

The Asianisation of Australia

Third edition, February 1998 by Chris Anderson

Table of Contents

(Volume One) An Exposé of the "Asian Future" Being Forced Upon Australia	3
<i>Explanatory Notes.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Acknowledgments.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Asianisation: A policy of many facets</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Asianisation: A Deliberate Policy</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Asian Immigration</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>The Future Asian Population in Australia.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Multiculturalism as a Cloak for Asianisation</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>The Undemocratic Nature of Asianisation</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Planning for Asianisation</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Moves Towards Asianisation: Australia's "Asian Future", and the "Labor" Side of Politics.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Moves Towards Asianisation: The "Fellow Travellers".....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Moves Towards Asianisation: The "Conservative" Side of Politics.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Moves Towards Asianisation: Big-Business</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Moves Towards Asianisation: Enmeshment With Asia (Selling Australia's Future for Asian Money).....</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>The Future?.....</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Resistance to Asianisation</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>References.....</i>	<i>39</i>
(Volume Two) Statistics (Immigration, Ethnicity, and Trade)	48
<i>Country of Birth and Ethnicity.....</i>	<i>48</i>
<i>Illegal Immigrants.....</i>	<i>49</i>
<i>West Asia</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Cyprus</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>Net Immigration</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>Category Jumpers</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>Immigration Categories</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>Misleading Statistics</i>	<i>56</i>
<i>Ethnicity Statistics.....</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>Australia: Migration Statistics</i>	<i>59</i>
EXPLANATION OF TERMS:.....	59
<i>The Asian Population in Australia.....</i>	<i>69</i>
<i>Australia: Trade With Asia and Europe.....</i>	<i>78</i>
<i>Government Lies and Immigration Statistics: A Case Study.....</i>	<i>82</i>
<i>Australian Governments, Prime Ministers, and Immigration Ministers: 1945 to 1998 (67).....</i>	<i>85</i>
<i>References.....</i>	<i>87</i>

(Volume Three) Opinion Polls, the Traitor Class, and the Yellow Peril 94

Immigration Opinion Polls 94

RELEVANT OPINION POLLS 96

The "New Class" 104

The Yellow Peril..... 114

References..... 117

(Volume One)

An Exposé of the "Asian Future" Being Forced Upon Australia

Explanatory Notes

Immigration statistics: It is important that "Appendix One: Immigration and Ethnicity Statistics" is read, in order that matters regarding immigration statistics used in this document are understood.

Statistics: Where figures have been rounded, minor discrepancies may occur between sums of the component items and totals (especially regarding percentage totals).

Square brackets, [and], denote explanatory or bridging remarks.

"UK & Europe" has been used as a category in various places in this document, to avoid confusion in those sectors where the term "Europe" is regarded as referring only to continental Europe.

The Department of Immigration is referred to by that name throughout this publication, although this department has actually undergone several name changes over the years.

For information on the historical background to the Asianisation of Australia, *The Demise of the White Australia Policy* (by Chris Anderson) is recommended reading.

Acknowledgments

The majority of statistics in this publication derive from:

- The Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- The Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research.
- The Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs.

The author is indebted, in several instances, to the published research of the following authors:

- John Bennett
- Prof. Geoffrey Blainey
- Dr. John C.A. Dique
- Denis McCormack
- Prof. Charles A. Price

The author is also indebted to those who have assisted with the provision of statistics included within this document.

Asianisation: A policy of many facets

The Asianisation of Australia is not just a single unconnected issue of immigration. There are historical, political, and economic aspects to this undeclared policy of the major political parties. While this document will, of course, discuss the demographic implications of Asianisation, other facets of the process will also be touched upon.

It appears that our nation's future is set to be determined by the high levels of Asian immigration that we are to have imposed upon us over the next few generations; that Australia will end up with an "Asian Future", which will destroy the previously homogeneous character of an essentially European Australia. Ironically, this "Asian Future" will also end up destroying the possibility of the "truly Multicultural Future" that has been envisioned by some multiculturalists.

The mass immigration programmes, set in place after the end of World War Two, led to the onset of multiculturalism; and the continuation of both mass immigration and multiculturalism has led to the onset of the Asianisation of Australia.

Asianisation is, in effect, the colonisation of Australia by Asia. It is being carried out by grovelling politicians who seek to "integrate" our nation into Asia; to "do a deal" whereby they supposedly achieve some economic and political benefits in return for our subjugation in political, cultural, and demographic terms. Also, in many ways, Asianisation fits in with the liberal-internationalist ideology held by most multiculturalists, including the majority of Australian politicians and Establishment figures, as well as alleviating the "white guilt complex" apparently held by so many of these cosmopolitans.

The Establishment's Asianisation policies have led to much frustration and anger being felt within the community, by those Australians who feel that they are being dispossessed and have been cheated by successive governments. As one letter-writer put it:

"Australians have become second class citizens in their own country. Asian immigrants, especially so-called "refugees", can receive various government benefits and help - in areas such as employment and housing - that average Australians miss out on. At the same time Asians take tens of thousands of jobs that would normally go to Australians - while thousands of our students miss out on a university education because their places have been taken by overseas students from Asia. But quite aside from the economic implications and the anti-Australian discrimination; our country is being taken away from us: When Aussies walk through the streets, we feel like strangers in our own land - Australians are being dispossessed; our people, our identity and our culture are all being slowly destroyed. Why have our governments let these people in? In my time, I've voted for the Liberal Party and the Labor Party, but all of the major parties are selling us out. They know what the problem is, and they know most Aussies don't want an Asianised Australia, but they refuse to solve the problem. There's so many Asians here that they're taking over the country just by sheer weight of numbers. If we don't do something about it now, we won't have a country left to pass onto our grandchildren."(1)

It is essential that Australians recognise the reality of the current situation: that Asianisation means not only the dismissal of Australia's independence, but also the destruction of our national identity and culture.

Asianisation: A Deliberate Policy

The Asianisation of Australia is deliberate Establishment policy.

As has been exposed by Professor Geoffrey Blainey, European immigrants are actually discriminated against and are discouraged from migrating to Australia. Blainey revealed that the immigration programme "gives massive preference to migrants from Asia and discriminates on a very startlingly scale against migrants from the British Isles... There are massive requests from Britain, from West Germany and from other countries to come to Australia, but the great majority of those requests are refused because of special guidelines now set up by the Government"(2) (although Blainey wrote those words in 1984, they still apply).

Consider the following points:

1) Programmes of mass Asian immigration have been carried out as part of a deliberate policy of "Asianisation". It has been estimated that Australia will be predominantly Asian in three to four generations.

There are two major reasons for the Asianisation of Australia:

The first is social: various liberal-internationalist "do-gooders" have decided to try and create a "Brotherhood of Man" here.

The second is economic: powerful financial and/or political individuals and groups want a rapid expansion of Australia's population, in order to create a larger consumer market, as well as to provide a cheaper work force.

For these reasons the Labor, Liberal, National, and Democrat parties, as well as big business and multi-national corporations, all encourage mass Asian immigration.

2) It has been known by Australian governments for many years that the family reunion category of the immigration programme, as Professor Blainey has stated, "strongly favours Asian immigrants", and - over several years - the family reunion component of the immigration programme has been steadily "bumped up", thus ensuring a huge increase in Asian immigration.(3)

The Labor Government led by Bob Hawke, and then by Paul Keating, was the worst offender in this regard. As Labor's Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Stewart West, announced in 1984, "This Labor Government is giving priority to family reunion and refugees".(4)

Blainey revealed that:

"Many multiculturalists strongly favour the family-reunion scheme. They know that it favours Asian immigrants... A strong emphasis on family reunion, at the expense of other migration categories, appears neutral, but it is not. Moreover, it is fair to point out, to a government that insists that its policy eschews anything smacking of racial preference, that a family-reunion scheme is overwhelmingly a racial-reunion scheme".(5)

3) Skilled migration has often lost out to immigration via family reunion and refugee immigration schemes. This has been done so as to lessen the numbers of Europeans coming to Australia, whilst enlarging the number of Asians entering. Various governments have known that the "skilled migration" category favours Europeans, as was admitted in 1985 by the then Minister for Immigration, Chris Hurford: "reverting to greater migration of skilled people and people under the business migration program... gives a decided advantage to Europeans, because our Australian institutions are so similar".(6)

4) During the 1970s and 1980s, immigration guidelines were changed, whereby the emphasis on the importance of having a grasp of the English language was lowered - yet another move which enabled an increase in the number of Asian immigrants.(7)

5) The "humanitarian" immigration category (which includes the refugee, special humanitarian, and special assistance sub-categories) is also well-known as being favourable to Asians (in the 1980s Polish refugees were discriminated against, while Vietnamese refugees were discriminated in favour of)(8). To this end, the Department of Immigration has issued internal policy directives in the past that give preference to Vietnamese. One such document reveals that officers of the Department of Immigration were instructed to "respond to the claims of Vietnamese applicants in a compassionate and flexible way" (in other words, to be more lenient towards Vietnamese applicants, than towards other applicants) and that "Application of the appropriate policy provisions to meet their circumstances may involve considerable use of available discretions with a relatively high number of cases receiving special attention" (Policy Control Instruction "PC 39", dated 2 August 1982, File Reference 82/95108).(9*)

Such discrimination continued on after the 1980s. The Asia-Australia Survey 1994, produced by the Centre for the Study of Australia-Asia Relations, revealed the little-known fact that "The majority of Vietnamese currently migrating to Australia are arriving directly from Vietnam under the special Vietnamese Family Migration Program, with only about 20 per cent of the Vietnamese settling in Australia as refugees. The Vietnamese Family Migration Program was established in the 1980s as part of an international strategy to reduce the outflow of refugees from Vietnam. Under this program Vietnamese nationals with immediate family members in Australia receive preferential treatment in seeking to migrate to Australia" (emphasis added).(10)

6) It has also been revealed by Nick Bolkus, then Labor Minister for Immigration, that "In relation to the business skills program... that the Government had moved specifically to target the Asian region".(11)

7) The result?: We need only to look at the increase of the Asian population in Australia. In 1966 there were only about 49 400 Asians resident in Australia (12) (1966 was the last census which actually published the racial background of the Australian population in detail) (13*). But by 1991, following the immigration changes made by various Liberal and Labor governments from 1966, the Asian population in Australia had incredibly risen to about one and a quarter million Asians (i.e. 7.4%: 1 288 000; comprising 1 055 000 full-Asians, 233 000 part-Asians) (14). By mid-1995, after further Asian immigration and the natural population increase of Asian ethnics, this figure rose to approximately 1 600 000 Asians in Australia, out of a population of only just over 18 million (i.e. 8.7%) (15). By the beginning of 1998, people in Australia of Asian and Third World descent would be well over 10% of the total population.

Note: Perhaps as a response to the community backlash against Asian immigration, John Howard's Liberal government has increased the proportion of the "skilled" category of the immigration intake; the Liberal's citing economic reasons for this move. However, it should be realised that such a move is only a matter of degree, and that mass Asian immigration, and the Asianisation of Australia, continues on.

Asian Immigration

Asian immigration is now 43.7% of the total permanent intake, whereas European immigration is now only 25.8% (1996-97 figures).

Of the net permanent intake, Asian immigration is now 59.7%, while European immigration is only 28.4% (1996-97 figures).

In 1991/92, 73.5% of the net permanent intake was from Asia (!!!!).

Note: "net permanent intake" is the migration increase calculated by subtracting the permanent departures from the permanent (settler) arrivals. Net migration statistics are important, as they reveal a more realistic picture of Australia's population increase via migration.

TABLE 1
SETTLER ARRIVALS, SELECTED YEARS
(Australian Immigration)

U.K. &								
Year	Asia	%	Europe	%	Other	%	Total	%
1959/60	2 694	2.5	97 498	92.1	5 695	5.4	105 887	100
1969/70	16 869	9.1	147 086	79.5	21 144	11.4	185 099	100
1979/80	26 602	32.9	31 276	38.7	22 870	28.3	80 748	100
1989/90	55 560	45.8	38 386	31.7	27 281	22.5	121 227	100
1996/97	37 456	43.7	22 167	25.8	26 129	30.5	85 752	100

TABLE 2
NET PERMANENT GAIN, SELECTED YEARS
(Australian Immigration)

U.K. &								
Year	Asia	%	Europe	%	Other	%	Total	%
1979/80	25 846	44.0	22 176	37.8	10 709	18.2	58 731	100
1989/90	53 901	57.7	30 395	32.5	9 074	9.7	93 370	100
1996/97	33 355	59.7	15 864	28.4	6 676	11.9	55 895	100

TABLE 3
NET PERMANENT AND LONG-TERM GAIN, SELECTED YEARS
(Australian Immigration)

U.K. &								
Year	Asia	%	Europe	%	Other	%	Total	%
1979/80	28 318	36.8	26 773	34.8	21 847	28.4	76 938	100
1989/90	63 346	61.0	32 122	30.9	8 398	8.1	103 866	100
1996/97	57 124	60.5	24 247	25.7	13 025	13.8	94 396	100

The Future Asian Population in Australia

What does the future hold for our nation? Australia's most respected demographic expert, Charles Price, has already published his projections: "the year 2020 would see some 2.7 million persons of unmixed Asian origin and about 3.9 million persons of part Asian ancestry; a Total Descent figure of 6.6 million persons of whole or part Asian origin; that is, 26.7% of the total Australian population" (16). So, it is expected that in just over 20 years, over a quarter of Australia's population will be of Asian origin!!!

Phillip Ruthven, Executive Chairman of IBIS Information International (a company specialising in economic forecasting; "a strategic and information consultancy advising most of Australia's top companies"), said in 1991 that:

"Our population grew from around three million citizens in 1888 to over 16 million in 1988 - a five and a half fold increase in a century, and averaging a modest 1.7 per cent per year. Continuing this modest rate, we would have a population of 91 million in 2088... I predict the actual level is likely to be around 150 million based on a slightly accelerated rate of redistribution of the Asia Pacific's people favouring Australia".(17)

Ruthven has forecast in The Age Good Weekend Magazine that Australia will be a "neo- Eurasian nation" by 2010, turning "Eurasian" by mid-century, and becoming "Asian" at the end of the next century (that's only three to four generations away!) (18). Ruthven has further elaborated on his estimate, and says that "about 25 per cent of Australians will be of Asian background by the middle of next century, and half to two thirds by the end."(19)

TABLE 4

THE INCREASING ASIAN PERCENTAGE OF AUSTRALIA'S POPULATION [\(20\)](#)

Year	1945	1966	1991	2020	2090
%	0.3	0.4	7.4	26.7	66.7?

Long-term estimation of the Asian-ethnic component of Australia's population is, of course, subject to many variable factors, such as rates of immigration, the Asian proportion of immigration, and the Asian-ethnic birthrate in Australia. Therefore, it can be difficult to pinpoint an exact estimate of Asian-ethnics in Australia for a date approximately 90 years away. However, we should bear in mind several relevant factors:

- 1) The large Asian component of our immigration programme since the early 1980s.
- 2) The high birthrate in Australia of Asian-ethnics (compared with European- ethnics).
- 3) The major interlocking of our economy with the Asian region (which has been specifically and deliberately encouraged by successive Australian governments, both Labor and Liberal-National) - a bipartisan policy which is ongoing.
- 4) The Establishment's ideological attachment to mass immigration, multiculturalism, and Asianisation.

Following consideration of the above factors, any realistic person can see that the Australian Establishment is leading us into a future situation where eventually Australia will have a population where the majority will be of Asian-ethnic background; whether fully Asian or part-Asian (Eurasian).

To those who would deny this, the following question could be posed:

"Is likely that in the future, the majority of the population in Australia will eventually be of Asian/Eurasian background?"

The answer to this question will invariably be "yes" (especially when asking anyone who is aware of Australia's current political and demographic trends). Indeed, anyone who answers "no" must surely either be ignorant, or a complete and utter liar.

The answers given to the above question in themselves should be proof of the fact that most people know where Australia's Establishment is leading us (although most may be too scared or apathetic to show opposition in public); it is a proof of the "Asianisation of Australia".

In 1993 Philip Burdon, then New Zealand's trade minister, was reported in Newsweek as recognising the impending Asianisation of both Australia and New Zealand. Newsweek reported that Burdon "speaks of a 'complete change of cultural identity'. By 2000, he thinks, one in five Australasians will be of Asian descent, and within 50 years the two countries' 'connection with Europe will be just a historical legacy'". While "one in five by 2000" would be a premature estimate, this nonetheless shows that New Zealand politicians have recognised the reality of the Asianisation of Australia (and, of course, of New Zealand).(21)

However, many (or most?) Australian liberal-internationalists are loath to admit that the Asianisation of Australia is taking place. They may answer "yes" to the above question, but will then quibble over when it will happen - but this doesn't change the fact that it is actually happening.

Therefore, it can be seen that under the rule of the current Australian Establishment, Asianisation is not a question of "if", but of "when" (the only question that remains is: "At what speed will the Liberal-National-Labor parties Asianise Australia?").

The fact remains: most people know the Asianisation of Australia is coming. Ordinary Australians want to stop the onslaught of this "Yellow Peril"; and it is in their hands that lies the destiny of Australia.

Note: Australia is currently undergoing an ideologically-driven process whereby European Australians are being reduced to an eventual minority by an ongoing influx of non-Europeans and the resulting growth of the population base of those non-Europeans. The background of these non-Europeans being primarily Asian; but also African, and even Central and South American).

Those who quibble about what is the exact number of Asians in Australia are missing the most important point: that we face the deliberate de-Europeanisation of Australia, and that it matters not whether the non-European influx (and the resulting population growth) is Asian, African, or whatever; as the "swamping" of Australia from any or all of these sources will lead to the same end: the destruction of Australia's European civilisation. However, it must be recognised that Asianisation is the major part of this de-Europeanisation of Australia. Of course it is a fact, as is sometimes pointed out, that Asia is not one monolithic entity - it comprises many countries and many cultures; but that is irrelevant insofar as to whether the massive influx of Asians into Australia are carrying with them a single culture or a myriad of cultures; the point remains simply this: that a massive influx of Asians will decimate Australia's national identity, culture, and way of life.

It must also be recognised that Asianisation is more than just an issue of demographics: the Asianisation of Australia encompasses the economic, political, cultural, and demographic integration of Australia into Asia (economics playing a large part in the ideological rationale of many in politics and business who favour Asianisation).

What we face is a "peaceful" demographic invasion of Australia by the populations of Asia (and to a lesser extent, by the populations of the rest of the Third World). This involves a similar principle to the situation facing Tibet, West New Guinea (West Irian), and East Timor. The Chinese have begun a huge influx of Chinese into Tibet, and the Indonesians have also begun a large influx of Indonesians into West Irian and East Timor - situations which will result in damage to (and quite possibly the eventual destruction of) the identity, culture, and way of life of the Tibetans, West Irians, and East Timorese.

Many people on the world stage have loudly opposed the demographic destruction (or genocide) of Tibet. In the same way, we have the right to oppose the demographic destruction of Australia; therefore, we have a democratic and a moral right to oppose the Asianisation of Australia.

The Asianisation of Australia means the genocide of the Australian people. The advent of Australia as an Asian or Eurasian country will mean the end of our national identity, our cultural identity, and our way of life. That this is a matter of genocide against the Australian people is beyond doubt. As Malcolm Fraser has written,

"Genocide involves the attempt to achieve the disappearance of a group by whatever means. It does not have to be violent, it could be a combination of policies that would lead to a certain group dying out."(22)

This certainly applies to the de-Europeanisation of Australia, of which the Asianisation of Australia is the central plank.

Multiculturalism as a Cloak for Asianisation

The post-World War Two mass immigration programmes created an extremely large ethnic base; the existence of which eventually led to the political development, and implementation, of the disastrous policies of multiculturalism. Stephen Rimmer, a Canberra-based economist and author, has recently exposed multiculturalism as a stepping-stone to the eventual Asianisation of Australia:

"Multiculturalism serves as a cloak for the undeclared policy of Asianisation which involves linking Australia economically, ethnically and culturally with the nations of North-East Asia. As part of Asianisation, Australia's non-discriminatory immigration policy has been abandoned. Migrants and refugees are now selected on the basis of ethnicity... Resources are spread unevenly and migration applications from North-East Asia are dealt with more quickly than applications from Europe".(23)

While the nations of North-East Asia figure more prominently in the economic aspect of this undeclared policy; it would be fair to add that Asianisation actually involves all, or most, of the nations of Asia - and this applies especially to the demographic aspect of Asianisation.

The Undemocratic Nature of Asianisation

That the Asianisation of Australia will mean the end of the Australian people cannot be denied (24*). Its implementation is bringing about the destruction of our national identity and culture.

It is also a fact that the Australian people never asked for this process of Asianisation; nor were any referendums ever carried out; nor were the people - as a whole - ever consulted. The reason for this is simple: the Government knows that most Australians are opposed to the Asianisation of their country. Therefore, this policy has been carried out by subterfuge and stealth; by lying and cunning; by knowingly ignoring the wishes of the community - therefore implementing a process which is one of the most evil and undemocratic actions in Australia's history.

The undemocratic nature of the implementation of the Asianisation of Australia can be seen in the following notes:

1) Refusal to hold a referendum.

There have been many calls for a referendum on the subject of immigration, but all of the major political parties have refused or ignored these calls. They know what the outcome would be (25*).

As Michael Barnard wrote in The Age in 1984:

"There is an even greater onus on the Government, once having placed its vision before the public, to put the issue to referendum. It is scandalous that any fundamental shift in national characteristic or any definitive step towards "Asianisation" should be attempted without proper public recourse to the ballot box."(26)

Note: In 1988, one opinion poll did actually ask whether "Australia should hold a national referendum on immigration policy"; the answer was that 70% thought we should.(27)

The majority of Australians did not ask for an end to Australia's traditional immigration policies, nor did they ask for a massive influx of Asians into Australia, or for the Asianisation of our nation.

2) Give little or no publicity to those opposing Asianisation.

It is an established media tactic to give little or no coverage to organisations opposing Asianisation and Multiculturalism. Many media outlets follow this tactic; and in those rare instances where coverage is given, it is almost always negative.

3) The media's "conspiracy of silence".

As the editor of The Australian Financial Review once admitted, the media in Australia have co-operated with the government in maintaining a "conspiracy of silence" in relation to immigration policies.(28)

John Bennett, President of the Australian Civil Liberties Union, has revealed that:

"The media has censored arguments for a return to a predominantly European immigration policy and has either ignored or berated people seeking to express support for the views of Professor Geoffrey Blainey who has said the current level of Asian immigration is too high. Reports indicating that a majority of immigrants are now from Asia are given little prominence. The failure of multi-racial and multi-cultural societies overseas is generally downplayed. People who call for a reduction in Asian immigration are subjected to character assassination and are wilfully described as inciting racial hatred while the racist immigration policies of Asian countries such as Japan, China, Malaysia and Indonesia are accepted as normal".(29)

4) The Government's "conspiracy of silence".

In 1993 The Herald Sun reported that Bob Hawke, former Labor Prime Minister, "told a Brisbane conference 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". Hawke said that:

"There are no other issues on which the major parties have been prepared to act in this way, with the common cement of ACTU support, to advance the national interest ahead of where they believed the electorate to be" (that is, the major political parties have been prepared to impose mass Asian immigration upon our nation, to advance the interests of their liberal-

internationalist beliefs, despite their knowledge that most Australians opposed their plans).(30)

At the same Brisbane conference, Ian Macphree (a former Liberal Minister for Immigration) said:

"I think bipartisanship is crucial because immigration and multiculturalism issues are of such long-term importance".(31)

In 1997 Malcolm Fraser, former Liberal Prime Minister of Australia, admitted that:

"Large-scale immigration is always a sensitive issue, but in Australia there was understanding between leaders that this was vital for the security of our children, and that therefore racial issues were off-limits in the political arena."(32)

Bob Hawke has further explained:

"the Liberal/National Party government of Harold Holt, with the support of the Australian Labour Party, began to dismantle the infamous White Australia policy. Neither Chifley, nor Holt, nor any of their successors enjoyed majority community support for what they did... Bipartisan support for a completely non-discriminatory immigration policy has been one of the great and rare distinctions of modern Australian political leadership. It has been a triumph of principle over populism, of reason over fear, of statesmanship over politics. Now all of this is at risk".(33)

What Hawke is saying is that the Australian Establishment intends to Asianise Australia, and does not "give a hoot" for what the majority of the Australian people think and want.

Professor McAllister, Professor of Politics at the Australian Defence Force Academy (University of New South Wales), confirms that the Liberal-National coalition and the Labor Party (both being part of the Australian Establishment/New Class elite) have a mutual interest in maintaining the "conspiracy of silence". McAllister stated that "there has been an implicit pact between the main parties to implement broad policies on immigration they know are not generally endorsed by the electorate" and that "This has been achieved by keeping the subject off the political agenda".(34)

The point is: Both major parties have a vested interest in keeping Asianisation off the political agenda, as this does not suit their ideological and economic aims, and they therefore have generally co-operated in keeping silent on the subject.

5) Government-approved "brainwashing".

The Sydney Morning Herald has exposed how "The Department of Immigration had a plan to feed themes sympathetic to immigrants into popular television soap operas" (35). The intent was (and is) to use television as a propaganda tool for the promotion of Australia's "Asian Future" and to try to create an atmosphere of acceptance for the increasing Asian proportion of our population.

Australians can only wonder as to what other amazing plans the Department of Immigration, and other government departments, have "cooked up" in order to indoctrinate and "brainwash" the public into accepting Asianisation and Multiculturalism.

6) "Brainwashing" via advertising and the media.

Various government institutions give "positive discrimination" (a euphemism for discrimination against Australians) to Asian immigrants; and, in matters of public propaganda, often seek to have Asian ethnics portrayed in disproportionate numbers or "in a positive light".

Perhaps not unconnected is the documented usage of Asians in disproportionate numbers in newspaper photos of a generalised nature, as well as in corporate advertising. The Myer retail company has been guilty of this latter practice, and the Target retail company consistently so - particularly in regard to the disproportionate numbers of Asian children (and other coloured children) used in their retail advertising. While some companies may claim this is being done in an effort to promote multiracialism, it has been suggested by some commentators that such ads are actually a vehicle by which large companies are trying to capture the present and future spending of the "ethnic dollar" (following a similar practice by many American businesses).(36*)

John Bennett, President of the Australian Civil Liberties Union, has exposed the media practice of disproportionately focusing on Asians, and has also revealed how "TV ads and TV 'soapies' are used surreptitiously to change public opinion which is still strongly opposed to the attempt to Asianise Australia" (37). He further says that:

"many TV and newspaper ads now seem biased against the white majority and give non-whites great prominence. Thus, a full page ad by Myer in The Sun, Melbourne, the largest circulation newspaper in the southern hemisphere, recently featured 7 children, only 3 of whom were white. In a society which is 95% white the use of a majority of non-whites in such ads is deliberately calculated to brainwash Australians into accepting the idea that a multi-racial Australia is both inevitable and desirable and to overlook the fact that multi-racial societies elsewhere are an abject failure. The use of multi-racial ads - a 'Big Brother' brainwashing technique - is a deliberate policy to encourage white Australians to accept large scale non-white immigration, the long term intention of which is a non-white majority in Australia".(38) John Bennett has also exposed the extraordinary disproportionate use of Asians in The Sun (Melbourne) newspaper in "photographs and stories giving Asians a prominence out of all proportion to the percentage of Asians in the community", as well as revealing that one of Australia's leading newspapers, The Age (Melbourne), "has used its paper as a brainwashing agency to secure public support for a high level of Asian immigration and has deliberately suppressed the views of the 70% of Australians opposed to that policy" by a massively disproportionate use of pro- immigration feature articles and letters to the editor (Bennett reports that "The Sydney Morning Herald had a similar bias").(39)

The main reason for all this anti-Australian bias in the media is almost certainly to be the ideological favouring of mass immigration, multiculturalism, and multiracialism apparently held by most journalists in Australia nowadays, although an economic angle is also possible - such as in the current American practise to "hire minority reporters", "include minorities in stories in which their race, sex or ethnic background are unrelated", and whereby "editors are encouraged to include photographs of minorities and women on their front pages", because "news executives are realising that they must appeal to minority readers or risk losing them".(40)

It is interesting to note here that it was journalist Phillip Adams who was the "brain" behind the Department of Immigration's strategy to "feed themes sympathetic to immigrants into popular television soap operas". Adams is not only an influential author, broadcaster, and film-maker, but also heads one of Australia's biggest advertising agencies - there can be little doubt that he has used his influence in order to "influence" ("brainwash"?) the Australian public; in his words, to "modify a hostile or anachronistic community attitude". John Bennett reports that "The advertising millionaire Phillip Adams has great influence in the advertising industry. He has stated that his own advertising company tries to use ads

which promote a multi-cultural Australian society, and avoid W.A.S.P. ads with only white Anglo Saxon Celtic Australians".(41)

The liberal-internationalist media has for a long time been misusing its position of influence and responsibility, by constantly reporting and producing information and articles in such a way so as to reflect and promote their own liberal- internationalist-multiculturalist point of view, instead of impartially reporting the truth - which is supposed to be the traditional role of the news media. This situation is not confined to Australia but is occurring in most, if not all, Western democracies. As the American commentator, Rush Limbaugh, wrote in 1992, "When people say they feel betrayed and sold out by the old-line political institutions of the country, they include The Media in the mix. The Media is now considered just another part of the arrogant, condescending, elite, and out-of-touch political structure which has ignored the people and their concerns and interests. People are beginning to view the media not as a watch dog against governmental abuses of power but as an institution which is itself engaging in the abuse of power". His words also apply to Australia.(42)

7) Covering up research results; and the suppression of intellectual dissent.

On several occasions over the years, studies have been kept hidden from public view because their results were not in accordance with what the government expected.

In 1979 The Age, in an article entitled "Minister Hides Racism Report", revealed "A State Government report on racism will not be released because it is believed it could fuel the fires it was intended to put out. The report is believed to be an indictment of Victorian attitudes because it shows that a large proportion of the population is bigoted with only a small proportion in favour of immigration. The report is the basis for a \$1 million Government advertising and educational campaign to combat racism... Both Labor and Liberal MPs have agreed not to release the report. It was prepared last year by the State Immigration and Ethnic Affairs Department after more than 1000 people were interviewed".(43)

A later newspaper article stated that "the report was not intended to be made public but it was leaked to a Melbourne Sunday newspaper". The article quoted Walter Jona, who was the Victorian Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs at the time when the report was commissioned: "Mr Jonah said that when he was Minister he was under strict instructions not to release the findings". The article stated that "the report showed that most of the more than 1000 second-generation Australians interviewed strongly believed in the White Australia policy. Their attitudes ranged from blatantly racist to mild or uncertain. But 78 per cent of those interviewed in the Melbourne metropolitan and Geelong areas held some form of anti-migrant attitude. The report found that 31 per cent of Victorians could be described as "conscious bigots"; 18 per cent were "unconscious bigots" and 29 per cent were uncertain. Only 22 per cent were found to have a positive attitude to migrants and believed the immigration program should continue" (the report referred to the latter group as "cosmopolitans").(44)

The newspaper also spoke to the new Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Mr Ward, who said that the survey's findings would be used to draw up a "total community education plan" and that "a media campaign similar to the successful Life Be In It campaign and a children's program to promote understanding between different races were being planned" (more re-education/brainwashing for the masses?).(45)

In 1981 Nation Review revealed that "Phillip Adams was commissioned by the Victorian Government to carry out a survey of attitudes to Asian migrants; the result was so disturbing that the report was withheld".(46)

In 1984 Ronald Wild, in an article in Australian Society, related that:

"The recent action of the Human Rights Commission in refusing to publish a major research report on affirmative action by Sydney law academic Dr Gabriel Moens raises once again the issue of censorship in contract research. Last year, on the ABC programme Monitor, I detailed several cases of contract research from La Trobe University where government departments refused to publish social research because the reports did not produce the expected results.

"In 1982, for example, after Dr Rosemary Wearing entered into a \$33,000 contract to research and write a report on citizenship among migrants, the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs refused to publish the report and even refused to distribute it within its own department. A further case involving the Human Rights Commission showed the enormously restrictive nature of the contracts used for such research. Government departments use social science research for several purposes other than the development of policies. First, it may be used to legitimise policy decisions already made on other grounds. In other words, the research findings fulfil a window-dressing function. Second, the data may not be used, referred to, or even made public. That is, research may be censored because it either goes against political decisions or may cause embarrassment to people in positions of authority. Third, research may be used to divert immediate political pressures. In such cases, elaborate research programmes may be established whose main function is to provide time and to prevent decisions from being made.

"Such approaches to contract research can have significant effects on the research problems selected, the methodology to be used, and the presentation of the results. A research programme may be tailored to the needs of politicians and bureaucrats rather than to the interests of those being studied or the interests of thorough and honest research. This is most likely to occur when a department requires results very quickly for political effect. Clearly, under such circumstances, the very problem selected for study reflects the short-term interests of those commissioning the research".(47)

In 1990, in *The Sunday Age*, Terry Lane wrote of "a study commissioned by the Immigration Department and the Australian Institute of Criminology into crime rates among Vietnamese migrants. The study reported that crime rates among adult Vietnamese in Victoria and New South Wales are 'much higher than among the general population'. In fact the murder rate is 'between seven and 10 times higher' than for the rest of the population. An astonishing fact, wouldn't you say?"

Lane further revealed that "The researcher who compiled the report claims that it was suppressed by the Department of Immigration. The department, however, says that it only commissioned a report into juvenile crime in the Vietnamese community. The department may be guilty of selective reporting. The report shows that juvenile crime in the Vietnamese community is lower than for the general community. That part was published."(48)

Such suppression of research can occur anywhere - within the media, universities, private corporations, and government departments. Mark Ragg, of *The Bulletin*, has revealed that such intellectual suppression can take various forms: research funding dries up, publications can be deliberately rejected, promotions can be blocked, careers can be sabotaged, positions not be renewed, job applications left unanswered, interviews not granted, and personal campaigns can be waged to smear or discredit dissenters - all of which can lead to an atmosphere that invites self-censorship (49).

It is also interesting to note that the results of a survey of journalists carried out by the University of Queensland showed that 41% had personally experienced "improper managerial interference" with an article (50).

Robert Manne once declared in *The Bulletin* that "It is rare for an intellectual to show signs of dissent". *The Bulletin* further reported that "When someone did break ranks, such as Geoffrey Blainey on the question of Asian immigration... they risked being marginalised (if they were strong-minded) or silenced (if they were weak)". Manne said that most Australian intellectuals belonged to cliques who shared the same world-view, such as "egalitarianism, moral individualism, feminism, sentimental multiculturalism, and so on", and - in general - engaged in "rather unthreatening dialogues with those who agree about fundamentals".(51)

The situation of Geoffrey Blainey is a case in point of what can happen to an intellectual who dissents from the Establishment's fundamental viewpoint. In 1984, when the media furore erupted over his comments about Asian immigration and multiculturalism, Blainey was attacked in the press by his "fellow academics", his classes at university were disrupted, and his public speaking engagements were demonstrated against and physically attacked. Also, a group of "academics" (led by that old liberal-internationalist hack, Andrew Markus) specifically wrote a book to denounce Blainey and all of his historical writings - a well-organised professional character assassination entitled *Surrender Australia? Essays in the Study and Uses of History: Geoffrey Blainey and Asian Immigration*. Hardly the reaction of true academics (who debate the issues at hand and seek answers), but rather the actions of a multiculturalist lynch mob or hit-squad. The controversy in the media was labelled "The Blainey Debate", but it couldn't truly be seen as a real debate, due to the massive media bias in favour of Asian immigration, and against Blainey. Coincidentally (?), Blainey's daughter was attacked and knifed during the media-driven "debate" over Blainey and Asian immigration (the police refused to reveal the race of the attacker - leading many to assume it was an Asian; although it was denied that the cowardly attack was related to her father's views). Ongoing attacks upon Blainey were mounted from both the media and academia, until he finally left his position with the University of Melbourne.(52)

Dr Katharine Betts, chairwoman of sociology at Swinburne University, has stated that it has been difficult to question immigration in Australia because of the "new-class ideology that links such questions with racism". Dr Betts said in 1993 that "Radical questions about the purpose of immigration had been repressed and the personal costs of attempting to raise them had been demonstrated once again, just as they had been in 1984".(53)

8) Bans on so-called "racist" immigrants.

Intending immigrants are screened for so-called "racist" views. In 1987 Mick Young (then Labor's Immigration Minister) revealed that "Applicants (in South Africa and elsewhere) must provide evidence of their tolerance and flexibility. A key part of the assessment of an applicant's eligibility involves ascertaining: The applicants's understanding that the Australian community includes people of various races, religions and cultures; The applicant's acceptance of the values embodied in Australia's multicultural society; Whether the applicant holds extremist views which would conflict with Australian social values", and that "In the South Africa context, such assessment procedures are carried out with particular thoroughness. Applicants undergo a rigorous settlement assessment to screen out extremists, including racists, holding views inconsistent with Australia's multi-cultural and multi-racial society" (54). Of course, to liberal-internationalists, anyone who opposes Multiculturalism is an "extremist".

9) "Brainwashing" of students.

