Malcolm Fraser: Making a Better World?
ABSTRACT

This essay will analyse Malcolm Fraser’s legacy as someone who made the world better through accepting thousands of Vietnamese refugees into Australia. It will evaluate recent revisionism by socially progressive and conservative journalists, and academic historians, who have questioned Fraser’s credentials, before concluding that his actions were still commendable.

ESSAY

On the morning of Malcolm Fraser’s funeral, members of the Vietnamese community gathered to lay wreaths and carried signs displaying the message: “Farewell to our true champion of humanity: Malcolm Fraser”. Fraser’s role in Australia’s distinctive model of multiculturalism led to the construction of heroic historical reputation. The image of the Vietnamese arriving to Australia, and Fraser’s acceptance of their place in the nation, has led him to be remembered as especially tolerant. Recently, however, Fraser has been criticised by revisionist commentators of a variety of political orientations who attack the conventional story that Fraser’s policies on Vietnamese refugees were motivated by a desire to make a better world. This essay will explore the established mythology surrounding Fraser’s Immigration Policy on Australia. It will then consider the revisionist perspectives offered by academic historian Rachel Stevens, conservative commentator Greg Sheridan and various progressive Socialist activists. Finally, it will defend Fraser against these charges arguing that, although imperfect, his policies did make a better world and a more tolerant Australia.

Many historians cite Fraser as the originator of Australian multiculturalism, in large part because he admitted thousands of Vietnamese refugees into Australia\(^2\). The admission of the Vietnamese refugees was not the entirety of Fraser’s policies on immigration—he also embraced multiculturalism despite being a conservative—however it was the most dramatic aspect for the Australian public\(^3\). Claire Higgins, Australian legal historian, argues, for instance, “figures from the Department of Immigration show that by the time Fraser left office in 1983, the department’s budget was four times larger than it had been in 1975-76, and Australia had welcomed about three times as many refugees each year\(^4\). There are several historiographical reasons why this trend has occurred. Many argue that the role of immigration policy in Fraser’s legacy is, in part, due to a lack of substantial economic reform, or another major social policy during his time in office\(^5\). Furthermore, this memorialisation of Fraser plays into contemporary refugee activism: Left wing figures and media sources such as New Matilda frequently praise Malcolm Fraser’s stance on refugees, which is especially significant in the political context of 2017 as he was a conservative Prime Minister\(^6\). Finally, the Vietnamese are now an accepted part of Australian society meaning his legacy is less controversial and can thus be invoked more often\(^7\), especially when compared, for instance, to Peter Dutton’s xenophobic recent claim that Fraser let in “too many” Lebanese Muslims\(^8\). These factors combined to ensure Fraser’s historical legacy is associated with a heroic, bold stance on Vietnamese refugees.


\(^4\) Ibid.


While one might expect Fraser to extensively promote his stance on Vietnamese migration during his post-Prime Ministerial career, his construction of his own legacy was more complicated. Interestingly, if one compares various speeches Fraser gave towards the end of his life, there is a difference in Fraser’s rhetoric when he discusses the policy of admitting Vietnamese boats depending on whether he is framing it as a refugee policy\(^9\) or multiculturalism policy\(^10\): in general, he claims more credit for multiculturalism than he does for liberalising asylum seeker law. A reason for this could be that Fraser wanted to foreground the agency of Vietnamese refugees in securing their own place in Australia, regardless of his Government’s policies. Perhaps he was, furthermore, wary of propagating a mythic status as the Australian Prime Minister who bravely ‘threw open the doors’ of the nation to those in need. In avoided self-mythologising, however, he has also tellingly propagated another historical myth by claiming the acceptance of Vietnamese refugees was due to the ‘heroic, tolerant’ Australian people. He told an audience of Vietnamese Australians: “Spare a thought for the Australia that it made it possible for you to come here. If today’s debates had taken place in the 1970’s and the early 1980’s it is most unlikely that that would have happened.”\(^11\)

One would be skeptical of the claim that Australia was previously exceptionally tolerant: when he announced his migrant policy, for instance, a woman on talkback radio expressed her concern to Fraser that ‘Australia will become another Rhodesia with a white minority’, signifying the strong, white nationalist opinion in Australia at the time\(^12\). Regardless, however,


\(^12\) Ibid.
Fraser indirectly using his legacy to instigate contemporary discourse on refugees, rather than bolster his own political legacy.

