

**Australian Multicultural Theory and Policy Changes: From
the 'Galbally Report' to 'A New Agenda for Multicultural
Australia'**

**By
John Pickett**

Fourth Year Honours Thesis

Word count: 10,500

**Victoria University
Faculty of Arts
School of Social Sciences**

Melbourne, Victoria.

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY



3 0001 00855 9710

FTS

THESIS
305.800
994
PIC

~~1082~~.THESIS

305.800994 PIC

30001008559710

Pickett, John

Australian multicultural
theory and policy changes :
from the 'Galbally report'

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Les Terry for his support and constant attempts to help me improve my work. I would also like to thank my mum, Gayle, for being my proof-reading guru. Lastly, I would like to thank Victoria University for providing me with my university education and the opportunity to do honours.

Synopsis

This thesis explores issues surrounding multicultural theory and policy. It also includes a discussion on immigration policy and the attempts made by the current Federal Government to shift public attention away from multiculturalism to discussions surrounding border control.

Chapter 1 focuses on pluralist multicultural theory and discussions surrounding its implementation into Australian multicultural policy during the late 70s and early 80s. It explores J.J. Smolicz's work on pluralist multiculturalism and ways in which the 'Report of the Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services for Migrants' (Galbally, 1981, p. 1-1) (the Galbally Report, Australia's first multicultural policy report) was based around a pluralist model. This chapter also includes early criticisms of such a model by theorists such as Jakubowicz (1984) and their attempts to begin the mainstreaming multicultural model.

Chapter 2 continues the discussion surrounding mainstreaming by exploring work by Castles (1986; 1987; 1989; 1990; 1992). This chapter explores some of the major issues that multicultural theory and policy were facing in the early to mid 1990s. These include racism and a lack of media representation for people from a Non-English Speaking Background (NESB) in Australia.

Chapter 3 discusses multicultural policy and changes in this policy between the Labor Government of the 80's and early to mid 90's, to the current Howard Liberal Government. This is conducted by analysing policy papers released by the respective governments regarding multiculturalism. Current immigration trends are also examined,

as are the possible downsizing of multicultural policy in favour of border protection polices by the current Howard Government.

Chapter 4 attempts to analyse the information collected throughout the thesis and suggest new avenues for multicultural policy. It summarises the theoretical and policy based work of the researchers discussed in this thesis and various issues arising from these theories.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	p. 7
Chapter 1	
<i>The introduction of Multiculturalism in Australia</i>	p. 9
• J.J Smolicz – cultural pluralism	p. 9
• Jakubowicz – criticisms of a pluralist model	p. 13
Chapter 2	
<i>Governmental changes to policy and another new direction in Australian</i>	
<i>Multiculturalism</i>	p. 18
• James Jupp – recommendations for multiculturalism	p. 18
• Stephen Castles – Problems with Australian Multiculturalism	p. 20
• Racism and Multiculturalism	p. 22
• Multicultural representation in the media	p. 25
Chapter 3	
<i>Governmental policies – a shift from the cultural to the economic</i>	p. 28
• Current Australian Government policy – Population flows, protection of borders and new agendas	p. 30
Chapter 4	
<i>Multiculturalism in Australia – Where do we go now?</i>	p. 38
Bibliography	p. 44

Introduction

The distinctions between the dominant 'Anglo-Celtic' culture in Australia and the cultural ethnic-minorities have been discussed through various papers on multiculturalism. Efforts by past and present politicians to create a 'European Utopia' have failed, while multicultural policies are criticised or lost in the stigma of the 'Quintessential Australian'. Media representations of minority cultural groups also seem to take a sub-standard view of people from a Non-English Speaking Background (NESB) and may create racial tension between the dominant and minority groups. This will be examined in this thesis by exploring the history of Australian multicultural theory and policy.

• Within Australia, any cultural group that can be classed as a minority group may suffer forms of discrimination and disadvantage in Australia. They may also face a general public that has misunderstood their beliefs or really has no interest and dismisses them.³ Even though multicultural policies have been in Australia for over 20 years, there are still many critics of the theory and policies surrounding it. While it would be expected that the dominant Australian culture would be 'Anglo-Celtic', discussion continues as to why people from a NESB are viewed as inferior, or as the 'other' which leads to a discussion involving cultural differences.

• As there are now many different cultural groups within Australia, the current immigration and border protection policy will be examined. While this is not strictly part of the multicultural debate, current political trends by the current conservative Government have caused a shift away from multicultural issues to discussions surrounding border protection and control, which will be discussed later in this thesis.