Trainee teachers are unofficially screened for so-called "racist" views (the same often applies to other positions within the public service). Teachers are also well-trained in Multiculturalism, and are encouraged to promote internationalism; both philosophies which have only one end for Australia: Asianisation. To this end, teachers are "armed" by internal training sessions, special journal articles, and even entire books (for example, *Anti-Racism: A Handbook for Adult Educators*, *The Prejudice Book: Activities For the Classroom*, and *Combating Prejudice In Schools: An Inservice Guide For Schools and Teacher Training Institutions*), all of which have been developed to help brainwash students

(euphemistically called "shaping students' attitudes") into the doctrine of Multiculturalism (and hence, our "Asian Future"). Many materials have been produced to this end, such as a kit called Teaching For Human Rights: Activities For Schools (produced by the Human Rights Commission), as well as a six-part TV series, The Migrant Experience, which comes with a Teacher's Guide and is regarded as "Suitable for History, English, Social Studies and topic-based Economics at a wide variety of levels" - proving that teachers seize upon the opportunity to preach multiculturalism in a whole range of classes.(55)

That liberal-internationalism is the prime ideology being pushed within the educational system is beyond doubt. A good example of this anti-nationalist mind-set being promoted is provided by Peter McGregor (from the School of Humanities, University of Western Sydney):

"The youth of today and tomorrow have no fatherland or motherland other than the planet itself. Either we build a better generation by offering them multicultural internationalism, or we mutually self-destruct in the trivia and conformity of uniforms and flags, the parochialism of patriotism" (56).

This sort of ideological clap-trap has been encouraged by education bureaucrats in many ways, such as through Victoria's 1991 Advanced Skill Teachers grading (giving teachers an increase in pay) whereby "the eligible teachers have been assessed on the basis of written applications in which they were required (among other things) to demonstrate ideological commitment to Government social justice and affirmative action plans".(57)

In the same vein, yet another example can be given as proof of the cosmopolitan- internationalist viewpoint that is being used in the indoctrination of school children, whereby politically internationalist educators mould "in their own image" their students' young minds. This is amply demonstrated in a 1997 advertisement for the Ivanhoe Grammar School (Melbourne), which gushed forth:

"Our sons and daughters are growing up in a world vastly different from that which we and their grandparents experienced as children. Communications technology and modern travel are creating an increasingly borderless world, and a major aim of modern education must be that of enabling our students to think of themselves as global citizens, to acknowledge the essential oneness of humankind, and to understand that the future of the planet will depend largely on those who can break out of tribal and regional thinking and new issues and events over a long time-period and in an international context.

"Australia, Victoria, and indeed Ivanhoe Grammar School are well situated to take advantage of our highly successful multiculturalism in preparing our young people for adult lives characterised by physical, intellectual and cultural mobility, in facilitating their growth towards being responsible citizens of the world, and in developing their confidence to be comfortable in an international context."

"Here at Ivanhoe Grammar School we are continuing to review and change curriculum with these considerations in mind, so that your sons and daughters will have every opportunity to become confident global citizens.

"R.D. Fraser, Principal"(58)

As Donald Horne has stated: "I agree with Al Grassby that one of the great battles for multiculturalism must be fought in the schools".(59)

Those who have read George Orwell's book 1984 will understand something of their motivation and tactics.

10) Willingness to ignore democracy.

In order to carry out their anti-Australian policies, the liberal-internationalists of the Establishment are quite prepared to cast democracy aside in pursuit of their goals. Consider the following quote from well-known journalist Sam Lipski:

"But what about democracy? What if 75% of Australians do want, ahead of all other concerns, to slow up or stop Asian immigration... the democracy we inherited is not meant to be government by referendums... parliamentary democracy is an interwoven net of representative institutions, not populist ones... It requires nurturing, political leadership - especially from conservatives - and an occasional editorial".(60)
In other words: liberal-internationalists believe that, no matter what 75% of Australians believe regarding immigration, the self-given duty of the Establishment's media and politicians is to press on with immigration policies that are opposed by the majority of Australians.

Apparently, politicians intend to ignore the views of the majority of Australians, in regard to immigration, no matter what. Opinion polls have consistently shown majority views against mass immigration from supporters of all of the major political parties, yet they are ignored. Senator Robert Ray, whilst Labor's Immigration Minister, said of immigration: "It is very hard to define what the attitudes of our supporters are. But that is one of those issues where even if we were not entirely in line with our supporters, we can't take any other line from the one we're taking. Some people scoff at Hawke's statement that if he had to lose an election on it, he would, but I'm convinced that is his view and the entire caucus's view".(61)

Politicians treat the views of ordinary Australians with contempt, as these "leaders" believe that only their views are correct, and that the rest of us need to be "re-educated", rather than the politicians abiding by what the majority want (a democratic concept that politicians only follow when it suits them).

11) Racial vilification laws, and the silencing of dissent.

"We will not allow to become a political issue in this country the question of Asianisation"
Bob Hawke, 1984 (then Labor Prime Minister).(62)

"It should be clear that in our own self-interest, if we are looking to the future of this country, it is an absurdity to allow, engage in or permit any suggestion of anti-Asian discrimination or racism in this country"
Bob Hawke, 1988 (then Labor Prime Minister).(63)

Racial Vilification laws have been enacted at both state and federal levels specifically in order to crush the opposition of Australians to the Asianisation of their country (not, as various politicians have suggested, to stop illegal behaviour against minorities - as such behaviour is already covered by existing legislation, such as laws relating to offensive behaviour, assault and battery, defacing property, incitement to riot, etc.). As Mark Uhlmann, editor of The Record, so clearly stated: "A major aim of Federal racial vilification legislation... is to complement the social intimidation which already greets anyone, particularly in public office, who dares to criticise matters connected to immigration and multiculturalism".(64)

It should be realised that the idea of "Big Brother" is not a literary fantasy, nor a sociological cliché, it is a reality (even if it hasn't taken on the all-pervading form as expressed by George Orwell); but it is a reality which can't readily be seen, because it is occurring slowly, bit by bit - taking away just one liberty at a time.

The Establishment wants to silence critics of its immigration policies, and is willing to act undemocratically in order that its liberal-internationalist ideology can be forced upon the Australian people. It is interesting to note that in the days of the White Australia Policy it was never made illegal to advocate non-European

immigration, multiracialism, or opposition to the White Australia Policy itself. It is quite clear that the "New Class" (sometimes referred to as the "Traitor Class") of the self-righteous, wowser, McCarthyist, "politically correct" liberal- internationalists are - despite any protestations to the contrary - undemocratic and authoritarian in their nature, and their actions, when anyone disagrees with them outside of the general confines of their liberal-internationalist ideology (especially if a credible and serious threat is posed) - this is why this "New Class" has been described by several commentators as quasi-fascist or as "the New Nazis".(65*)

While more and more Australians are coming to realise that our right to free speech is under attack by politicians and rabid multiculturalists, what really "sticks in the throat" of many people is the fact that there are those Asians who have come to Australia, immigrating via the Asianisation policies of our traitorous Establishment, and then demand that Australians should not have freedom of speech. A case in point is Vietnamese refugee Tan Le, who says "I don't believe that freedom of speech includes the right to hurt people and to incite racial disharmony" (Tan Le was made "Young Australian of the Year" for 1998: the "Australian of the Year" awards have made a point of giving their awards to a highly disproportionate number of non-Europeans, a clear case of anti-White discrimination, but that's another story). Another example is Phong Nguyen, whose comments were reported in the Herald Sun: "The most painful thing is to hear Pauline Hanson say that the silent majority agrees with her... There is a clear distinction between free speech and racism" (66). Nguyen arrived on a Vietnamese refugee boat in 1978, and he now runs a Indochinese welfare centre in Springvale, where money is being spent on even more Vietnamese (presumably funded by the long-suffering Australian taxpayers, the majority of whom don't apparently deserve to have freedom of speech).

Graeme Campbell, the independent member for Kalgoorlie, made a telling point when he said: "If the people of a nation do not have any rights to say with whom they share their country, what rights do they have?"(67)

12) The result?

Asianisation means that Australia will no longer be a nation (in the true sense of the word), but will simply be another area on the map populated by the teeming masses of Asia (or rather, a mixture of Asian peoples - with a large number of Africans, Melanesians, and Polynesians thrown in for good measure). What Europeans there are will be quickly outbred, and within some generations it is quite possible that most of the remaining few Europeans would probably have interbred with non- Europeans (especially when one considers the effects that the Establishment will have had in the promotion of multiculturalism, multiracialism, and cosmopolitan liberal-internationalism - through media, education, and government - upon Australia's coming generations). And, to anticipate the response of many people: NO, the answer isn't to flee to Tasmania - that will be Asianised as well in due course.

Apparently, Australia is following the process of destruction being dealt out to all of the liberalistic, guilt-ridden, bleeding-heart White countries of the world.(68*)

Yes, the Asianisation of Australia is very undemocratic. However, there is no point in whingeing about the injustice of it all. Frankly, the anti-Australian traitors of the current Establishment don't give a damn. It is up to all of us to oppose the Asianisation of Australia, and - in one way or another - to support nationalist-patriotic organisations who are fighting this evil.

Planning for Asianisation

In August 1980, approximately 120 of "Australia's top young opinion-leaders" from a range of backgrounds (business and commerce, law, unions, education, politics, etc.) were gathered together in Melbourne for the Future Directions Conference, to discuss "the options facing Australia in the future".(69)

The five-day residential conference was held at LaTrobe University, and its main sponsors were: David Syme & Co. (which includes The Age newspaper, which heavily reported the event), the Commonwealth Government, the Commonwealth Fund of New York, and La Trobe University. Politicians from all of the major political parties attended.(70)

At the end of the Conference, The Age reported that "There was widespread agreement that there should be... closer links with Asia" and that "The conference drew attention to the growing importance of Australia's relations with Asia". The conference discussions produced "three significant and connected strands", one of which "was called Asianisation, the need for Australia to become much more [part] of its region" (the other two strands of thought were "feminisation" and "Aboriginalisation").(71)

During the conference, it was suggested that Australia be re-named "Australasia", for such time as "Australia becomes part of Asia" - while "the assumption behind changing Australia into Australasia was that, by 1990, 10 per cent of the Australian population would be Asian in origin" - and that "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".(72)

This conference would not have been the first time that politicians, business people, academics, or "fellow travellers" had spoken of a desire to give Australia an "Asian Future"; although it was one of the first times that such Establishment figures spoke openly of plans or desires for such an "Asian Destiny" - or of the possibility of Australia being "Asianised", or subject to the process of "Asianisation".

Such talk from Establishment figures - about aims and/or plans for an Asianised Australia - increased in the 1980s and 1990s.

Moves Towards Asianisation: Australia's "Asian Future", and the "Labor" Side of Politics

It is all too easy to see a definite bias towards Asia from politicians, government officials, and various people in prominent public positions (especially in the business sector). For their own personal reasons (whether it be for motives of ideology, self-promotion, or for chasing profits) many of these people have insisted on telling us that "Australia is a part of Asia" (contrary to geographical realities), or that our country has an "Asian Future".

While some earlier instances can be traced, widespread talk of Australia being "part of Asia" really began in earnest with the Labor government of Bob Hawke (first elected in 1983). As Professor Richard Robison has noted, "When Labor came to power in Australia in the early 1980s,... a deliberate "look north" policy was adopted, identifying Asian economies as the engine room of world growth and placing Asian markets at the heart of Australia's strategy for internationalising its economy and world view".(73)

There are many example's of the pro-Asia viewpoint of the Labor Party's leaders:

"Australia's destiny lies in Asia and the Pacific" - Al Grassby, 1982 (Labor's former Minister for Immigration, then Commissioner for Community Relations).(74)

"Australian rhetoric has for some years past spoken of our realisation that our future lies with Asia" - Bill Hayden, 1983 (then Labor's Foreign Minister).(75)

"If I can get through what I am aiming at over the next couple of years, Australia will be favourably repositioned in that South-East Asian area where we live because I am quite certain that's our future" - Bill Hayden, 1983 (then Labor's Foreign Minister).(76)

"The increasing Asianisation was inevitable" - a spokesman for the then Immigration and Ethnic Affairs Minister, Stewart West, 1984.(77)

"Australia is a part of Asia" - Bob Hawke, 1985 (then Labor Prime Minister).(78)

*"The destiny of the secure, dynamic, prosperous and fair society which we are building lies in the Asia-Pacific region, and especially the Western Pacific."
Bob Hawke, 1985.(79)*

*"Australia's capacity to survive in the years ahead... will depend upon the preparedness of this country to enmesh itself with the dynamism of our region, the Asia-Pacific region"
Bob Hawke, 1988 (then Labor Prime Minister).(80)*

Dr Katharine Betts (of Swinburne University) has noted that [regarding the period following the 1988 immigration debate]:

"Senator Ray had been given the Immigration portfolio on 23 August, replacing Clyde Holding, and a number of commentators, including the new Minister, emphasised that Australia had no choice on the question of Asian immigration (Grattan 1988c). Asian immigration was not to be discussed and an Asian future for Australia was desirable and probably unavoidable. As one journalist put it: "We needed young skilled immigrants and they'd probably be Asian. That doesn't worry me a bit. We live in Asia, and we'd better start getting used to it. And, economically speaking, in the coming decades, Asia will be the best part of the world to live in; (Gittens 1988)".

"...The Financial Review insisted that, like it or not, we were part of Asia. If we did not accept this we would simply become the 'poor white trash of Asia' (Nolan 1988).(81)

"For Australia the logic of greater enmeshment with the regional economy is very clear. The Asia-Pacific region is the most dynamic area of the world economy and developments in our region will play a decisive role in shaping Australia's economic future" - Bob Hawke, 1989 (then Labor Prime Minister). Hawke also spoke of "our growing appreciation of the Asian component of the Australian population".(82)

"Australia's future lies inevitably in the Asia/Pacific region" - Gareth Evans, 1990 (then Labor's Foreign Minister).(83)

"I think the preponderance of migrants in the future will be from the Asia-Pacific region" - Paul Keating, 1992 (then Labor Prime Minister). Keating admitted that he saw Australia's future as being "Eurasian" (although he said it would not happen for a "long time"). In answer to the question "Do you think Australia will become a Eurasian country, perhaps the world's first?", Keating replied: "The fact that our migrants are increasingly going to come from South and North Asia means these people are going to be a larger component of the Australian population. But it will take a long time before anyone could describe the place as Eurasian, though the changes mean the place is more Eurasian than it has ever been".(84)

In 1994, former Labor prime minister Bob Hawke continued on with his previous pronouncements when he proclaimed that:

"I said in my first days as prime minister that Australia's future depended upon becoming more enmeshed with Asia. And that indeed happened in the period of which I was speaking... demography is working as inexorably as economics to make Australia's future be part of Asia. And I have no doubt that when people look at this in the year 2038 they will know then that the sort of vision I had in 1983, of Australia's future being enmeshed with Asia, will have become a reality" (emphasis added).(85)

It was in 1983 that Bill Hayden (then the ALP's Foreign Minister) gave a remarkable speech alluding to Australia's future:

"Australia is changing. We're an anomaly as a European country in this part of the world. There's already a large and growing Asian population in Australia and it is inevitable in my view that Australia will become a Eurasian country... I happen to think that's desirable. That means we are becoming part of the mainstream of this region". He also said that Australia: "should welcome the process of gradually becoming a Eurasian-type society... we will become not just a multicultural society - which seems to me to be a soft sort of terminology anyway - we will become a Eurasian society and we will be all the better for it".

Even though Hayden's views were widely reported, no politician or government official condemned his comments, leading many to believe that the Labor Government and Liberal-National Opposition generally concurred with his views. Hayden further compounded his statements the following year, when he revealed his "vision" that Australia should have a population of 50 million, predicting an upsurge in migration from "the obvious Asian populations around us... [and the] large Polynesian and Melanesian population in our near region".(86)

Such a call for a population of 50 million had previously been made by a Victorian Liberal Government Minister, Brian Dixon, in 1979. As The Age reported, Dixon urged the Federal Government "to double its net migrant intake to 140,000 a year and to aim for an Australian population of 50 million".(87)

In 1996 Bill Hayden (now as a former Governor-General) said "our fellow Australians of Asian background are proving to be among the best human resource assets we have" and claimed that "Asian migrants were necessary to fill Australia's growing demand for 'intellectual capital' and for Australia to achieve future economic and cultural growth". Hayden went on to confirm his remarks of 1984, by stating that Australia's optimum population level "is around the 50 million mark". But it appears Hayden would like an even larger population here, as he said that his figure of 50 million "may prove too cautious".(88)

In 1997 Malcolm Fraser, ex-Liberal Prime Minister of Australia, wrote an article agreeing with Hayden's 50 million target figure:

"Australia's population has grown 2 1/2 times since 1945. There is no reason at all why we could not grow 2 1/2 times again by the middle of next century. We would then be a nation of 45 million to 50 million people."(89)

Phil Ruthven, Executive Chairman of IBIS Information International, believes that Australia's population should be driven up much higher than 50 million. Ruthven's views have been reported in The Age:

"Mr Ruthven believes most of the new settlers should come from countries north of Australia. The United Nations says Australia could support 125 million people, more than twice the population of Britain, but Mr Ruthven reckons 450 million is not an unrealistic figure."(90)

Alison Broinowski, a former diplomat, described some of the political force behind the "Australia is a part of Asia" rhetoric: "As prime minister from 1983, Bob Hawke referred for the first time to Australia's location in Asia as a positive advantage. But it was not until late 1991, when Prime Minister Paul Keating took over the discourse, that the political language changed to include assertions that Australia was an Asian country, or part of Asia".(91)

However, while it was the Labor governments of Bob Hawke and Paul Keating that were the "prime movers" in forcing an "Asian Future" upon Australia, the Liberal and National parties have also followed the same line. This "integration with Asia" policy is being followed by both sides of the political Establishment, as Professor Peter Drysdale (of the Asia Pacific Economics Group at the Australian National University) has noted:

"The internationalisation of the Australian economy and its steady reorientation towards Asia was strongly associated with the Labor government which held office over the past 13 years, and there were, frankly, doubts in Asia when the coalition government came to power in March, about whether these trends would continue under a Howard conservative government. These doubts were misplaced, since the priority attached to our relations with East Asia - and to APEC - is significantly and naturally bipartisan in character."(92)

Moves Towards Asianisation: The "Fellow Travellers"

The pro-Asia attitude of the Labor Party's leaders has been echoed by many of their cosmopolitan-internationalist "fellow travellers":

"It's not easy for people of English-speaking background to accept the fact that we are a South-East Asian country"

Frank Galbally, 1984 (then chairman of the National Advisory Council of the Special Broadcasting Service).(93)

"We must realise Australia is an Asian country, not European. We must be Asians racially as well as geographically" - Eddie Lui, 1989 (Chinese-Australian community leader).(94)

"Australians need to accept the geopolitical reality of their destiny in Asia"

Richard Woolcott, 1992 (then the Secretary of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade - and a former Ambassador).(95)

"Australia has to recognise that it is an Asian nation"

Wal King, 1992 (Chief Executive Officer of Leighton Holdings).(96)

"Nowadays when one talks about Australia's image, the question which almost invariably arises is to whether Australia is part of Asia... it is"

Dr Peter Wilenski, 1992 (Secretary of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade).(97)

"Australia... is an Asian nation"; "Australia's future will be primarily determined by its relationships with Asian countries" - Irene Moss, 1994 (then Race Discrimination Commissioner, Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission - and a Chinese-Australian).(98)

Also, in 1994, Bill Ferris, (then the immediate past Chairman of Austrade) said that Australia needed to focus its attention on Asia, and should resist "attempts to 'de-Asianise' our immigration and education programs".(99)

In 1996 Ross Terrill, author of *China in our Time*, wrote:

"I hope and expect Australia will become Eurasian. But I would not argue about that vision with people who disagree because it will come about, if it does, through a thousand incremental decisions, and many involuntary happenings, that go beyond the policy of any party or the will of one generation."(100)

"I think that the increased emphasis on Asian migration and a lot of things related to Asia will in the long-term enrich Australia" - Dr John Yu, 1996 (Chief Executive of the New Children's Hospital, Sydney, and "1996 Australian of the Year"). The Australian reported that Dr Yu "was adamant the Asianisation of Australia was a positive development".(101)

"Australians are learning, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, to accept that our future lies in the Asian region"

Judith Brett, 1997 (teacher of politics at LaTrobe University), writing for The Age.(102)

"Asia is our future."

Tim Colebatch, 1997 (Economics Editor for The Age).(103)

Moves Towards Asianisation: The "Conservative" Side of Politics

Even though the specific push for Asianisation began with Bob Hawke's Labor government, the Liberal and National parties have not been slow to follow Labor's lead. Although some noises were made by various people in the Liberal Party about a need to return to a "balanced" immigration programme, such as by Andrew Peacock in 1984 (104), and by John Howard in 1988 (which he recanted in 1995), basically the Liberal Party and other "conservatives" have acquiesced - if not openly assisted - in the carrying out of the policy of the Asianisation of Australia:

In 1971, the then Liberal Prime Minister, John Gorton, said:

"I think 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 will have a multi-racial country without racial tensions - and perhaps the first in the world".(105)

In 1972 Don Chipp, then a Liberal Minister (later to be the leader of the Australian Democrats), told television viewers that:

"I would like to see a stage in the 1980s where Australia is becoming the only true multi-racial country in the world, and that is the Liberal Party's aim".(106)

In 1977 the then Premier of Queensland, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen (National Party) stated that:

"Japan, as a country that does good business with Australia, is surely entitled to send emigrants to our State. There is no bar to Japanese people who want to migrate to Australia".(107)

In 1978 the then Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, Paul Everingham (Country Liberal Party), said that the then flood of Vietnamese refugees was "just the beginning" and that "Australians would have to be educated to the fact that the country would become an Asian nation"... "We've got to accept Asian immigrants in the same way we accept people from Europe". He also stated that "At the moment, the Northern Territory would be better off as a part of the federation of Malaysia than the federation of Australia".(108)

In 1979, in what was apparently a show of cross-Party unity on Indo-Chinese refugees, the then Prime Minister and Leader of the Liberal Party, Malcolm Fraser, along with Clyde Cameron (Labor Party), and Bruce Lloyd (National Party) presented a petition to Parliament concerning Vietnamese refugees, which stated that "Australia is able to play a major part in the rescue as well as resettlement of these refugees. It should be possible for Australia to: establish and maintain on the Australian mainland basic transit camps for the housing and processing of 200,000 refugees each year;... accept the offer of those church groups which propose to resettle some thousands of refugees in Australia. The adoption of such a humane policy would have a marked effect on Australia's standing within the region". The next day in Parliament, another petition - of the exact same wording - was presented to Parliament by John Bourchier (Liberal Party), Alan Jarman (Liberal Party), and Andrew Peacock (Liberal Party).(109)

"I, as Foreign Minister, with successive immigration Ministers, was trying to get the Australian community to accept the significant increase in Indo-Chinese refugees... it is only 22-odd years ago that both major parties were being pushed, properly so, to abandon the White Australia policy. It was as recent as that. As a student, I participated in those campaigns"
Andrew Peacock, 1984 (then Leader of the Liberal Party).(110)

"I have heard people come in here today and say that our future lies with Asia and the Pacific and therefore we must increase Asian migration. That is not questioned"
Andrew Peacock, 1984 (then Leader of the Liberal Party).(111)

In 1985, Philip Ruddock, then Shadow Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (later Minister for Immigration in John Howard's Liberal Government), complained about a reduction of the Indo-Chinese refugee intake, and demanded that Australia take in more Asian refugees. Also, Ruddock stated that:

"The Opposition believes Australia has a particular obligation to the South-East Asian region as against any widening of the scope of the program to other regions."(112)

In 1988 the Administrator for the Northern Territory, Commodore Eric Johnston, "was floating the idea of mass Asian immigration" after discussions about the "greenhouse effect" revealed that "the predicted rise in sea levels would result in millions of Asian refugees". Johnston's idea was that "the transformed land could be cut into small lots and handed to Asian immigrants" in order to populate Northern Australia.(113)

In 1990 the then Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, Paul Everingham (Country Liberal Party), said that "Australia should consult Asian countries before it made any changes to its immigration policy".(114)

"I want to congratulate the mining industry for leading the way... in realising that Australia's economic destiny lies predominantly in Asia"
Dr John Hewson, 1992 (then the leader of the Liberal Party in opposition).(115)

"We're part of South-East Asia"
Steve Hatton, 1992 (then the Country Liberal Party's Minister for Industries and Development in the Northern Territory).(116)

The Record reported on an immigration conference held in Darwin in September 1993 ("Asia-Pacific Migration Affecting Australia"): "At the conference, Marshall Perron [the Northern Territory's Chief Minister] suggested that Australia should considerably increase immigration, particularly from Asia. He said that he could envisage Darwin as a city of one million with half its population from Asia. He has enthusiastically backed a Federal Government idea that Darwin be promoted as "Australia's Asian capital". His government is from the non-Labor side of politics."(117)

"We are absolutely committed to a racially non-discriminatory policy... The question of race or country of origin doesn't matter at all. Our policy rejects the idea that we have too many Asians... Asian immigration is a non-issue" - Senator Jim Short, 1994 (then the Liberal Party's spokesman on immigration).(118)

"Comments based on race do not belong in the Australian political environment. I do not believe that they belong in the Liberal Party" - Malcolm Fraser, 1994 (former Liberal Prime Minister).(119)

The Liberal and National parties issued, prior to the 1996 elections, a joint policy on "Multicultural Affairs & Settlement", which included the following statements:

"We have a rich heritage as a multicultural nation... The Coalition takes great pride in its role in this achievement, with a proud history in the fields of immigration and ethnic affairs. Coalition Governments presided over the arrival in Australia of millions of migrants in the 1950s, 1960s, late 1970s, and early 1980s. These periods spanned the greatest diversity ever experienced in our official immigration intake. Coalition Governments opened up large scale immigration from continental Europe, the Mediterranean, Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and more recently Asia and the Pacific... Coalition Governments led the way in the abandonment of the White Australia Policy... We stand proud of our record and history of achievement in the areas of immigration and ethnic affairs."(120)

Of John Howard's Liberal Government, The Age said in 1996 that "the new Government sees Australia's economic and political future in the Asia Pacific rim".(121)

Confirming this view, the Liberal Government's Foreign Minister, Alexander Downer (once leader of the Liberal Party in Opposition), spoke in April 1996 of a foreign policy of "Asia First" (but was quick to assure us that "a policy of 'Asia First' does not mean 'Asian Only'"). Downer further prattled on, telling us that "Australia should also pause more often to acknowledge the contribution that immigrants from Asia have made to Australia... and of course they enrich Australian culture."(122)

Downer was later to reiterate his anti-Australian stance: "We simply reject the proposition that we should ever have a racially based immigration policy" - what he is really doing is defending the bi-partisan policy of continuing mass Asian immigration. Downer further said that "We reject the proposition that Australia... is being swamped by Asians" (123); which flies in the face of immigration projections (such as researched by Dr. Charles Price) which clearly state that Australia is being steadily Asianised. One could only assume that Downer is either a complete idiot; or - most likely - that he is a liar, and is trying to minimise public unrest about Asianisation by denying that it is happening.

After his comments in 1987-88 attacking Bob Hawke's Labor Government regarding the "imbalance" between Asian and European immigrants, John Howard was at pains in 1995 to retract, soften, or "explain away" his earlier statements: "If [my comments] were seen by Australians of Asian descent as suggesting that I regard them in any way as lesser Australians, then I regret that very much".(124)

We could also look at some of John Howard's earlier comments:

"The Liberal Party has a proud record of high achievement in migration policy... It was a Liberal Government that abandoned the White Australia policy... I am particularly proud of our record concerning the assistance we gave to the refugees from Indochina".(125)

One political commentator reviewed the situation of the Liberals in 1996 regarding Asianisation:

"The new Liberal Government has announced policies to stop new immigrants getting the dole for their first 2 years here; and for the slashing of family reunion immigration - both are measures which will affect Asian immigration - and no doubt, these policies have been designed to pick up the anti-immigration vote. Thus, Prime Minister John Howard, hopes to bolster the Liberal Party's vote, at the same time destroying much of the base of support for AAFI and Australia First, without actually solving the immigration-Asianisation problem... In this, he is copying what Margaret Thatcher did in Britain to draw in the anti-immigration vote, at the same time destroying the National Front's increasing voter base. Howard's Liberal Government may slow down (not stop) Asian immigration, but it will not stop the Asianisation of Australia."(126)

Indeed, in October 1996, John Howard spoke of an Asian Future for Australia:

"(regarding) the Asia-Pacific Region... of course we remain deeply committed to that region. Our political, our economic, increasingly our people to people future is tied up with that region and rightly so."(127)

In October 1997 Malcolm Fraser, ex-Liberal Prime Minister of Australia, intoned:

"If we have 20 million or 25 million people by the end of the next century, we sideline and marginalise ourselves. We will never be regarded as a serious player... With the population pressures that exist in the world, an Australia that turns its back on providing a better home for more people than we already have is an Australia that will not be long respected throughout Asia. We would be regarded as insular and selfish. If we were an Australia of 40 or 50 million people, it would be a different matter... our future is irrevocably bound with the region and the lands to our north. There is no other future for us. Those who want to take us back to the past should be cast aside."(128)

Moves Towards Asianisation: Big-Business

Economics plays a large part in the current policies of Asianisation: As has already been pointed out, powerful financial and political groups want a rapid expansion of Australia's population, in order to create a larger consumer market, as well as to provide a cheaper work force. Also, it is believed that, by making our country "Asian", Australian businesses - and the general economy - will be able to obtain economic benefits by being enmeshed with the "economic dynamo" of Asia. For these reasons, all of the major political parties, big businesses, and multi-national corporations happily encourage mass Asian immigration.

The editors of The Asia-Australia Survey 1994 stated that:

"Driven largely by the need to improve Australia's economic performance, recent Australian governments have come to regard economic integration into Asia as a matter of the highest priority. But while economic imperatives have been behind Australia's drive to get into Asia, the issues it raises are much wider, touching, among other things, matters of national identity". They also made the point that both Prime Ministers Hawke and Keating "would emphasise the importance of developing a closer relationship with the countries of Asia" and that "Australia's economic integration into Asia" was continuing. In capping off their review of 1993, the editors stated "Australia and Australians continued to lay the foundations for a broadly based future in Asia... the nation's further "enmeshment" with Asia is a realistic goal and much was done to attain it during the year".(129)

As quoted earlier in this document, in 1989 Bob Hawke (then Labor Prime Minister) said that:

"For Australia the logic of greater enmeshment with the regional economy is very clear. The Asia-Pacific region is the most dynamic area of the world economy and developments in our region will play a decisive role in shaping Australia's economic future".(130)

Several big-business executives and employer groups have called for a large rise in Australia's population; for example:

Hugh Morgan (Chief Executive of Western Mining) has proposed a figure of "about half a million migrants annually".(131)

John Elliott (Managing Director of Elders IXL) advocated that "we aim at a quarter of a million a year".(132)

Campbell Anderson (Chief Executive of Renison Goldfields Consolidated) called for our migrant intake to be "increased to about one per cent of the population each year" (i.e. about 175 000).(133)

The Chamber of Commerce has called for an increase of up to 180 000, and the Master Builders' Federation has said the annual intake should be 150 000.(134)

The Business Council of Australia, one of the country's largest employer groups, said that immigration should be increased to more than 180 000.(135)

The Australian Chamber of Manufactures "has called on the Federal Government to increase Asian immigration" and, in particular, "says it wants more immigrants from Asian business communities such as Hong Kong and Taiwan".(136)

In 1997, the chief executive of the Australian Chamber of Manufactures, Allan Handberg, called for "more immigrants to stimulate the economy".(137)

Professor Hughes (Director of the National Centre for Development Studies at the Australian National University) has stated that:

"the future success of Australia's economy will depend greatly on large-scale immigration from Asia and the Pacific... a greater intake of immigrants could improve the use of capital, reduce the cost of introducing new technology, and increase economies of scale".(138)

Multinational corporations and banks have been putting pressure upon Australia to economically integrate with Asia. In a 1996 article entitled "Missing the boat to Asia" (with a sub-heading of "100 global company chiefs have given Australia this message: Get moving on Asia") the Herald Sun reported that:

"Corporate heavy-hitters from more than 100 of the world's biggest multinationals have flown out of Canberra after a private briefing session with senior ministers from the Howard government.

"...They warned that we had better get our act together quickly to decide how best to position ourselves in Asia.

"The corporations represented at the roundtable conference included computer giant Unisys, Chase Manhattan Bank and British Telecom.

"The combined turnover of the corporations at the conference is more than double the entire annual output of the Australian economy.

"The fifth such conference, it was an invaluable opportunity for the Howard government to spell out why we would be a good environment for investment into the next century.

"...With its share of world markets about to slip beneath 1 per cent, Australia has a narrowing window of opportunity to cash in on the investment splurge in the Asian region.

"...the message from international business is that Australia cannot afford the luxury of being half-hearted in its efforts to benefit from Asian economic growth.

"The expression "poor white trash" might come to have real meaning to our future generations if the opportunities are lost."(139)

This "integrate with Asia" attitude can be found in many of Australia's big companies. A 1997 article reported that the Hudson Conway corporation "is unlikely to pursue big projects in Australia in the medium term, instead preferring what it sees as the growth economies of South-East Asia". Hudson Conway's chief executive, Lloyd Williams, dismissed concerns about the economic turmoil that had arisen in Asia, and was optimistic about Asia's long-term prospects. Williams said "When you look at the fundamentals of Asia, the population, and look at the can-do attitude, Asia is going to be the powerhouse of the world".(140)

So, the big-business sell-out of Australia is a two-edged sword. On one hand big business is demanding larger programmes of mass immigration, so as to create "economies of scale" in Australia; and perhaps a more compliant workforce - via poor Asian migrants as well as from increased competition for jobs. And at the same time big business sends Australian capital overseas to take advantage of Asia's more flexible (and sometimes corrupt) governments, less environmental restrictions, and a cheaper workforce (used to poor working conditions) - which, of course, means that Australia loses its investment capital, loses industries (and potential industries), and suffers from the resulting higher unemployment.

[Moves Towards Asianisation: Enmeshment With Asia \(Selling Australia's Future for Asian Money\)](#)

Ralph L. Harry (then Director of the Australian Institute of International Affairs) has noted that immigration has been described as a "concrete way of developing relations between governments"; and Alan Renouf (former Secretary of the Department of Foreign Affairs, and a former Ambassador) has said that "immigration can be a useful diplomatic tool" and has advocated "a larger flow of Asian peoples" on the basis that such an action "could cement materially Australia's ties with such countries".(141)

In 1977 the Australian Population and Immigration Council stated that:

"The Asian region has immense potential as a source of migrants for Australia".(142)

In 1980 the then Head of the Immigration Department, John Menadue, said that:

"Australia was eager to attract migrants, but traditional source countries such as Great Britain could be gradually edged out... as Asia became more industrialised it would be possible to attract large numbers of skilled Asian immigrants".(143)

In 1984 the Manly Daily reported the views of the then Prime Minister, Bob Hawke (Labor), that "Australia's future is firmly enmeshed with the progress of China, South-East Asia and the Pacific region".(144)

Bob Hawke further stated that:

"A most important step in drawing closer to Asia is that we have accepted and welcomed the fact that people from Asia form part, and most likely an increasing part, of our population, and that Asian culture will, likewise, form an increasing part of our national heritage. No less important has been the transformation of our economic relationship with Asia... we will continue to make this a major priority".(145)

In 1987 The Daily Mirror revealed that the Federal Government had a secret plan to massively boost the migrant intake over the following 20 years - possibly right up to 1,000,000 per annum (with an estimated 750 000 of these coming from Asia and the Pacific).(146)

In 1989 Ross Garnaut produced his report, Australia and the Northeast Asian Ascendancy, which had been commissioned by the then Prime Minister Bob Hawke. It contained recommendations that were to be acted upon by the then Labour government (indeed, the report merely echoed what was basically the viewpoint already held by that government):

"It is true, nevertheless that Australia's success in utilising opportunities associated with Northeast Asian economic growth is of fundamental importance to long-term economic success, and of substantial importance politically and culturally as well. Relations with Northeast Asia are of an order of magnitude more important to economic development in Australia than are relations with any other region. "

"...Australia's central economic interests are in the continuation of internationally-oriented growth in Northeast Asia, "

"...we must accelerate progress in domestic economic reform, to build a flexible, internationally-oriented economy that is capable of grasping the opportunities that will emerge in the decades ahead. "

"...Australia's relevance and influence in Northeast Asia will decline until we succeed in increasing the international orientation and growth of the Australian economy. "

"...It is not to Australia's advantage to deny the Australian economy the benefits of international integration by restricting investment from Northeast Asia "

"...Migration has a pivotal role to play in helping Australia to make maximum use of economic opportunities in Northeast Asia."(emphasis added)(147)

The economic impulse behind Asianisation is shown up in the salesman-like patter of Perry Nolan (a former senior foreign affairs officer, then a businessman involved in foreign trade):

"The reality is that Australia is located in the Asian/Pacific region. Like it or not, this geographical fact is not going to change. Accept it and use it as an advantage... Refuse to accept our location and opportunities and we will, very soon, become the 'poor white trash of Asia'."(148)

Some believe, as The Age reported, that "Increasingly, Australia has been made to appear sluggish and unproductive by the resourceful nations of South-East Asia, leading to the belief that our salvation lies in becoming "Eurasian", through higher Asian immigration". Such a "Eurasian future" was forecast by Phil Ruthven in 1991: "Three per cent of the population is now Asian, and most forecasts are about 13 per

cent before 2015. By 2088 I think Asians will be about 40 to 45 per cent" (149). Of course, this Asian ethnicity forecasts by Ruthven may be regarded as woeful under- estimates (compare the projections of Charles Price, and even Ruthven's own later projections).(150)

In 1991 Gareth Evans, then Labor's Foreign Minister, made some revealing comments:

"There is a degree of uncertainty as to whether, or to what extent, we are an "Asian" country. Australia being an "Asia Pacific" nation is easier to manage, conceptually and psychologically, than us being an "Asian" one. But the substance of the issue cannot be skirted. We should acknowledge that we do encounter risks of misunderstanding and non-acceptance in our relations with Asian countries. The management of those risks in a constructive and productive way - the management, in fact, of Australia's Asian future - is a central task of Australian foreign policy... In approaching the management of our Asian future we should not over-estimate the difficulty of the task. The diversity of the Asian region is part of its challenge... One cannot overstate the economic dynamism of the Asian region, and the challenge and opportunity this presents for Australia. The major economies were recording an average annual GDP growth of about 7 per cent, and an export growth of 14.5 per cent. In less than three decades, production in North-East Asia alone had expanded from something less than one-quarter of that of North America's to one-quarter of that of the world... The task for Australia is to lock itself into this regional economic dynamism to the maximum degree possible.(151)

In a similar vein, Professor Stephen Fitzgerald declared in 1992 that:

"this decade will see the progressive Asia-orientation of the Australian economic environment".(152)

In 1993 Richard Woolcott, former Secretary of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade - and a former Ambassador, advocated that

"Closer integration with the Asian region is the path Australia must follow".(153)

In 1994 the views of a well-known property developer, Dennis Wong (Chinese-born, now resident in Australia; Chairman of Mandarin International Developments), were reported in The Sydney Weekly, that (regarding "future trade possibilities with China") "the Australian Government should open the doors for greater immigration from Asia as a way of cementing these trade relations" (154). This seems to be the view shared by many involved in big-business.