Fraser’s reputation as truly pro-refugee Prime Minister, who encouraged Australia to make a better world, has subsequently come under attack. Australian migration historian Rachel Stevens challenged this consensus, noting Fraser’s government was initially reluctant to resettle Vietnamese refugees in Australia. For example, during the Liberal Party’s 1977 Election campaign, Fraser drew attention to the problem of ‘six boat arrivals in one day’ but only to suggest he would wanted to reduce arrivals to zero and address public concerns over immigration\textsuperscript{13}. Stevens argues, moreover, Fraser’s immigration policy towards the Vietnamese changed for a number of reasons which had little to do with making a better world. External pressure from the United States, the United Nations, and neighbouring Asian nations, such as Malaysia and Indonesia, coerced Australia into accepting more Vietnamese refugees. In 1978, Communist Vietnam banned private businesses, leading to a significant increase in individuals seeking asylum\textsuperscript{14}. The United States, which was accepting most Indochinese refugees to date, refused to accept a similar proportion of this new group due to domestic political pressures\textsuperscript{15}.

Fraser also had to regulate refugees accepted by Australia to appease domestic fears these refugees were merely economic migrants. Fraser knew processing asylum seekers directly from Malaysia and Indonesia reduced their incentive to travel by sea\textsuperscript{16}. Mass hysteria surrounding Australia’s refugees intake led to misinterpretations of terms such as ‘people smugglers’. The criminal connotation of the word ‘smuggling’ led people to believe that


\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{15} See 3.

‘dangerous’ unprocessed refugees were arriving in Australia. Fraser thus assumed it would be preferable if he could argue he was ‘processing’ refugees through official channels.

Finally, Fraser’s policy attracted bipartisan support because of its foreign policy benefits. In the 1977 election, the Government faced pressure from the ALP opposition; Shadow Immigration Spokesperson Tony Mulvihill stoked public hysteria over immigration. Afterward, Bill Hayden became leader of the Labor Party and was decidedly more open to immigration and cultural diversity. He accepted the variety of benefits of immigration, and by 1983 his spokesperson on that portfolio conceded: “It seems to me that what Australia has done [by accepting refugees] in the last six years... has been much more influential in our region than other initiative.” The reputational benefits of easing the pressure on Australia’s South-East Asian neighbours thus became, politically, too great to ignore. Stevens further claims his policy was not as entirely humanitarian as claimed in the dominant narrative: The Fraser government rather “hand-picked” skilled, educated refugees and left the most disadvantaged in Singaporean and Indonesian processing camps.

After Stephen’s critique of Fraser, political commentators have questioned, somewhat more aggressively, if Fraser’s intent behind his immigration policy is to better the world. Journalist Greg Sheridan wrote a piece in The Australian popularising Stephen’s conclusions but in a fashion that was markedly more critical of Fraser. Sheridan does not acknowledge, for
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instance, the unpopularity Fraser's embrace of refugees. Sheridan is biased as a current supporter of offshore processing; it is thus in his interest to dismantle the cult of heroism around Fraser. Fraser is an especially important ideological weapon for pro-refugee advocates because he was a right-of-centre Prime Minister, like Turnbull, who made a principled decision to accept swathes of refugees. It is thus in Sheridan’s interest to use Steven’s article to frame Fraser as a hypocrite. Sheridan obscures his own current conservative bias on refugee policy by underscoring his personal support for Vietnamese refugees in the 1970s when he was an activist for B. A. Santamaria’s National Civic Council. Of course, Sheridan’s prior support for Vietnamese refugees was based on the fact that he shared their anti-communist politics and Catholic faith. Tellingly, he also wrongly calls Fraser the “father of offshore processing” for accepting refugees from Malaysian and Indonesian camps. In fact, these refugees were resettled in the fashion that is now the international best standard, not deliberately processed in offshore camps as per the policy of recent Australian Governments. Sheridan’s revisionist account, unlike Steven’s, was motivated by political manipulation. As a polemicist, rather than academic historian, he has more license to be sensationalistic with his claims that Fraser did not intend to make a better world.

