hosted by Kerry O’Brien on Australia Day, January 26, 1996.

McCormack has been named in parliament as having contributed to the rise of Pauline Hanson, his arguments on the Asianization strategy have not been challenged by any political or academic commentator. His paper has drawn favorable comment from serious long-term observers of migration into developed countries in the United Kingdom, France, Germany and the United States.

At John Tyndall's direction, it was also reviewed positively by Nick Griffin for *Spearhead* (1997), who concluded that "the picture of the long-plotted murder of Australia is a frightening one". Other references are included in books by Pauline Hanson (1997, p. 107), Peter Wilkinson (2007, p. 158) and Alan James (2013, p. 113).

The paper has also been considered by the authors of a number of books produced by the academic left and typically issued by leading Australian publishers. These sorts of pro-immigration books are generally released every few years to feed, condition and influence undergraduates and the public at large. The song remains the same in each of these texts. They repeat, regurge, recap and reference their "black armband" academic mentors and predecessors whilst straining to add 10% of new material to shore up their politically correct views of Australia's history as "racist" and usually inferring that contemporary Australian society is not worthy of survival.

Thus historian (and now Pratt Foundation Chair of Jewish Civilization, Monash University) Andrew Markus' *Race: John Howard and the Remaking of Australia* (2001), presented John Howard as promoting undesirable "Anglo" ideals, even though it can be argued (as did Wilkinson, 2007) that Howard made a major contribution to large-scale Asian immigration to promote the financial interests of the corporate elites.

"The Grand Plan" paper was purposely misrepresented as a conspiracy theory (Markus, 2001, pp. 122-123), a view also taken by Gwenda Tavan (2005, p. 3). In her book's Acknowledgements section, Tavan thanks Markus who was one of the examiners for her PhD from which her book evolved. Ironically much of Tavan's book supports a "grand plan" view and she admits that the incrementalist dismantling of the White Australia policy was done in a "sometimes secretive" fashion because "radical shifts in policy would precipitate a strong domestic backlash, which could in turn harm the electoral prospects of incumbent governments" (p. 235). Tavan wrongly reinforces Markus' standard usage of "conspiracy" (involving a highly integrated series of plots), whereas in fact quite early in "The Grand Plan" (above) the "grand plan" is clearly defined as a loose undertaking by leaderships across whole-of-government and civil-society organizations.

Markus and Tavan each cite "The Grand Plan" in their books, but have they actually read it? Relevant to observe is that neither of them has attempted to discuss the issues with the author – despite the fact that we all live in the same city and occasionally attend the same events.

Also noteworthy are comments made about the dismantling of the White Australia policy by *The Australian* journalist Paul Kelly, a strong supporter of the Asianization of Australia (2001, pp. 73-74):

There was no public suggestion ...that the principle of immigration restriction were being removed...It was a reform that pretended to be no reform. The reason is

manifest: any declaration that White Australia was being abolished would provoke a public outcry. The issue was never put to the people. The policy was dismantled as a result of a simultaneous re-think within both parties and astute political management. Its dismantling was a “smoke and mirrors” exercise...The White Australia policy was dismantled by stealth and by a group of politicians and public servants who struck ahead of community opinion.

With the passage of time, some of these writers have subtly admitted being able to recognize the immigration concerns shared by the majority. In 2010, early in the “Big Australia” debate, Nancy Viviani expressed concern at the “explosive” pace of change in Australia (2010), and Greg Sheridan, still foreign editor at *The Australian*, has fallen out of love with multiculturalism and Muslim immigration specifically (2011; 2012). Sheridan’s latest reiteration of his views (2014) serves as a timely summary of the research embodied in “The Grand Plan”:

Almost nothing in Australian history has been as successful as Asian immigration. As recently as 50 years ago, in the mid-1960s, Australia had a White Australia policy. Asian Australians had been few and had suffered a great deal of discrimination, some of it violent and murderous. Once Alice Springs had been majority ethnic Chinese. From the late 70s, less than 40 years ago, Australia began accepting large numbers of Asian immigrants.

Almost from the first words I wrote for public consumption I have strongly supported this policy. It has resulted, incidentally, in a kind of benign cultural genocide. The old race of “Austral-Britons” is gone forever. It was not a bad race and it produced a good culture. Don’t think this was not a real identity. National leaders as recent as John Curtin and Robert Menzies called Australia a British nation, or even more explicitly, “a nation of Britishers”. We are certainly not that now. The old Austral-Britons have been supplanted by a much more diverse range of ethnic and cultural backgrounds. I don’t feel at all unhappy about that because race and ethnicity are the least interesting or important things about a person. It is the content of their character that counts.

In 40 years the racial and ethnic identity of Australia has been completely transformed.