"We cannot and should not cut immigration because this would jeopardise our integration with Asia"

Nick Bolkus, 1995 (then Labor Minister for Immigration).(155)

In 1995, the then Labor Prime Minister, Paul Keating, stated:

"Asia is emphatically where this county'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".(156)

Keating further explained his stand:

"Put simply, the Government is seeking Australia's security in Asia... Asia's economic importance to Australia is now widely understood. Around 60 per cent of our exports go to East Asia... the Government believes that, in a quite different way from the past, all Australia's interests - economic, strategic and political - now coalesce in the region around us."(157)

The new Liberal Government (elected in March 1996) very quickly spelt out its position on Asia. In April 1996, the Liberal Government's Foreign Minister, Alexander Downer (once leader of the Liberal Party in Opposition), gave an address entitled "Australia and Asia: Taking the Long View":

"I want to give an unequivocal message to the region: closer engagement with Asia is the Australian Government's highest foreign policy priority... There is a national consensus on the importance of Australia's engagement with Asia and there is a strong recognition that no side of Australian politics "owns" the Asia vision... Looking forward I am confident that rapid growth in the region will continue and I am cautiously optimistic that growth will continue at high rates at least until the year 2020. By one favourable estimate the region will then include China as the biggest economy in the world, India the third or fourth, and Indonesia perhaps the fifth. Technological trends could see Malaysia with the economic profile of a developed country. Region-wide, the Asia Pacific would account for three-quarters of world trade and three-quarters of world output. There is no doubt these changes in the region will have a potentially greater effect on our national fortunes than any external development since World War Two. Australia's geographic position should allow us to capitalise on the enormous trade and investment opportunities that will result from this extraordinary economic transformation."

Downer also added another string to his bow, stating that:

"Ethnic networks boost our markets" (the lure of the "almighty dollar" seems to be very strong upon Downer, no matter the devastating effects that Asianisation would wreak upon Australian people, and our national identity and culture).(158)

In 1997 John Howard drew a distinction between the economic foreign policies of his Liberal Party government and that of the former Labor Party government. Prime Minister Howard said:

"the Asia-only policy followed by the former Government was misplaced and short-sighted... We are following an Asia-first policy, we're not following an Asia-only policy".(159)

In an address to the United Nations in October 1997, Downer announced the Liberal Government's intention for Australia to align itself with the Asian countries in the UN. The Age reported that "Australia has initiated a push to change its official United Nations alignment with western European powers to one comprised of Asian and Pacific nations."(160)

Australian politicians have also been trying to peddle their pro-Asia views to other countries. In October 1997, the Liberal Government's Defence Minister, Ian McLachlan, urged the USA to take a more active role in the Asia-Pacific region, saying that "The world's economic and strategic centre of gravity is shifting from Europe to the Asia-Pacific". McLachlan intoned that "American policy-makers... must catch up with this reality."(161)

It would seem that it is towards Asia that politicians, business magnates, and government bureaucrats are looking to provide the "future" for Australia. Some observers have commented that it would seem that there is an implicit "trade-off" involved: in return for being enabled to economically enmesh Australia with the growing Asian economies, Australia will in turn demographically enmesh itself with Asia's populations. As one government Minister is reported to have said, "we are part of Asia and our economic

development, our future is inextricably intertwined with Asia - tourism, trade and economic development".(162)

The price that Australia is expected to pay for this "trade-off" involving economics, politics, and immigration was made quite clear by Malaysia's Prime Minister, Dr. Mahathir, when he stated that Australia could only be accepted as an equal in Asia when 70% of its people were of Asian ethnicity. The Herald Sun (17 December 1995) reported that:

"Dr Mahathir said yesterday that Australia was not geographically or culturally part of Asia... Dr Mahathir said that Australia could only make the transition to Asia by changing its racial make up".

Mahathir's views were further quoted:

"Possibly with more Asians settling in Australia - maybe the proportion might be 70 per cent Asian, 30 per cent people of Caucasian origin - perhaps that's when there will be no problem at all".(163)

Dr. Mahathir has realised that money is the main motivation behind many of those businessmen and politicians who are pushing policies that will cause the Asianisation of Australia. He expressed this succinctly when he said that:

"Australians shouldn't think that they can become Asian simply because Asia is wealthy and has lots of money. When Europeans were rich, you Australians were Europeans. Then you became Americans when America was rich. When Asians get rich, you become Asians. Is that what you are saying?".(164)

This has also been the conclusion of many other Asians, such as Indonesian lawyer Buyung Nasution:

"Australia wants to be a part of Asia now that the money is there, but it must be done for the right reasons and not merely to help businesses. Most Asians think it is some kind of a trick".(165)

Also, Noordin Sopiee, former editor of the New Straits Times and founding head of the principal think tank of Malaysia's Prime Minister, has said that:

"the only reason Australia is cosying up to Asia is because we have the crown jewels, the loot. To be fair, one has to ask whether Australia would be interested if we were still impoverished".(166)

Several media commentators have all but confirmed this "monetary gain for integration with Asia" line. One writer for Time magazine stated that:

"Closer ties with Asia will have a cash reward. Australia already has a trade surplus with Asia of about \$4 billion a year, and can expect to sell even more raw materials if Asia's infrastructure boom - and its demand for coal and ore - continues"(167)

In 1994, Australian Business Monthly published an article entitled "It's Official - We're Part of Asia". The article's sub-heading declared that:

"this year's exporters survey confirms our future is linked to Asia", while the article itself went on to say that "75 per cent of Australia's \$63 billion merchandise exports now go to the Asian region,... There is little doubt that economically we have become part of Asia."(168)

In 1996, an editorial on the front page of The Sydney Morning Herald stated that:

"We would not be a Euro-centred nation because, although white Europeans had founded modern Australia, they had done so on Asia's Pacific rim... we would be a mongrel nation. History and geography had made us mongrels... there wasn't much alternative. The bold road was crucial to Australia's future. Exports to East Asia in 1995 were \$43.3 billion - 60.5 per cent of total exports".(169)

Such articles give yet another indication that the "Asian future" being pushed upon Australia by politicians and big business is largely economically-driven (indeed, such economics fits in well with their anti-National, globalist ideology).

The sad fact is that our nation's Establishment is selling Australia's future for Asian money. For many business people and politicians, this current sell-out of Australia to Asia is primarily a matter of "profits before people" (or "money before motherland"). Ordinary Australians can expect little from "our leaders" who are prepared to sell-out Australia's future just to make a few lousy dollars.

Note: In 1997 The Age published an interview with the USA's ambassador to Australia, Genta Hawkins Holmes, revealing some very pertinent comments:

Does our assertion that we must become more a part of Asia cause the US any discomfort?

"Heavens, no, absolutely not. We say the same thing. We're also a Pacific nation."

You say the US is part of Asia?

"Well, a part of us is a part of Asia. If you go to California, you'll see just how much a part of Asia we are. Culturally, we are attached to Asia now." (170)

This is an "interesting" viewpoint from an American ambassador. So, it appears that not only is Australia part of Asia, but America is too. Considering that Asia also adjoins Europe and Africa, then surely that must mean that Europe and Africa are part of Asia as well? Indeed, maybe the whole world is part of Asia? Or just maybe the "we're part of Asia" talk from politicians and businessmen is just a load of rubbish? As some Asians have already realised, the "we're part of Asia" line is simply one way that some people are trying to ingratiate themselves with an Asia that they consider to be laden with money-making possibilities.

The Future?

It is finally being recognised by a large segment of the population that the Asianisation of Australia is underway. Also, the fact that our nation is undergoing the process of Asianisation is now even being openly admitted by a number of prominent people.

Greg Sheridan, Foreign Editor of The Australian, has written about some important aspects of the threat to Australia (although he portrays it in a different light, and tries to deny that it is a threat):

"Crucial policy changes of the 1980s led directly to the Asianisation of almost every sphere of Australian life",

"In education as in so many other areas, internationalisation for Australia has meant Asianisation",

"Now about half of our migrants come from Asia and this is likely to be roughly the case for as far ahead as one can imagine".(171)

The Bulletin reported that:

"Whatever happens, Indochinese will continue to make up a sizeable proportion of Australia's immigration intake... They may indeed signal an increasingly Asianized Australia".(172)

Peter Robinson wrote in the Sun-Herald that:

"We all know what has happened to Australia's population structure. Its dominant characteristic is that it has become more and more Asian. Our economy has become overwhelmingly linked with Asia, our tourism industry is dominated by it and our education system is increasingly enmeshed in Asia... We need to be encouraged to accept that Australia is rapidly becoming more and more Asianised and a good thing it is... In many ways, we represent the way ahead for Asia and will increasingly do so as our "Asianisation" develops".(173)

Also, it was reported in The Bulletin that "Professor Stephen Fitzgerald, of the Australia-Asia Institute, has argued that the "Asianisation" of Australia is already underway and that in the not too distant future Australia will be a "honey coloured" part of an East Asian community".(174)

The views of Stephen Fitzgerald were outlined by John Shaw in the Sun-Herald in 1993:

"He believes Australia's best future lies in the evolution of an "Asian Community", a region-wide association including Australia... He said the region now sensed there was urgency in discussing closer association for economic reasons but governments had "reservations about other directions" - i.e. political. "But economic linking will not be enough - there has to be more," he said. Australia's economic commitment to Asia is clear. Exports to Asia are now running at \$35 billion a year - almost 60 per cent of our total overseas sales of minerals, wool, food, manufactures and technology. Services like tourism, education and contracting will add another \$2 billion more income from Asia this year... Overall, East Asia is expected to "grow" by 200 million affluent consumers in the next 15 years, making a new market as big as Europe is now... No wonder, then, that Prime Minister Paul Keating believes Australia's prosperity depends on economic integration with East Asia, on "increasingly becoming part of Asia"... Dr FitzGerald believes an Asian Community is both desirable and achievable and he is prepared to advocate "some kind of ultimate political confederation"... His institute's charter directs it to work for the attainment, for the region and Australia, of an Asian Community".(175)

Similar views on such a proposed "Asian Community" has been espoused by Professor Julian Disney. Regarding issues such as Australia's possible future with APEC (the Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation forum), Disney's view was:

"These regional associations are going to be of enormous importance, whether benign or malign, to our future as a country... They are of the most profound importance. Far more important, for example, than discussing our national Constitution. Our Constitution in 30 or 40 years time will be the APEC constitution, not the national one".(176)

Even foreign politicians have recognised what sort of future the Australian Establishment is dragging our country into. The observations of Lee Kuan Yew (Singapore's Prime Minister, 1959-1990) were reported in The Bulletin in 1990:

"Lee Kuan Yew sees a steady and inevitable Asianisation of Australia, with our European population ending up as the "white trash of Asia"." (177)

Resistance to Asianisation

Very few people within the Australian Establishment have tried to speak out against our enforced enmeshment with Asia, however, some have expressed concerns over the idea, such as:

A 1989 editorial of The Sunday Herald, entitled "Asia: Our New Cultural Cringe", attacked the "recently discovered article of faith... that 'Australia is part of Asia' and our only hope of salvation lies in our enlisting as a small contingent in the mighty Asian army":

"It was not so long ago that some critical Australians used to castigate their compatriots over what they referred to as our "cultural cringe". It was alleged, not without some truth, that Australians showed a sycophantic deference towards British institutions and to a lesser extent, towards those of Western Europe and the United States. More recently, many of these critics have congratulated themselves and us on the decline of this phenomenon and our new sense of independence.

"It, seems, however, we are now just as cringing as we ever might have been. The difference is that the subject of our veneration is Asia. This seems to be derived in part from an odd understanding of geography. Australia is not part of Asia. Italy, Greece, Spain and Portugal are all nearer to the Sahara than we are to Kowloon. England is a quarter of the distance from Mali that we are from Japan. Yet none of these countries has boasted that it is part of Africa.

"All the more baffling is the fact that this discovery of the proximity of Asia has come about as communications technology has reduced the significance of distance. It is as easy to send a fax to Stockholm, as it is to Singapore and to fly to London takes only a few hours longer than to Tokyo.

"The economic significance of Asia, and not only its north-eastern segment, has undoubtedly grown. Australia assuredly must have good commercial relations with it. We should try to improve our links with it. But it does not follow that Australia should try to become a part of Asia.

"...[the] argument that we need to increase Asian immigration if we wish to increase our trade with Asia is not convincing. Japan, South Korea and Taiwan have not found it necessary to import American, European and Australian immigrants in order to carry on international business. The idea that our future prosperity should be achieved by Japanese living in Australia dealing with Japanese living in Japan is a particularly self-abasing manifestation of the cultural cringe".(178)

A 1992 column written by James Dunn (a former Australian ambassador) in The Bulletin gave the opinion that:

"There is a lack of sophistication about the "Let's get closer to Asia" argument, not least because it is all about economic relationships and presupposes that our external economic links will expand if we become Asian in outlook - whatever that means... It represents a rather

simplistic view of our options and is obviously designed to appeal to that section of the electorate which believes that our main foreign-policy concerns should be promoting trade and investment and making our work force internationally competitive... we must not, for the sake of getting on with Asia, devalue those principles which bear on the quality of our democracy and on international human rights...

"Australia is not part of Asia. The most useful definition is of a predominantly European nation on the periphery of Asia. And the tantalising view of Asia as an economic powerhouse is a flawed generalisation. Fewer than 10% of its people enjoy standards of living commensurate with ours. Most of the rest of the 2800 million people between Pakistan and Japan live in conditions our poorest would find unacceptable. Half endure abject poverty while most live under the stifling weight of authoritarian rule. In our ASEAN neighbours we are looking at a region largely run by military regimes, most with poor human rights records. The Europe we are drifting away from has highly developed standards of human rights and social justice".(179)

Also in 1992, Hugh Morgan argued that:

"The idea of Asia, in the Australian mind, emphatically does not include Australia... "

"When we survey the Asian scene, beginning at India, and moving around South-East Asia, and up to Japan, we find many millions of people speaking English, we find many Christians of all sorts, we find cricket, soccer, golf, tennis and squash, but nowhere do we find the established political and legal institutions, the modes of thought, which we so highly value. Our habits of political discourse and argument; our manners towards our political opponents; our capacity to transfer power from one political elite to another without any violence whatsoever; our complete and wholly justified faith in the integrity and independence of our judiciary; these are the things which separate us from our Asian neighbours. "

"It is these things which enable us to understand who we are and where we have come from. These are the things which provide us with the foundation upon which we can look at the rest of the world, trade with the world, talk confidently to the world and, in the final test, defend our territory against would-be invaders. "

"Much of the current obsession with "Asia" is merely a manifestation of our continuing economic decline. As we slip further down the ladder of international competitiveness and prosperity, and as the nations of the West Pacific climb up and pass us on that ladder, it is perhaps not surprising that some of our political leaders should lose confidence in the people who have elected them to office... "

"The time has come to throw off this nonsense. We can solve our problems; we can be the best in the world again, if we really want to be. But we have to understand ourselves as we really are, to have confidence in our ability to solve our problems, and not try to pretend to ourselves, and to the rest of the world, that we have something different. That way lies tragedy".(180)

In 1994, Brian Toohey wrote of "the determination of Asian leaders such as Goh [Singapore's Prime Minister, Goh Chok Tong] to maintain a distinctive local cultural identity in ways which raise difficult issues for Australia's attempts to "enmesh" with Asia. Toohey further wrote:

"In a speech in Brisbane last week, the Prime Minister, Paul Keating, said that by the year 2000 he wanted Australia to be a country in which "our national culture is shaped by, and helps shape, the cultures around us".

"Yet not a lot of thought has been given to what it is likely to mean to have our values increasingly shaped by Asia. "

"There is a comfortable assumption that - as we become more enmeshed economically - Asian leaders will discover an irresistible desire to accommodate their cultural and political values to ones more in keeping with our notions of democracy. "

"Speaking in Darwin last week, however, a former Australian ambassador to Indonesia and Japan, Rawdon Dalrymple, said that it was wrong to assume that economic success in Asia would lead to a corresponding embrace of liberal democratic values. "

"Dalrymple said he expected that a Confucian style authoritarianism would prevail as Asian countries gained more confidence in the ability of their own "Cultural roots, values and traditions to explain economic success stories".

"As far as Asia's ruling elites are concerned, these traditions and values do not encompass the degree of political dissent, nor the relative generosity of the social safety nets, to which Australians have become accustomed. "

"Both features of Australian society are likely to come under increased pressure as our values become more influenced by Asia... "

"Australia's traditional social safety nets will come under increased stress as we enmesh with Asia. "

"Likewise, there will be increased pressures to take a more quiescent approach on human rights, even though our long-term security interests may be best served by encouraging less authoritarian governments in our neighbourhood."(181)

In 1993 Graeme Campbell, Member of Parliament for Kalgoorlie, made some important points:

"it needs to be stressed again and again that Australia is not a part of Asia. It is a separate and distinct nation-continent. We are unique and should be proud of our uniqueness. "

"The challenge for Australia is to build on the best of its traditions, rather than - out of fear of being left alone in the big wide world - trying to artificially integrate with one section of it. Rather than redirecting towards Asia the colonial cringe and the cargo cult that have been features of our past we must have the faith to invest in our own people and resources. "

"'Integration' with Asia will ensure that we are eternally a colony. An independent approach which meets our neighbours as independent equals is the way not only to international respect, but self-respect and self-confidence. These are issues of substance which have to be confronted if Australia is ever to fulfil its great potential".(182)

Graeme Campbell (the Member of Parliament for Kalgoorlie since 1980) was ousted by the Labor Party for his outspoken views, and in a similar fashion the Liberal Party withdrew their endorsement for Pauline Hanson as their candidate for Oxley because of her outspoken views. Nonetheless, in the March 1996 federal elections, Graeme Campbell was re-elected, and Pauline Hanson won the seat of Oxley; both as independents.

Pauline Hanson, in her maiden speech to parliament on 10 September 1996, said:

"Immigration and multiculturalism are issues that this government is trying to address but for far too long, ordinary Australians have been kept out of any debate by the major parties. I and most Australians want our immigration policy radically reviewed and that of multiculturalism abolished. I believe we are in danger of being swamped by Asians. Between 1984 and 1995, 40% of all migrants into this country were of Asian origin. They have their own culture and religion, form ghettos and do not assimilate. Of course, I will be called racist but if I can invite who I want into my home, then I should have the right to have a say in who comes into my country".(183)

The courage of Pauline Hanson and Graeme Campbell is to be applauded by all true-blue Australians. However; it should be noted that, all in all, very few prominent people have questioned the direction Australia is taking, in regard to Asia. Even fewer, more outspoken, people have opposed some aspects of our Asianisation. But so far, it appears that it is only the fledgling patriotic and nationalist organisations who will actually oppose the whole spectrum of our nation's Asianisation, and who advocate the steps to be taken to reverse this evil, undemocratic, anti-Australian process. It is to be hoped that more Australians will join those organisations, and/or that other groups will follow their lead. By reports received, it is apparent that such organisations are making gains, both in membership and organisational abilities.

It is time that all Australians make a stand against the Asianisation of our nation.

References

1. The Radical Nationalist (Bulletin of the National Republican Movement), Number 9, September 1996, p. 4.
2. Haley, Ken. "Blainey Renews Attack On Immigration Policy", The Age, 28 April 1984.
3. Birrell, Robert. "Migrant Figures", Australian Society, June 1985, p. 30.
- Blainey, Geoffrey. All for Australia, Methuen Haynes, North Ryde, NSW, 1984, pp. 94-100.
- Button, Jane. "Increase In Skilled Migration Will Boost European Influx", The Australian, 31 May 1984.
- Bunk, Steve. "Immigration Laws Alter the Profile of Australia", The Australian, 5 January 1984.
- Haley, Ken. "Blainey Renews Attack On Immigration Policy", The Age, 28 April 1984.
4. West, Stewart. Speech to the House of Representatives on 7 March 1984, edited extract reprinted in The Age, 20 March 1984, p. 11.
5. Blainey. All for Australia, Methuen Haynes, North Ryde, NSW, 1984, pp. 96-98.
6. "Refugee Intake to Fall; More UK Migrants", The Australian, 24 April 1985.
7. Blainey, Geoffrey. All For Australia, p. 89.
- Mohajer, John. "Counting the Cost of Multiculturalism", The Record, Spring 1995, p. 5.
8. Blainey, Geoffrey. All For Australia, pp. 103-119, 156.
9. Department of Immigration. Policy Control Instruction. Series: Refugees & International; Number: PC 39; Index Subject: Vietnam; Date: 2 Aug 1982; File Reference 82/95108. (Author's note: This Policy Control Instruction favours Vietnamese). Department of Immigration. Policy Control Instruction. Series: Executive; Number: PC 207; Index Subject: Lebanon; Date: 8 Sep 1983; File Reference 83/95233. (Author's note: This Policy Control Instruction favours Lebanese). Department of Immigration. Policy Control Instruction. No. PC 1002; Date Of Issue: 1/12/83; File No.: 82/78664, 82/79070; Title: Family Migration Sponsorship - Processing and Pre-Selection. (Author's note: This Policy Control Instruction favours Vietnamese).

The author holds copies of all of the above documents, however, there is no telling how many other directives have been issued that discriminate against Europeans, and in favour of Asians. Certainly, we will never know how many verbal instructions have been given to use greater "discretion" in admitting Vietnamese, or any other Asians.

10. Trood, Russell; and McNamara, Deborah (eds). *The Asia-Australia Survey 1994*, Macmillan Education Australia, South Melbourne, 1994, p. 290.
11. Armitage, Catherine. "Immigration To Rise Next Year", *The Australian*, 6 December 1994, pp. 1-2.
12. 1966 Census of Population and Housing, 30 June 1966, Commonwealth of Australia, Volume 1: Population: Single characteristics. Part 11: Race, Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Canberra, (1971), p. 10-11, Table No. 1: "Population , by Race: Australia, Censuses, 1933 to 1966".
13. Notwithstanding the ancestry question in the 1986 census, which was meant to determine the ethnicity of the population, but was not conducted so as to properly determine racial background. The ancestry question was not well- defined, and therefore received a response that was too inaccurate for an overall view.

As Charles Price and Patricia Pyne explained, "Earlier censuses used to publish racial statistics relating to "full blood" and "half-caste" persons in considerable detail; the 1947 census, for example, listed some 25 racial categories, ranging from Afghan to West Indian, and cross classified 21 of these by country of birth. In the 1960's, however, with the growth of feelings that statistics of race reflected attitudes, policies and practices of race prejudice and discrimination, the race questions came under fire and were gradually cut back. The 1976 census coded only six racial categories - Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander, European, Chinese, Pacific Islander, Other - and these did not distinguish between "full blood" and "half-caste". In 1981 there will be no race question at all - simply a question as to whether a person identifies as an Aborigine (or Torres Strait Islander) or not.

Price, Charles and Pyne, Patricia. "Foreign Born Persons in the 1976 Census", in: Price, Charles A. (ed.) *Australian Immigration: A Bibliography and Digest*, The Australian National University, Canberra, 1979, p. A47.

14. Price, Charles A. "Australia As Intermediary With Asia: A Demographic View", *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 1, 1993, p. 30.
15. See table in Volume 2: "Estimated Asian Population in Australia".
16. Price, Charles A. "Australia As Intermediary With Asia: A Demographic View", *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, Volume 14, Number 1, 1993, p. 31.
- Jenkins, David. "Our Asian Future Is Closer Than We Thought", *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 May 1990, p. 1.
- Jenkins, David. "2001: Our Race Odyssey", *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 May 1990, p. 71, 76.
17. Ruthven, Phil. "Question: Can We Live With 150 Million People?", *The Age*, 14 April 1991, p. 15.
18. *The Macquarie Dictionary*, Second Revision, The Macquarie Library, Macquarie University, NSW, 1987, p. 733 (defining a "generation" as a span of 30 years).
- Maslen, Geoffrey. "Prophet of Gloom", *The Age Good Weekend Magazine*, 3 September 1994, pp. 15-16.
19. Armitage, Catherine. "Policy Makers Should Just Go With the Flow", *The Australian*, 22 April 1995.
20. 1945 and 1966 estimates from the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics; cited in: 1966 Census of Population and Housing, 30 June 1966, Commonwealth of Australia, Volume 1: Population: Single characteristics. Part 11: Race, Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Canberra, (1971), p. 10-11, Table No. 1: "Population , by Race: Australia, Censuses, 1933 to 1966".
- 1991 and 2020 estimates from Charles Price; cited in: Price, Charles A. "Australia As Intermediary With Asia: A Demographic View", *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, Volume 14, Number 1, 1993, p. 31.
- 2090 estimate from Phillip Ruthven; cited in: Armitage, Catherine. "Policy Makers Should Just Go With the Flow", *The Australian*, 22 April 1995.
21. Elliott, Michael. "The White Asians: Don't Count Them Out", *The Bulletin* (Newsweek section), 30 November 1993, p. 64.
22. Fraser, Malcolm. "One Nation, One Notion", *The Age*, 8 July 1997, p. A13.
23. Rimmer, Stephen. "Counting the \$7 Billion Cost of Multiculturalism", *The Age*, 30 June 1991, p. 15.

24. With the exception that it will be denied by liberal-internationalists, who always deny the bad effects of everything they do (even when they eventuate); or they will deny that it is a bad thing for the Australian people to be destroyed (in the interests of "global humanity" and the eventual aim of "coffee-coloured people by the score").

25. The Establishment will never allow a referendum on the subject of immigration. However, in the interests of exploring the issue further, if it ever did allow such a referendum, then either one of two tactics would be used:

1) The referendum question would be worded in such a way as to render voting against immigration almost unthinkable, for example: "Do you want to stop the poor, starving people of Asia to ever have the opportunity for a better life, by stopping them from coming to Australia?". Of course, this would not be the exact wording, but you can see the point being made. Most certainly the propaganda put out by the government and the media would follow such a line, in order to pull at the emotional heart-strings of the Australian public, in order to convince them to vote against their better judgement. Also, the propaganda line that has been pushed in the educational system since the 1960s (and particularly since the early 1980s) has indoctrinated and "brainwashed" a large portion of students, many of whom will now be of voting age. It should also not be forgotten that Racial Vilification laws would be used, by threat and by action, in order to stop the efforts of Australians campaigning against immigration during such a referendum.

2) The Establishment could leave the holding of such a referendum until such time as when a large part of the population in Australia is non-European (full-bloods and otherwise), which - supplemented by the White liberal- internationalist minority (which would have been expanded by the long-standing indoctrination of students) - will be able to deliver a majority in favour of immigration.

26. Barnard, Michael. "Where a Plebiscite is Essential", The Age, 14 February 1984.

27. "Newspoll", The Australian, 3 February 1988, p. 2.

28. Cited in: Bennett, John. Your Rights 1986, Australian Civil Liberties Union, Carlton, 1988, p. 76.

29. Bennett, John. Your Rights 1994, Australian Civil Liberties Union, Carlton, 1994, p. 14.

30. Collins, Carolyn; and Eccleston, Roy. "Pact with Libs Dictated Policy, Says Hawke", The Australian, 25 May 1993.

"Immigration and Bipartisanship" (editorial), Sydney Morning Herald, 26 May 1993, p. 18.

McDonnell, Dan. "Hawke Reveals Political 'Pact'", Herald Sun, 25 May 1993 (later edition), p. 4.

31. Signy, Helen. "Voters the Libs Forgot: Migrant Aussies", Sydney Morning Herald, 26 May 1993, p. 1.

32. Fraser, Malcolm. "Why Racial Hatred Hurts Us All", The Age, 23 October 1997, p. A15.

33. Hawke, Bob. "Resisting the Rallying Call of Fear", The Age, 9 September 1988, p. 11-12.

34. Collins, Carolyn; and Eccleston, Roy. "Pact With Libs Dictated Policy, Says Hawke", The Australian, 25 May 1993.

35. McGregor, Richard. "Department Planned to Infiltrate TV Soapies to Counter Racist Attitudes", The Sydney Morning Herald, 22 April 1985, p. 3.

36. "The Dark Side Of Beauty", Toorak Times, 2 May 1990, p. 14.

Eden, Millie. "Ads For A Racial Rainbow", The Herald, 10 December 1989, p. 29.

Mabry, Marcus; and Adams, Rhonda. "A Long Way From Aunt Jemima", The Bulletin, 5 September 1989, pp. 78- 79.

It was the very obvious use by Myer of disproportionate numbers of Asian and other coloured children in their retail advertising that first drew the attention of many people to this anti-Australian practice in 1985 (note: it should be recognised that this is an anti-Australian practice as such deliberate disproportionate

use of Asian/coloured child models is clear discrimination against Australian child models of European background). Invariably, this practice is predominant with child models, rather than adult models, which can usually be seen in the retail catalogues on the pages advertising children's clothes - perhaps the advertisers see "cute" children as acceptable to Australian consumers, whereas the use of adult models may be more unacceptable and provide consumer discomfort or even a consumer backlash.

In 1985 this practice received publicity, due to the campaign carried out against it by Australian National Action (refer: Ultra (Bulletin of Australian National Action), No. 27, 1985, pp. 4-5). Some "classical" examples of the practice come from that year:

Myer advert, The Sun, 21 March 1985, p. 18:
7 children - 3 white, 4 non-white.

Myer advert, The Sun, 22 May 1985, p. 29:
3 children - 2 white, 1 non-white.

Myer's Impressions In Wool catalogue (only one page for children's clothes - p. 24, the back cover):
8 children - 4 white, 4 non-white.

Myer's Directions: Winter 85 catalogue (only two pages for children's clothes - pp. 24-25):
13 children - 7 white, 6 non-white.

All of which is pretty incredible, considering that the white population at that time was around 90-95% (following which, non-white children would have only randomly appeared as 1 or 2 amongst every 20 child models).

Note (as at December 1996): Myer still continue this practice of disproportionately using Asian/coloured child models. Target has consistently done the same over several years; a study of Target retail catalogues covering the period of January 1996 to May 1996 confirms that this practice continues with that retail chain.

37. Bennett, John. Your Rights 1988, Australian Civil Liberties Union, Carlton, 1988, p. 87.
38. Bennett, John. Your Rights 1987, Australian Civil Liberties Union, Carlton, 1987, pp. 76-77.
39. Bennett, John. Your Rights 1987, pp. 76-77.
- Bennett, John. Your Rights 1988, p. 88.
40. Zuckerman, Laurence. "Aiming Beyond White Readers", Time, 19 December 1988, p. 49.
41. Adams, Phillip. "Soapies: Washing Away the Barriers", The Bulletin, 2 July 1985, p. 60.
- Bennett, John. Your Rights 1988, p. 88.
42. Limbaugh III, Rush H. The Way Things Ought To Be, Pocket Books (Simon and Schuster), New York, 1992, p. 269.
43. Dunstan, Kate. "Minister Hides Racism Report", The Age, 14 June 1979, p. 19.
44. Armstrong, Caroline. "Race Bigotry Survey Condemns Half State", The Australian, 25 June 1979.
45. Armstrong, Caroline. "Race Bigotry Survey Condemns Half State", The Australian, 25 June 1979.
46. Rissen, J.R. "The Boat People: Australia's Replacement", Nation Review, April 1981, p. 14.
47. Wild, Ronald. "Researchers: Do They Have Rights?", Australian Society, December 1984, p. 28.
48. Lane, Terry. "Look Behind the Racist Label For the Truth", The Sunday Age, 3 June 1990.
49. Ragg, Mark. "Muzzles For the Mind", The Bulletin, 9 February 1993, pp. 34-36.
50. Henningham, John. "The Hack's Progress", Time, 11 January 1993, p. 45.
51. Bagnall, Diana. "Minds In Neutral", The Bulletin, 20 October 1992, p. 22.
52. Batties, Rebecca. "24 Colleagues Disagree With Blainey", The Age, 19 May 1984.
- Grutzner, Anna. "Blainey Hits At Demo Stirrers", The Herald, 19 June 1984.

- Markus, Andrew and Ricklefs, M.C. (eds.). *Surrender Australia? Essays in the Study and Uses of History: Geoffrey Blainey and Asian Immigration*, Allen and Unwin, North Sydney, 1985.
- O'Donnell, Lynne. "Wild Demo In Asia Row", *The Sun*, 19 June 1984, pp. 1-2.
- "Protest Against Blainey Sparks Campus Violence", *The Australian*, 19 June 1984, p. 1.
- Robertson, I.G. "Danger in the Asian Debate", *The Australian*, 24 May 1984.
- Robertson, I.G. "Immigration Policy", *The Age*, 19 May 1984.
- "We Were Wrong", *The Age*, 22 May 1984.
53. Collins, Carolyn; and Eccleston, Roy. "Pact With Libs Dictated Policy, Says Hawke", *The Australian*, 25 May 1993.
54. Gleeson, Andrew. "Government Will Take More Care To Screen Out Racist S Africans", *The Age*, 25 July 1986, p. 15.
- House of Representatives. *Hansard*, 3 June 1987, p. 3938.
55. Carswell, Phil. "An Activities Course In Rights", *The Victorian Teacher*, August 1984, pp. 35-36 (re. Ralph Pettman's book, *Teaching For Human Rights*).
- Carswell, Phil. "Anti-Racism. What To Do", *The Victorian Teacher*, August 1984, pp. 40-41.
- Lees, Caroline. "Attacking Racism Early", *The Bulletin*, 16 August 1988, p. 24.
- McRae, David. "Agents Of Change", *The Victorian Teacher*, August 1984, pp. 37-38 (re. the six-part TV series, *The Migrant Experience*).
- Szwarc, Josef; and Dugan, Michael. "Anti-Racism. Asian Migration: The Facts", *The Victorian Teacher*, August 1984, pp. 38-40.
- "Teaching For Human Rights" (Human Rights Commission advertisement), *The Age*, 14 December 1985, p. 21.
- Tons, John. "Prejudice and its Opposition", *The Australian Teacher*, June 1990, pp. 25-26.
56. McGregor, Peter. "Global Tolerance" (letter), *The Bulletin*, 6 June 1989, p. 18.
57. Barker, Geoffrey. "When Careers Depend On Politics, Not Performance", *The Age*, 25 July 1991, p. 13.
58. Fraser, R B. "Internationalism" (advertisement), *Diamond Valley News*, 13 August 1997, p. 7.
59. Quirk, Tricia. "Aussie Mix 'Has Too Much British'", *The Sun*, 19 October 1983, p. 34.
60. Lipski, Sam. "Leaders in the Limelight", *Bulletin*, 13 September 1988, p. 104.
61. Grattan, Michelle. "Does Robert Ray Have the Right Stuff?", *The Age*, 29 August 1988, p. 13.
62. House of Representatives. *Hansard*, 8 May 1984, p. 2000.
63. House of Representatives. *Hansard*, 3 June 1988, p. 3263.
64. Uhlmann, Mark. "From the Editor", *The Record*, Spring Issue, No. 3 for 1994, p. 1.

65. The Establishment proclaims "democracy" and "freedom of speech" when such posturing serves its purpose, and for ordinary matters these ideals are basically observed, but when its liberal-internationalist creed is threatened - then its "true colours" are revealed.

As one writer has pointed out: "What's the difference between a Nazi fascist and a Liberal-Internationalist fascist? The answer is that one believes he is "right" and uses the power of the State to oppress his opponents (the fascist theory and usage of "might is right"), while the other believes he is "right" and uses the power of the State to oppress his opponents (the fascist theory and usage of "might is right"). Get the picture?"

While the System claims it is democratic, it actually has a hidden tyrannical, or quasi-fascist, nature. This is why it deliberately continues mass Asian immigration, even when it is widely known that most Australians oppose it; and this is why they try to silence, or crush, the activities of Australian patriots and nationalists, because they fear the potential of these groups.

"First they came for the Australian nationalists, but I did not speak up ...".