Fraser is also criticised by left wing sources based on distinctions he articulated between authorised and “unauthorised” refugees, and between skilled and unskilled refugees. Terms such as ‘queue jumpers’ surfaced during Fraser’s leadership: he argued that Australia should accept Vietnamese migrants from camps so that they could be effectively processed before arrival, rather than letting unprocessed refugees arrive by boat. The hierarchy this creates between ‘processed’ (and therefore ‘legitimate’) and ‘unprocessed’ (and therefore
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‘illegitimate’) is unfounded under international refugee law, and haunts Australian politics to this day\(^\text{27}\). It also led, furthermore, to the government engaging in dubious tactics to prevent refugees arriving by boat\(^\text{28}\). In the documentary, *Admission Impossible*, Greg Humphries, an Immigration Department official under Fraser’s Government, recounts how he was sent to Malaysia to bore holes in the bottom of the transportation ships so they would sink overnight and therefore be unsuitable for travel to Australia\(^\text{29}\). It is important, however, to consider the bias of this source: Socialist critics would not have wanted a Conservative PM to be the symbol of pro-refugee causes, in particular, because the Fraser narrative is contingent upon the idea that his social democratic Labor predecessor, Gough Whitlam, ignored refugees.

Although Fraser has been heavily criticised by the right and left wing, his legacy should still be celebrated. At the time of Fraser’s leadership, domestically, the norm surrounding processing refugees was one that was still very exclusionary. Before his Prime Ministership, Australia had experienced non-white migration only for a few years. Prime Minister Holt dismantled major parts of the White Australia Policy in 1966, and the Whitlam government only completely removed it in 1973, as such Fraser’s immigration policy was very radical at the time\(^\text{30}\). Globally, there was no settled standard on how governments should process, evaluate, and accept refugees into their country\(^\text{31}\). The loose norm that nations should accept refugees based on their need, not ability, education, and skills is very historically recent\(^\text{32}\). Moreover, that loose


\(^{29}\) *Admission Impossible*, dir. Alec Morgan, Film Australia Ltd, 1992, documentary/short film.


\(^{32}\) Ibid.
norm is still being violated during the Syrian crisis today: young, able-bodied, skilled refugees accepted more often.

Even if his motives were not entirely about making a better world, his contribution is undeniable. This is an important distinction: as historians, the motivations of politicians are not the only factor in evaluating their impact. Cat Thao Nguyen, a Vietnamese-Australian author observes that between 1998 and 2005, three Young Australians of the Year were of Vietnamese heritage. Vietnamese Australians have not just thrived, but become a symbol for how tolerance towards migrants and refugees improves Australia. Sociologist Andrew Jakubowicz argues “the Vietnamese settlement process provides an almost archetypal case of cultures in collision, emerging from a dynamic ignorance, to one of cultural interaction.” Jakubowicz credits much of the contributions made by the Vietnamese to Australian life, to the explosion in Vietnamese presence under Fraser. However, it is unfair to attribute the success of the Vietnamese community entirely to Fraser, as Vietnamese refugees also worked hard to secure their important national role today.

Ultimately, Fraser’s relationship to refugees has been critiqued for two reasons. First, the heavy politicisation of migration from both sides of politics has led to a contested historical discourse on Fraser’s legacy: Greg Sheridan and far left activists both have an incentive to diminish it. The construction of a simplistic myth that Fraser was a unswerving champion for diversity has also given historians an incentive to critique it. This critique is important, not only because of multiculturalism’s centrality to Australian identity, but also because it
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increases the accountability for politicians. When historians critique politician’s historical legacies, it challenges current leaders to actually build a better world, rather than construct myths that simply imply that they did.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY


This news article details the events of Malcolm Fraser’s funeral and the impact of his leadership of Australia. This source is reliable because it was produced by a highly scrutinised news outlet. The source was useful because it explains Fraser’s impact on Australia’s history of multiculturalism and, in particular, the Vietnamese community. The source is used in the introduction of the essay to reflect the intense emotional bond the Vietnamese community feel with Fraser: this supports my approach that intention may not be the only relevant way to assess whether he made a better world.


This short film uncovers the various political forces and propaganda campaigns that shaped Australia’s immigration. The source is to some extent reliable: while it does have a pro-refugee bias, the section that was the most relevant to the essay was Greg Humphries’ recount of the Australian government undermining the transportation of refugees into Australia during the 1970s. The source is useful in portraying how the Fraser administration was not simply motivated by making the world a better place - the government repeatedly undermined humanitarian efforts in secret.


This news article aggressively argues that Fraser’s immigration policy and rhetoric around refugees was not inspired by making the world a better place from a socially progressive perspective. This source is to some extent reliable because it uses statistical and numerical evidence to support its claims, but it is also written by an incredibly left-wing socially progressive news outlet, and written by an amateur unreputable journalist with an activist background. This does not necessarily make the source biased but it does mean they would not have the usual journalistic concern about appearing objective. This source is useful in understanding criticism of Fraser’s policy and rhetoric by the socially progressives.