By way of conclusion, here are some remarks made by the author and reported in *The Washington Post*, April 4, 1993 by William Branigin (and reprinted in *The Guardian Weekly*, April 11, 1993), that still aptly sum up Australia’s plight:

“We cannot environmentally, economically or culturally afford to continue with mass immigration and its Trojan horse, multiculturalism,” said Denis McCormack, a spokesman for the group. He said Australians risk being “culturally swamped” if heavy immigration, particularly from Asia, continues. He cited a widely publicized poll last year showing that 70 percent of Australians do not feel they are part of Asia and do not wish to be further integrated with Asia. “It is not a position of cultural or racial superiority to wish to preserve your own culture,” McCormack said. “Our complete racial and socio-cultural milieu is being changed through undemocratic policies. This is grounds for revolution.”

## References

All internet links were accurate as at January 21, 2015.

Abbott, T.

1990. "The real issue is the changing face of our society", *The Australian*, May 31, 1990, p. 8. (This article has recently been made available online, via <http://reduceimmigration.wordpress.com/2013/08/31/the-real-issue-is-the-changing-face-of-our-society>)

Australian Bureau of Statistics

2012. *Migration, Australia, 2010-11*. ABS publication 3412.0, p. 5. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia. This publication is available online via: <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/3412.02010-11>

Australian Bureau of Statistics

2014. *Australian Demographic Statistics, Mar 2014*. ABS publication 3101.0, p. 1. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia. This publication is available online via: <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/3101.0>

Birrell, B., Healy, E., Betts, K. and Smith, F.T.

2011. *Immigration and the Resources Boom, Mark 2*. Melbourne: Centre for Population and Urban Research, Monash University.

Blainey, G.

1984. *All for Australia*. North Ryde, NSW: Methuen Haynes.

Branigin, W.

1993. "Australian Immigration Raising New Concerns; Influx of Asians, Others Seen as Both a Source of Strength and of Rising Tensions", *The Washington Post*, April 4, 1993.

Branigin, W.

1993. "Australia Questions 'Open Door' Policy To Asiatic Migrants", *The Guardian Weekly*, Vol. 148, No. 15, p. 18, April 11, 1993.

Brimelow, P.

1995. *Alien Nation: Common Sense about America's Immigration Disaster*. New York: Random House.

Burnham, J.

1941. *The Managerial Revolution: What is happening in the world*. New York: John Day Company. (The first UK edition was published in 1942 by Putnam & Co Ltd, London.)

Campbell, G.

1996. "Immigration: Asianisation", *Parliamentary debates (Hansard): House of Representatives / Commonwealth of Australia*, October 28, 1996, p. 5959. Canberra: Australian Parliament House. Accessible via: <http://tinyurl.com/28Oct1996-Campbell>.

Greenwood, G., Harper, N. and Australian Institute of International Affairs

1968. *Australia in World Affairs: Vol. 3, 1961-1965*. Melbourne: F.W. Cheshire.

Griffin, N.

1997. "The grand plan: Australians expose the drive for an Asian future". *Spearhead*, No. 335, January 1997.

Hayek, F.A.

1949. "The Intellectuals and Socialism". *University of Chicago Law Review*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 417-433.

Henry, M. and Thomson, P. (eds)

1980. *Future Directions: 1980 Conference Report: A report of the Future Directions Conference held at Chisholm College, La Trobe University, 10-14 August 1980*. Melbourne: Australian Frontier.

Holt, H.

1966. *Parliamentary debates (Hansard): House of Representatives / Commonwealth of Australia*, March 8, 1966, p. 34. Canberra: Commonwealth Government Printer.

Hudson, P.

2010. "Immigration the key to boosting population growth, says Opposition Leader Tony Abbott", *Herald Sun*, January 23, 2010. See: <http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/some-recent-migrants-oppose-australian-notions-of-equality-says-opposition-leader-tony-abbott/story-e6frf7jo-1225822658614>

Huntington, S.P.

1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Immigration Reform Group

1962. *Immigration: Control or Colour Bar? The Background to White Australia and a Proposal for Change*. Edited by Kenneth Rivett. Parkville, Vic: Melbourne University Press.

James, A.

2013. *New Britannia: The rise and decline of Anglo-Australia*. Melbourne: Renewal Publications.

Keating, P.

1995. Speech by the Prime Minister, the Hon P J Keating MP, to the Tenth Anniversary Dinner of the

Australian Chinese Forum of NSW, Sydney, October 12, 1995. See:

<http://pmtranscripts.dpnc.gov.au/transcripts/00009793.pdf>

Kelly, P.

1997. "Our timid shift to multiculturalism", *The Australian*, January 1, 1997, p. 15.

Kelly, P.

2001. *100 years: The Australian Story*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin.

Koch, C.J.

1978. *The Year of Living Dangerously*. West Melbourne: Thomas Nelson.

Liberal Party of Australia.

2010. *Real Action on Sustainable Population Growth*. Media release, July 25, 2010. Barton, ACT: Liberal Party of Australia. Available online at: <http://www.liberal.org.au/latest-news/2010/07/25/real-action-sustainable-population-growth-0>

Liberal Party of Australia.