The Radical Nationalist, Number 9, September 1996, p. 6.

66. Dow, Steve. "Proud Young Australian Accuses Hanson of Inciting Hate", *The Age*, 29 January 1998, p. A5.

Masanauskas, John(?). "Insult Ruined his Rosy View", *Herald Sun*, 23 October 1996, p. 14.

67. Campbell, Graeme. "Abuse of Nation's Tolerance" (letter), *Herald Sun*, 14 October 1996, p. 20.

68. It is these liberal-internationalists that are the cause of Asianisation, as well as the cause for so many of Australia's other ills. It is these people who should be politically targeted by those opposing Asianisation. Asian immigrants are generally not at fault here, they are just taking advantage of a "good deal" put in front of them; they are just a symptom, rather than the cause, of the problem.

69. Metherell, Mark. "Steering Into the Unknown", *The Age*, 4 August 1980.

Roberts, Peter. "120 Top People Air Their Views", *The Age*, 11 August 1980.

70. Metherell, Mark. "Judge Warns Of Difficult Times Ahead", *The Age*, 11 August 1980.

Metherell, Mark. "Steering Into the Unknown", *The Age*, 4 August 1980.

71. Metherell, Mark; and Roberts, Peter. "Conference Believes the Time For Change is Here", *The Age*, 15 August 1980.

72. "Move Closer To Asia Or Face Isolation", *The Age*, 18 August 1980.

"Simply Put, There Were Difficulties", *The Age*, 18 August 1980.

73. Robison, Richard. "Asian Engagement Necessary", *The Australian*, 28 October 1996, p. 11.

74. Grassby, A.J. *Australian Ethnic Affairs Policy for the 80's*, Clearing House on Migration Issues, Richmond, Victoria, (1982?), p. 27.

75. Hayden, W.G. "Australia and the Asian Region" (speech delivered to the Committee for the Economic Development of Australia, on 24 October 1983), *Australian Outlook*, December 1993, p. 154.

76. Smark, Peter. "Hayden: An Uncomfortable Reminder", *The Age*, 11 May 1983, p. 11.

77. Haley, Ken. "Asian Entry Threatens Tolerance: Blainey", *The Age*, 19 March 1984.

78. *The Sunday Mail*, 23 June 1985; cited in: Dique, Dr. J.C.A. *Immigration - A Policy of Perfidy*, Veritas, Bullsbrook, Western Australia, c1985, p. 61.

79. Cumming, Fia. "Hawke Readies a Warm Response", *The Bulletin*, 15 January 1985, p. 57.

80. House of Representatives. Hansard, 3 June 1988, pp. 3262-3263.

81. Betts, Catherine. "Public Discourse, Immigration and the New Class", in: Jupp, James; and Kabala, Marie (eds). *Politics of Australian Immigration*, AGPS, Canberra, 1993, pp. 237, 238.

82. Hawke, Bob. "Asians' Growing Role In Australia", *The Monthly Record*, September 1989, pp. 498-499.

83. Murdoch, Lindsay. "Asian View Of Australia Wrong: Evans", *The Age*, 29 July 1990, p. 5.

84. "Forging A National Identity", *Time*, 6 April 1992, p. 19.

85. Cited in: Halliwell, Malcolm. "Fighting over Asia" (Letter), *The Australian*, 31 October 1994, p. 8.

86. "For Australia, a 'Eurasian' Role", *Asiaweek*, 19 August 1983, p. 7.

McClusky, Leigh and Merrigan, Ken. "50 Million Aussies - Hayden Aim", *The Sun*, 24 March 1984, pp.1-2.

Smark, Peter. "Hayden Hope for a Eurasian Australia", *The Age*, 11 May 1983, pp. 1, 6.

87. Elias, David. "Lift Migrant Level: Dixon", *The Age*, 20 August 1979, p. 3.

88. "Counting on Asia", *Herald Sun*, 15 November 1996, p. 15.

89. Fraser, Malcolm. "Time to Rekindle Spirit of Growth", *The Australian*, 3-4 May 1997, p. 7 ("Immigration: The Real Debate" supplement).

90. Ellingsen, Peter. "Social Turmoil Ahead: Futurologist", *The Age*, 9 July 1985.

91. Broinowski, Alison. "Asia-Literacy", in: Trood, Russell and McNamara, Deborah (eds). *The Asia-Australia Survey 1994*, Macmillan Education Australia, South Melbourne, 1994, p. 56.

Broinowski, Alison. "Learning To Read the Asia Situation", in *The Australian*, 15 March 1994, "Asians in Australia" supplement p. 3.

92. Drysdale, Peter. "East Asian Growth is Vital to 'Dynamism of Global Economy'", *International Business Asia*, 30 September, 1996, p. 12.

93. "It's A Warning, Says Peacock", *The Herald*, pp.1-3.

94. "Ease Migration Law To Lift Economy: Chinese Leader", *The Sunday Mail*, 1 January 1989, p. 7.
95. Edwards, Ken. "A Lasting Affair With Asia", *Time*, 16 March 1992, pp. 56-57.
96. Blainey, Geoffrey. "The Immigration Debate: Blainey vs Business", *Australian Business Monthly*, July 1992, p. 31.
97. Wilenski, Dr Peter, "Immigration, Multiculturalism and Australia's International Role ", *The Verbatim Report*, January/February 1993, p. 5.
98. Moss, Irene. "Australia and the Question of National Identity"; in: David Heardon, James Warden and Bill Gamage (eds.), *Crown Or Country*, Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards, NSW, 1994, p. 136.
99. "Republic Push Has New Backer", *The Sunday Herald Sun*, 13 February 1994, p. 19.
100. Terrill, Ross. "We're Too Worried About What the Neighbours Think", *The Australian*, 28 October 1996, p. 11.
101. Foreshe, Jennifer. "Honoured Doctor's Concern for Health Care", *The Australian*, 27 January 1996, p. 10.
102. Brett, Judith. "A Small Nation Like Ours Needs its Asian Friends", *The Age*, 19 June 1997, p. A 17.
103. Colebatch, Tim. "There's a Fog Obscuring the Lie of Our New World", *The Age*, 30 August 1997, p. A29.
104. Costigan, Peter. "Migrants: No Switch Says West", *The Herald*, 21 May 1984, pp. 1, 3.
- Kelton, Greg. "Libs To Press Attack", *The Sun*, 15 May 1984, p. 17.
- Usher, Robin; and Legge, Kate. "Asian Leaders Warn Of Hostility As Migration Row Escalates", *The Age*, 10 May 1984, p. 5.
105. "Gorton Says: Australia Will Abolish Racism", *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 January 1971, p. 12.
- "PM Explains His Role At Singapore Conference", *The Australian*, 26 January 1971, p. 4.
106. Monday Conference (television programme), Channel 2, 1 May 1972; cited in: Dique, Dr. J.C.A. *Immigration: the Quiet Invasion*, Veritas, Bullsbrook, WA, c1985, pp. 164-165.
- Chipp, Don. "The Path to a Multicultural Society", in: Milne, Frances; Shergold, Peter (eds) *The Great Immigration Debate*, Federation of Ethnic Communities' Council of Australia, Sydney, 1984, p. 61.
107. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 11 March 1977 (?), cited in: "Yes Or No?", a leaflet produced by the Australian National Alliance (in 1978?).
108. "Aust Will Be Asian State: NT Leader", *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 December 1978, p. 11.
109. House of Representatives. Hansard, 11 September 1979, p. 899.
- House of Representatives. Hansard, 12 September 1979, p. 983.
110. House of Representatives. Hansard, 8 May 1984, p. 2027.
111. House of Representatives. Hansard, 8 May 1984, p. 2028.
112. Ruddock, Philip. "Refugee Cutbacks Unjustified" (letter), *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 June 1985.
113. "'Little Asia' Plan For NT", *The Courier Mail*, 3 October 1988.
114. "Asia Policy Talks Urged", *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 14 May 1990, p. 4.
115. Hewson, Dr John. "To Be As Good As We Say We Are", *The Verbatim Report*, June 1992, p. 137.
116. Leser, David. "NT Signs Up With Indonesia", *The Bulletin*, 28 January 1992, p. 22.
117. "Conference Review: Asia-Pacific Migration Affecting Australia, held by the Bureau of Immigration and Population Research in Darwin from 14 - 17 September 1993", *The Record*, Summer 1993, pp. 11-12.
118. Sheridan, Greg. "On Common Ground", *The Australian*, 15 March 1994, "Asians in Australia" supplement p. 1.
119. Sheridan, Greg. "On Common Ground", *The Australian*, 15 March 1994, "Asians in Australia" supplement p. 1.
120. Liberal Party and National Party. *Policies for a Coalition Government: Multicultural Affairs and Settlement*, undated (early 1996?), pp. 2, 25 (and see p. 17).
121. Skelton, Russell. "A Good Beginning, But There's Still Work To Be Done In Asia", *The Age*, 21 March 1996, p. 15.
122. "Australia and Asia: Taking the Long View" ("Address by Mr Alexander Downer, MP, Minister for Foreign Affairs, to the Foreign Correspondents' Association, Sydney, 11 April 1996"), Department of

Foreign Affairs and Trade, 1996, available on the Internet (http://www.dfat.gov.au/pmb/speeches/fa_sp/asia-long.html).

123. Hewett, Jennifer. "Downer Strikes Out at Amnesty", *The Age*, 2 October 1997, p. A1.
124. Pristel, S. "Labor Wary Of Howard Backdown", *Herald Sun*, 9 January 1995, p. 5.
125. Howard, John. "The Meaning Of 'One Australia'", *The Age*, 9 September 1988, pp. 11-12.
126. Tremayne, David. "A New Party on the Block: Graeme Campbell and Australia First", *The Radical Nationalist*, Number 9, September 1996, p. 3.
127. Howard, John, 26 October 1996; Transcript of the Prime Minister the Hon John Howard MP; Keynote Address to the New South Wales State Convention; University of New South Wales, (Office of the Prime Minister?), Canberra, 1996, (p. 6).
128. Fraser, Malcolm. "Why Racial Hatred Hurts Us All", *The Age*, 23 October 1997, p. A15.
- Greene, Gervase. "Immigration Vital For Nation's Future: Fraser", *The Age*, 23 October 1997, p. A3.
129. Trood, Russell; and McNamara, Deborah (eds). *The Asia-Australia Survey 1994*, Macmillan Education Australia, South Melbourne, 1994, pp. ix, 3, 11, 22.
130. Hawke, Bob. "Asians' Growing Role In Australia", *The Monthly Record*, September 1989, pp. 498-499.
131. Blainey, Geoffrey. "The Immigration Debate: Blainey vs Business", *Australian Business Monthly*, July 1992, p. 32.
132. "Call To Bring In 250,000 Migrants", *The Adelaide Advertiser*, 22 December 1984.
- Dixon, Robyn. "West Rejects Migrant Call", *The Herald*, 21 September 1984.
- Rees, Jacqueline. "Refugees' Uneasy Welcome", *The Far Eastern Economic Review*, 10 May 1984, p. 28.
133. Blainey, Geoffrey. "The Immigration Debate: Blainey vs Business", *Australian Business Monthly*, July 1992, p. 30.
134. Pekol, Suzanne. "Asian Worries Surface in Migrant Probe", *The Sun*, 28 March, p. 15.
- Pekol, Suzanne. "Migrants 'Needed To Ease Labor Shortage'", *The Advertiser*, 27 January 1988.
135. "Business Council Wants Migration Lifted To 180,000", *The Advertiser*, 8 January 1988.
136. Wright, Steve. "Employers Say More Skilled Asians Needed", *The Advertiser*, 3 February 1988.
137. Pristel, Simon; McKenzie, Scott. "Employer Calls For Immigrants", *Herald Sun*, 20 February 1997, p. 12.
138. Cited in: Donath, E.J. "Demography - An Important Business Tool", *National Australia Bank Monthly Summary*, April 1986, p. 16.
139. Parkinson, Tony. "Missing the Boat to Asia", *Herald Sun*, 14 October 1996, p. 19.
140. Wood, Leonie. "HudCon Looks to Asian Focus", *The Age*, 17 October 1997, p. B3.
141. Harry, Ralph L. "Ethnic Minorities in Australia and Foreign Policy", *World Review*, April 1982, p. 57.
- Renouf, Alan. *The Frightened Country*, Macmillan, Melbourne, 1979, p. 538.
142. Australian Population and Immigration Council, *Immigration Policies and Australia's Population: A Green Paper*, AGPS, Canberra, 1977, p. 47.
143. *Advertiser (Adelaide)*, 25th November 1980; cited in: Dique, Dr. J.C.A. *Immigration: the Quiet Invasion*, Veritas, Bullsbrook, Western Australia, c1985, p. 165.
144. "PM Sees the Future With Asia", *Manly Daily*, 16 March 1984.
145. Hawke, R.J. "Australia's Security In Asia"; cited in: McCormack, Denis. "Immigration and Multiculturalism", in *Your Rights '94*, Australian Civil Liberties Union, Carlton, 1994, p. 10.
146. Evans, David. "Plan For Massive Migrant Intake", *The Daily Mirror*, 27 February 1987, p. 2.
147. Garnaut, Ross. *Australia and the Northeast Asian Ascendancy: Report to the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade*, AGPS, Canberra, 1989, pp. 6, 10, 12, 31.
148. Nolan, Perry. "Ability the Only Criterion that Matters in Migration", *The Australian Financial Review*, 5 September 1988, p. 12.
149. Yallop, Richard. "Australia Inc.: Has the Business Gone Bust?", *The Age*, 25 May 1991, *Saturday Extra* supplement pp. 1, 4.
150. In 1995, Ruthven stated that "about 25 per cent of Australians will be of Asian background by the middle of next century, and half to two thirds by the end."
- Armitage, Catherine. "Policy Makers Should Just Go With the Flow", *The Australian*, 22 April 1995.

151. Evans, Gareth. "Managing Australia's Future", 21.C, Summer 1991/92, p. 16-18.
 152. Fitzgerald, Professor Stephen. "The Reality of Asia", The Verbatim Report, October 1992, p. 238.
 153. Woolcott, Richard. "Asia: Can't Live With It - Or Without It", The Bulletin, 14 December 1993, p. 25.
 154. Chipperfield, Mark. "China Town", The Sydney Weekly, March 22-28 1994, p. 14.
 155. Cited in: Australians Against Further Immigration Party. "Editorial", Australians Against Further Immigration Newsletter, January 1996, p. 3.
- See also similar comments made by Bolkus:
- Armitage, Catherine. "Immigration To Rise Next Year", The Australian, 6 December 1994, pp. 1-2.
- Armitage, Catherine. "Policy Makers Should Just Go With the Flow", The Australian, 22 April 1995.
156. Speech made by Paul Keating at the Australian Chinese Forum in Sydney on 12 October 1995; cited in: Australians Against Further Immigration Party. "Editorial", Australians Against Further Immigration Newsletter, January 1996, p. 3.
157. Keating, Paul. "Seek Security in Asia, Not Against It", The Age, 19 October 1995, p. 17.
158. "Australia and Asia: Taking the Long View" ("Address by Mr Alexander Downer, MP, Minister for Foreign Affairs, to the Foreign Correspondents' Association, Sydney, 11 April 1996"), Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 1996, available on the Internet (http://www.dfat.gov.au/pmb/speeches/fa_sp/asia-long.html).
159. Wood, Leonie. "PM Deals A Losing Asia Hand: Crown", The Age, 17 October 1997, p. 1A.
160. Hewett, Jennifer. "Downer Bid for UN Group Shift", The Age, 4 October 1997, p. A19.
161. Hewett, Jennifer. "US Urged to Take Lead in Asia", The Age, 9 October 1997, p. A10.
162. Pervan, Dr. Ralph. "Opening Address By Dr. Ralph Pervan, Chairman of the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission of Western Australia Given at the 7 December 1984 Session of the FECCA National Congress", in: Proceedings of the First National Congress, Sixth National Conference and Annual General Meeting of the Federation of Ethnic Communities' Councils of Australia Inc.: 3 - 9 December, 1984, p. 139.
163. Baker, Mark. "Keating Finds a New Friend", The Age, 20 January 1996, p. 23.
- Baker, Mark. "Mahathir Vows To Block Australia", The Age, 26 February 1996, p. A8.
- Cumming, Fia. "Mahathir Hits At PM", Herald Sun, 17 December 1995, p. 3.
164. Barker, Geoffrey. "Australia's Strategic Players Tip-Toe Around Mahathir", The Australian Financial Review, 28 October 1994, p. 19.
165. Edwards, Ken. "The True Believer", Time, 28 November 1994, p. 34.
166. Jenkins, David. "Through Asian Eyes", Sydney Morning Herald, 2 November 1996, p. 4S (Spectrum section).
167. Edwards, Ken. "The True Believer", Time, 28 November 1994, p. 34.
168. Arbouw, John; Jacques, Bruce. "It's Official - We're Part of Asia", Australian Business Monthly, August 1994, pp. 66-71.
169. "Why We Must Not Lose Our Way On Race", The Sydney Morning Herald, 2 November 1996, p. 1.
170. Trioli, Virginia. "Straight Shooter", in The Age, 28 June 1997, p. 6 (Saturday Extra supplement).
171. Sheridan, Greg. Living With Dragons: Australia Confronts Its Destiny, Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards, NSW, 1995, pp. 5, 15-16.
172. Mellor, Bill; and Ricketson, Matthew. "Suburbanasia!", Time, 8 April 1991, p.20.
173. Robinson, Peter. "Australia's Asian Destiny", Sun-Herald, 12 December 1993.
174. Woolcott, Richard. "Asia: Can't Live With It - Or Without It", The Bulletin, 14 December 1993, p. 25.
175. Shaw, John. "Asiacrats push Australia's Line", Sun-Herald, 21 November 1993, p. 32.
176. Gunn, Michelle. "Asia Links Crucial, Says Academic", The Australian, 22 October 1993, p. 2.
177. McNicoll, David. "Home Truths From Lee Kuan Yew", The Bulletin, 11 December 1990, p. 87.
178. "Asia: Our New Cultural Cringe" (editorial), The Sunday Herald, 26 November 1989, p. 14.
179. Dunn, James. "The New Republicanism", The Bulletin, 17 March 1992, p. 30.
- See also: Dunn, James. "The Ambassador has no Clothes", The Bulletin, 12 May 1992, p. 26.
180. Morgan, Hugh. "Our Great Obsession With Asia", The Age, 17 May 1992, p. 17.
181. Toohey, Brian. "Enmeshing With Asian Values", Australian Financial Review, 3 November 1994, p. 19.
182. Campbell, Graeme. "Yes to Australia, No to the P.C. Republic", The Record, Summer 1993, p. 47.

183. Hanson, Pauline. Maiden Speech, Pauline Hanson MP, Independent Member for Oxley, [self-published?], Parliament House, Canberra, 1996, p. 9.

(Volume Two)
Statistics
(Immigration, Ethnicity, and Trade)

Country of Birth and Ethnicity

In seeking the ethnicity of immigrants into Australia it is wise to use only those immigration statistics which are based upon "country of birth", as "country of citizenship" figures are unreliable (How many Timorese come here with Portuguese citizenship? How many Indians from Britain, and Chinese from Hong Kong, come here with British citizenship?). Immigration statistics based upon "country of last residence" are also unreliable (How many Asian nationals have resided in European countries prior to migrating to Australia?).

Refer to the Tables below for a comparison of how different categories of statistics can radically change statistics regarding Asian immigration.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF IMMIGRATION STATISTICS:
IMMIGRATION: FINANCIAL YEAR 1994/95 [\(1\)](#)

	Asia	%	U.K. and Europe	%	Other	%	Total	%
Settlers by country of birth	38 448	44.0	25 523	29.2	23 457	26.8	87 428	100
Settlers by country of citizenship	26 558	30.4	32 950	37.7	27 920	31.9	87 428	100
Settlers by country of last residence	36 787	42.1	24 929	28.5	25 712	29.4	87 428	100

Note regarding "Settlers by country of citizenship": The figures for Asia and Europe may be slightly understated (and the figure for "Other" may be slightly overstated), as the table these figures are taken from was not arranged by region, so that some of the 697 immigrants listed under "Other" in that table may properly belong to Asia and Europe. Also, it should be noted that there were 1913 immigrants listed as "Stateless", with another 3 immigrants listed as "Not Stated"

TABLE 2**COMPARISON OF IMMIGRATION STATISTICS:
CHINESE IMMIGRATION, SELECTED YEARS [\(2\)](#)**

	1970/71	1979/80	1989/90	1994/95
Settlers, by country of birth	287	1 290	3 069	3 708
Settlers, by country of citizenship	240	748	959	2 831
Settlers by country of last residence	179	867	1 005	1 604

Note: These figures are drawn from the statistics marked "China" in the relevant categories (i.e. these statistics do not include all "ethnic Chinese").

Unfortunately (due to deliberate policy), no immigration statistics are kept by race or ethnicity, and therefore "country of birth" statistics are considered to be the best available primary measure of ethnicity.

Of course, there will be those Asians born in Europe (who will inadvertently be counted as European ethnics) as well as those Europeans born in Asia (who will inadvertently be counted as Asian ethnics); however, it is believed that the numbers of such cases involved in current migration intakes are quite low, and thus not to be of any high importance (although there will certainly be more European-born non-Whites migrating from Europe in the 1990s than in previous decades; not to mention, for instance, the Asiatics from the South and East of the old-USSR). It should also be noted that in the 1940s to 1960s large numbers of migrants from Asia were Europeans, such as the White Russians from China and the Dutch from Indonesia, but that such migration has since dramatically declined.(3*)

Ian Macphée, a former Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, noted in 1982 that:

"Although we do not keep statistics according to ethnic background, many persons migrating from the UK are of Asian origin".(4)

Illegal Immigrants

It should also be borne in mind that there are many illegal immigrants living in Australia. All of these people are illegally in this country: Most of them are "overstayers" (those who have stayed in Australia past the expiry of their visa), but some have actually entered Australia illegally via boat or plane (and thus have not been counted in any immigration statistics). The number of illegal immigrants is currently estimated at around 79 800 (at June 1993). Of these, it is estimated that 64% came here as visitors, 20% as students, 7% as temporary residents, with another 9% from other categories. In 1992-93 there were 14 874 illegal immigrants found (of which "some 5560 or 37 per cent admitted when interviewed that they had worked illegally").(5)

The numbers of illegal immigrants may be more than realised, due to the activities of highly organised Asian criminal gangs. As an indication of the seriousness of such gangs, The Bulletin reported that:

"Members of the highly-secret Asia mafia-style groups known as triads and tongs have established themselves in Australian society and are organising criminal activities among

Australia's growing Asian community. Groups of Asian criminals are running blackmail and protection rackets in our capital cities and major country towns. “

"With the influx of Asian boat people and the increase generally in immigrants from Asian countries, police are alarmed at the growth over the past two years of crimes among established Asian communities. Law enforcement agencies, both State and Federal, are ill-equipped to fight the new criminal threat because they face a language and culture barrier. “

"Immigration and Foreign Affairs officials are also probing a large illegal immigration racket among Asians which has been linked strongly with organised crime groups within the Asian community. “

"The triads are operating lucrative illegal activities such as prostitution, drugs, gambling and armed robberies in several Australian capital cities. Asians with criminal records in Timor and Vietnam have managed to penetrate the Australian immigration system with bogus documents and gain status in this country"(6).

These sort of activities are an on-going problem. In 1992, it was reported that "Australian officials believe a highly organised Singapore-based international racket arranged the recent arrival of three groups of illegal immigrants on islands in Torres Strait". A commonly used ruse was to fly to Port Moresby on tourist visas, then to travel via boat to the Torres Strait islands, and then on to the Australian mainland. The Age reported the comments of an official from Papua New Guinea's Ministry of Foreign Affairs that "PNG recognised there was a problem with foreigners crossing the border illegally, but suggested that Australia should provide more resources if it wanted PNG to boost surveillance"(7).

West Asia

Presumably following instructions from the Commonwealth Government, the Department of Immigration changed its definition of Asia, in order to disguise the large numbers of Asian migrants coming to Australia. This was because, as Stephen Castles (a pro-multiculturalism researcher) has noted:

"in the late 1960s it was desired to widen migrant recruitment without creating fears of an 'Asian influx'. Middle East migrants were therefore turned into 'honorary whites' by a stroke of the pen"(8).

By this devious means, the whole of West Asia disappeared from the Immigration Department's definition of Asia (the Australian Bureau of Statistics continued for some years to maintain immigration records unaffected by such "fiddling of statistics", although they later adopted the same criteria).

As Geoffrey Blainey wrote in 1984 (before the Australian Bureau of Statistics decided to "toe the line" over the Immigration Department's definition of Asia):

"Where is Asia? Every atlas and globe can point to it but the immigration department has cut Asia down to size. If Asia is made smaller, the pace of Asian migration to Australia does not appear so great. Since about 1980 the "Asian" figures issued by the immigration department go no farther west than Afghanistan. That is where Asia ends, or begins, according to the department. The immigrants who arrive from Iran, Lebanon or Arabia are now classified as coming from the Middle East and not from Asia. And yet much of the Middle East is part of west Asia.

"The main federal authority on statistics, the Australian Bureau of Statistics, follows the United Nations' definition of Asia. It sees Asia, as geographers see it, as a continent. The bureau is

independent of detailed government interference: it would not alter its definition of Asia simply because its presiding minister decided to dismember Asia. Its definition of Asia is the official definition, and the sooner the government teaches the immigration department a polite lesson in geography the easier it will be for us to know what immigration is taking place.

"The immigration department is entitled to break Asian statistics into regions: Asia is so large that they can become meaningless. There is also merit in providing separately the immigration statistics for east Asia, south or central Asia, and for west Asia. But to omit a crucial part of Asia and to continue to use the word "Asia" for that dismembered continent is misleading. Commentators who do not know that two definitions of Asia are used in Canberra are easily misled into minimising the extent of Asian immigration. As the immigration department is far and away the busier issuer of statistics, and as the Bureau of Statistics does not enter into controversy, the immigration department has the stronger influence on public debate and opinion. Its confusing statistics puts its own critics at a disadvantage"(9).

Refer to the Table below for the Australian Bureau of Statistics' original definition of Asia.

TABLE 3

**COMPOSITION OF COMPONENT REGIONS OF ASIA
USED IN ABS OVERSEAS ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES STATISTICS (1983) [\(10\)](#)**

(Source: Based on the composition of regions shown on p. 42-43 of the United Nations Demographic Year Book, 1983).

EAST AND SOUTH EAST ASIA	SOUTH CENTRAL ASIA
EAST ASIA	Afghanistan
China	Bangladesh
Taiwan Province	Bhutan
Japan	India
Hong Kong	Iran
Korea, Democratic People's	Maldives
Republic of	Pakistan
Korea, Republic of	Sri Lanka
Macau	
Mongolia	WESTERN ASIA (MIDDLE EAST)
	Bahrain
SOUTH EAST ASIA	Cyprus
Brunei	Iraq
Burma	Israel
East Timor	Jordan
Indonesia	Kuwait
Kamuchea	Lebanon
Laos	Oman
Malaysia	Qatar
Philippines	Saudi Arabia
Singapore	Syria
Thailand	Turkey
Vietnam	United Arab Emirates
	Yemen, Arabic Republic
	Yemen, Democratic Republic

Note: This table is a reproduction of the table of the same name (although "1983" has been added for the purposes of this document) used in immigration documents of the Australian Bureau of Statistics, until it

later changed it's definition of Asia to match the definition used by the Department of Immigration. Referral to any decent encyclopaedia will confirm the above definition of Asia.

As noted above, the Australian Bureau of Statistics later changed it's definition of Asia to match the definition espoused by the Department of Immigration. Adrienne Millbank, of the Australian government's Parliamentary Research Service, has reported that:

"The definition for migration purposes of 'Asian' arrivals used by the Australian Bureau of Statistics before 1990 was based on the United Nations geographical definition of the continent of Asia: thus the Middle East was considered to be part of Asia. From 1 July 1990 the ABS and the (then) Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs jointly adopted the Australian Standard Classification of Countries for Social Statistics (ASCCSS)... Since 1990, arrivals from the Middle East (including Lebanon, Turkey, Iran and Iraq) have not been counted as 'Asian'."(11)

It is extremely obvious (especially after reading Stephen Castle's observation, as noted above) that this new hocus-pocus "ASCCSS" definition of Asia is a deliberate attempt to cover-up the extent of Asian immigration into Australia. By one stroke of the pen, government and immigration officials can refer to 39,524 Asian settler arrivals in 1995/96 (by excluding West Asia), rather than the actual 46,087 Asian settler arrivals (including West Asia).

Refer to the Tables below for a comparison of how excluding West Asia from the definition of Asia can radically change statistics regarding Asian immigration.

TABLE 4

**COMPARISON OF IMMIGRATION STATISTICS:
ASIAN IMMIGRATION
(INCLUDING AND EXCLUDING WEST ASIA)
FINANCIAL YEAR 1995/96 [\(12\)](#)**

	Including West Asia	% of total immigration	Excluding West Asia	% of total immigration
Permanent (settlers)	46 087	46.5	39 524	39.9
Permanent and long-term	112 308	42.7	102 537	39.0

TABLE 5

**COMPARISON OF IMMIGRATION STATISTICS:
NET ASIAN IMMIGRATION
(INCLUDING AND EXCLUDING WEST ASIA)
FINANCIAL YEAR 1995/96 [\(13\)](#)**

	Including West Asia	% of total net immigration	Excluding West Asia	% of total net immigration
Permanent	42 478	60.3	36 328	51.5
Permanent and long-term	65 825	60.0	59 178	54.0

It is amazing to think that when the Australian government speaks of "Asia", it is - by deliberate design - excluding West Asia. What would Australians think if the government spoke of Australia, but by a new hocus-pocus "definition" deliberately excluded Western Australia? Or if a new hocus-pocus "definition" of Europe deliberately excluded Western Europe? Naturally, such a move would be seen as a ridiculous and farcical notion.

Another angle to the new ASCCSS country classification scheme is that it has divided Asia up into several separate sections, while leaving Europe still classified as one section. The main regions, according to ASCCSS, are now: (14)

- Oceania
- Europe and the Former USSR
- Middle East and North Africa
- Southeast Asia
- Northeast Asia
- Southern Asia
- Northern America
- South America, Central America and the Caribbean
- Africa (excluding North Africa)

At first glance, many may wonder why Asia has been divided up into three regions (actually four, including West Asia; i.e. the Middle East), when Europe has been left as one region; as, following the same logic as used for Asia, Europe could easily have been divided into North, South, East, and West regions (indeed, these four areas have been used as sub-regions for Europe, along with a "United Kingdom and Ireland" sub-region). This strange classification of main regions doesn't seem to make sense, until one realises what can be achieved by it.

Consider the pronouncements made in the "Main Features" section of the Immigration Update magazine (produced by the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs for release to the general public, researchers, and media): (15)

March Quarter 1996 (on page one):

"On a regional basis, Europe and the Former USSR (26.5 per cent) was the largest contributor followed by Northeast Asia (18.6 per cent), Oceania (15.4 per cent) and Southeast Asia (13.7 per cent)."

June Quarter 1996 (on page one):

"On a regional basis, Europe and the Former USSR (26.7 per cent) was the largest contributor followed by Northeast Asia (18.8 per cent), Oceania (16.4 per cent) and Southeast Asia (13.3 per cent)."

September Quarter 1996 (on page one):

"On a regional basis, Europe and the Former USSR (27.2 per cent) was the largest contributor followed by Northeast Asia (20.6 per cent), Oceania (16.6 per cent) and Southeast Asia (12.7 per cent)."

December Quarter 1996 (on page one):

"On a regional basis, Europe and the Former USSR (27.7 per cent) was the largest contributor followed by Northeast Asia (18.7 per cent), Oceania (16.6 per cent) and Southeast Asia (13.5 per cent)."

The September and December issues also include bar graphs on page one showing "Settler Arrivals by Region of Birth" whereby the Europe and the Former USSR section towers over all of the other regions; whereas - in truth - the Asian section (combining North, South, East, and West) should've been obviously towering over all the rest).

It is quite obvious that the ASCCSS classification scheme has been designed to enable the government to inform the media and public how immigration from Europe is the largest component of the immigration programme, thus deceiving the public.

The dividing of Asia into separate regions, and the exclusion of West Asia from "Asian immigration" statistics and "Asian born" statistics, are obvious and contemptible attempts to confuse the Australian public, and to hide from them the extent of the Asianisation of Australia.

Cyprus

Geographically, Cyprus is considered to be a part of West Asia (this Mediterranean island is much closer to the mainland of Asia than to that of Europe). However, due to cultural, demographic, and historical reasons, it is often considered as a part of Europe.

Cyprus was listed as part of Asia for many years by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Department of Immigration, but in recent years it has been listed by both bodies as part of Southern Europe(16*).

Charles Price has included Cyprus within Southern Europe as an ongoing practice with his work on Australian immigration and demography; especially relevant with the estimation, regarding Cypriot immigration to Australia, that "some 75 per cent... are of Greek origin".

In recognition of these factors, and in order to enable direct comparison with contemporary statistics, Cyprus has been treated as part of Southern Europe within this document in all statistical tables relating to births, deaths, and immigration.

Charles Price has stated:

"Australian-census language and religious statistics suggest that, of the 26 000 or so Cypriot-born persons in Australia in 1987, some 75 per cent (nearly 20 000) are of Greek origin; 15 per cent (about 4000) are Turkish; and the remainder is a mixture, some being children born to British and Australian servicemen posted temporarily on the island. But the Greek-Cypriot settlement in Australia is older than the Turkish-Cypriot; indeed, Turkish Cypriots migrated relatively rarely until after independence, there being only 350 or so in Australia in 1954. Early Greek-Cypriot migration, however, was not particularly large before the Second World War: the censuses record fewer than 10 Cypriots in 1881, about 30 in 1911, 500 in 1933 and 700 in 1947. Then they began to increase quite rapidly: 5800 in 1954, 10 700 in 1966, 22 000 in 1976, 24 000 in 1986 and about 26 000 in 1987. Large-scale Cypriot migration to Australia, in short, is mainly a post-war event, closely linked to civil tension and disturbances in Cyprus itself."(17)

Net Immigration

It is a fact, well-known by the Department of Immigration, that departures of European migrants (i.e. those who migrate to Australia, but then later leave) far outweigh departing Asian migrants. Thus, when looking at immigration statistics, in order to ascertain the real increase in the Australian population, it

pays to look not just at the plain immigration figures, but at the immigration and emigration figures, to see the real situation of "net immigration" (i.e. arrival numbers minus departure numbers). Net immigration gives us a more accurate insight into the ethnic proportions of the population increase brought about by immigration.

Category Jumpers

Many people arriving in Australia listed under short-term categories later change their status to a permanent or long-term category (and visa versa). These people are known as "category jumpers", and can have a distinct effect upon the real nature of immigration numbers. The most significant contributing factor to "category jumping" in recent years was the approximately 20 000 Chinese students who were given "asylum" ("granted permanent residence") in 1989 by the then Prime Minister Bob Hawke.

Note: The number of Chinese students allowed to stay in Australia, after the Tiananmen Square massacre of pro-democracy demonstrators, has risen from the original 20,000 to about 37,000 who have been granted permanent residency in Australia. In 1992 the then immigration minister, Gerry Hand, admitted that the granting of permanent residency to the Chinese students could lead to a flood of 300,000 Chinese into Australia, due to the entitlement for those students to bring their relatives here under the family reunion programme.(18)

Refer to the Table below for an indication of the extent of category jumping.

TABLE 6

CATEGORY JUMPING: OVERSEAS VISITORS (Australian Immigration and Emigration) [\(19\)](#)

1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93
49 604	34 064	64 249	52 202	57 063	51 861	44 385

Immigration Categories

Because of category jumping, it has therefore been recommended by some demographers to look at short-term, long-term, and permanent arrivals as a whole, not just at the "settler", or even "permanent and long-term" immigration statistics.

To illustrate the difference between the different categories of immigration statistics, compare the different categories in the following Tables.

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF IMMIGRATION STATISTICS: IMMIGRATION: FINANCIAL YEAR 1994/95 [\(20\)](#)

	Asia	%	U.K. and Europe	%	Other	%	Total	%
Permanent (settlers)	38448	44.0	25523	29.2	23457	26.8	87428	100
Permanent and long-term	96416	40.4	53714	22.5	88393	37.1	238523	100
Total permanent, long-term, and short-term	2163354	35.1	1321957	21.5	2675439	43.4	6160750	100

TABLE 8

**COMPARISON OF IMMIGRATION STATISTICS:
NET IMMIGRATION: FINANCIAL YEAR 1994/95 [\(21\)](#)**

	Asia %	U.K. and Europe %	Other %	Total %
Settlers	35923 47.9	20660 27.6	18373 24.5	74956 100
Permanent	35118 58.1	19746 32.6	5616 9.3	60480 100
Permanent and long-term	52604 56.5	27338 29.4	13100 14.1	93042 100
Total permanent, long-term, and short-term	40495 37.9	42576 39.8	23852 22.3	106923 100

However, it should be noted that total immigration figures are based largely upon short-term arrivals, which unfortunately are derived from sampling estimates, rather than proper counting of all such short-term movement. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) says that "All movements with a duration of stay of less than one year are sampled", and maintains that "For any estimate of greater than 10,000 the relative standard error will be less than 6%". The ABS reports that "All movements with a duration of stay less than one year are sampled using the following stratification:

"Country of Citizenship:	Sample:
Australia	1 in 55
Japan	1 in 50
New Zealand, United Kingdom (excluding Ireland) and the United States of America	1 in 40
Germany, Malaysia, Singapore and Taiwan	1 in 20
Canada, France, Indonesia, Italy, Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Switzerland and Thailand	1 in 15
Any other individual country depending on the number of movements	1 in 1, or 1 in 4, or 1 in 10 ". (22)

Misleading Statistics

As John Bennett has stated:

"Figures put out by the Government on the extent of legal Asian immigration, of illegal Asian immigration, the current percentage of Asians in Australia, and the likely percentage of Asians in ten and twenty years time are often misleading or deliberately deceptive"(23).