This news article details how Peter Dutton, the current Minister for Immigration, criticised Fraser’s immigration policy. This source is reliable because it was produced by a reputable political reporter under a highly scrutinised news outlet, and moreover its quotes are corroborated by a number of different outlets. The source was useful because it explicates the differences aims Fraser’s legacy: essentially it highlights his role in Australian multiculturalism is today evaluated differently if one is examining Lebanese Muslims or Vietnamese communities. role in Australian politics and impact on
Australia’s history of multiculturalism, and provides a contrast between Australia’s current and past immigration policy.


This source is provides quotes from Malcolm Fraser’s opening speech at the ASRC, Asylum Seeker Resource Center. This source is reliable because it directly quotes Malcolm Fraser and is produced by a reputable organisation, moreover Fraser had a longstanding involvement with the ASRC and thus could check the quotations accuracy. The source is useful in providing an insight into Fraser’s activism and beliefs on refugee policy after his time in office, and is an example of how he constructs his legacy to make points about the current political context.


This source is a transcript of one of Malcolm Fraser’s post- parliamentary speeches on the progress of Australia as a multicultural country since the implementation of the White Australia Policy. This source is reliable because it directly quotes Malcolm Fraser and is published by a reputable organisation. The source is useful in providing an insight into Fraser’s activism and beliefs on refugee policy after his time in office, and his own view of his role in history.


This source is a speech given by message from Malcolm Fraser on the occasioning of the opening of a new facility for to the ASRC, Asylum Seeker Resource Center, on . This source is reliable because it directly quotes Malcolm Fraser and is produced by a reputable, albeit biased, organisation. The source is useful in providing an insight into Fraser’s activism and beliefs on refugee policy after his time in office, and the role his own construction of his legacy plays in how he intervenes in current policy debates.


This source is a transcript of one of Malcolm Fraser’s post parliament speeches on the Vietnamese TET festival, and his thanks to the Vietnamese people for adapting and contributing to Australian culture. This source is reliable because it was directly sourced from directly quotes Malcolm Fraser’s own archival papers, and is published online by a reputable academic organisation. The source is useful in providing an insight into Fraser’s activism and beliefs on refugee policy after his time in office.


This part-memoir, part-authorised biography details Fraser’s experience in public life as a politician. This source is reliable as it is written with Fraser’s oversight and uses direct quotes from Fraser, and is written in collaboration with reputable journalist, Margaret Simons who has an incentive to fact-check his claims. It is obviously biased towards defending his legacy. The source is useful in providing an insight into the reasons behind many of Fraser’s decisions and policies in office.

This news article highlights the contrast between Fraser’s immigration policy and the immigration policy of Australia today. This source is reliable because it was produced by a reputable political commentator and academic, and published by a serious journalistic outlet. The source was useful in understanding how Fraser’s legacy is instrumentalised by activists today.


This source explores how Vietnamese Australians have adapted to, whilst retaining their own culture, and contributed to, Australian life. This source is reliable, because it is written by a reputable professor of Sociology at the University of Technology Sydney, who has conducted field work in the Vietnamese community. It is useful because it provides a detailed account of how Vietnamese Australians, under Fraser’s immigration policy, thrived in Australia and continues to do so today.


This article explains the origins, use, dismantling, and effects of the White Australia Policy on Australia and on surrounding nations. The source is reliable as it is published on The Conversation, which is curated by professional academic editors, and it is written by a Research Fellow in the School of History at Australian National University. The article is useful in providing balancing analysis amidst the rise of revisionist perspectives of Fraser’s policy and rhetoric around refugees.


This article outlines some of Fraser’s most positive rhetoric around refugees while in office. This source is reliable because it directly quotes Fraser, though it has a political incentive to cherry pick rhetoric that fits the left-wing, pro-refugee bias of the source. Ultimately, however, it is useful because it provides an insight into criticisms of Fraser’s legacy in a way that counterbalances Sheridan’s more conservative perspective.

McKay, F., Thomas, S., et al., *Any one of these boat people could be a terrorist for all we know!* Media representations and public perceptions of ‘boat people’ arrivals in Australia, *Journalism: theory, practice, and criticism*, Volume 12, No 5, pp. 607-626. 12 May 2011.