2013. *Our Plan: Real solutions for all Australians: The direction, values and policy priorities of the next Coalition government*. Melbourne: Liberal Party of Australia.

Mackie, J.

1992. "The Immigration Reform Group: Some Recollections", pp. 21-31 in N. Viviani (ed.), *The Abolition of the White Australia Policy: The Immigration Reform Movement Revisited*. Australia-Asia Papers, No. 65, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia, June 1992. Nathan, Queensland: Centre for the Study of Australian-Asian Relations, School of Modern Asian Studies, Griffith University.

Markus, A.

2001. *Race: John Howard and the Remaking of Australia*. Crows Nest, NSW: Allen and Unwin.

McCormack, D.

1991. "National / International Ramifications of Current Immigration Policy and the Relationship to Environment / Population Issues in Australia", in Ronnie Harding (ed.), *Ecopolitics V Conference, 4-7April 1991*. Kensington, NSW: Centre for Liberal and General Studies, University of New South Wales.

McCormack, D.

1992. "The desirable composition of any migrant intake", pp. 409-430 in *Second National Immigration Outlook Conference, 11-13 November 1992: Proceedings*. Carlton, Victoria: Bureau of Immigration Research.

McCormack, D.

1996. *The Grand Plan: Asianisation of Australia – Race, Place and Power*, with an introduction, “Asianisation – the dreams of the elite”, by Graeme Campbell MHR for Kalgoorlie. Melbourne. The National Library of Australia’s catalogue entry is online at: <http://catalogue.nla.gov.au/Record/1659254>. A scan of this booklet is available via: <http://reduceimmigration.wordpress.com/links/why-should-immigration-be-reduced/>

McDonnell, D.

1993. “Hawke reveals political ‘pact’”, *Herald Sun*, May 25, 1993, p. 4.

Moore, E.

1997. “Asianization of Australia”, *The Social Contract*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (Winter 1997-1998). See: [http://www.thesocialcontract.com/artman2/publish/tsc0802/article\\_718.shtml](http://www.thesocialcontract.com/artman2/publish/tsc0802/article_718.shtml)

Rivett, K. (ed. for the Immigration Reform Group)

1975. *Australia and the Non-White Migrant*. Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press.

Sheridan, G. (ed.)

1995. *Living with Dragons: Australia Confronts its Asian Destiny*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin in association with Mobil Oil Australia.

Sheridan, G.

2011. “How I lost faith in multiculturalism”, *The Australian*, April 2, 2011. Available at: <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/how-i-lost-faith-in-multiculturalism/story-fn59niix-1226031793805>

Sheridan, G.

2012. “The unacceptable face of multiculturalism”, *The Australian*, September 17, 2012. Available at: <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/columnists/the-unacceptable-face-of-multiculturalism/story-e6frg76f-1226475181053#>

Sheridan, G.

2014. “Constitutional change will divide not unite the nation”, *The Australian*, September 20, 2014. Available at: <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/columnists/constitutional-change-will-divide-not-unite-the-nation/story-e6frg76f-1227064539257>

Sydney Morning Herald

1993. Editorial: “Immigration and bipartisanship”, *Sydney Morning Herald*, May 26, 1993, p. 18.

Tavan, G.

2005. *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*. Melbourne: Scribe Publications.



The Age

1980. "Move Closer to Asia or Face Isolation", *The Age*, August 18, 1980, p. 3. Available online at: <http://tinyurl.com/Age-August18-1980>

Viviani, N. (ed.)

1992. *The Abolition of the White Australia Policy: The Immigration Reform Movement Revisited*. Australia-Asia Papers, No. 65, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia, June 1992. Nathan, Queensland: Centre for the Study of Australian-Asian Relations, School of Modern Asian Studies, Griffith University.

Viviani, N.

1992. "Intellectuals and the abolition of the White Australia Policy", pp. 33-39 in N. Viviani (ed.), *The Abolition of the White Australia Policy: The Immigration Reform Movement Revisited*. Australia-Asia Papers, No. 65, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia, June 1992. Nathan, Queensland: Centre for the Study of Australian-Asian Relations, School of Modern Asian Studies, Griffith University.

Viviani, N.

2010. "Immigration: Taking a Long View", *The Asialink Essays*, Melbourne: The University of Melbourne. Available at: [http://asialink.unimelb.edu.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0007/408724/Viviani2010Essay2.pdf](http://asialink.unimelb.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/408724/Viviani2010Essay2.pdf)

Wilkinson, P.

2007. *The Howard Legacy: Displacement of Traditional Australia from the Professional and Managerial Classes*. Essendon, Victoria: Independent Australian Publications.

Woodard, G.

1995. "Macmahon Ball's Goodwill Mission to Asia, 1948", *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (May 1995), pp. 129-134.