In 1984, Professor Geoffrey Blainey said "It is important to know how Australia will be affected if the present rate of Asian immigration continues for the next fifteen or twenty years. The official view is that Australia's population will not be noticeably altered"; he went on to explain how the then Asian population (in 1984) was given as 2% to 2.1% of the general Australian population, being estimated to reach only 4% by the year 2000. Blainey says "It is reasonable to suggest, however, that the immigration estimates are misleading". Blainey revealed how the Asian population figures are "cooked"(24):

A) The whole of West Asia is removed from the statistics, by deliberately having it listed separately under the category of "The Middle East" (whereby West Asia is combined with North Africa). Blainey was quite right when he said "The immigration department has followed the old trick of ignoring the western part of Asia, without revealing its omission"(25).

B) The figures given are those of the last Census, thereby excluding the following few years of the Asian immigration intake. Also, West Asia was excluded from the Census statistics for Asia. When Blainey wrote about this in 1984, this point was particularly relevant, as such figures were "thus omitting one of the most vigorous phases of Asian immigration in our history"(26).

C) These official statistics "counted none of the local-born children of Asian immigrants", who comprise a very important - and numerous - part of the Asian population of Australia(27).

Blainey pointed out that:

"These are unusual distortions in arriving at a figure on a matter of national importance"; but this was, no doubt, an academic understatement - it would be more correct to have stated quite clearly that various prominent people in the Government, public service, media, etc., were deliberately using statistics that they knew were untrue (or "misleading" at best)(28).

As Blainey said:

"By means of those loaded calculations, several hundred thousand Asians living in Australia have been sent underground. We have been told that they no longer exist. Using the same method of calculating, it would be easy to compute that the European and British peoples formed only one in five of Australia's population... In Australia's federal history, few forecasts on an issue of importance are as incompetent and, perhaps, as mischievous as this forecast of Australia's ethnic or racial composition"(29).

Ethnicity Statistics

Researchers need to be careful of statistics relating to the ethnicity of the Australian population as there are various ways of measuring their size and strength. Charles Price has explained the differences:

"There are three principal measures. Unmixed Origin (or "pure origin") refers to persons with no recent ethnic intermixture; someone, say, who has four Croat grand-parents from Split in Dalmatia and who, even though several generations back an Italian seaman landed in Split and married into the family, is accustomed to think of herself as purely Croat. This is a useful measure for assessing the demand for ethnic services (radio, schools, language classes etc.) as persons of unmixed ethnic descent are usually more interested in maintaining the ethnic language and culture than are persons with, say, a Croat father and an Irish-Australian mother.

"The second measure is Total Descent: this shows all persons with any particular ancestry, even if only one-quarter or one-sixteenth; as instance a fifth generation Australian of predominantly Anglo-Celtic origin but one of whose great-great-grandfathers came to Australia from Sweden in the 1820's. Total Descent gives the maximum possible size for any ethnic population and is useful for assessing claims that Australia has 100,000 or 200,000, or more, of any particular ancestry. Because persons of mixed origins are counted in all their ancestral groups the final Total Descent Total greatly exceeds a country's total population.

"The third measure is Ethnic Strength, derived by adding fractions of ancestry. A third generation Australian with two Irish grandparents, one Polish and one Lebanese grandparent, counts as a half in the Irish total, a quarter in the Polish and a quarter in the Lebanese totals. It is basically a genetic measure (and is of interest to epidemiologists and others concerned with genetic characteristics) and shows the strength of any particular ethnic contribution. It is

the best measure for comparing the relative strength of the various contributions, and always adds to the total population."(30)

It is important to compare the differences between these three methods of measuring the Asian-ethnic component of the Australian population:

- 1) "Unmixed". For example; a group of 1000 people, all of whom are half-Asian, will be completely overlooked in a count of "unmixed" Asian-ethnics, even though most Australians would regard them as Asian-ethnics.
- 2) "Ethnic Strength". For example; a group of 1000 people, all of whom are half-Asian, will only be counted as 500 Asian-ethnics, in a count of the "ethnic strength" of Asian-ethnics, even though most Australians would regard the group as 1000 Asian-ethnics.
- 3) "Total Descent". The "total descent" measurement of a group of 1000 half-Asians would accurately reflect the count as 1000 Asian-ethnics.

"Unmixed Origin" does not reveal the full extent of the Asian population in Australia as it does not include part-Asians. "Ethnic Strength" likewise does not reveal the full extent, as part-Asians are counted as fractions (for instance, two half-Asians are counted as one Asian). Therefore; the "Total Descent" method of ethnic measurement is the best method, as it enables an accurate estimation of the full extent of the Asian-ethnic component of the Australian population, as using this method includes all of those of Asian descent (including both full-Asians and part-Asians).

Many, or most, politicians and journalists, when discussing the number of Asians in the population, often refer to statistics regarding the "Asian-born". This is simply a devious tactic used to avoid the issue of the actual Asian-ethnic proportion of the population.

In talking about the Asianisation of Australia, the relevant factor is not the proportion of the "Asian-born", but the proportion of Asian-ethnics. As Professor Charles Price has said:

"people aren't interested in the percentage that will be Asian-born in 1991 but in how 'Asian' Australia is going to be. It's a question of how many Asian-looking people there will be as you walk down the street. That the basis on which ordinary people will make their judgments".(31)

To talk only of the "Asian-born" is ridiculous in terms of national ethos and cultural change. To illustrate this, we need only look at Fiji and the major divisions between the native-Fijian population and the massive Asian-ethnic population (in this case, mainly derived from India). While 43.5% of the Fijian population is Indian, most were born there, whilst approximately only 0.04% of the Indian population in Fiji is actually "Asian born". In discussing national identity, to speak of there being only 0.04% "Asian-born" in Fiji is blatantly ridiculous; the relevant point is the proportion of Asian-ethnics in the population, not the proportion of the "Asian-born". The same applies to Australia.(32)

An important section of the Asian-ethnic population in Australia are the part-Asians. Part-Asians are a large part of the Asian-ethnic population (mainly relevant are the half-Asians and quarter-Asians); European Australians would generally view part-Asians as "Asian" (i.e. "Asian-ethnics"), and the part-Asians would generally view themselves as "Asian" or "part-Asian" (i.e. "Asian-ethnics").

These "part-Asians" should be recognised as "Asian-ethnics" by the government (as well as the recognition of the "full-Asians" not born in Asia), for to do otherwise would be highly hypocritical; just compare the government's recognition of the ethnicity status of Aborigines. In a group of 1000 "half-blood" Aborigines

(and even another 1000 "quarter-blood" Aborigines), most would be likely to regard themselves ethnically as "Aborigines". By the Government's own definition of Aboriginality, this would generally suffice to regard them as Aborigines. The same applies to the Asian-ethnic population; those that would be regarded by the general population as ethnic-Asians should be counted as such in any estimation of the ethnic-Asian population of Australia.

Australians need to be very wary when the media and/or government officials sprout fourth figures of the "Asian-born" population in Australia when being queried on, or discussing the effects of, Asian immigration and Asianisation. Their use of such government figures deliberately avoids the inclusion of Australian-born Asians, part-Asians, and Asians from West Asia. Australians must be distrustful of those who attempt to conceal the true extent of the Asian-ethnic population in Australia.

We can refer to the statement by Philip Ruddock, the Liberal Government's Minister for Immigration, who wrote that "Recently, forecasts by my department, using country of birth data, project the proportion of Asian-born people will be about 7.5 per cent in 2031. Such projections are more useful for public discussion and planning purposes". What Ruddock means is that his figures are "more useful" because they specifically minimise the extent of Asianisation, thus trying not to upset or stir to anger the Australian public.(33)

We can also refer to earlier statements during the Asian immigration "debate" of 1984 whereby various pro-immigration people referred to the Asian population in Australia as being only 2%. Bill Hayden (then Foreign Minister) referred to the Asian population as being 2%, and said that it would rise to only about 4% by the year 2000. In 1985, Professor Jamie Mackie (a pro-immigration advocate, who was active in the Immigration Reform Group in the 1960s) said regarding Hayden's use of the 2% figure that "It seems likely that his statement was intended primarily to reassure people by creating the impression that the Asian proportion of Australia's population will remain so small as to be not at all worrying. While this may have been a necessary and understandable strategy at the time (March 1984), I am not sure that blurring the figures is the best approach on a longer term view... People are likely to feel more uneasy about a double-digit percentage of Asians in our midst than they do about a mere 2 to 4 per cent. But I believe we should begin to get accustomed to it."(34)

The lesson to be learned from this is that many multiculturalists and pro- immigrationists have lied, and will continue to lie, in order to cover-up the extent of the Asianisation of Australia. Expect it to happen continually.

The proportion of Asian-ethnics and other non-Europeans will steadily increase within Australia over the next few decades (and beyond). This massive demographic "invasion", and the accompanying cultural/social changes, will result in the destruction of Australia's national identity, culture, and way of life.

[Australia: Migration Statistics](#)

These statistics show the decline in the rate of European immigration over the years. For example, the 1959/60 Settler Arrivals from Europe were 92.1% of the total intake, whereas this had dropped to 25.8% in 1996/97. The Asianisation of Australia: An Exposé of the Asian Future Being Forced Upon Australia and The Demise of the White Australia Policy show how such a decline has been brought about, and that it was deliberately contrived.

[EXPLANATION OF TERMS:](#)

Permanent Arrivals (Settlers):

"Settlers comprise persons arriving in Australia who hold permanent visas, regardless of stated intended period of stay, New Zealand citizens who indicate an intention to settle, and those who are otherwise eligible to settle (eg. overseas- born children of Australian citizens)."(35)

The Department of Immigration notes that "This definition of settlers was adopted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) in January 1985 to equate that used by this Department. Prior to that date the definition used by the ABS was based on the traveller's stated intention only." (Note: In compiling the statistics in this document, from the ABS' microfiche statistics and the Department of Immigration's published Consolidated Statistics series, discrepancies only appeared in the statistics for the period 1982/83 to 1987/88; therefore, supplementary tables have been produced in this document, listing the Department of Immigration's statistics for that period, although these differ only minutely from those produced by the ABS).(36)

Net Settler Gain:

Comprises Permanent Arrivals (Settlers), minus any Former Settlers departing permanently.

Net Permanent Gain:

Comprises Permanent Arrivals (Settlers), minus any Former Settlers departing permanently, and minus the permanent departure of any other Australian residents.

Long-Term Movement:

"Temporary visa holders arriving and residents departing temporarily with the intention to stay in Australia or abroad for twelve months or more, and the departure of temporary visa holders and the return of residents who had stayed abroad for twelve months or more."(37)

Short-Term Movement:

"Travellers whose intended or actual stay in Australia or abroad is less than twelve months."(38)

Permanent and Long-Term Arrivals:

Comprises Permanent Arrivals (Settlers) plus Long-Term Arrivals.

Net Permanent and Long-Term Gain:

Comprises Permanent Arrivals (Settlers) plus Long-Term Arrivals; minus 1) the departure of Former Settlers, 2) the departure of other Australian residents, and 3) the departure of Long-Term Arrivals.

Net Total Immigration:

Comprises Permanent Arrivals (Settlers), plus Long-Term Arrivals, plus Short-Term Arrivals; minus 1) the departure of Former Settlers, 2) the departure of other Australian residents, 3) the departure of Long-Term Arrivals, and 4) the departure of Short-Term Arrivals. However, as has been discussed elsewhere in this document, this category is to a great extent based upon Short-Term Movement, for which category the Australian Bureau of Statistics uses a system of "sampling", rather than full calculation of the numbers involved.

TABLE 9

IMMIGRATION FROM ASIA AND EUROPE: AUSTRALIA 1959/60 - 1996/97
PERMANENT ARRIVALS (SETTLERS) [\(39\)](#)

Year	Asia	%	U.K. and Europe	%	Other	%	Total	%
1959/60	2 694	2.5	97 498	92.1	5 695	5.4	105 887	100
1960/61	3 210	3.0	98 601	91.0	6 480	6.0	108 291	100
1961/62	3 171	3.7	76 467	89.1	6 170	7.2	85 808	100
1962/63	3 801	3.7	91 053	89.4	7 034	6.9	101 888	100
1963/64	3 960	3.2	109 011	89.1	9 347	7.6	122 318	100
1964/65	4 336	3.1	125 402	89.5	10 414	7.4	140 152	100
1965/66	5 842	4.0	127 733	88.7	10 480	7.3	144 055	100
1966/67	6 372	4.6	120 778	87.1	11 526	8.3	138 676	100
1967/68	8 598	6.2	113 034	82.2	15 893	11.6	137 525	100
1968/69	13 610	7.7	141 930	80.8	20 117	11.4	175 657	100
1969/70	16 869	9.1	147 086	79.5	21 144	11.4	185 099	100
1970/71	17 116	10.1	127 174	74.8	25 721	15.1	170 011	100
1971/72	14 645	11.0	94 148	70.9	23 926	18.0	132 719	100
1972/73	12 898	12.0	75 893	70.7	18 610	17.3	107 401	100
1973/74	16 637	14.8	73 682	65.4	22 393	19.9	112 712	100
1974/75	14 491	16.2	56 274	63.1	18 382	20.6	89 147	100
1975/76	11 072	21.0	29 468	55.9	12 208	23.1	52 748	100
1976/77	24 848	35.0	31 169	43.9	14 899	21.0	70 916	100
1977/78	21 693	29.6	32 693	44.7	18 785	25.7	73 171	100
1978/79	23 170	34.5	23 060	34.3	20 962	31.2	67 192	100
1979/80	26 602	32.9	31 276	38.7	22 870	28.3	80 748	100
1980/81	29 112	26.3	52 665	47.6	28 912	26.1	110 689	100
1981/82	31 384	26.6	62 692	53.1	23 955	20.3	118 031	100
1982/83	27 704	29.8	47 377	50.9	17 930	19.3	93 011	100
1983/84	29 660	43.1	23 930	34.8	15 220	22.1	68 810	100
1984/85	35 329	45.6	22 132	28.5	20 047	25.9	77 508	100
1985/86	36 280	39.2	28 099	30.3	28 211	30.5	92 590	100
1986/87	44 656	39.3	36 544	32.2	32 341	28.5	113 541	100
1987/88	57 363	40.0	43 560	30.4	42 543	29.6	143 466	100
1988/89	61 150	42.1	42 438	29.2	41 728	28.7	145 316	100
1989/90	55 560	45.8	38 386	31.7	27 281	22.5	121 227	100
1990/91	67 106	55.1	32 333	26.6	22 249	18.3	121 688	100
1991/92	60 301	56.1	26 870	25.0	20 220	18.8	107 391	100
1992/93	37 586	49.2	22 200	29.1	16 544	21.7	76 330	100
1993/94	31 681	45.4	20 473	29.3	17 614	25.2	69 768	100
1994/95	38 448	44.0	25 523	29.2	23 457	26.8	87 428	100
1995/96	46 087	46.5	26 463	26.7	26 589	26.8	99 139	100
1996/97	37 456	43.7	22 167	25.8	26 129	30.5	85 752	100

Notes:

a) All years listed are financial years: July 1st to June 30th.

b) "Settler" statistics were kept only from January 1959.

c) "Asia" includes "West Asia", except that Cyprus has been included in "Europe".

d) Immigration statistics for 1983/84 have been rounded off.

e) There are slight differences between the immigration figures produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (unpublished statistics used in this document) and the Department of Immigration (the Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research's *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics* issues numbered 17 and 18) for the years 1982/83 - 1987/88 [\(40*\)](#). The Department of Immigration's figures for those years are produced below, while the Australian Bureau of Statistics' figures are incorporated in the table above, so that direct comparisons can be made with the other immigration tables in this document.

TABLE 10
IMMIGRATION FROM ASIA AND EUROPE: AUSTRALIA 1982/83 - 1987/88
PERMANENT ARRIVALS (SETTLERS)
(Department of Immigration figures) [\(41\)](#)

1982/83	28 048	30.1	47 249	50.7	17 880	19.2	93 177	100
1983/84	30 266	43.4	24 212	34.7	15 330	22.0	69 808	100
1984/85	35 661	45.7	22 329	28.6	20 097	25.7	78 087	100
1985/86	36 275	39.2	28 020	30.3	28 115	30.4	92 410	100
1986/87	44 588	39.3	36 434	32.1	36 434	32.1	113 309	100
1987/88	57 397	40.0	43 566	30.4	42 527	29.6	143 490	100

TABLE 11
IMMIGRATION FROM ASIA AND EUROPE: AUSTRALIA 1959/60 - 1996/97
NET SETTLER GAIN
(Permanent Arrivals [Settlers] minus Former Settler Departures) [\(42\)](#)

Year	Asia	%	U.K. and Europe	%	Other	%	Total	%
1959/60	2 527	2.5	91 911	92.3	5 146	5.2	99 584	100
1960/61	2 997	2.9	93 431	91.3	5 932	5.8	102 360	100
1961/62	2 857	3.7	68 553	89.5	5 157	6.7	76 567	100
1962/63	3 502	3.8	83 707	89.8	5 982	6.4	93 191	100
1963/64	3 612	3.2	102 090	89.8	7 957	7.0	113 659	100
1964/65	3 913	3.0	117 312	90.3	8 656	6.7	129 881	100
1965/66	5 333	4.2	113 863	89.2	8 496	6.6	127 692	100
1966/67	5 893	5.0	103 187	87.3	9 158	7.7	118 238	100
1967/68	8 164	7.2	92 340	81.0	13 501	11.8	114 005	100
1968/69	14 826	9.7	121 767	80.0	15 527	10.2	152 120	100
1969/70	16 372	10.3	124 310	78.7	18 335	11.5	159 017	100
1970/71	16 464	11.6	103 822	73.2	21 481	15.1	141 767	100
1971/72	13 996	13.9	67 593	67.3	18 850	18.8	100 439	100
1972/73	12 195	16.2	51 121	67.8	12 124	16.1	75 440	100
1973/74	16 032	18.6	52 356	60.9	17 610	20.5	85 998	100
1974/75	13 979	20.3	39 889	57.8	15 095	21.9	68 963	100
1975/76	10 584	29.7	15 530	43.6	9 484	26.6	35 598	100
1976/77	24 383	44.0	18 690	33.7	12 396	22.3	55 469	100
1977/78	21 177	35.8	21 690	36.6	16 332	27.6	59 199	100
1978/79	22 608	42.3	12 704	23.8	18 083	33.9	53 395	100
1979/80	26 077	38.0	23 277	33.9	19 350	28.2	68 704	100
1980/81	28 568	28.6	46 169	46.3	25 064	25.1	99 801	100
1981/82	30 663	28.9	56 151	52.9	19 276	18.2	106 090	100
1982/83	27 080	34.9	38 354	49.4	12 191	15.7	77 625	100
1983/84	29 000	53.2	15 720	28.8	9 820	18.0	54 540	100
1984/85	34 635	52.1	15 983	24.0	15 852	23.8	66 470	100
1985/86	35 642	42.9	23 316	28.1	24 073	29.0	83 031	100
1986/87	43 883	42.7	31 517	30.7	27 342	26.6	102 742	100
1987/88	56 585	42.6	38 295	28.8	37 870	28.5	132 750	100
1988/89	60 235	44.8	36 663	27.3	37 434	27.9	134 332	100
1989/90	54 525	50.0	32 379	29.7	22 221	20.4	109 125	100
1990/91	65 491	62.2	25 039	23.8	14 769	14.0	105 299	100
1991/92	58 279	63.2	19 739	21.4	14 194	15.4	92 212	100
1992/93	35 442	56.3	16 441	26.1	11 100	17.6	62 983	100
1993/94	29 446	51.7	15 296	26.9	12 157	21.4	56 899	100
1994/95	35 923	47.9	20 660	27.6	18 373	24.5	74 956	100
1995/96	43 313	50.5	21 305	24.8	21 208	24.7	85 826	100
1996/97	34 337	47.7	16 809	23.3	20 840	28.9	71 986	100

Notes:

- a) All years listed are financial years: July 1st to June 30th.
b) "Settler" statistics were kept only from January 1959.
c) "Asia" includes "West Asia", except that Cyprus has been included in "Europe".
d) Immigration and emigration statistics for 1983/84 have been rounded off.
e) "Net Settler Gain" is "Settler Arrivals" minus "Former Settler Departures".
f) There are slight differences between the immigration figures produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (unpublished statistics used in this document) and the Department of Immigration (the Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research's *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics* issues numbered 17 and 18) for the years 1982/83 - 1987/88. The Department of Immigration's figures for those years are produced below, while the Australian Bureau of Statistics' figures are incorporated in the table above, so that direct comparisons can be made with the other immigration tables in this document.

TABLE 12

IMMIGRATION FROM ASIA AND EUROPE: AUSTRALIA 1982/83 - 1987/88
NET SETTLER GAIN
(Department of Immigration figures) (43*)

1982/83	27 424	35.2	38 226	49.1	12 141	15.6	77 791	100
1983/84	29 546	53.2	16 002	28.8	9 990	18.0	55 538	100
1984/85	34 967	52.1	16 180	24.1	15 902	23.7	67 049	100
1985/86	35 637	43.0	23 237	28.0	23 977	28.9	82 851	100
1986/87	43 815	42.7	31 407	30.6	27 288	26.6	102 510	100
1987/88	56 619	42.6	38 301	28.8	37 854	28.5	132 774	100

TABLE 13

IMMIGRATION FROM ASIA AND EUROPE: AUSTRALIA 1976/77 - 1996/97
NET PERMANENT GAIN
(Permanent Arrivals [Settlers] minus Permanent Departures) (44)

Year	Asia	%	U.K. and Europe	%	Other	%	Total	%
1976/77	24 281	52.4	18 100	39.1	3 948	8.5	46 329	100
1977/78	21 019	42.0	20 874	41.7	18 785	37.5	50 075	100
1978/79	22 822	54.6	11 006	26.3	7 935	19.0	41 763	100
1979/80	25 846	44.0	22 176	37.8	10 709	18.2	58 731	100
1980/81	28 372	31.1	45 409	49.8	17 412	19.1	91 193	100
1981/82	30 446	31.3	55 362	57.0	11 338	11.7	97 146	100
1982/83	26 901	39.4	37 550	55.1	3 730	5.5	68 181	100
1983/84	28 790	64.7	14 780	33.2	940	2.1	44 510	100
1984/85	34 382	60.2	14 967	26.2	7 781	13.6	57 130	100
1985/86	35 397	47.5	22 570	30.3	16 523	22.2	74 490	100
1986/87	43 629	46.6	30 773	32.9	19 211	20.5	93 613	100
1987/88	56 407	45.9	37 541	30.5	29 047	23.6	122 995	100
1988/89	59 822	48.4	35 527	28.7	28 320	22.9	123 669	100
1989/90	53 901	57.7	30 395	32.5	9 074	9.7	93 370	100
1990/91	65 042	71.8	23 897	26.4	1 619	1.8	90 558	100
1991/92	57 555	73.5	18 524	23.7	2 190	2.8	78 269	100
1992/93	34 610	71.5	15 273	31.5	-1 458	-3.0	48 425	100
1993/94	28 730	67.6	14 288	33.6	-530	-1.2	42 488	100
1994/95	35 118	58.1	19 746	32.6	5 616	9.3	60 480	100
1995/96	42 478	60.3	20 364	28.9	7 627	10.8	70 469	100
1996/97	33 355	59.7	15 864	28.4	6 676	11.9	55 895	100

Notes:

- a) All years listed are financial years: July 1st to June 30th.
- b) "Asia" includes "West Asia", except that Cyprus has been included in "Europe".
- c) Migration statistics for 1983/84 have been rounded off.
- d) There are slight differences between the immigration figures produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (unpublished statistics used in this document) and the Department of Immigration (the Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research's *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics* issues numbered 17 and 18) for the years 1982/83 - 1987/88 (45*). Notwithstanding this, the "Permanent Departure" figures from the ABS and the BIMPR are exactly the same; however, as the Department of Immigration's immigration figures for those years are different, this means that the net immigration figures will also differ. Therefore, the Department of Immigration's figures for those years are produced below, while the Australian Bureau of Statistics' figures are incorporated in the table above, so that direct comparisons can be made with the other immigration tables in this document.

TABLE 14

IMMIGRATION FROM ASIA AND EUROPE: AUSTRALIA 1982/83 - 1987/88
NET PERMANENT GAIN
(Department of Immigration figures) (46)

Year	Asia	%	U.K. and Europe	%	Other	%	Total	%
1982/83	27 245	39.9	37 422	54.7	3 680	5.4	68 347	100
1983/84	29 396	64.6	15 062	33.1	1 050	2.3	45 508	100
1984/85	34 714	60.1	15 164	26.3	7 831	13.6	57 709	100
1985/86	35 392	47.6	22 491	30.3	16 427	22.1	74 310	100
1986/87	43 561	46.6	30 663	32.8	19 157	20.5	93 381	100
1987/88	56 441	45.9	37 547	30.5	29 031	23.6	123 019	100

TABLE 15

IMMIGRATION FROM ASIA AND EUROPE: AUSTRALIA 1976/77 - 1996/97
PERMANENT AND LONG-TERM ARRIVALS [\(47\)](#)

Year	Asia	%	U.K. and Europe	%	Other	%	Total	%
1976/77	31 886	20.4	51 876	33.2	72 480	46.4	156 242	100
1977/78	28 965	18.3	53 868	34.0	75 694	47.7	158 527	100
1978/79	33 431	20.6	45 895	28.3	82 876	51.1	162 202	100
1979/80	37 473	22.0	53 281	31.3	79 543	46.7	170 297	100
1980/81	41 703	20.4	76 212	37.2	86 865	42.4	204 780	100
1981/82	45 691	21.7	85 207	40.4	79 753	37.9	210 651	100
1982/83	43 082	24.9	65 746	38.1	63 911	37.0	172 739	100
1983/84	45 260	31.1	40 590	27.9	59 430	40.9	145 280	100
1984/85	51 705	31.7	41 924	25.7	69 627	42.6	163 256	100
1985/86	53 381	28.6	50 204	26.9	82 811	44.4	186 396	100
1986/87	63 091	30.7	58 456	28.4	84 204	40.9	205 751	100
1987/88	78 461	32.4	67 249	27.8	96 538	39.8	242 248	100
1988/89	86 189	34.5	67 101	26.8	96 590	38.6	249 880	100
1989/90	88 204	38.0	63 030	27.2	80 688	34.8	231 922	100
1990/91	102 465	43.3	56 411	23.9	77 523	32.8	236 399	100
1991/92	108 667	46.4	50 457	21.5	75 048	32.0	234 172	100
1992/93	83 735	41.1	46 199	22.7	73 832	36.2	203 766	100
1993/94	82 522	39.8	46 475	22.4	78 371	37.8	207 368	100
1994/95	96 416	40.4	53 714	22.5	88 393	37.1	238 523	100
1995/96	112 308	42.7	56 337	21.4	94 072	35.8	262 717	100
1996/97	110 644	42.4	54 919	21.0	95 438	36.6	261 001	100

Notes:

- a) All years listed are financial years: July 1st to June 30th.
- b) "Asia" includes "West Asia", except that Cyprus has been included in "Europe".
- c) Migration statistics for 1983/84 have been rounded off.

TABLE 16

IMMIGRATION FROM ASIA AND EUROPE: AUSTRALIA 1976/77 - 1996/97
NET PERMANENT AND LONG-TERM GAIN [\(48\)](#)

Year	Asia	%	U.K. and Europe	%	Other	%	Total	%
1976/77	23 754	55.1	13 279	30.8	6 109	14.2	43 142	100
1977/78	20 075	35.8	20 782	37.0	15 281	27.2	56 138	100
1978/79	23 694	40.6	13 661	23.4	20 947	35.9	58 302	100
1979/80	28 318	36.8	26 773	34.8	21 847	28.4	76 938	100
1980/81	32 409	27.3	53 733	45.3	32 516	27.4	118 658	100
1981/82	35 664	29.0	62 516	50.8	24 778	20.1	122 958	100
1982/83	31 380	41.6	37 001	49.0	7 069	9.4	75 450	100
1983/84	32 220	69.2	11 870	25.5	2 450	5.3	46 540	100
1984/85	37 231	54.7	16 291	23.9	14 487	21.3	68 009	100
1985/86	38 258	40.7	27 196	28.9	28 478	30.3	93 932	100
1986/87	47 186	45.5	34 858	33.6	21 615	20.8	103 659	100
1987/88	60 814	42.5	43 063	30.1	39 347	27.5	143 224	100
1988/89	64 264	46.8	39 157	28.5	33 821	24.6	137 242	100
1989/90	63 346	61.0	32 122	30.9	8 398	8.1	103 866	100
1990/91	70 208	74.1	24 634	26.0	-85	-0.1	94 757	100
1991/92	68 341	76.0	19 683	21.9	1 864	2.1	89 888	100
1992/93	41 649	66.5	19 240	30.7	1 782	2.8	62 671	100
1993/94	41 220	61.2	20 442	30.3	5 719	8.5	67 381	100
1994/95	52 604	56.5	27 338	29.4	13 100	14.1	93 042	100
1995/96	65 825	60.0	28 166	25.7	15 670	14.3	109 661	100
1996/97	57 124	60.5	24 247	25.7	13 025	13.8	94 396	100

Notes:

- a) All years listed are financial years: July 1st to June 30th.
- b) "Asia" includes "West Asia", except that Cyprus has been included in "Europe".
- c) Migration statistics for 1983/84 have been rounded off.

TABLE 17

IMMIGRATION FROM ASIA AND EUROPE: AUSTRALIA 1976/77 - 1996/97
NET TOTAL IMMIGRATION [\(49\)](#)

Year	Asia	%	U.K. and Europe	%	Other	%	Total	%
1976/77	28 417	50.4	15 165	26.9	12 783	22.7	56 365	100
1976/78	20 090	35.3	20 891	36.7	15 882	27.9	56 863	100
1978/79	22 644	37.4	8 352	13.8	29 574	48.8	60 543	100
1979/80	24 603	25.2	25 959	26.6	46 922	48.1	97 484	100
1980/81	37 154	25.2	97 619	66.2	12 728	8.6	147 501	100
1981/82	37 580	34.9	58 217	54.1	11 900	11.0	107 697	100
1982/83	30 098	37.6	30 369	37.9	19 591	24.5	80 058	100
1983/84	34 900	155.1	-100	-0.4	-12 300	-54.7	22 500	100
1984/85	37 553	61.6	8 117	13.3	15 304	25.1	60 974	100
1985/86	41 194	33.9	31 414	25.9	48 753	40.2	121 361	100
1986/87	53 729	43.4	40 328	32.6	29 782	24.0	123 839	100
1987/88	82 681	43.2	51 771	27.1	56 778	29.7	191 230	100
1988/89	76 453	60.6	43 494	34.5	6 112	4.8	126 059	100
1989/90	87 574	90.5	24 870	25.7	-15 720	-0.2	96 724	100
1990/91	59 446	88.5	15 744	23.4	-8 000	-11.9	67 190	100
1991/92	49 566	142.1	9 138	26.2	-23 823	-68.3	34 881	100
1992/93	23 120	63.2	4 102	11.2	9 343	25.5	36 565	100
1993/94	36 842	62.4	17 248	29.2	4 914	8.3	59 004	100
1994/95	40 495	37.9	42 576	39.8	23 852	22.3	106 923	100
1995/96	62 746	56.7	36 348	32.8	11 583	10.5	110 677	100
1996/97	25 933	32.9	44 461	56.4	8 480	10.7	78 874	100

Notes:

a) All years listed are financial years: July 1st to June 30th.

b) "Asia" includes "West Asia", except that Cyprus has been included in "Europe".

c) Migration statistics for 1983/84 have been rounded off.

TABLE 18**NET IMMIGRATION BY RACE: AUSTRALIA 1914 - 1957** [\[50*\]](#)

Year	Asian	European	Other	Total
1914	-1 048	29 305	-198	28 059
1915	-1 500	5 274	144	3 630
1916	949	-1 101	509	357
1917	649	140	96	3 559
1918	-29	3 054	255	3 280
1919	-363	4 959	399	4 995
1920	-889	18 850	104	18 065
1921	-2 229	19 931	-177	17 525
1922	245	39 654	258	40 157
1923	256	39 488	-30	39 714
1924	339	45 470	260	46 069
1925	340	39 422	39	39 801
1926	-91	44 845	29	44 783
1927	-502	52 022	60	51 580
1928	383	29 645	26	30 054
1929	48	11 644	128	11 820
1930	-541	-7 953	-36	-8 530
1931	-950	-9 094	-50	-10 094
1932	-306	-2 789	98	-2 997
1933	-292	487	19	214
1934	151	2 148	-19	2 280
1935	-214	-98	23	-289
1936	195	1 292	10	1 497
1937	206	4 961	36	5 203
1938	522	8 592	23	9 137
1939	147	13 748	-4	13 891
1940	-268	13 640	28	13 400
1941	-37	5 237	-16	5 184
1942	1 038	5 085	43	6 166
1943	855	429	-13	1 271
1944	-440	-1 703	-40	-2 183
1945	95	-2 728	4	-2 629
1946	-507	-14 669	28	-15 148
1947	-657	11 235	33	10 611
1948	115	18 685	35	18 835
1949	436	149 461	104	150 001
1950	1 187	151 326	-8	152 505
1951	1 945	109 363	125	111 433
1952	1 367	92 689	-24	94 032
1953	957	41 854	86	42 897
1954	653	67 698	-144	68 207
1955	1 349	95 729	177	97 255
1956	2 010	91 852	136	93 998
1957	506	78 206	20	78 732

Notes:

- a) All years listed are calendar years: January 1st to December 31st.
- b) Minus sign (-) denotes excess of departures over arrivals.
- c) 1948 figures are for the 6 months ended June 1948 only.
- d) Excludes troop movements for 1915 to 1920, and September 1939 to June 1947; includes troop movements for 6 months ended June 1948, and 1949-1950.
- e) It appears that migration statistics by race were not kept after 1957.

The Asian Population in Australia

In determining the ethnic-Asian proportion of the population, the best solution would be for such information to be gathered in a census. However, the Australian government, via the Australian Bureau of Statistics, no longer gathers such information. Nonetheless, it may be of interest to note the results of the race question in previous censuses.

In the tables below, results from the 1933, 1947, 1954, 1961, and 1966 censuses are given. 1966 was the last census in which detailed racial origins were published; after 1976 the census stopped asking a "race" question altogether (except for the continuing question re. Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders). Also below, detailed information from the 1961 census is given, which lists the Australian population by race, in "full- blood" and "mixed-blood" categories.

Contemporary statistics are also provided, regarding the estimation of the current ethnic-Asian population in Australia.

TABLE 19

**POPULATION BY RACE:
AUSTRALIA, CENSUSES, 1933 TO 1966 (51)**

RACE (a):	1933	%	1947	%	1954	%
EUROPEAN (b):	6 579 993	98.883	7 524 129	98.960	8 921 691	98.988
NON-EUROPEAN (c):						
Asian:						
Afghan	246		220		214	
Arab, Persian	115		150		301	
Asiatic Jew	216		135		83	
Asiatic (n.e.i.)	77		31		1 014	
Chinese	14 349		12 094		15 558	
Cingalese, Burgher, Tamil	350		254		391	
Filipino	390		449		428	
Indian, Pakistani	3 098		2 898		2 647	
Indonesian, Javanese, Timorese, etc.	111		269		381	
Japanese	2 466		335		785	
Malay	1 129		974		1 234	
Siamese, Thailander	13		35		266	
Syrian, Lebanese	3 182		1 898		2 489	
Total Asian	25 742	0.387	19 742	0.260	25 791	0.286
Pacific Islander:						
Fijian	70		178		99	
Maori	197		249		257	
Pacific Islander (n.e.i.)	(d) 1 822		(d) 5 583		2 212	
Papuan, New Guinean	247		34		53	
Torres Strait Islander	(e)		(e)		4 362	
Total Pacific Islander	2 336	0.035	6 044	0.080	6 983	0.077
African:						
African (n.e.i.)	(f)		(f)		72	
Egyptian	16		42		72	
Negro	330		254		204	
Total African	346	0.005	296	0.004	348	0.004
Mixed blood (g)	(f)	-	(f)	-	(f)	-
Other and Indefinite	(h) 802	0.012	(h) 1 968	0.026	(i) 358	0.004
Total Non-European (excluding Aborigines)	29 226	0.439	28 050	0.369	33 480	0.371
Australian Aborigines (j)	45 066	0.677	51 048	0.671	57 722	0.640
Total Non-European (including Aborigines)	74 292	1.116	79 098	1.040	91 202	1.012
Grand Total	6 654 285	100.00	7 603 227	100.00	9 012 893	100.00
RACE (a):	1961	%	1966	%		
EUROPEAN (b):	10 418 761	98.809	11 453 375	98.740		
NON-EUROPEAN (c):						
Asian:						
Afghan	217		89			
Arab, Persian	596		1 321			
Asiatic Jew	114		243			
Asiatic (n.e.i.)	1 346		2 636			
Chinese	23 568		26 723			
Cingalese, Burgher, Tamil	891		1 679			
Filipino	693		765			
Indian, Pakistani	4 065		4 411			
Indonesian, Javanese, Timorese, etc.	678		818			
Japanese	2 671		3 573			
Malay	1 705		1 749			
Siamese, Thailander	276		562			
Syrian, Lebanese	3 457		4 855			
Total Asian	40 277	0.382	49 424	0.426		
Pacific Islander:						

Fijian	181		257	
Maori	449		862	
Pacific Islander				
(n.e.i.)	2 915		3 005	
Papuan, New Guinean	206		502	
Torres Strait Islander	5 217		5 403	
Total Pacific Islander	8 968	0.077	10 029	0.086
African:				
African (n.e.i.)	105		601	
Egyptian	103		425	
Negro	251		102	
Total African	459	0.004	1 128	0.010
Mixed blood (g)	(f)	-	4 812	0.041
Other and Indefinite	(i) 549	0.005	523	0.004
Total Non-European				
(excluding Aborigines)	50 253	0.477	65 916	0.568
Australian Aborigines (j)	75 309	0.714	80 207	0.691
Total Non-European				
(including Aborigines)	125 562	1.191	146 123	1.259
Grand Total	10 544 323	100.00	11 599 498	100.00

Notes:

(a) Racial categories, as well as the following notes, are those as stated in the Census table.