This journal details and explains representations of ‘boat people’ arrivals in contemporary Australia, both from the media and the public. This source is reliable because the contributors are known figures. This source is useful in depicting perceptions of asylum seekers and refugees in the media and in the public eye today to contrast with decades ago when Fraser was in power. It helped me question Fraser’s view that his Australia was so incredibly accepting.


George Megalogenis’ book gives an account of mainstream Australian politics and economics in the past 40 years. This text is a reliable source because it uses historical case studies and economic data as evidence for its analysis. The section of the source dealing with Fraser was obviously most useful because it argues that Fraser’s lasting impact on Australia centres on the issue of race as opposed to economic reform.

This news article displays the respect that Bill Hayden, Leader of the Opposition during Fraser's Prime Ministership, had for Fraser. The source is reliable because it directly quotes Bill Hayden and is published on a reputable news outlet, of course as a eulogy it would contain some self-censorship and bias. The source is useful because it portrays Fraser’s legacy after his death and the respect he earned from other politicians, including his political opponents.


This news article attempts to tear down the common belief that Fraser’s immigration policy and rhetoric around refugees was inspired by desiring to make the world a better place. This news article aggressively argues that Fraser’s immigration policy and rhetoric around refugees was not inspired by desiring to make the world a better place. This source is reliable because it is published on a reputable news outlet and written by a well-known journalist. It is important to consider the motivation behind Sheridan’s writing - he personally disagrees with many of Fraser’s rhetoric, and frames Fraser as a hypocrite to dismantle criticism by the socially progressive that Fraser was Liberal and is still seen to be the “father of multiculturalism”. Despite this, the source is useful in understanding the criticism of Fraser’s policy and rhetoric by the socially conservative.


This source was used in the essay to reflect Greg Sheridan’s current biases against asylum seekers and thus helped me accurately evaluate other sources. In this context, the source is reliable because it is written by Sheridan himself and published by a reputable news outlet. It is important to consider the motivation behind Sheridan’s writing - he personally disagrees with many of Fraser’s rhetoric, and frames Fraser as a hypocrite to dismantle criticism by the socially progressive that Fraser was Liberal and is still seen to be the “father of multiculturalism”. Despite this, the source is useful in understanding the criticism of Fraser’s policy and rhetoric by social conservatives.


This news article provides an insight into Sheridan’s student politics before his shift in political identity. This source is biased insofar as Sheridan here reports on his own experiences in student politics, but it is at least written for a reputable outlet. This source is useful in understanding how Sheridan attempted to obscure his bias on the topic of refugees but concealing that his former pro-refugee position was largely motivated by his involvement in a right wing DLP movement.


This news article also attacks the common belief that Fraser’s immigration policy and rhetoric around refugees was inspired by making the world a better place from a radical left perspective. This source is not entirely reliable because it is published by a Marxist which also had plenty of incentive to attack
Fraser and, moreover, it does not name the author. However, this source is useful in understanding criticism of Fraser’s policy and rhetoric by the far left.


This journal article was a critical secondary source for my essay. It provides key revisionist arguments against Fraser that question if he worked towards a better world. This source is reliable, as it is written by a reputable academic who is evenhanded in her treatment of politicians of various parties and political positions. Moreover, Stevens and uses factual evidence to support her its claims. The source is useful in providing important arguments and evidence against the common belief of Fraser as being completely motivated by making the world a better place.


This news article details the important role that Vietnamese refugees have had and still have in Australia to help it grow into the country it is today, and help it to continue growing. This article is reliable as it is published on the SBS, a reputable, public news source, and uses statistical and numerical evidence to support it. The source was useful for my essay in that it emphasised the importance in not simply dismissing the successes of the Vietnamese community to Fraser and his government’s immigration policy.


This source details various statistics and information surrounding the resettlement of refugees. The source is reliable, because it is written by a reputable, global organisation, the UNHCR. The source is useful in pointing out that although today, “cherry picking” refugees when resettling them is a violation of the norm, Fraser was not violating a rule at the time.


This source details various statistics and information surrounding the resettlement needs of refugees in 2016. The source is reliable for this purpose, because it is written by a reputable, global organisation, the UNHCR. Even insofar as the UNHCR is biased towards refugees they would have the best data available on this issue. For my essay, the source is useful in pointing out that despite there is a norm not to “cherry pick” resettling refugees, it is still applicable today when looking at conflicts in Syria and the Middle East.