(b) Persons of over 50 per cent European race.

(c) Persons of more than 50 per cent of the race specified, or of 50 per cent of the race specified and 50 per cent European.

(d) Includes Torres Strait Islander.

(e) Included in Pacific Islander n.e.i.

(f) Included in "Other and indefinite".

(g) Persons of three or more races where no race represents more than 50 per cent, or persons of two non-European races each of which represents 50 per cent.

(h) Includes African n.e.i. and mixed blood.

(i) Includes mixed blood.

(j) Includes people who reported themselves as being more than 50 per cent Aboriginal or simply as Aboriginal.

(n.e.i.) - not elsewhere included.

TABLE 20
POPULATION ACCORDING TO RACE
AUSTRALIA, 30TH JUNE, 1961 CENSUS (52)

Race (a)	Full-Blood Non-European	Mixed-Blood: European and (c)	
Total			
Asian:			
Afghan	99	118	217
Arab, Persian	555	41	596
Asiatic Jew	101	13	114
Asiatic (n.e.i.)	1 118	228	1 346
Chinese	20 382	3 186	23 568
Cingalese, Burgher, Tamil	663	228	891
Filipino	297	396	693
Indian, Pakistani	3 532	533	4 065
Indonesian, Javanese, Timorese, etc.	539	139	678
Japanese	1 718	953	2 671
Malay	1 063	642	1 705
Siamese, Thailander	240	36	276
Syrian, Lebanese	3 241	216	3 457
Total Asian	33 548	6 729	0 277
Pacific Islander:			
Fijian	138	43	181
Maori	194	255	449
Pacific Islander (n.e.i.) (b)	2 186	729	2 915
Papuan, New Guinean	130	76	206
Torres Strait Islander	4 972	2 45	5 217
Total Pacific Islander	7 620	1 348	8 968
African:			
African (n.e.i.)	84	21	105
Egyptian	76	27	103
Negro	132	119	251
Total African	292	167	459
Other and Indefinite	120	429	549
Total non-European (excluding Australian Aboriginal)	41 580	8 673	50 253
Australian Aboriginal	36 137	39 172	75 309
Grand Total	77 717	47 845	125 562

Note: The 1961 Census estimated that there were a further 3 944 Full-Blood Aboriginals that were not counted as they were "out of contact at Census".

(a) Racial categories, as well as the following notes, are those as stated in the Census table.

(b) Includes Pacific Islander, Polynesian and South Sea Islander so described.

(c) This category covers persons with European blood to the extent of one-half and blood of a Non-European race to the extent of one-half.

(n.e.i.) = not elsewhere included.

TABLE 21

**POPULATION ACCORDING TO RACE
FIGURES AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE AUSTRALIAN POPULATION
(As at 30th June, 1961)**

Asians:	40 277	0.38%
Other Non-Europeans (excluding Australian Aborigines):	9 976	0.09%
Total Non-Europeans (excluding Australian Aborigines):	50 253	0.48%
Europeans:	10 418 761	98.77%
Australian Aborigines (Half-Blood):	39 172	0.37%
Australian Aborigines (Full-Blood):	40 081	0.38%
Total Australian Aborigines:	79 253	0.75%
Total Australian population (excluding Aboriginal Full-Bloods):	10 508 186	99.62%
Total Australian population:	10 548 267	100.00%

Note: This table is a summarisation of the 1961 census information, as provided by the preceding two tables.

TABLE 22

**ETHNO-EUROPEAN AND ETHNO-ASIAN
MIGRATION TO AUSTRALIA
(As at 1978)**

Dr. Charles Price has estimated the numbers of ethno-Europeans born outside of Europe that have migrated to Australia (as at 1978):[\(53\)](#)

UNITED KINGDOM:

(From Asia) 100 Turkey, 250 Lebanon-Syria, 3172 Palestine, 55185 India, 2292 Pakistan, 482 Bangladesh, 6132 Sri Lanka, 4935 Burma, 20 Thailand, 8833 Malaysia, 873 Philippines, 626 Indonesia, 161 East Timor, 150 Indochina, 67274 China etc., 5646 Japan, 465 Korea, 1850 Other Asia = 158,446.

(From elsewhere) 359 Egypt, 6307 Mauritius, 37693 South Africa, 11827 Other Africa, 10540 British West Indies, 616 Spanish America, 5481 Papua New Guinea, 9819 Fiji, 15668 Pacific, 94 At Sea = 98,404.

SOUTH EUROPE:

(From Asia) 500 East Timor, 500 India, 500 Sri Lanka, 437 China, 3875 Philippines, 1200 Turkey = 7,012.

(From elsewhere) 17742 Egypt, 1515 Africa, 1225 British West Indies, 42501 Spanish America, 1350 Portugese America = 64,333.

EAST EUROPE:

(From Asia) 3116 Palestine, 6500 China = 9,616.

WEST/NORTH EUROPE:

(From Asia) 196 Palestine, 500 Lebanon-Syria, 5250 Sri Lanka, 8800 Indonesia, 75 Thailand, 750 Indo-China = 15,571.

(From elsewhere) 107 Egypt, 7500 South Africa, 5500 Mauritius, 1260 Other Africa, 1950 British West Indies, 5425 Pacific, 2000 Papua New Guinea = 23,742.

TOTALS:

From Asia

190,645

From elsewhere

186,479

Total

377,124

Dr. Charles Price has also estimated the numbers of ethno-Asians born outside of Asia that have migrated to Australia (as at 1978):

WEST ASIA:

(From Europe) 250 Cyprus.

(From elsewhere) 1750 Egypt.

SOUTH ASIA:

(From Europe) 300 United Kingdom,

(From elsewhere) 935 Mauritius, 375 South Africa, 1000 Other Africa, 1300 Fiji, 190 Pacific, 35 Papua New Guinea = 3,835.

SOUTH-EAST ASIA:

(From Europe) n/a.

(From elsewhere) 100 Other Africa, 100 Papua New Guinea = 200.

EAST ASIA:

(From Europe) n/a.

(From elsewhere) 50 Mauritius, 15 South Africa, 10 Other Africa, 10 Spanish America, 10 British West Indies, 1400 Papua New Guinea, 250 Fiji, 195 Pacific = 1,940.

TOTALS:

From Asia

550

From elsewhere

7,725

Total

8,275

It should be noted that the above information relates to the period before the massive influx of immigrants from the Asian region in the 1980s and 1990s; and that the ethno-European influx from Asia was largely an historical event that occurred during the 1940s to 1960s due to various political and social factors, such as the overthrow or dismantling of the European colonial governments in Asia and other parts of the Third World.

It should also be noted that the above information relates not only to first generation immigrants, but also to their offspring.

TABLE 23

ASIAN BIRTHS IN AUSTRALIA, 1978-1988 [\(54\)](#)

Year	Mother born in Asia:	Father born in Asia; mother born elsewhere:						Not stated	Father Sub-Total
	Total	Africa	America	(Asia)	Australia	Europe	Pacific Islands		
1978	8399	74	40	(6176)	1384	471	72	2	2043
10	442								
1979	9263	74	41	(6858)	1522	439	79	-	2157
11	420								
1980	9948	87	42	(7417)	1478	464	78	-	2149
12	097								
1981	11212	68	58	(8214)	1553	481	87	-	2247
13	459								
1982	12396	76	49	(8868)	1755	491	89	-	2460
14	856								
1983	13298	77	47	(9175)	1642	477	91	-	2334
15	632								
1984	13384	79	49	(9267)	1560	414	92	-	2194
15	578								
1985	15127	92	60	(10254)	1716	441	110	1	2420
17	547								
1986	14916	86	67	(10130)	1805	457	100	-	2515
17	431								
1987	16276	92	61	(11058)	1867	414	101	-	2535
18	811								
1988	17709	80	70	(12229)	1887	475	132	3	2647
20	356								

Summary

	Mother born in Asia:	Father born in Asia, mother born elsewhere:	Total:	"Father" increase over "Mother" figures; %
1978	8 399	2 043	10 442	24.3
1979	9 263	2 157	11 420	23.3
1980	9 948	2 149	12 097	21.6
1981	11 212	2 247	13 459	20.0
1982	12 396	2 460	14 856	19.8
1983	13 298	2 334	15 632	17.5
1984	13 384	2 194	15 578	16.4
1985	15 127	2 420	17 547	16.0
1986	14 916	2 515	17 431	16.9
1987	16 276	2 535	18 811	15.6
1988	17 709	2 647	20 356	14.9
1978-1986	141 928	25 701	167 629	18.1

Notes:

a) All years listed are calendar years: January 1st to December 31st.

b) "Asia" includes "West Asia", except that Cyprus has been included in "Europe".

c) The "Asia" category for "Father born in Asia; mother born elsewhere" section has not been added to the sub-total or total, so as not to double-count births already included in the "Mother born in Asia" section.

TABLE 24

ESTIMATED ASIAN POPULATION IN AUSTRALIA
(From the 1996 Census)
(Including statistical workings)

See tables 24-A to 24-E

TABLE 24-A

ESTIMATED ASIAN POPULATION IN AUSTRALIA
(at the time of the 1996 Census)

Total of mother born in Asia	328 177	
minus father/mother both born in Asia	-237 553	
	= 90 624	
Total of father born in Asia	318 677	
minus father/mother both born in Asia	-237 553	
	= 81 124	
Father and mother both born in Asia	237 553	
Total second generation		409 301
Persons born in Asia		1 008 327
Allowance for Census net undercount, at 2% of above totals (1 417 628) (55)		28 353
Net allowance for subtracting ethnic-Europeans born in Asia (and their offspring) and adding approximate population of "other ethnic-Asians" (3rd generation, etc.) (56*)		169,674
TOTAL ESTIMATE OF ASIAN POPULATION IN AUSTRALIA:		1 615 655

Ethnic-Asian percentage of the Australian population
(estimated at 18,289,100 at 30 June 1996) [\(57*\)](#) = 8.8%

(56*)

TABLE 24-B

1996 Census

Persons born in Asia: [\(58\)](#)

West Asia	152,183
Southeast Asia	456,460
Northeast Asia	254,186
Southern Asia	145,498
Total	1,008,327

Note: Excludes overseas visitors.

TABLE 24-C

1996 Census

Australian-born offspring of persons born in Asia (by father): [\(59\)](#)

Birthplace of father:

Birthplace of mother:	West Asia	S.E. Asia	N.E. Asia	S. Asia	Total
Australia	14 670	18 153	9 542	16 014	58 379
New Zealand	445	527	185	330	1 487

Melanesia	11	142	241	41	435
Micronesia	4	-	9	-	13
Polynesia	114	138	126	318	696
U.K. and Ireland	1 321	2 492	951	3 319	8 083
Southern Europe	1 657	481	163	405	2 706
Western Europe	726	1 304	335	572	2 937
Northern Europe	77	54	39	63	233
Eastern Europe	379	122	136	141	778
Former USSR and Baltic States	214	34	200	54	502
West Asia	89 303	63	66	195	89 627
Southeast Asia	437	78 421	3 817	1 903	84 578
Northeast Asia	181	3 424	34 071	125	37 801
Southern Asia	238	645	79	25 395	26 357
Northern America	205	137	61	99	502
South America	380	120	37	70	607
Central America	38	28	3	15	84
Caribbean	28	16	9	19	72
North Africa	634	36	12	49	731
Central and West Africa	155	4	-	6	165
Southern and East Africa	200	193	59	340	792
Inadequately described, at sea, and n.e.c.	174	82	35	55	346
Not stated	320	262	81	103	766
Total	111 911	106 878	50 257	49 631	318 677

Notes:

(a) Excludes persons whose place of usual residence on Census night was overseas.

(b) Polynesia excludes Hawaii.

(c) "n.e.c." is an abbreviation of "not elsewhere classified"

TABLE 24-D

1996 Census

Australian-born offspring of persons born in Asia (by mother): [\(60\)](#)

Birthplace of mother:

Birthplace of father:	West Asia	S.E. Asia	N.E. Asia	S. Asia	Total
Australia	6 240	30 937	8 500	10 572	56 249
New Zealand	142	1 149	314	273	1 878
Melanesia	8	164	258	21	451
Micronesia	-	3	-	-	3
Polynesia	30	126	93	184	433
Europe n.f.d.	-	5	3	-	8
U.K. and Ireland	666	6 592	1 577	3 124	11 959
Southern Europe	1 119	2 812	526	560	5 017
Western Europe	470	3 577	623	716	5 386
Northern Europe	25	333	60	58	476
Eastern Europe	585	812	327	147	1 871
Former USSR and Baltic States	220	103	524	50	897
West Asia	89 303	437	181	238	90 159
Southeast Asia	63	78 421	3 424	645	82 553

Northeast Asia	66	3 817	34 071	79	38 033
Southern Asia	195	1 093	125	25 395	26 808
Northern America	102	298	112	146	658
South America	147	194	46	47	434
Central America	16	31	7	4	58
Caribbean	20	27	8	8	63
North Africa	918	184	62	42	1 206
Central and West Africa	212	34	3	18	267
Southern and East Africa	111	346	86	355	898
Inadequately described, at sea, and n.e.c.	123	188	55	63	429
Not stated	517	1 088	197	181	1 983
Total	101 298	132 771	51 182	42 926	328 177

Notes:

(a) Excludes persons whose place of usual residence on Census night was overseas.

(b) Polynesia excludes Hawaii.

(c) "n.e.c." is an abbreviation of "not elsewhere classified"

(d) "Europe n.f.d." is an abbreviation of "Europe and former USSR not further defined"

TABLE 24-E

1996 Census

Birthplace of mother and father (both born in Asia): [\(61\)](#)

Birthplace of mother:

Birthplace of father:	West Asia	S.E. Asia	N.E. Asia	S. Asia	Total
West Asia	89 303	437	181	238	90 159
Southeast Asia	63	78 421	3 424	645	82 553
Northeast Asia	66	3 817	34 071	79	38 033
Southern Asia	195	1 093	125	25 395	26 808
Total	89 627	83 768	37 801	26 357	237 553

Australia: Trade With Asia and Europe

The following tables show up patterns in Australian trade; how trade with European/Western countries (UK, continental Europe, USA, Canada, and New Zealand; although South Africa and some other European/Western countries have not been specifically included) has decreased (from 88.9% in 1905, down to 54.2% in 1995), while trade with Asian countries (Japan and the rest of Asia) has increased (from 9.2% in 1905, up to 41.7% in 1995).

These tables are relevant insofar as to demonstrate the background to the explanation about how increasing economic ties with Asia has increased economic, political, and diplomatic pressures for Australia to increase the level of Asian immigration into our country.

TABLE 25

IMPORTS BY COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
AUSTRALIA 1905-1995 [\(62\)](#)

(1905-1945: values given in millions of pounds)

(1950-1990: values given in millions of dollars)

Note: The statistics given below are of every fifth year (i.e. not every year), giving an indication of the trends of Australian trade.

Year (a)	United Kingdom		Other Europe		U.S.A.		Canada		New Zealand	
	£m	%	£m	%	£m	%	£m	%	£m	%
1905	18.4	54.9	5.7	17.0	4.6	13.7	0.3	0.9	0.8	2.4
1910	27.7	51.6	10.6	19.7	7.0	13.0	0.7	1.3	1.1	2.0
1915	29.5	50.7	7.3	12.5	9.9	17.0	1.1	1.9	1.4	2.4
1920	35.0	38.9	5.8	6.4	21.7	24.1	2.5	2.8	1.7	1.9
1925	62.8	47.1	14.6	10.9	30.1	22.6	3.1	2.3	1.9	1.4
1930	49.3	41.5	14.0	11.8	27.6	23.2	3.2	2.7	1.4	1.2
1935	35.1	42.5	8.5	10.3	12.6	15.2	4.7	5.7	1.5	1.8
1940	50.1	38.0	9.1	6.9	22.9	17.4	10.4	7.9	1.2	0.9
1945	70.3	33.1	0.4	0.2	81.3	38.3	10.2	4.8	2.0	0.9

	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%
1950	557	51.9	111	10.3	104	9.7	27	2.5	10	0.9
1955	757	45.0	257	15.3	204	12.1	48	2.8	15	0.9
1960	660	35.7	308	16.7	299	16.2	59	3.2	31	1.7
1965	761	26.2	508	17.5	692	23.9	117	4.0	47	1.6
1970	845	21.8	712	18.4	965	24.9	151	3.9	86	2.2
1975	1213	15.0	1708	21.2	1668	20.7	217	2.7	184	2.3
1980	1648	10.2	3017	18.6	3577	22.0	446	2.7	547	3.4
1985	2012	6.7	5820	19.4	6816	22.7	620	2.1	1115	3.7
1990	3356	6.5	10409	20.3	12373	24.1	1228	2.4	2173	4.2
1995	4439	5.9	15159	20.3	16048	21.5	1277	1.7	3554	4.8

Year (a)	Japan		Other Asia		All Other		Total	
	£m	%	£m	%	£m	%	£m	%
1905	0.3	0.9	2.8	8.3	0.6	1.8	33.5	100
1910	0.7	1.3	4.5	8.4	1.4	2.6	53.7	100
1915	1.3	2.2	5.4	9.3	2.3	3.9	58.2	100
1920	3.8	4.2	15.1	16.8	4.3	4.8	89.9	100
1925	3.8	2.8	14.1	10.6	2.9	2.2	133.3	100
1930	3.8	3.2	14.2	11.9	5.4	4.5	118.9	100
1935	5.3	6.4	10.5	12.7	4.4	5.3	82.6	100
1940	6.6	5.0	24.5	18.6	7.1	5.4	131.9	100
1945	0	0	32.5	15.3	15.4	7.3	212.1	100

	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%
1950	14	1.3	182	17.0	67	6.2	1072	100
1955	37	2.2	285	16.9	79	4.7	1682	100
1960	83	4.5	306	16.5	102	5.5	1848	100
1965	259	8.9	396	13.7	118	4.1	2898	100
1970	481	12.4	455	11.7	180	4.6	3875	100
1975	1418	17.6	1361	16.9	301	3.7	8070	100
1980	2527	15.5	3834	23.6	623	3.8	16219	100
1985	6645	22.1	5974	19.9	1020	3.4	30022	100
1990	9872	19.2	10288	20.0	1634	3.2	51333	100
1995	12779	17.1	18380	24.6	3002	4.0	74638	100

Notes:

(a) 1905-1910: year ending 31st December. 1915-1945: year ending 30th June. 1950-1985: year ending 31st December. 1990- 1995: year ending 30th June.

TABLE 26

EXPORTS BY COUNTRY OF DESTINATION
AUSTRALIA 1905-1995 [\(63\)](#)

(1905-1945: values given in millions of pounds)

(1950-1990: values given in millions of dollars)

Note: The statistics given below are of every fifth year (i.e. not every year), giving an indication of the trends of Australian trade.

Year (a)	United Kingdom		Other Europe (b)		U.S.A.		Canada		New Zealand	
	£m	%	£m	%	£m	%	£m	%	£m	%
1905	22.4	49.3	13.4	29.5	1.1	2.4	—	—	1.3	2.9
1910	35.5	50.8	22.6	32.3	1.6	2.3	0.1	0.1	1.7	2.4
1915	38.2	66.0	3.3	5.7	4.7	8.1	0.3	0.5	2.2	3.8
1920	80.8	56.0	14.8	10.2	11.1	7.7	0.3	0.2	7.7	5.3
1925	69.1	42.9	46.3	28.7	9.2	5.7	0.7	0.4	5.8	3.6
1930	43.4	44.2	25.1	25.6	4.2	4.3	0.7	0.7	3.6	3.7
1935	53.7	51.8	14.4	13.9	2.8	2.7	1.5	1.4	3.6	3.5
1940	96.0	64.2	13.5	9.0	4.9	3.3	3.4	2.3	6.5	4.3
1945	52.1	33.5	2.5	1.6	30.8	19.8	3.8	2.4	7.1	4.6
Year (a)	United Kingdom		Other Europe (b)		U.S.A.		Canada		New Zealand	
	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%
1950	475	38.7	326	26.6	100	8.1	18	1.5	43	3.5
1955	571	37.5	396	26.0	105	6.9	21	1.4	76	5.0
1960	476	25.7	460	24.8	152	8.2	28	1.5	109	5.9
1965	516	19.6	552	21.0	264	10.0	40	1.5	158	6.0
1970	488	11.9	637	15.5	556	13.5	113	2.7	199	4.8
1975	450	5.2	1380	15.9	832	9.6	289	3.3	526	6.0
1980	949	5.0	3234	17.1	2044	10.8	339	1.8	864	4.6
1985	1006	3.3	4506	14.7	3598	11.7	303	1.0	1591	5.2
1990	1736	3.5	7176	14.6	5426	11.6	760	1.5	2616	5.3
1995	2267	3.4	5957	8.9	4633	6.9	1132	1.7	4768	7.1
Year (a)	Japan		Other Asia		All Other		Total			
	£m	%	£m	%	£m	%	£m	%		
1905	0.6	1.3	3.0	6.6	3.6	7.9	45.4	100		
1910	0.7	1.0	2.9	4.1	4.8	6.9	69.9	100		
1915	2.0	3.4	3.1	5.3	4.1	7.1	57.9	100		
1920	7.2	5.0	10.9	7.5	11.5	8.0	144.3	100		
1925	11.6	7.2	7.2	4.5	11.2	6.9	161.1	100		
1930	6.6	6.7	8.4	8.5	6.2	6.3	98.2	100		
1935	12.1	11.7	7.6	7.3	8.0	7.7	103.7	100		
1940	5.5	3.7	10.2	6.8	9.6	6.4	149.6	100		
1945	0	0	23.6	15.2	35.4	22.8	155.3	100		
Year (a)	Japan		Other Asia		All Other		Total			
	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%	\$m	%		
1950	48	3.9	144	11.7	73	5.9	1227	100		
1955	117	7.7	153	10.1	82	5.4	1521	100		
1960	269	14.5	231	12.5	129	7.0	1854	100		
1965	441	16.7	455	17.3	207	7.9	2633	100		
1970	1021	24.9	683	16.6	410	10.0	4107	100		
1975	2455	28.3	1864	21.4	893	10.3	8689	100		
1980	5083	26.9	4822	25.5	1536	8.1	18871	100		
1985	8043	26.2	8842	28.8	2854	9.3	30743	100		
1990	12781	26.0	15235	31.0	3348	6.8	49078	100		
1995	16286	24.3	27347	40.8	4646	6.9	67036	100		

Notes:

(a) 1905-1910: year ending 31st December. 1915-1995: year ending 30th June.

(b) "Other Europe" 1905-1945 includes only the major European export countries of Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands.

Government Lies and Immigration Statistics: A Case Study

This case study is a look at just one example of the official lying that constantly takes place in regards to matters of immigration and Asianisation.

In his book *All For Australia* (published in 1984), Geoffrey Blainey wrote a section about the "Decline In European and British Immigration", where he exposed the way in which the Government misled the Australian people over the pro-Asia bias in the immigration programme:

"In the last year Asian peoples appear to have been favoured. They increased at a time when immigrants from the other main sources - Europe and the British Isles - were declining. In the calendar year of 1983 the immigrants from Asia increased, at the expense of the traditional sources of immigrants. Permanent settlers coming from the United Kingdom and Ireland fell by 46 per cent, a drastic fall. Permanent settlers coming from continental Europe fell by 42 per cent.

"The government, faced with such figures, argued that it was simply applying the same criteria to applications from every corner of the world, and that it so happened that a growing number of Asian applicants must have put forward the superior case. The government explained that part of the answer lay in Europe and the British Isles, where people were no longer so keen to migrate. The immigration rules had also changed in recent years, the impartial scoreboard and its 60 points being altered in such a way that it favoured Asian applicants. This was true. The increasing emphasis on family reunion, whether intentionally or not, did favour Asian applicants. They valued the family more. Economic conditions in Asia also gave them a strong incentive to value the family, because the family-reunion scheme enabled them to immigrate from a land of poverty to a land of opportunity and social services. To be on the dole in Australia was like paradise compared to working hard in Indo-China. To find a well-paid job in Australia doubled the joys of paradise. The refugee programme also favoured Asians, for we brought refugees from Indo-China rather than other regions in the troubled world. That many refugees were not really refugees was simply one of the risks of any humanitarian or supposedly humanitarian policy.

"This was not a sufficient explanation of the rapid turnabout in the ratio of Asian to European and British immigrants. Perhaps, in addition, all those cities from Athens to Dublin had decided that Australia was no longer the promised land? They hesitated to migrate to Australia, and so our government perhaps had no alternative but to award fewer places to Europe and the British Isles. Here was an effective way of shrugging off part of the responsibility for the change in immigration policy. Here was a way of quietly explaining that now our immigrants would come increasingly from an enthusiastic Asia than from a lukewarm Europe and the British Isles.

"In the federal parliament in May 1984, Mr Hawke and Mr West employed this argument. They said that they themselves were not discriminating - far from it. Immigrants from Europe and the British Isles were rather discriminating against Australia by saying that they did not wish to live here. This argument dovetailed with the anti-British stance of the Labor government.

"Mr West gained prestige by explaining to parliament that fewer British were applying to settle in Australia than in former years, but they were still treated favourably compared with applicants from Europe and Asia. 'It can be seen that of these three regions, the British ratio of successful visas to applications for the first nine months of this year 1983-4 was by far the most favourable.' The newspapers and radio accepted the argument, for it seemed to them to be more persuasive than the Liberals' arguments. But was it valid? The officials of the immigration department did not necessarily agree with the prime minister and the immigration minister. Faithful public servants, they said nothing. But their silence had not extended to the paper they prepared for parliament. In that paper they warned of the danger of making the kind of observation that Mr West and Mr Hawke made to parliament. Explaining that delays in the processing of immigrant applicants were variable, the officials warned - and placed their warning on paper - that 'it is not possible to calculate valid success or failure rates' within any given period. In short, the immigration officials, in possession of the facts, had stated that the interpretation that Mr Hawke and Mr West placed on the facts was 'invalid'.

"There must have been some gaping mouths in the immigration department when those speeches were made and those reports published. High officials, in briefing the minister, must have explained that they could not prove that enthusiasm for immigration had declined startlingly in Ireland, Great Britain and Europe. We can see the pains they had taken. In the minister's own speech the notes appended to the official statistics on immigration are emphatic that figures on British and Irish applications to settle in Australia can't be taken too seriously. They had been counted primarily as a way of measuring the amount of paperwork and interviews and report writing that falls to the Australian immigration officials at the various embassies. These figures should not be used for any other purpose: 'they have not been collected or used as an objective measure of interest in migration'. The minister for immigration ignored those warnings. He went on to cite the statistics as proof that British interest in immigration was waning.

"We know how the British - and possibly the Europeans - are excluded from a larger share of the migrant places. The word spreads that it is difficult to win a place in the migrant queue to Australia. In one sense this is true, because Australia now wants migrants only in those restricted categories to which the British and Europeans do not fit so easily. But the elimination of many who do apply is pressed further in Australia House in London. When applicants write to express interest in migrating, they are sent first an information form. If they remain interested, they are sent a preliminary inquiry form, which they answer in some detail. The form is read by the immigration officers in London; and if the applicant has no chance of succeeding in the next stage of the selection process, the form is filed away. Incredibly, this preliminary inquiry form is not recorded as a statement of interest in migrating. Accordingly, the English public interest in migrating to Australia is far larger than the official applications indicate. In the Australian embassy in some countries, by contrast, the preliminary inquiry form is counted as a measure of local interest in migration. Indeed, in some Australian embassies the immigration officers, as a matter of clerical procedure, count many of the applicants twice, once when they submit the preliminary form and again when they submit the more formal application. The outcome of those discrepancies is that British interest in migration is much understated.

"When, on 30 May 1984, Mr West explained to parliament that he was not discriminating against the British, he had before him several warnings about the statistics on which he had rested his case. The warnings were like the small print in a contract, the whereases and the wherefores and the aforesaid, but they were arresting. In effect the statistics in the minister's hands told him sternly: 'Use me at your peril'. Before him stood a sentence that in its utter

simplicity should have advised him to abandon his central argument, that 'total applications have fallen significantly from the UK, Ireland and Europe as the tables show; and applications are rising from Asia'. He decided to press on, insisting that he was merely preferring Asians to Europeans because they especially wanted to come.

"That he was misleading parliament stands out in Hansard, the record of parliamentary debates, for 30 May 1984. The sentence quotes the figures reporting 'applications' by potential migrants from many parts of the world: 'These figures are collected as a means of providing general information on the workload of individual posts; they have not been collected or used as an objective measure of interest in migration.'

"That sentence demolished his tables of statistics claiming that European and British interest was declining and that Asian interest was rising. Only an impartial survey would tell us whether British interest in migrating to Australia was declining or was increasing. Nothing in the statistics used by the minister enables us to answer that question with confidence"(64).

Blainey's conclusions were supported by the research of John Grover:

"With Professor Blainey being given "the treatment" for raising the immigration issue, it seemed worth finding out whether Minister Stewart West's denial of an anti-British policy was true.

"I found, from government documents, a surprising story indeed, beginning under the Fraser regime.

"Fraser's Minister Macphree began the cold war against the British:

- Ten points given to intending migrants for knowledge of English were discontinued. (Brilliant! It now costs us taxpayers \$42 million to teach English to migrants!).*
- Instead, desk officers were told to judge the ability of an applicant to learn English and award points! (How stupidly bureaucratic can you be?).*
- London immigration staff were cut by 43 per cent (that slows 'em!).*
- Staff elsewhere were not reduced (a win for the "multiculturalists"?).*

"Under Hawke, Minister West took command:

- Remaining London staff were reduced by a further 15 per cent.*
- Staff in Asian countries were increased.*
- British applicants had to have 60 points to qualify, as well as a firm job offer in Australia, and financial support from a sponsor who had to have a residential qualification of two years.*
- Asian applicants did not have to have a minimum number of points, or a job offer, financial support or residential qualification for a sponsor (staff orders reveal all!).*
- London desk staff were ordered to give British applicants preliminary application forms and fail them on that form.*
- They were ordered not to count those who failed.*

"Thus Mr West was able to look us in the eye and tell of "little interest" in migrating to Australia from Britain.

"The Immigration "Statistics Monthly" publication of April showed 44 per cent more Asian "approvals" than from Europe. After Blainey, the May issue was censored. It did not appear.

"The Bureau of Statistics was ordered to change the format for the June issue so we could not find out the number of Asian approvals. Hiding facts has worked very well. We were bamboozled. Minister West "won"."(65)

The Herald reported that "Mr West rejects fears that Australia is becoming 'Asianised', a word he dislikes tensely" (West said "I don't like the expression because all human beings should be treated equally"); and quoted some further comments from Immigration Minister Stewart West:

"Currently about two per cent of our population is Asian".

"We won't become increasingly Asianised".

"There is no possibility that we will see a large percentage of Asians in the future".

"I've said that it could get to 4 per cent -- others, using figures that include people from as far away as Cyprus and Lebanon as Asians, get a figure as high as 7 per cent... I see nothing wrong with that."(66)

The lies of Stewart West and his ilk stand exposed, particularly in relation to the anti-British/anti-European bias that has characterised Australia's immigration policies, and their lies that in 1984 only about 2% of our nation's population was Asian, and their ridiculous claims that Australia "won't become increasingly Asianised".

[Australian Governments, Prime Ministers, and Immigration Ministers: 1945 to 1998 \(67\)](#)

The list below has been produced to give readers an appreciation of how various Australian governments have handled immigration. If this list is compared with the tables of immigration statistics, the results can be enlightening.

Following the end of World War Two in 1945, it was the Labor Party which began the mass immigration programmes (based upon the notion of "populate or perish"). When the Liberal Party came into government in 1949 it continued the policy of mass immigration.

Looking at the statistics of Settler Arrivals in this document, it can be seen that Asian immigration was being kept low, from 1959 to 1965 it was around 2.5% to 4%. However, when Harold Holt became the (Liberal) Prime Minister in 1966 he changed the immigration rules to allow an increase in Asian immigration ("the thin edge of the wedge"), which was further increased by subsequent Liberal Prime Ministers, rising from 4% to 11%.

The immigration policies of the 1970s Labor government of Gough Whitlam (with Al Grassby as Immigration Minister until June 1974) bumped up the proportion of Asian immigration significantly from 11% to 21% (bear in mind that the effects of the immigration policies of one government do not end immediately on the day that they lose office).

It was the Liberal government of Malcolm Fraser that really gave Asian immigration a boost, mostly keeping it steady in-between 26% to 35%.

But it was the Labor governments of Bob Hawke and Paul Keating which gave the biggest boost to Asian immigration, always keeping it above 39%, and normally as high as 45% to 55%.

What is shown by a brief look at these immigration trends is that the Labor and Liberal-National parties have, since the mid-1960s, been promoters of mass immigration, and therefore are guilty of carrying out the Asianisation of Australia.

Government: Labor Party 13.7.1945 - 19.12.1949

Prime Minister: Joseph Benedict (Ben) Chifley 13.7.1945 - 19.12.1949

Minister for Immigration: Arthur Calwell 13.7.1945 - 19.12.1949

Government: Liberal Party - Country Party coalition 19.12.1949 - 5.12.1972

Prime Minister: Robert (Bob) Menzies 19.12.1949 - 26.1.1966

Prime Minister: Harold Holt 26.1.1966 - 19.12.1967

Prime Minister: John McEwan 19.12.1967 - 10.1.1968

Prime Minister: John Gorton 10.1.1968 - 10.3.1971

Prime Minister: William (Billy) McMahon 10.3.1971 - 5.12.1972

Minister for Immigration: Harold Holt 19.12.1949 - 24.10.1956

Minister for Immigration: Athol Gordon Townley 24.10.1956 - 19.3.1958

Minister for Immigration: Alexander Downer 20.3.1958 - 18.12.1963

Minister for Immigration: Hubert Opperman 18.12.1963 - 14.12.1966

Minister for Immigration: Billy Snowdon 14.12.1966 - 12.11.1969

Minister for Immigration: Phillip Lynch 12.11.1969 - 22.3.1971

Minister for Immigration: Alexander James Forbes 22.3.1971 - 5.12.1972

Government: Labor Party 5.12.1972 - 11.11.1975

Prime Minister: Gough Whitlam 5.12.1972 - 11.11.1975

Minister for Immigration: Lance Barnard 5.12.1972 - 19.12.1972

Minister for Immigration: Albert (Al) Grassby 19.12.1972 - 12.6.1974

Minister for Labor and Immigration: Clyde Cameron 12.6.1974 - 6.6.1975

Minister for Labor and Immigration: James Robert McClelland 6.6.1975 - 11.11.1975

Government: Liberal Party - National Country Party coalition: 11.11.1975 - 11.3.1983

Prime Minister: Malcolm Fraser 11.11.1975 - 11.3.1983

Minister for Labor and Immigration: Anthony Street 12.11.1975 - 22.12.1975

Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs: Michael MacKellar 22.12.1975 - 8.12.1979

Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs: Ian Macphie 8.12.1979 - 7.5.1982

Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs: John Hodges 7.5.82 - 11.3.83

Government: Labor Party 11.3.83 - 11.3.1996

Minister: Bob Hawke 11.83.3.83 - 20.12.1991

Minister: Paul Keating 20.12.1991 - 11.3.1996

Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs: Stewart West 11.3.1983 - 13.12.1984

Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs: Chris Hurford 13.12.1984 - 16.2.1987

Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs: Michael (Mick) Young 16.2.1987 - 24.7.1987

Minister for Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs: Michael (Mick) Young 24.7.1987 - 12.2.1988

Minister for Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs: Clyde Holding 15.2.1988 - 2.9.1988

Minister for Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs: Robert Ray 2.9.1988 - 4.4.1990

Minister for Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs: Gerald (Gerry) Hand 4.4.1990 - 24.3.1993

Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs: Nick Bolkus 24.3.1993 - 11.3.1996

Government: Liberal Party - National Party coalition 11.3.1996 - present

Prime Minister: John Howard 11.3.1996 - present

Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs: Philip Ruddock 11.3.1996 - present

Note: The Department of Immigration was created on 13.7.1945.(68)

References

1. Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics Number 19, 1995-96*, AGPS, Canberra, 1997, pp. 19-21, Table 2.9; pp. 22-24, Table 2.10; pp. 37-38, Table 2.15.
2. Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics Number 18, 1993-94*, AGPS, Canberra, 1995, pp. 19-21, Table 2.9; pp. 22-24, Table 2.10; pp. 37-38, Table 2.15.
- Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics No. 12, 1981*, AGPS, Canberra, 1982, pp. 38-50, Table 21; pp. 51-55, Table 22; pp. 60-63, Table 24.
- Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics Number 19, 1995-96*, AGPS, Canberra, 1997, pp. 19-21, Table 2.9; pp. 22-24, Table 2.10; pp. 37-38, Table 2.15.
3. The White Russians were those who had opposed the Red (Communist) revolution in Russia in 1917, and - following their defeat - many migrated to China or Manchuria. In all, about 7000 eventually came to Australia. 5500 were evacuated from Shanghai, shortly before the fall of the Kuomintang (Nationalist) government, were held on a island of the Philippines under the auspices of the International Refugee Organisation; about a quarter of these later came to Australia. Also, after the end of the Korean War, the Chinese government decided that it no longer wanted the presence of these Russians and therefore encouraged them to leave the country; many of these came to Australia, under sponsorship of Australian residents.
- Christa, Boris. "Russians", in: Jupp, James (general editor). *The Australian People*, Angus and Robertson, North Ryde, NSW, 1988, pp. 755-756.
- Regarding the Indonesian-born (Dutch East Indies) Dutch, Henk Overberg says that "Birthplace statistics do not distinguish ethnic Dutch persons among those persons from the former Dutch East Indies who were repatriated to Australia during the Second World War, and after as a result of Indonesian independence. Estimates of the numbers of these people in Australia vary widely, but there were many thousands of ethnic Dutch living in Indonesia at the time of independence. The Empire Ex-Servicemen's Scheme, which ran from 1947 until 1955, consisted largely of Dutch nationals - of the 21,994 persons who arrived in Australia under this scheme, 16,830 were Dutch, the majority having come directly from Indonesia. Some of these would have been Dutch-born, others Indonesian-born."
- Overberg, Henk. "Dutch", in: Jupp, James (general editor). *The Australian People*, Angus and Robertson, North Ryde, NSW, 1988, p. 356.
4. Macphee, Ian. "Australia's Migration Policy"(letter), *The Bulletin*, 18 May 1982, p. 10.
5. Shu, Jing; Khoo, Siew Ean; Struik, Andrew; and McKenzie, Fiona. *Australia's Population Trends and Prospects 1993*, AGPS, Canberra, 1994, pp. 35-37.
6. Richards, David. "Triads Move Into Melbourne Crime", *The Bulletin* 27 May 1980, p. 63.
7. Roberts, Greg. "Racket Blamed For Illegal Immigrants", *The Age*, 6 November 1992, p. 9.
8. Castles, Stephen. "The "New" Migration and Australian Immigration Policy", in: Inglis, Christine; Gunasekaran, S.; Sullivan, Gerard; and Wu, Chung-Tong (eds). *Asians in Australia: The Dynamics of Migration and Settlement*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, NSW, 1992, p. 70.
9. Blainey, Geoffrey. *All For Australia*, pp. 66-68.
10. Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Overseas Arrivals and Departures, Australia, June 1985* (ABS catalogue no. 3401.0), ABS, Canberra, 1986, p. 7.
11. Millbank, Adrienne. *Asian Immigration*, Parliamentary Research Service (Department of the Parliamentary Library), Canberra, 1996 (Current Issues Brief 16; Last updated: 12 December 1996; Internet source: <http://library.aph.gov.au/prs/pubs/cib/97cib16.htm>), section headed "Source Countries".

12. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "PMTR005A, Total Arrivals" (financial year 1996).
13. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "PMTR005A, Total Arrivals" (financial year 1996); and "PMTR005A, Total Departures" (financial year 1996).
14. Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs: Research and Statistics Branch. *Immigration Update*, December Quarter 1996, DIMA, Canberra, 1997, p. 39.
15. Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs: Research and Statistics Branch. *Immigration Update*, March Quarter, p. 1; June Quarter, p. 1; September Quarter, p. 1; December Quarter, p. 1.
16. Note: Microfiche statistical tables PMTR005A and PMTR005B from the Australian Bureau of Statistics include Cyprus as part of Europe from Financial Year 1991 onwards (previously, Cyprus was included in Asia).
17. Price, C.A. "Greek Cypriots", in: Jupp, James (ed.) *The Australian People*, Angus and Robertson, North Ryde, NSW, 1988, p. 532.
18. Aubin, Tracey. "PM: Now Students Can Stay Forever", *The Australian*, 15 June 1990, p. 1-2.
- Chamberlin, Paul. "Migrant Reunions at Risk", *The Age*, 20 June 1996, p. A4.
- Easterbrook, Margaret. "Influx of Chinese Possible, Says Hand", *The Age*, 13 May 1992, p. 5.
- Jaivin, Linda. "The Contradictions of Compassion", *Australian Society*, July 1990, p. 13.
- Walsh, Kerry-Anne. "Chinese Feel the Squeeze", *The Bulletin*, 6 August 1996, pp. 12-13.
- Walsh, Kerry-Anne. "Cracking the Chinese Puzzle", *The Bulletin*, 16 November 1993, p. 16.
19. Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Migration Australia 1993-94*, AGPS, 1995, Canberra, pp. 6-7, 38.
20. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "PMTR005A, Total Arrivals" (financial year 1995).
21. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "PMTR005A, Total Arrivals" (financial year 1995); and "PMTR005A, Total Departures" (financial year 1995).
22. Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Overseas Arrivals and Departures* (issue "Embargoed until 11:30 Thurs 22 August 1996"), Australian Government Publishing Service, (Canberra), 1996, pp. 12, 16.
23. Bennett. *Your Rights 1988*, p. 87.
24. Blainey. *All For Australia*, pp. 65-71.
25. Blainey. *All For Australia*, p. 69.
26. Blainey. *All For Australia*, p. 69.
27. Blainey. *All For Australia*, p. 69.
28. Blainey. *All For Australia*, pp. 69-70.
29. Blainey. *All For Australia*, pp. 70-71.
30. Price, Dr. Charles A. *Ethnic Groups In Australia*, Australian Immigration Research Centre, Canberra, (1989?), pp. 8-9.
31. Jenkins, David. "2001 Our Race Odyssey", *The Sydney Morning Herald*, p. 76.
32. Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research, *Community Profiles, 1991 Census, Fiji Born*, AGPS, Canberra, 1995, p. 1.
- Cuthbertson, Sandy; Cole, Rodney (eds). *Population Growth in the South Pacific Island States - Implications for Australia*, AGPS, Canberra, 1995, pp.6-7.
- The Far East and Australasia 1997* (Twenty-Eighth edition), Europa, London, 1997, p. 726.
- India on the Fiji Crisis*, XP Press, 1989, pp. 13-14 (p. 14 says "there are about 250 Indian nationals" in Fiji).
33. Ruddock, Philip (letter). "Figures May Mislead", *Herald Sun*, 31 October 1996, p. 20.
34. Legge, Kate. "Asian Intake Ought to be Watched: ANU Academic", *The Age*, 27 June 1985, p. 20.
- Mackie, J.A.C. "On Asian Migration", *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 June 1985.
35. The Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research. *Immigration Update: September Quarter 1995*, AGPS, Canberra, c1995, p. 48.
36. The Bureau of Immigration Research: Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics: Number 15: 1988*, AGPS, Canberra, c1989, p. 7.
37. The Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research. *Immigration Update: September*

Quarter 1995, AGPS, Canberra, c1995, p. 48.

38. The Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research. *Immigration Update: September Quarter 1995*, AGPS, Canberra, c1995, p. 48.

39. 1959/60 - 1967/68 figures: Department of Immigration. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics No. 2*, AGPS, Canberra, 1968, pp. 57-60, Table 24.

1968/69 - 1972/73 figures: Department of Immigration. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics No. 7*, AGPS, Canberra, 1973, pp. 58-61, Table 24.

1973/74 - 1981/82 figures: Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics No. 13, 1982*, AGPS, Canberra, 1984, pp. 60-63, Table 24.

1982/83 - 1987/88 figures: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "MIG011B, Overseas Arrivals and Departures" (financial year 1983); "PMTP009A, Total Arrivals" (financial year 1984); and "PMTR009A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1985 to 1988).

1988/89 - 1993/94 figures: Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics Number 18, 1993-94*, AGPS, Canberra, 1995, pp. 19-21, Table 2.9.

1994/95 figures: Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research. *Immigration Update, September Quarter 1995*, AGPS, Canberra, c1995, pp. 21-23, Table 1.13.

1995/96 - 1996/97 figures: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "PMTR005A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1996 to 1997).

1976/77 - 1996/97 figures confirmed by using:

Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "MIG011B, Overseas Arrivals and Departures" (financial years 1977 to 1983); "PMTP009A, Total Arrivals" (financial year 1984); "PMTR009A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1985 to 1989); and "PMTR005A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1989 to 1997).

Note: A minor corrective adjustment of 109 has been made to the 1975/76 figures for the Permanent Arrivals (Settlers) table since the Oct. 1996 and Dec. 1996 editions of this publication.

40. Issues of *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics* up to, and including, edition number 16, followed the Australian Bureau of Statistics' definition used for Settler status (refer to Settler Arrival statistics, with particular regard to the years 1982/83 - 1987/88). *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics* from editions numbered 17 and 18 followed the Department of Immigration's definition used for Settler status (again - refer to Settler Arrival statistics, with particular regard to the years 1982/83 - 1987/88).

41. 1982/83 - 1983/84 figures: Bureau of Immigration and Population Research. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics Number 17, 1991-92*, AGPS, Canberra, c1993, pp. 24-26, Table 2.9.

1984/85 - 1987/88 figures: Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics Number 18, 1993-94*, AGPS, Canberra, 1995, pp. 19-21, Table 2.9.

42. 1959/60 - 1967/68 figures: Department of Immigration. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics No. 2*, AGPS, Canberra, 1968, pp. 57-60, Table 24.

1968/69 - 1972/73 figures: Department of Immigration. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics No. 7*, AGPS, Canberra, 1973, pp. 58-61, Table 24.

1973/74 - 1981/82 figures: Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics No. 13, 1982*, AGPS, Canberra, 1984, pp. 60-63, Table 24.

1982/83 - 1987/88 "Net Settler Gain" figures have been calculated by subtracting departing Former Settlers from Settler Arrivals:

a) 1982/83 - 1987/88 Settler Arrivals: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "MIG011B, Overseas Arrivals and Departures" (financial year 1983); "PMTP009A, Total Arrivals" (financial year 1984); and "PMTR009A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1985 to 1988).

b) 1982/83 - 1987/88 departing Former Settlers: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "MIG011B, Overseas Arrivals and Departures" (financial year 1983); "PMTP009A, Total

Departures" (financial year 1984); and "PMTR009B, Total Departures" (financial years 1985 to 1988). 1988/89 - 1993/94 "Net Settler Gain" figures have been calculated by subtracting departing Former Settlers from Settler Arrivals:

a) 1988/89 - 1993/94 Settler Arrivals: Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics Number 18, 1993-94*, AGPS, Canberra, 1995, pp. 19-21, Table 2.9.

b) 1988/89 - 1993/94 departing Former Settlers: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "PMTR005B, Total Departures" (financial years 1989 to 1994). S:YB 11025-1173.

1994/95 figures are calculated by subtracting departing Former Settlers from Settler Arrivals:

1994/95 Settler Arrivals: Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research. *Immigration Update, September Quarter 1995*, AGPS, Canberra, c1995, pp. 21-23, Table 1.13.

1994/95 departing Former Settlers: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "PMTR005B, Total Departures" (financial year 1995).

1995/96 - 1996/97 figures are calculated by subtracting departing Former Settlers from Settler Arrivals:

1995/96 - 1996/97 Settler Arrivals: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "PMTR005A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1996 to 1997).

1995/96 - 1996/97 departing Former Settlers: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "PMTR005B, Total Departures" (financial years 1996 to 1997).

1976/77 - 1996/97 figures confirmed by using:

Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "MIG011B, Overseas Arrivals and Departures" (financial years 1977 to 1983); "PMTP009A, Total Arrivals" (financial year 1984);

"PMTP009B, Total Departures" (financial year 1984); "PMTR009A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1985 to 1989); "PMTR009B, Total Departures" (financial years 1985 to 1989); "PMTR005A, Total Arrivals"

(financial years 1989 to 1997); and "PMTR005A, Total Departures" (financial years 1989 to 1997).

43. 1982/83 - 1987/88 "Net Settler Gain" figures have been calculated by subtracting departing Former Settlers from Settler Arrivals:

a) 1982/83 - 1987/88 Settler Arrivals:

1982/83 - 1983/84 figures: Bureau of Immigration and Population Research. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics Number 17, 1991-92*, AGPS, Canberra, c1993, pp. 24-26, Table 2.9.

1984/85 - 1987/88 figures: Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics Number 18, 1993-94*, AGPS, Canberra, 1995, pp. 19-21, Table 2.9.

b) 1982/83 - 1987/88 departing Former Settlers:

Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "MIG011B, Overseas Arrivals and Departures" (financial year 1983); "PMTP009B, Total Departures" (financial year 1984); and "PMTR009B, Total Departures" (financial years 1985 to 1988).

Although there are slight differences between the immigration figures produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Department of Immigration for the years 1982/83 - 1987/88, the emigration figures they use are the same. Table 2.17 "Permanent Departures By Region/Country Of Birth 1984-85 To 1993-94" in *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics Number 18, 1993-94* (pp. 42-43) shows that those "Permanent Departure" figures are exactly the same as the "Total Permanent" departure figures in the Australian Bureau of Statistics' unpublished statistics used in this document. The ABS's "Total Permanent" departure figures are derived from the totalling of two categories: "Former Settlers" and "Other Residents". As *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics Number 18, 1993-94* (pp. 42-43) only gives "Permanent Departure" figures as a whole, and does not include a "Former Settlers" sub-category, the 1982/83 - 1987/88 "Net Settler Gain (Department of Immigration figures)" table was calculated by subtracting the ABS's "Departures - Former Settlers" figures from the Department of Immigration's "Settler Arrivals" figures.

44. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "MIG011B, Overseas Arrivals

and Departures" (financial years 1977 to 1983); "PMTP009A, Total Arrivals" (financial year 1984); "PMTP009B, Total Departures" (financial year 1984); "PMTR009A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1985 to 1989); "PMTR009B, Total Departures" (financial years 1985 to 1989); "PMTR005A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1989 to 1997); and "PMTR005A, Total Departures" (financial years 1989 to 1997).

45. Issues of *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics* up to, and including, edition number 16, followed the Australian Bureau of Statistics' definition used for Settler status (refer to Settler Arrival statistics, with particular regard to the years 1982/83 - 1987/88). *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics* from editions numbered 17 and 18 followed the Department of Immigration's definition used for Settler status (again - refer to Settler Arrival statistics, with particular regard to the years 1982/83 - 1987/88).

46. 1982/83 - 1983/84 figures: Bureau of Immigration and Population Research. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics Number 17, 1991-92*, AGPS, Canberra, c1993, pp. 24-26, Table 2.9.

1984/85 - 1987/88 figures: Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research. *Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics Number 18, 1993-94*, AGPS, Canberra, 1995, pp. 19-21, Table 2.9, pp. 42-43, Table 2.17.

47. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "MIG011B, Overseas Arrivals and Departures" (financial years 1977 to 1983); "PMTP009A, Total Arrivals" (financial year 1984); "PMTP009B, Total Departures" (financial year 1984); "PMTR009A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1985 to 1989); "PMTR009B, Total Departures" (financial years 1985 to 1989); "PMTR005A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1989 to 1997); and "PMTR005A, Total Departures" (financial years 1989 to 1997).

48. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "MIG011B, Overseas Arrivals and Departures" (financial years 1977 to 1983); "PMTP009A, Total Arrivals" (financial year 1984); "PMTP009B, Total Departures" (financial year 1984); "PMTR009A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1985 to 1989); "PMTR009B, Total Departures" (financial years 1985 to 1989); "PMTR005A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1989 to 1997); and "PMTR005A, Total Departures" (financial years 1989 to 1997).

49. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "MIG011B, Overseas Arrivals and Departures" (financial years 1977 to 1983); "PMTP009A, Total Arrivals" (financial year 1984); "PMTP009B, Total Departures" (financial year 1984); "PMTR009A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1985 to 1989); "PMTR009B, Total Departures" (financial years 1985 to 1989); "PMTR005A, Total Arrivals" (financial years 1989 to 1997); and "PMTR005A, Total Departures" (financial years 1989 to 1997).

50. Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics. *Commonwealth Demography*, (Commonwealth of Australia), Melbourne, issue: 1920, pp. 30-31 (Table 18a "The Nationalities of Persons, Males and Females, who Arrived in the Commonwealth of Australia during the Years 1914-1920" and Table 18b "The Nationalities of Persons, Males and Females, who Departed from the Commonwealth of Australia during the Years 1914-1920").

Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics. *Australian Demography*, (Commonwealth of Australia), Canberra, issue: 1934, p. 26 (Table 17i "Population - Net Migration according to Nationality or Race, 1921 to 1934").

Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics. *Demography*, (Commonwealth of Australia), Canberra, various issues: 1950, p. 34 (Table 35 "Migration: Net Migration according to Racial Origin, Australia", covering 1935-1947); 1948, p. 31 (Table 33 "Migration: Racial Origin of Persons who Arrived or Departed, Australia, Six months ended June, 1948"); 1950, p. 29 (Table 29 "Migration: Racial Origin of Persons who Arrived or Departed, Australia, 1949 and 1950"); 1951, p. 29; 1952, p. 23; 1953, p. 23; 1954, p. 23 (1951-1954 were all Table 28 "Overseas Migration: Racial Origin of Persons who Arrived or Departed, Australia"); 1955, p. 23; 1956, p. 23 (1955-1956 were both Table 30 "Overseas Migration: Racial Origin, Australia"); 1957, p. 22 (Table 29 "Overseas Arrivals and Departures: Racial Origin, Australia, 1957").

Note: A notation to the 1948 table states that "The particulars shown are directly comparable with those published in Bulletins prior to No. 64 under the heading of "Nationality or Race." The figures should not, however, be regarded as a completely accurate record of "Racial Origin" as they are based

on the passenger's own statement as to race, which in many cases may express the country of his nationality or birthplace rather than the actual race. So far as available information permits, however, migrants are classified according to race. This applies particularly in cases where a person's nationality differs from race through naturalization or marriage. From July, 1948 onwards, migrants have been classified separately according to both nationality and race and the particulars available are no longer directly comparable with those published for previous years."

51. *1966 Census of Population and Housing, 30 June 1966, Commonwealth of Australia*, Volume 1: Population: Single characteristics. Part 11: Race, Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Canberra, (1971), p. 10-11, Table No. 1: "Population, by Race: Australia, Censuses, 1933 to 1966". As has already been stated, the racial categories used are those as given in the Census table. The grouping of those categories into "Asian", "Pacific Islander, and "African" follows the usage as set in the table of "Non-European Races, 30th June, 1961 (Excluding Overseas-born Migratory)" in the *Census of the Commonwealth of Australia, 30th June, 1961*, Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Canberra, (1968), Vol. VIII - Australia, Statistician's Report, p. 192.

52. *Census of the Commonwealth of Australia, 30th June, 1961*, Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Canberra, (1968), Vol. VIII - Australia, Part I - Cross-Classifications of the Characteristics of the Population, pp. 64-65: Table "No. 33. - Population According To Race: Australia, Censuses, 1947 To 1961 (Exclusive Of Full-Blood Aborigines)"; Vol. VIII - Australia, Statistician's Report, p. 189: Table "Full-Blood Aborigines, 30th June, 1961".

As has already been stated, the racial categories used are those as given in the Census table. The grouping of those categories into "Asian", "Pacific Islander, and "African" follows the usage as set in the table of "Non- European Races, 30th June, 1961 (Excluding Overseas-born Migratory)" in the *Census of the Commonwealth of Australia, 30th June, 1961*, Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Canberra, (1968), Vol. VIII - Australia, Statistician's Report, p. 192.

53. Price, Charles A. *Immigration and Ethnicity*, Commonwealth Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, Canberra, 1996, pp. 105-108 (Table 3.3: "Converting Birthplace Origin to Ethnic Origin: 1978"). Note: Egypt has been included with "Africa".

54. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "Table BIRTH08R - Confinements And Births - Relative Birthplaces of Mother & Father By Legitimacy", (calendar years 1978 to 1982).

Australian Bureau of Statistics, Unpublished Statistics (on microfiche): "Table BTHR009 - Births - Country of Birth of Mother and Father and Nuptiality", (calendar years 1983 to 1986).

In calculating this table, Cyprus figures (deducted from the "Mother born in Asia" category) were taken from the Australian Bureau of Statistics publication *Births, Australia* for the years 1978 to 1982.

55. McLennan, W. *Population Estimates: Concepts, Sources and Methods*, Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS catalogue no. 3228.0), Canberra, 1995, p. 4.

56. Charles Price has estimated the number of ethnic-Asians in Australia at the time of the 1991 census: "Preliminary estimates for 1991 suggest that there are some 1,055,000 persons of unmixed Asian descent - first, second and later generations taken together - and about 233,000 persons of part Asian origin, a total of 1,288,000 persons of whole or part Asian ancestry".

As can be seen from the workings below, the 1991 census covered 1,118,326 persons of Asian background (822 226 1st generation plus 296,100 2nd generation). Therefore this would mean that the net "other ethnic-Asian population" (allowing for the Asian-born ethnic-Europeans and their offspring and the ethnic-Asians born overseas in places other than Asia) is approximately 169,674.

1991 Census

Asian immigrants (i.e. 1st generation):

West Asia	134 373
South-East Asia	377 844
North-East Asia	199 515
Southern Asia	110 494
Total	822 226

1991 Census

Australian-born of Asian parentage
(i.e. 2nd generation) by father:

West Asia	89 377
South-East Asia	68 497
North-East Asia	35 440
Southern Asia	37 183
Total	230 497

Allowance for Australian-born of Asian parentage
(i.e. 2nd generation) by mother, based upon the
1996 census, where the father sub-total is 78% of
the overall 2nd generation total 65 603

= 1991 2nd generation total of 296 100

Note: The West Asia sub-total of the "1991 Census Australian-born of Asian parentage (i.e. 2nd generation) by father" is taken from the "Middle East" total (113,773); subtracting the Egypt sub-total (21,098), and - based upon the Egyptian 2nd generation being approximately 2/3rds of the 1st generation (21,098 2nd generation from 33,214 1st generation) - also subtracting an estimated 3,298 2nd generation "Other North Africa" (based upon 4,946 "Other North Africa" 1st generation).

Birrell, Bob; and Khoo, Siew Ean. *The Second Generation in Australia: Educational and Occupational Characteristics* (Statistical Report No. 14), AGPS, Canberra, 1995, p. 3.

Bureau of Immigration Research, Statistics Section. *Birthplace and Related Data from the 1991 Census: Final Counts for Australia*, BIR, (Canberra?), 1993, pp. 5-6.

Price, Charles A. "Australia As Intermediary With Asia: A Demographic View", *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, Volume 14, Number 1, 1993, p. 30.

57. Note: The figure given for the Australian population (at 30 June 1996) is a preliminary estimate. Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Migration: Australia: 1995-96*, ABS (catalogue no. 3412.0), Canberra, 1997, p. 68 (Table 38 "Estimated Resident Population By Country Of Birth, Australia: 30 June 1990 to 1996p").

58. McLennan, W. (Australian Statistician) *1996 Census of Population and Housing: Selected Social and Housing Characteristics: Australia*, Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS catalogue no. 2015.0), Canberra, 1995, p. 39 (Table B06 "Birthplace (Regions)").

59. Australian Bureau of Statistics. "Number of Persons Born in Australia by Birthplace of Mother by Birthplace of Father, Australia, August 1996" (Statistics from the 1996 Census of Population and Housing; customised census table produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics), ABS, Melbourne, 1997.

60. Australian Bureau of Statistics. "Number of Persons Born in Australia by Birthplace of Mother by Birthplace of Father, Australia, August 1996" (Statistics from the 1996 Census of Population and Housing; customised census table produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics), ABS, Melbourne, 1997.

61. Australian Bureau of Statistics. "Number of Persons Born in Australia by Birthplace of Mother by Birthplace of Father, Australia, August 1996" (Statistics from the 1996 Census of Population and Housing; customised census table produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics), ABS, Melbourne, 1997.

62. Castles, Ian (ed.) *Year Book Australia 1994*, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra, c1993, pp. 768-

770.

International Merchandise Trade: Australia, June Quarter 1995, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra, c1995, pp. 10-11.

Vamplew, Wray (ed.) *Australians, Historical Statistics*, Fairfax, Syme & Weldon, 1987, Broadway, NSW, pp. 196, 204.

63. Castles, Ian (ed.) *Year Book Australia 1994*, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra, c1993, pp. 768-770.

International Merchandise Trade: Australia, June Quarter 1995, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra, c1995, pp. 10-11.

Vamplew, Wray (ed.) *Australians, Historical Statistics*, Fairfax, Syme & Weldon, 1987, Broadway, NSW, pp. 193, 201.

64. Blainey. *All For Australia*, pp. 106-112.

65. Grover, John. "Migration: 'Secret Figures Prove Blainey Right'", *Australia First*, Issue 11, 1985, p. 10.

66. Costigan, Peter. "Stewart West Stands Firm In Asian Storm", *The Herald*, 21 May 1984, p. 4.

67. Department of the Parliamentary Library. *Parliamentary Handbook of the Commonwealth of Australia* (Twenty-Sixth edition, 1993), AGPS, Canberra, 1993, pp. 398, 401-402, 420-446.

68. Department of the Parliamentary Library. *Parliamentary Handbook of the Commonwealth of Australia* (Twenty-Sixth edition, 1993), p. 421.

(Volume Three)
Opinion Polls,
the Traitor Class,
and the Yellow Peril

Immigration Opinion Polls

During the past 15 years there have been quite a few opinion polls published regarding population policies - particularly about immigration, with some specifically referring to Asian immigration.

Such polls are to be welcomed, as they can provide an indication of the level of public feeling over immigration matters.

However, there are three matters to be considered in regards to such polls: 1) their overall precision and validity; 2) the information given as background to the questions, and the wording of the actual questions themselves; and 3) whether the interviewees' answers reflect their actual beliefs (regarding their wariness of interviewers). These three matters are to be considered in regarding the accuracy of such polls.

1. Overall precision and validity.

The general accuracy of opinion polls has been questioned many times. The best achievable opinion poll would be of 100% of the population; however, this being impractical, most opinion polls try to reflect the nation's feelings by interviewing usually between 1000 to 2000 people. Some regard this to be too small a sample to be truly accurate.

However, in the opinion poll industry, such a figure is regarded as acceptable and accurate, particularly if the range of interviewees is spread through all major cities, as well as between city and country; different age levels; educational qualifications; political leanings; gender; with some weightings made to reflect population distribution.

It is believed by some experts that face-to-face interviews are more accurate than telephone interviews. However, other experts maintain that not only can face-to-face interviewing take longer to conduct and to compile results, but can be less accurate due to geographic clustering of interviewees, a lack of centralised

quality control, and a weighting towards the "stay at home" population. Phone-in polls, such as may be conducted by current affairs or news shows, are regarded as having little or no proper scientific accuracy.(1)

2. The questions.

The background to questions are extremely important. For instance, a question on Asian immigration that understates the level of such immigration could elicit a lower anti-immigration response. An example of this was the Morgan Gallup Poll regarding 1987/88 immigration, which understated Asian immigration by some 14.6% to 37.6%; i.e. stating it was 49 000, not 57 363 (settler immigration) or 78 461 (permanent and long-term immigration). Note: the figure of 48 553 (settler immigration) can be arrived at, if immigration from West Asia is subtracted from the total intake figure for Asia (see Volume Two regarding "tricks" used in official immigration statistics). There may well have been a distinct difference in the results of that opinion poll, if the interviewees were told that Asian immigration during the previous year amounted to 78 000 (not 49 000).

There can also be a built-in bias to questions. For example, the AGB McNair poll on multiculturalism describes the policy thus: "This involves encouraging migrants to become Australians without having to give up their own culture"; such a policy (as described by the pollster) doesn't seem too objectionable, especially when what has been left out of the question is the most pertinent points of the multicultural doctrine: the official encouragement of the second generation - and later generations - to retain their forebears' culture (and thus not to become all-over Australians), the massive official funding of ethnic groups, the billions of dollars that the policy costs our country, ethnic influences over our immigration programme, and the ongoing destruction of the Australian identity and culture. If these factors were included in the question, then there is no doubt that the results would be very different.

Also, definitions of terms may not be clear. For instance, the Irving Saulwick poll published by The Age on 27 August 1984 asked whether "Australia should accept as migrants... suitable migrants from any country". What does "suitable" mean? Among other possibilities, many people may regard it as meaning "White people" from "any country". The term is unclear. Also, in the same poll, the question was asked as to whether "Australia should accept as migrants.... Europeans only", which to many interviewees could mean "people from Europe, only", i.e. excluding Whites from other countries, such as New Zealand, South Africa, the U.S.A., etc.; and some may also have thought it to exclude people from Britain - as many people consider the U.K., or the British Isles, to be an entity separate from "Europe" (many use the term "Europe" to refer to continental Europe). The poll result may well have been quite different if the question was worded as "British-European-White people only" or especially as "predominantly British-European-White people only".

3. Wariness by interviewees.

In the current climate of "political correctness" - brought about by the government, major political parties, media, and academia - ordinary Australians are often becoming too wary, or afraid, to speak their minds on many issues, particularly regarding immigration, multiculturalism, and Asianisation. This wariness also extends to the answering of questions by opinion pollsters. Remember, these pollsters know where the interviewee lives and/or know their phone number, are complete strangers, cannot be trusted by the interviewees to be neutral or impartial regarding the questions at hand (interviewers are human, after all, and can be expected to have their own views and biases), and cannot be trusted to preserve the confidentiality of the interviewee (even if the pollster regards himself/herself as impartial, that perception cannot be expected to be shared by all interviewees).

Research from the U.S.A. shows that "Americans are notoriously unreliable when answering questions related to race". For instance, in the 1989 campaign to elect a new Governor for the state of Virginia, it was found that

"When white voters were questioned by white pollsters... they favoured Republican Marshall Coleman (a white candidate) by 16 points. But when whites were telephoned by interviewers

with recognisably black intonation, they leaned to Douglas Wilder (a black candidate) by 10 points".(2)

This same point was made regarding opinion polling in the election for the Mayor of Los Angeles in 1982:

"Some whites were reluctant to admit to pollsters that they planned to vote against a black".(3)

The point is that these days, when what Mark Uhlmann has called "social intimidation"(4) is so prevalent regarding matters of race and immigration, opinion polls cannot be expected to be completely accurate in their polling of the views of ordinary Australians. Responses on such matters as race and immigration can be expected to be even far more inaccurate if opinion poll companies use pollsters that are perceived to be "ethnic", particularly Asian "ethnics".

Such considerations reinforce the belief that anti-immigration results in opinion polls are likely to be much lower than such results should be in reality.

RELEVANT OPINION POLLS

13 June 1979, The Age, p. 4.
Poll by Irving Saulwick and Associates.
2000 people interviewed.

"Recently a Greek couple was deported from Australia as illegal immigrants. It was said at the time that there may be many thousands of illegal immigrants in Australia. Do you think the government should: seek to find such people and deport them; deport such people if and when they are found; consider each case on its merits; or allow all such people who are currently in Australia to stay, provided they make themselves known to the authorities within a specified time?"

Response	%:
Seek out illegal immigrants and deport them	17
Deport illegal immigrants if and when they are found	13
Consider each case on its merits	53
Allow all illegal immigrants to stay, provided they make themselves known to the authorities	16
Don't know	1

"In the last year or two Australia has allowed about 10,000 refugees from Vietnam and other Indo-Chinese countries to settle in Australia each year. In future should we: accept more each year; accept about the same number each year; accept fewer each year; or accept no more?"

Response	%:
Accept more each year	7
Accept about the same each year	23
Accept fewer each year	30
Accept no more	37
Don't know	3

13 September 1981, National Times, p. 28.
Poll by ANOP.
1004 people interviewed; Melbourne, Sydney, and Brisbane.

The ideal Australian population mix: "Thinking of the sorts of people that will make up the Australian population in the future, in an ideal situation what would you prefer?" (A card was shown listing the three below).

Response:	%:
Basically white English speaking backgrounds	55
Mainly European backgrounds	13
A mixture of races and cultures	30
Unsure	2

(Author's note: Total response favouring a population of those of British/European backgrounds was 68%).

"Thinking about immigration as a whole, do you believe the Federal Government is letting too many people into Australia, or too few, or about the right number?"

Response:	%:
Too many	45
Too few	11
About the right number	37
Unsure	7

"Referring now just to Asian immigration, do you believe the Federal Government is letting too many Asian people into Australia, or too few, or about the right number?"

Response:	%:
Too many	48
Too few	8
About the right number	36
Unsure	8

*19 May 1984, The Herald, p. 1.
Poll by Australian Public Opinion Poll (The Gallup Method).
2053 people interviewed, nationwide, May 1984.*

"In 1984 about 90,000 migrants in total will be allowed to come and live in Australia, mostly relatives of previous migrants. Do you think this is: Too many migrants? Or too few migrants? Or about the right number?"

Response:	%:
Too many	64
Too few	4
About right	27
Don't know	5

"An increasing proportion of migrants are coming from Asia compared with the United Kingdom and Europe. Do you approve or disapprove of this?"

Response:	%:
Approve	30
Disapprove	62
Don't know	8

17 July 1984, The Bulletin, pp. 29-30.
Poll by Morgan Gallup Poll (Finding No. 1203).
About 2000 people interviewed, nationwide, June 1984.

"People surveyed were told that in the next 12 months from July about 72,000 people will come to Australia to live permanently. People were then asked:
In your opinion, are 72,000 people too few, too many or about right?"

Response:	%:
Too many	62
About right	27
Too few	4
No opinion	7

Those who said "Too many" were asked "About how many do you favour in the next 12 months?"

Response:	%:
None	20
1 - 9 999	2
10 000 - 19 999	4
20 000 - 29 999	3
30 000 - 39 999	11
40 000 - 49 999	2
50 000 - 59 999	4
60 000 - 69 999	*
70 000 - 79 999	*
80 000 - 89 999	-
90 000 - 92 999	-
Can't say	16
Total favour fewer	62

* = Fewer than 1 percent

"People were then told that of the 72,000 people who will come here in the next 12 months about 24,000 will be Asians who will be given permanent resident status in Australia. People were then asked: In your opinion, are 24,000 Asians too few, too many or about right?"

Response:	%:
Too many	59
About right	30
Too few	4
No opinion	7

Those who said "Too many" were asked "About how many do you favour in the next 12 months?"

Response:	%:
No Asians	23
1 - 9 999	10
10 000 - 19 999	14

20 000 - 23 000	1
Can't say	11
Total favour fewer	59

27 August 1984, The Age
Poll by Irving Saulwick and Associates.
2000 people interviewed, nationwide, July 1984.

"Australia should accept as migrants:"

Response:	%:
Suitable migrants from any country	37
Those who have the skills we need	36
People who have relatives here	24
Refugees	18
People with money to invest here	15
Europeans only	6
Australia should not accept any migrants at the present time	34
Don't know/Not stated	2

27 August 1984, The Herald, pp. 1, 3.
Poll by Australian Public Opinion Poll (The Gallup Method).
2182 people interviewed, nationwide, August 1984.

"A decreasing proportion of migrants are coming from the United Kingdom and Europe compared with Asia. Do you approve or disapprove of this?"

Response:	%:
Approve	28
Disapprove	60
Don't know	12

3 February 1988, The Australian, p. 2.
Poll by Newspoll
1150 people, interviewed by telephone, nationwide, 29-31 January 1988.

"Do you personally agree or disagree with these statements about Australia's immigration policy?":

"Australia's immigration policy should favour Asian immigration because of our Pacific region location"

Response:	%:
Agree	17
Disagree	75
Uncommitted	8

"Australia should hold a national referendum on immigration policy"

Response:	%:
Agree	70
Disagree	22
Uncommitted	8

9 August 1988, The Australian, p. 1.

Poll by Newspoll.

1150 people, interviewed by telephone, nationwide, 5-7 August 1988.

"Do you agree or disagree with the recent statement by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Howard, that Asian immigration to Australia should be slowed down? If agree, is that strongly agree or only partly agree? If disagree, is that strongly disagree or partly disagree?"

Response:	%:
Strongly agree	51
Partly agree	26
Total agree	77
Partly disagree	10
Strongly disagree	8
Total disagree	18
Neither/Don't know	5

27 September 1988, The Bulletin, p. 17.

Morgan Gallup Poll (Finding No. 1755).

1277 people interviewed, Australia-wide, mid-August 1988.

"People surveyed were told that last year about 143,000 people came to Australia to live permanently. They were then asked: In your opinion, were 143,000 people too few, too many, or about right?"

Response:	%:
Too many	46
About right	42
Too few	7
No opinion	5

Those who said "Too many" were asked "About how many do you favour each year?"

Response:	%:
None	8
1 - 39 999	5
40 000 - 59 999	7
60 000 - 79 999	9
80 000 - 142 999	7
Can't say	10
Total favour fewer	46

"The same people were then told that of the 143,000 people who came here last year, about 49,000 were Asians, who were then given permanent residential status in Australia. People were then asked: In your opinion were 49,000 Asians too few, too many or about right?"

Response:	%:
Too many	57
About right	34
Too few	3
No opinion	6

Those who said "Too many" were asked "About how many do you favour each year?"

None	14
1 - 9 999	6
10 000 - 19 999	9
20 000 - 29 999	14
30 000 - 48 999	4
Can't say	10
Total favour fewer	57

12 September 1989, The Bulletin, p. 21.
Poll by Morgan Gallup Poll
1071 people interviewed, nationwide, August 1989.

"145 000 immigrants last year were:"

Response:	%:
Too many	47
About right	41
Too few	8
No opinion	4

"55 00 Asian immigrants last year was:"

Response:	%:
Too many	58
About right	33
Too few	3
No opinion	6

13 May 1990, The Sun, p. 2.
Poll by Roy Morgan Research Centre.
818 people interviewed, 10 May 1990.

"Present immigration program is seriously aggravating Australia's economic problems:"

Response	%:
Strongly disagree	39
Mostly agree	27
Total agree	66
Mildly disagree	17
Strongly disagree	11
Total disagree	28
Can't say	6

"Attitude to reducing immigration in Australia's present difficult economic situation:"

Response	%:
Yes, should	70
No, should not	28
Can't say	2

"The multi- function polis is:"

Response	%:
Good idea	27
Bad idea	52
Can't say	21

"Overseas investors ownership of land in Australia?:"

Response	%:
Should be allowed	27
Should not	67
Can't say	6

"Concerned about the level of Japanese ownership:"

Response	%:
Concerned	77
Not concerned	21
Can't say	2

4 November 1991, The Age, p. 3.

Poll by Irving Saulwick and Associates. 1000 people interviewed by telephone, nationwide, 23-24 October 1991.

"Over the past four years Australia's intake of immigrants has averaged numbers 132,000 a year. The target for this financial year is 111,000. Do you think that Australia should take: more than 111,000 immigrants this year, about 111,000 immigrants, fewer than 111,000 immigrants, or take no immigrants this year?"

Response	%:
More than 111,000	9
About 111,000	16
Fewer than 111,000	46
No immigrants	27
Don't know	2

Of those who preferred to take fewer than 111,000 the following question was also asked: "You say that you would prefer fewer than 111,000 immigrants this year. In taking this position, which of the following considerations concerns you most: unemployment at the present time, or population pressure on resources and the environment, or higher levels of immigration may lead to social tension?"

Response	%:
Unemployment	76
Pressure on resources	13
Social tension	10
Don't know	1

"If you were choosing immigrants, who would you favour most: immigrants with money to invest, immigrants with skills we need, immigrants with family in Australia, or immigrants who are refugees?"

Response	%:
With money to invest	15
With skills we need	56
With family here	14
Refugees	10
Don't know	5

"Which of these statements comes closest to your view: Australia is a country with rich resources and will benefit from immigration and a larger population; or immigration will lead to a growth in population that will put too much strain on Australia's land and resources?"

Response	%:
We benefit	39
It strains resources	56
Don't know	5

19 June 1996, The Age, p. 2.

Poll by AGB McNair.

2063 people interviewed by telephone, nationwide, 14-16 June 1996.

"Do you feel that the current level of immigration to Australia is too high, too low or about right?"

Response:	%:
Too high	65
Too low	3
About right	30
Don't know	3

"Do you feel that the current balance of migrants from different countries and regions to Australia is about right or do you feel that we receive too many migrants from a particular region or country?"

Response:	%:
About right	35
Too many from regions	51
Don't know	14

"If too many. Which region(s) do you feel that we receive too many migrants from?"

Response:	%:
Asia	88
Middle East	9
All	5
Other	3
Europe	3
UK, Ireland	2

New Zealand	1
Pacific	1

"Successive Australian governments have adopted a policy of multiculturalism. This involves encouraging migrants to become Australians without having to give up their own culture. Do you agree or disagree with this policy?"

Response:	%:
Strong agree	21
Agree	40
Disagree	21
Strongly disagree	13
Neither agree nor disagree	5

Note: The built-in bias of the above question is clearly evident - see the introductory notes in the preface to this section.

4 October 1996, The Australian, p. 4.

Poll by Newspoll.

1200 people, interviewed by telephone, nationwide, 27-29 September 1996.

"Thinking now about immigration. Do you personally think that the total number of migrants coming into Australia each year is too high, too low or about right? If too high - is that a lot too high or a little too high? If too low - is that a lot too low or a little too low?"

Response	%:
A lot too high	52
A little too high	19
Total too high	71
A little too low	1
A lot too low	1
Total too low	2
About right	20
Uncommitted	7

The "New Class"

The people who comprise the bulk of the current Establishment in Australia are from that section of the population termed the "New Class" (generally referred to as "cosmopolitans"; and referred to by many nationalists as the "Traitor Class"). This New Class, simply put, is in essence the "Lost Generation" of the 1960s and 1970s, whereby much of that generation came under political and social influences that imbued them with a general ideology (or "world-view") of liberal-internationalism.

As can be generally observed, each rising generation slowly replaces the previous generation as the nation's "Establishment"; that is, people of the upcoming generation eventually come into positions of influence and power within political parties, the media, the education system, business, unions, the legal system, and the public service; in particular, we are discussing the highly educated elite of the upcoming generation (generally, they are university-educated), as it is the highly educated of the new generation that eventually rise into, and then come to dominate, the "Establishment" of the country. This is the natural progression of generations. However, it is unfortunate that certain historical, political, and social circumstances combined so as to produce a new elite that generally holds a liberal-internationalist viewpoint. Of course, in speaking of trends regarding changing generations, we must recognise that we

are looking at general trends, and that there will always be large numbers of the specified social group that are not part of the overall trend of the new generation.

Padraic McGuinness (former editor of the Australian Financial Review) has discussed the concept of the New Class in *The Age*:

"It is accurate and useful to describe the social and political structure of Australia as being dominated by a "new class" which is roughly identified with the educated white-collar middle class and professionals who constitute the political elite of our society.

"As Marx once put it, every rising class identifies its own interests and morality as universal.

"Just as the bourgeois and subsequently the proletariat in the marxist analysis successively identified themselves as the last word in freedom and social morality, so does the new class which has come to power over the past 50 years, and which now attempts to express its interests as universal and morally good.

"...Essentially it points to the fact that any regime tends to come under the control of the educated political elites who govern in their own interest rather than in that of the working class or the people."(5)

Australia's "New Class" is based upon the tertiary-educated white-collar middle class and professionals. In basic terms, the ideology of this New Class is liberal- internationalism; and therefore they are generally supporters of mass immigration, multiculturalism, and Asianisation (although not referring to the latter as such, being more likely to use terms as "Asian destiny" or "integration with Asia").

It is clear that such a New Class exists, and carries with it a liberal- internationalist ideology that is very different to the ideology of the Australian Establishment of the 1900s to 1950s, which was characterised as generally patriotic, socially conservative, pro-White Australia, and pro-British.

The New Class grew out of the student generation of the 1960s and 1970s (university- based in particular) that opposed: 1) the White Australia Policy (we should recognise the influence of contact with Asian/Third World university students via the Colombo Plan, as well as with the university-based immigration reform groups), 2) the Vietnam War, and 3) conscription (the latter two, in particular, raised much debate, and resulted in student "crusades").

The New Class enabled its own further growth when it came to dominate the universities via 1) older students graduating into academic teaching positions, 2) the university recruitment of "New Class" academics from America, and 3) the oppressive "politically correct" atmosphere generated within the universities by New Class ideological-political-social-academic "thuggery" (the effective harassment and intimidation of those in the universities - academics in particular - who differed from, or opposed, the general liberal-internationalist viewpoint). This domination of the universities (as well as the primary and secondary education systems, which came to be dominated by the university-graduated New Class teachers of the 1960s and 1970s) led to the subtle indoctrination of the upcoming student generations by New Class teachers constantly espousing their liberal-internationalist views.

It is important to note that the longer students stay within the education system, the more likely they are to be subtly "brainwashed" by the continual and insidious effect of having their views moulded by liberal-internationalist teachers (whose teachings are affected and coloured by their beliefs and ideology). As these new students then themselves become teachers/academics, the New Class becomes a self-

perpetuating circle. However, the New Class' ideological hold upon academia, media, and politics cannot be regarded as absolute, and may yet face another generation's "backlash".

Dr Katharine Betts (of Swinburne University) has noted the links between immigration, multiculturalism, and the New Class:

"Since the late 1970s they have been two main ways in which immigration has been defined by its supporters in Australia. In one definition it is an economic policy that promotes national wealth, while in the other it is an act of international altruism. Variants of the 'economic' definition have a long history; the second 'altruistic' and 'cosmopolitan' way of seeing the program is more recent. Immigration itself is not popular with the public at large (see polls cited in Betts 1988: 70) and the kinds of immigrants likely to be brought in by an 'altruistic' program -- refugees and family reunion immigrants -- are the least desired elements of an unpopular program (Age, 4 November 1991). Despite this, the 'altruistic' definition has been influential, if not dominant, with many ethnic organisations arguing for family reunion, supporters of refugees, some journalists and lawyers, many academics and a number of members of the policy-making elite. These groups are characterised by a mixture of altruism, special pleading and vested interests; the label 'altruistic cosmopolitan' simply describes the language they employ. It may or may not describe their private motives.

"People who use the economic definition claim that a properly constituted immigration program will boost Australia's national wealth. The label 'economic' does not indicate whether these people really believe their claims, or whether these claims have any merit. It just describes the language that they use when they talk of the intake in terms of skills, age distribution and entrepreneurship. This way of looking at immigration tends to find favour with employer groups and with economic rationalists arguing for closer links with Asia. In contrast, the altruistic cosmopolitans talk of family reunion, cultural pluralism, internationalism and humanitarianism... Groups that have supported immigration since the early 1950s because of their stake in a growing domestic market in land, housing and other goods (see Birrell and Birrell, 1987) have no inherent preference for the type of immigrant. But this traditional 'growth of the domestic market' lobby now tends to endorse the 'economic' definition. Though immigration is unpopular, an intake designed to bring in skilled people and entrepreneurs is not as unacceptable as one based on family reunion and refugees, and the type of immigrant recruited by an 'economic' program is likely to be less visible. Given this lobby's commitment to growth, a policy of recruiting the largest numbers of the least conspicuous immigrants is in its interests.

"Much of the public discourse about immigration in Australia is between the 'altruistic cosmopolitans' and those who use the language of economics. Neither group is critical of the fact of immigration, nor of the size of the intake, provided it is substantial; so both sets of interests support continued high immigration. And sometimes their specific arguments overlap. People who base their case on economics may claim that recruiting skilled people will also foster internationalism, and 'altruists' may argue that bringing in more brothers and sisters boosts economic growth. But they do in fact quarrel over the composition of the intake and it is this that creates the impression of controversy.

"...Altruistic cosmopolitans and people arguing that skilled immigrants promote economic growth often disagree strongly on the composition of the intake, with the latter taking particular exception to low-skilled entrants coming in under extended family reunion categories. But, for all this disagreement, both groups support a large program.

"...As with most areas of public policy, nearly all participants in debate about immigration who have any influence are tertiary-educated members of the new professional middle class. These are people Alvin Gouldner describes as the 'new class', a group whose claims to income and wealth are based on a lengthy education and professional expertise authenticated by credentials (1979: 19-27).

"...The explanation for the intelligentsia's attitudes to immigration does not lie with any sophisticated cost-benefit analysis by members of the new class of the effects of population growth. Many tend to be impatient of the 'economic' definition; its quibbles about age and skill seem narrow and self-interested. The perspective offered by altruists and cosmopolitans, with its themes of internationalism, cosmopolitanism, exotic foods and customs, and its imagery based on compassion for the world's poor, is more attractive, providing an intriguing blend of urbane sophistication and low-cost benevolence. The development of this way of looking at immigration has coincided with rapid growth in the numbers of new-class professionals. As the post-war generation of new recruits to the ranks of graduates and professionals worked hard to establish a special identity for themselves, they drew on the symbolism provided by the altruistic, cosmopolitan definition. They have used it to shape an identity based on a clear distinction between people of insight, discernment and cosmopolitan understanding, and the narrow parochialism of their parents' generation.

"As Gouldner describes it, the economic base of the new class rests on the cultural capital built up during their university education. But, like other social classes, they use symbols to differentiate their own particular social position. In Australia, being ideologically sound on immigration has become one such status symbol (see Betts 1988: 77-84, 97-119, 141-7, 160-8). Opposition to racism is a central new-class value and this symbolism draws much of its strength from the association of immigration with questions of race. The association between supporting immigration and opposing racism is often illogical, but it is the nobler side of the new-class badge of belonging. The reverse, scored with contempt for native Australian traditions, is less impressive. People wear the badge when they demonstrate that they 'know' that criticism of immigration is racist, and that multiculturalism is the best feature of an otherwise rather third-rate country. In displaying these values they send a clear signal that they are among those who have arrived. In contrast, people who openly doubt the worth of these convictions risk demonstrating that, whether they have formal educational qualifications or not, they are in fact really lower-middle-class parochials and not part of the chosen circle after all.

"The development of this symbolism did not happen by chance. There are historical reasons why attitudes to immigration, rather than to some other topic, became key markers of new-class status in Australia. The main elements here are the White Australia Policy, ardently contested by the student generation of the 1950s, and the Viet Nam War, resisted with even greater passion in the 1960s. Themes that link race, immigration and the fear of invasion have a long history in Australia. The Viet Nam War served to consolidate these links.

"... 'Multiculturalism' was originally a new-class creation; most of the ethnic organisations that affect our politics today did not exist when concerned welfare professionals discovered 'problem immigrants' in the late 1960s and offered cultural pluralism as a solution for their difficulties (Martin 1978: 208-9, 233-6, 247, 254-5; Kovacs & Cropley 1975: 43-4, 54-7, 124-8). Once launched, multiculturalism struck an immediate chord with other professional people. Here, in one policy, was restitution for the wrongs that immigrants had suffered, a delightful new variety of cosmopolitan lifestyles to be sampled, and a standing reminder to the old Australian working class (and the Anglophile middle class) of the poverty of their own cultural

practices. Opposition to the White Australia policy and protest against the Viet Nam War had been frustrating and bitter; multiculturalism was fun. And contempt for the past and enthusiasm for trendy new restaurants and exotic foreign films could establish one's superiority and alienate outsiders almost as effectively as radical politics. As one writer put it, premulticultural Australia was a 'wasteland. A nation of barbarians. A land without culture and interesting food... Above all a country of suffocating boredom' (Dale, in Good Weekend, 3 November 1990: 22). Or, in Phillip Adams' words, it was 'dull, self-satisfied and joylessly conformist... Not merely mindless, but lobotomised' (Age, 12 July 1980).

"...The force of the altruistic cosmopolitan definition in new-class imagery is illustrated by journalist Peter Hasting's claim that the Second World War was 'the best thing to happen to this country'. Pre-war Australia had been a byword for cultural wilderness and philistinism. This malaise lingered after the war; and Hastings and many of his contemporaries 'got the hell out of Australia and headed "abroad"'. But the aftermath of the war brought immigration and, with it, cultural enrichment. Now he could tolerate his country (Hastings 1988). Others write that 'one of the greatest creative forces in Australia continues to be our immigration program, pursued in a multicultural mode...' (Horne 1987) and rejoice that Australian history is being rewritten, 'unravelling the old myths and knitting together new ones that will help to create the mind-set of acceptable Asian citizens' (Johnson 1988).

"...it is difficult to question immigration in this country because of the new-class ideology that links such questions with racism and holds that racism, however defined, cannot be discussed. It can only be condemned. This is an ideology supported by advocates for the 'altruistic' and 'economic' definitions, and by most journalists working for the quality press. It means that discourse critical of immigration is quickly interpreted as 'racist' and not to be entertained, especially if concern about cultural cohesion is its point of departure."(6)

As Padraic McGuinness has noted, the New Class views its own beliefs as morally good; and therefore it sees its liberal-internationalist views, and subsequent actions, in a self-righteous light. This explains "the undemocratic nature of Asianisation"; that is, why Multiculturalists and Asianisers are quite prepared to trample on democracy with hob-nailed boots (happily stomping upon other people's rights and freedoms in the process).

New Class liberal-internationalists self-righteously believe that only their general ideology and world-view is correct, and cannot conceive that any opposing viewpoint could be correct; and do not want to allow opposing viewpoints to express themselves, or - especially - to let them grow and gain wider support (as would normally happen in a democracy). Thus, anyone opposing immigration, multiculturalism, or Asianisation may become subject to social-political-legal- economic "thuggery" from the Establishment-New Class, whether it be social intimidation (see the antics of the media), political/legal oppression (see the various so-called racial vilification laws), or economic harassment (withdrawal of government contracts, economic boycotts, or deliberately damaging media attacks upon individuals, leading to the loss of jobs or business).

Mark Uhlmann, editor of The Record magazine, has written of such harassment as being:

"the social intimidation which already greets anyone, particularly in public office, who dares to criticise matters connected to immigration and multiculturalism".(7)

The Herald has reported the views of Tony Fitzgerald, former head of the Fitzgerald Inquiry into corruption in Queensland, who has warned against the pressure, and social intimidation, which stops many Australians from speaking out:

"He warned society would pay a heavy price if it accepted philosophies dictated by a "current elite", or if it succumbed to pressure not to speak out on issues which could bring condemnation.

"...If the public was not properly informed it would not take a genuinely effective part in the democratic process.

""But the complementary techniques of secrecy, disinformation and news management are readily available to those in power to restrict and obfuscate the information which is available to the community as the basis for its conclusions."

"He warned there was a great penalty to be paid when all but the most courageous - or foolish - were forced to adopt the "superficially popular view or that promoted by the current elite in order to avoid personal condemnation".

"The result of such resignation, Mr Fitzgerald said, would be that "discussion is stifled; the exchange of ideas is inhibited; perspectives are narrowed. Many of those who could contribute are deterred from participating. And ordinary persons become confused and lose respect for authority and the political process.""(8)

That the New Class holds quite different views to the general population has been demonstrated by Professor Ian McAllister (of the Australian Defence Forces Academy, University of New South Wales). McAllister has compared the views of general voters (from the 1990 Australian Election Study) with the views of the political Establishment (from a survey of all major-party candidates in the 1990 federal election):

"At a popular level, immigration raises strong, sometimes extreme, political feelings. The social consequences of immigration are readily observed by the residents of any major Australian city, with large numbers of newly arrived immigrants congregating in inner-city areas... The economic consequences of immigration are the subject of considerable scholarly debate, but again the popular view is clear-cut: immigration during periods of low economic growth and high unemployment is bad.

"...Perhaps the best indication of the popular salience of the issue is the proportion of opinion survey respondents who are unable to express a view when asked a question about it by an interviewer. In surveys, immigration produces the lowest proportion of non-committal answers of any contemporary political issue, with the possible exception of capital punishment, about which many citizens also possess strong views.

"...The anomaly is that at the level of party politics, immigration policy is debated only infrequently and it has never been a major post-war election issue. In practice, party political elites have almost completely ignored it. Why? One explanation for this concerns the nature of party competition. Although the immigration issue opens up great electoral opportunities for political parties, not least the ability to mobilise large numbers of voters on a single policy, it contains major dangers. To ensure their own survival, parties must avoid issues that could jeopardise internal party unity or divide the social bases of support upon which they depend for electoral success. Political parties deal with this problem by restricting conflict along an economic dimension, usually arranged from left to right, which presents voters with two clear political choices - collectivism versus the free market. Immigration, along with other non-economic issues like abortion, capital punishment and illicit drugs, represents an issue which

cross-cuts established patterns of party competition and has the potential to threaten party unity.

"...Liberal democracies base their legitimacy on the notion of accountability to their citizens. The operation of accountability takes place through political parties, who are either rewarded or punished by voters at elections for their actions while in government. But if party political elites avoid public debate on an aspect of policy and maintain a consensus on it, there can be no accountability to voters. This is effectively what has occurred with immigration in the post-war years.

"...When elite opinion and voter opinion are compared, some of the reasons for bipartisanship on immigration are evident: a majority of voters want to reduce the level of immigration, and almost one-third are strongly in support of that view. Faced with such a decisive popular view, the only way to maintain immigration is through bipartisanship, and by an informal agreement between the parties that it should not be placed on the political agenda. In the absence of party political debate, successive governments have been able to maintain what is effectively an unpopular policy.

"...Immigration policy is one of a small number of contemporary political issues about which many voters express strong opinions. But despite these intensely held popular opinions, the issue does not form part of the parties' political agendas and it has never been a post-war election issue. Voters' opinions on immigration also diverge markedly from those of their elected representatives, who are more likely to favour either the status quo or increased immigration. Immigration is one of a small group of issues that share five characteristics:

- # they are often intensely held;*
- # they are largely non-economic in nature;*
- # they produce major divisions between mass and elite;*
- # they result in few partisan divisions at the popular level;*
- # they do not constitute part of the public debate between political elites.*

"Other issues that fall into this category include capital punishment, abortion, the decriminalisation of marijuana, and Aboriginal land rights."(9)

McAllister has shown the divergence of views held by the "elite" and the "mass" (the people) by referring to the following survey re. attitudes to immigration:

TABLE 1

**ATTITUDES TO IMMIGRATION AMONG CANDIDATES AND VOTERS
AT THE 1990 FEDERAL ELECTION: [\(10\)](#)**

	Elite (all major parties)	Mass (all voters)
Gone much too far	8	29
Gone too far	28	29
About right	50	34
Not gone far enough	11	7
Not gone nearly far enough	3	2
	Elite (Labor)	Mass (Labor voters)
Gone much too far	1	28
Gone too far	17	28
About right	68	34
Not gone far enough	9	7
Not gone nearly far enough	6	2
	Elite (Liberal- -National)	Mass (Liberal- National voters)
Gone much too far	8	31
Gone too far	34	30
About right	41	32
Not gone far enough	6	6
Not gone nearly far enough	4	1
	Elite (Democrat)	Mass (Democrat voters)
Gone much too far	14	27
Gone too far	31	26
About right	43	38
Not gone far enough	8	8
Not gone nearly far enough	4	1

A later poll (published in the Herald Sun, 16 December 1996, page 8) confirmed these differences:

TABLE 2

**IMMIGRATION;
NUMBER OF MIGRANTS ALLOWED IN TO AUSTRALIA HAS: [\(11\)](#)**

	Elite (all parties)	Mass (all voters)
Gone much too far	7	33
Gone too far	25	29
About right	54	30
Not gone far enough	11	6
No response	3	2

As stated earlier, the differences between the views of "our leaders" and that of most Australians extends to many other social questions, as evidenced by this poll (made at the same time as the above poll on immigration):

TABLE 3

PRIDE IN AUSTRALIAN HISTORY: [\(12\)](#)

	Elite (all parties)	Mass (all voters)
Very proud	22	37
Fairly proud	37	41
Little or no pride	38	18
No response	3	4

Such differences, between mass and elite on various issues of social contention, have been further noted by McAllister:

"For example, questions on capital punishment produced 67 per cent support for it among voters in the 1990 AES [Australian Election Study] but only 27 per cent among party elites. The decriminalisation of marijuana produced 32 per cent support among voters, 52 per cent among elites. Support for Aboriginal land rights was 16 per cent among voters and 48 per cent among elites. Abortion is an exception in that there is little mass-elite division of opinion: around half in each group wanted abortion to be available on demand."(13)

Remembering that the population basis of the New Class is, as previously noted, the tertiary-educated white-collar middle class and professionals; we can compare the attitudes of the university-educated, and of the highly paid (which presumably includes a high level of those who have been university-educated), to that of other Australians in the following opinion polls:

27 August 1984, The Age.

Poll by Irving Saulwick and Associates.

2000 people interviewed, nationwide, July 1984.

"Australia should accept as migrants:"

Response:	General population: %	Tertiary graduates: %
Suitable migrants from any country	37	59
Those who have the skills we need	36	56
People who have relatives here	24	36
Refugees	18	39
People with money to invest here	15	22
Europeans only	6	3
Australia should not accept any migrants at the present time	34	17
Don't know/Not stated	2	1

Note 1: The "general population" result includes the "tertiary graduates" (New Class) group and therefore the real "general" result, if those of the New Class were not counted, would be even more markedly different to the result of the "tertiary graduates" as seen here.

Note 2: Of course, while the population basis of the New Class is, as has been noted earlier in this chapter, primarily the tertiary-educated white-collar middle class and professionals, obviously not everyone from that background will hold the ideology of the New Class. However, it must be emphasised, that the specified social group does provide the bulk of the ideological adherents of the New Class.

4 October 1996, The Australian, p. 4.

Poll by Newspoll.

1200 people, interviewed by telephone, nationwide, 27-29 September 1996.

"Thinking now about immigration. Do you personally think that the total number of migrants coming into Australia each year is too high, too low or about right? If too high - is that a lot too high or a little too high? If too low - is that a lot too low or a little too low?"

Response:	Household income:		
	Less than \$30,000 %	\$30,000 \$49,999 %	\$50,000 plus %
A lot too high	59	48	38
A little too high	21	22	20
Total too high	80	70	58
A little too low	*	1	3
A lot too low	1	1	1
Total too low	1	2	4
About right	14	22	31
Uncommitted	5	6	7

Note 1: * = less than 0.5%

Note 2: It has been theorised that as many individuals "climb up the social ladder", whether in business, politics, community organisations, etc, the further they climb, the more they are compromised by having to agree with the predominant New Class ideology within those circles. Especially in business, where so much trade in now being carried on with Asia; many may change their views as they become more Asia-orientated through business and personal wealth gain, a matter of "money first, Australia second".

Looking at the above polls on immigration, we can see the great differences between the views of the Establishment (New Class) and those of the general public. This is not a case of the country's elite "not being in touch with the views of the common people"; but instead it shows that those who "rule" Australia actually hold a different set of views (that is, they hold a different world-view or ideology) to the views of the general Australian population.

The current Establishment in Australia, comprising people of the New Class, generally believes in the world-view known as liberal-internationalism, and thus they are willing to continue on with programmes of mass immigration, multiculturalism, and Asianisation, no matter what the majority of the Australian people want. Therefore, it should be clearly understood that "our leaders" do not hold the interests of the Australian nation and the Australian people at heart.

Note: Sometimes "smart alec" liberal-internationalists ask "If this is the case, then how come these people of the New Class still represent the common people in parliament?" The fact is that whilst the common people hold views against Asian immigration, this is but one view they hold amongst many, so that the economic issues - which are, by necessity, so important to them - are generally catered for by the mainstream political parties, and therefore most of the common people feel no great or desperate need to begin a new political party. Of course, those who view immigration as the main concern facing Australia may try to begin a new political party in response to objecting to the current mainstream political party, but this is as easy as starting a new mainstream newspaper in response to objecting to the pro-multiculturalist and anti-Australian bias of the current mainstream newspapers - the points are the same: 1) voter/client trends are so well entrenched as to favour the existing mainstream bodies, 2) much money is needed, and 3) the media support, coverage, and validation (which is so very important) are just not available. Of course, Pauline Hanson (at the time of publication) is doing admirably in striving to create a new mainstream political party, but the original rush of support for her was generated by the simple media reporting of her activities (albeit negative reporting), whereas (at the time of publication) now the cosmopolitan- internationalists in the media have realised this and are instead continually carrying out deliberate media "hatchet jobs" (heavily and actively biased "reporting") upon Pauline Hanson and her new One Nation party so as to damage her support (a "clever" tactic which appears to be working, judging by a lessening of support for Ms Hanson as reported in subsequent public opinion polls).

The Yellow Peril

For much of Australia's post-European settlement history, at least since the 1850s, her people have been highly concerned about the "Yellow Peril", that is, the possibility that the "teeming hordes of Asia" would swamp the country, whether by warlike or peaceful means.

This concern over Asianisation led to various immigration restrictions being put into place over the years. It also led some Australians to believe that our nation would need to "Populate or Perish". As Arthur Calwell put it in 1947, following the Japanese threat of World War Two:

"We have 25 years at most to populate this country before the yellow races are down on us"(14).

Some people have scorned the concept of the "Yellow Peril". A typical example is Donald Horne - who, while sneering at the concept, at the same time paradoxically reinforced the concept, by relating his "interesting" conversations with Asians that he had met:(15)

"My Chinese host was discussing the White Australia policy. "Be careful of the Chinese," he said. "We are the most intelligent race in the world. If you let too many Chinese into your country they will take you over"..."(16).

"The Filipino beside me said: "... We are all interested in Australia. It is a huge continent. In a hundred years' time it will be peopled from all over Asia"."(17)

Horne himself advocated:

"that ultimately - but perhaps not for some years - Australia's population problem will be solved in what may be the only way it can finally be solved - by large scale Asian immigration."(18)

More to the point, Horne stated

"My own view is that the future holds dramatic possibilities for Australia which may necessarily include racial change, that this is Australia's "destiny". It is going to happen one way or the other. It is a task that will be undertaken either by Australians, or by someone else."(19)

Yet, even despite his own evidence of Asian interest in Australia; and despite his own views that our nation will be swamped by Asians, to be carried out "either by Australians, or by someone else" - which is the basic concept of "the Yellow Peril" - Horne still debunks the concept itself. This denial (after having already recognised the threat) is, no doubt, because he cannot see past his own ideological bias.

The view that Australia must bring in Asian immigrants, or face the prospect that such immigration will be forced upon us (perhaps by economic, political, or military threats; or possibly by an actual invasion), is still voiced sometimes.

For example: In 1984 The Age reported the views of Phil Ruthven, Director of Ibis Corporate Services, that:

"Australia would risk invasion in about 40 years unless the immigration programme was stepped up and the population grew... this could take the form of a military invasion, or more likely "persuasive pressures" from our heavily- populated neighbours or from the United Nations".

Ruthven said:

"Either we orchestrate it [population growth] carefully and start sharing this great country with more people, or we can do nothing and have a very quick catch-up in around about 40 years time - called an invasion"(20).

In 1985 Ruthven repeated his warning in The Age:

"If we don't have at least 100,000 migrants a year (to lift economic activity), they will be a catch-up in the form of an invasion".

The Age further reported that:

"Mr Ruthven believes most of the new settlers should come from countries north of Australia. The United Nations says Australia could support 125 million people, more than twice the population of Britain, but Mr Ruthven reckons 450 million is not an unrealistic figure."(21)

Some years later, in 1990, Ruthven was to say"

"The world is crowded and if we don't move to share this country with other people, someone might want to take it from us"(22).

The following year, Ruthven used a similar argument against those opposing mass immigration:

"One theory is that Australia's population should be limited to 25 million. This assumes such nonsense as the world and the Asia Pacific in particular allowing us to do so... In reality, a global economic village will not tolerate such a thesis"(23).

In 1991 Senator John Button (talking about the Multi Function Polis, the technological City that was intended to be built in Australia in conjunction with Japan) said that Australia:

"is a country of enormous resources both natural and human. The development of state of the art-enabling technologies to help us with the development of the resources in this country will be absolutely crucial to its future... I strongly believe if we are not prepared to do it, someone else might. In one way or another."(24)

The Record reported that "In reply to Prime Minister Keating's racist slur against the Liberals in January this year [referring here to 1992], Liberal Leader John Hewson said that he wasn't a racist and that when the economy recovered he would vastly increase immigration and if he didn't, "someone else" would make Australia increase it"(25).

In 1992 The Bulletin reported the views of a senior official from the Northern Territory ("who declined to be identified"):

"I think it will be only 50 to 100 years before most people in the north of Australia have their roots in Asia. It may come by war, it may come by immigration. For the sake of Australia, I would like the north to be settled by the process of immigration"(26).

In 1996 Rian Hassan and Adam Jamrozik of Flinders University wrote that:

"With the growing population pressures in the Third World countries and in some of Australia's neighbours, the 'empty spaces' of the Australian continent, especially its northern regions, will increasingly attract international attention... It would be better to consider these issues by our own initiative, rather than by initiatives that might be taken by other countries or be imposed by international bodies such as the United Nations."(27)

The Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne, Dr. George Pell, in 1997 called for Australia's population to be increased to 50 million, saying:

"If people imagine that in the centuries to come, which are likely to be dominated by Asian superpowers, that they will allow us to hold on to a continent as big as the United States with 20 million people - I mean that's cuckoo land stuff."(28)

In 1997 Malcolm Fraser, ex-Liberal Prime Minister of Australia, said:

"If we believe we can maintain Australia at 18 or 20 million people without increasing envy, without marginalising ourselves, without challenge, then we are gravely and seriously mistaken. I have already had people from Asia asking me about our population policies, about our commitment to developing and growing Australia... Australia's population has grown 2 1/2 times since 1945. There is no reason at all why we could not grow 2 1/2 times again by the middle of next century. We would then be a nation of 45 million to 50 million people." (emphasis added)(29)

That the threat of the "Yellow Peril" (another term for Asianisation) was (and still is) a real one is beyond doubt - if immigration restriction laws had not been put in place in the 1850s, 1890s, and in 1901, Australia would have been Asianised long before now. Indeed, it must be recognised that modern Australia is still dealing with the "Yellow Peril", and is - in fact - currently undergoing a process of Asianisation (i.e. the "Yellow Peril"), as forced upon it by the liberal- internationalist Establishment.

Whether our nation will survive, and not be overwhelmed or swamped by the teeming masses of the "Yellow Peril", depends on whether the Australian people can find within themselves the fortitude and strength to stop the insidious Asianisation of Australia.

Australians, the future lies in your hands.

References

1. Lebovic, Sol. "Why Newspoll Is More Accurate Than Morgan", *The Australian*, 28 June 1995, p. 11.
2. Morgan, Gary. "Why Telephone Polls Get It Wrong", *The Bulletin*, 27 June 1995, p. 33.
3. "White Lies, Bad Polls", *Time*, 20 November 1989, p. 44.
4. Uhlmann, Mark. "From the Editor", *The Record*, Spring Issue, No. 3 for 1994, p. 1.
5. McGuinness, Pádraic P. "The Left, Right Beat of the Hanson Drum", *The Age*, 3 May 1997, p. A29.
6. Betts, Catherine. "Public Discourse, Immigration and the New Class", in: Jupp, James; and Kabala, Marie (eds). *Politics of Australian Immigration*, AGPS, Canberra, 1993, pp. 222-228, 230, 237-238.
7. Uhlmann, Mark. "From the Editor", *The Record*, Spring Issue, No. 3 for 1994, p. 1.
8. Daly, Martin. "Fitzgerald: My Most Foolish Decision", *The Sunday Herald*, 1 October 1989, p. 2.
9. McAllister, Ian. "Immigration, Bipartisanship and Public Opinion", in: Jupp, James; and Kabala, Marie (eds). *Politics of Australian Immigration*, AGPS, Canberra, 1993, pp. 161-162, 166-168.
10. McAllister. "Immigration, Bipartisanship and Public Opinion", pp. 166-167.
11. Masanauskas, John. "Workers Dump Elitist Labor", *Herald Sun*, 16 December 1996, p. 8.
12. Masanauskas, John. "Workers Dump Elitist Labor", *Herald Sun*, 16 December 1996, p. 8.
13. McAllister. "Immigration, Bipartisanship and Public Opinion", p. 178.
14. Gutman, G.O. "Cultured Convicts of a Latter Day", *The Age*, 26 February 1983.
15. Horne, Donald. *The Lucky Country: Australia in the Sixties*, p. 132.
16. Horne, Donald. *The Next Australia*, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1970, p. 214.
17. Horne, Donald. *The Lucky Country: Australia in the Sixties*, p. 15.
18. Horne, Donald. *The Lucky Country: Australia in the Sixties*, p. 15.
19. Horne, Donald. *The Lucky Country: Australia in the Sixties*, p. 252.
20. Horne, Donald. *The Lucky Country: Australia in the Sixties*, p. 132.
21. West, Rosemary. "Increase Immigration or Risk Invasion: Economist", *The Age*, 8 December 1984.
22. Ellingsen, Peter. "Social Turmoil Ahead: Futurologist", *The Age*, 9 July 1985.
23. Gawenda, Michael. "Counting Heads", *Time*, 14 May 1990, p. 57.
24. Ruthven, Phil. "Question: Can We Live With 159 Million People?", *Age*, 14 April 1991, p. 15.
25. Burton, Tom. "Button Gives a Boost to 'Misunderstood' MFP", *The Age*, 19 June 1991, p. 5 ("Japan-Australia Business Report" supplement).
26. McCormack, Denis. "McCormack on Migration" (edited version of a 1992 speech), *The Record*, Autumn 1994, pp. 48-49.
27. Leser, David. "NT Signs Up With Indonesia", *The Bulletin*, 28 January 1992, p. 22.
28. Steketee, Mike. "Rich Society - But at a Price", *The Australian*, 3-4 May 1997, p. 3 ("Immigration: The Real Debate" supplement).
29. Birnbauer, Bill; and Button, James. "Australia Must Populate: Pell", *The Age*, 8 November 1997, p. A1.
30. Fraser, Malcolm. "Time to Rekindle Spirit of Growth", *The Australian*, 3-4 May 1997, p. 7 ("Immigration: The Real Debate" supplement).