The main purpose of Multiculturalism, however, was to break down barriers and create a new 'Australian culture'. The first chapter will examine the early theories of Multiculturalism, beginning with J.J Smolicz's work on cultural pluralism. This includes the inception of multicultural policy within Australia through pluralisms' inclusion in Australia's first multicultural report, the 'Report of the Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services for Migrants' (Galbally, 1981, p. 1-1), also known as the Galbally report. Early criticisms of pluralist theory in multiculturalism by Jakubowicz (1984) will also be discussed. Chapter 2 will explore changes to multicultural policy in the mid 80s, including suggestions by Jupp (1986) on improvements to multicultural policy. The argument against pluralism is continued by Castles (1986; 1987; 1989; 1990; 1992) who suggests a mainstreaming model that would allow greater 'access and equity' for ethnic-minorities in Australia. Problems that appear to have affected multiculturalism in Australia, for example, racism, will be examined, as will arguments against multiculturalism presented by Blainey (1984) and Hanson (Ricklefs, 1997). Chapter 3 will focus on more recent government policy and national agendas for multiculturalism by two consecutive governments. Government policies regarding immigration and illegal entries into Australia, including arguments of a possible shift of attention from multiculturalism to border control and immigration policy will also be discussed. Chapter 4 will reflect on the earlier three chapters and will discuss the main issues regarding multicultural policy in Australia and examine them as a whole. This will highlight some possible contours of future multicultural policy in Australia.

Chapter 1

The introduction of Multiculturalism in Australia

In 1978, the Report of the Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services for Migrants, also known as the Galbally report was released in Australia. This was the first attempt by the Australian Government to outline principals for the creation of a multicultural country. This report also appeared to be aligned with the pluralist school of thought, regarding multiculturalism. One of the main advocates of this type of multiculturalism was J.J Smolicz (1980; 1981) who felt that it was best implemented through the education system. During this time, however, theorists began arguing against the idea of a pluralist multicultural structure. Jakubowicz's (1984) arguments against pluralist multiculturalism highlighted troubled areas in Multiculturalism and suggested a different direction, away from pluralism, which focused on power relations between minorities and the dominant group and the 'ethnic inequalities' that arise. It should be noted at this time that there were other writers involved in both of these fields, but the thesis will focus on these writers as they allow a more precise view of the two different types of policy.

J.J Smolicz – cultural pluralism

J.J. Smolicz was one of the strongest advocates of cultural pluralism in Australia. He extended the idea of cultural pluralism through education, which would allow schools to be designed to accommodate cultural groups so they have an education system relevant to their own or family cultural structure. Smolicz (1982, p. 5) highlighted three 'fundamental principals' of which 'underlie Australian society'. First, he believed that there was 'no one ruling group'. His feelings were that no-one in Australia was viewed as

superior to another 'on account of a legally ascribed status that is based on religion, language, ancestry or other cultural or racial criteria' (Smolicz, p. 5). Secondly, he believed that Australians had shared values and that Australia was in 'an ongoing process whereby a whole constellation of cultural values (are) being evolved that (are) shared by most members of the Australian community' (Smolicz, p. 5). Smolicz also felt that the shared values he believed existed in Australia had helped to draw people from other cultures to Australia in their 'search of more democratic, more tolerant, and economically freer atmosphere than they could find in their home countries' (Smolicz, p. 5). The third principal Smolicz believed existed in Australia was one of 'Ethnic values' (Smolicz, p. 6). He felt that cultures that were brought by people from a NESB had been influenced by their life in Australia and have 'surrendered some parts of its heritage in exchange for participation in the shared values of the whole nation' (Smolicz, p. 6).

For Smolicz, one of the keys in the transmission of culture was through education systems, where the youth have an understanding of different cultures and concepts. This view was essential in applying pluralist multiculturalism into education systems, thus, in the authors view 'the cultures of Australia should be made available to all Australians. In this way the minority groups will not experience feelings of isolation and inferiority, since they will see their cultures respected and activated by those from other backgrounds' (Smolicz, 1982, p. 11). This would then have been applied by schools teaching students ethnic cultural values in the classroom so all students could gain a greater understanding of different cultures. The application of learning languages other than English was also highlighted by Smolicz as an important step towards pluralism. The main functions of multicultural education according to Smolicz (p. 15) was 'to

counteract assimilationist tendencies, overt in the case of the few remaining stalwarts of an anachronistic Anglo-conformity'. Therefore, Smolicz felt that if ethnic students were subjected to forms of separatism, multiculturalism would not flourish in Australia. A way to counter this was to introduce a type of 'transitional multiculturalism' which was designed to assist ethnic-minorities to move into education systems.

Transitional multiculturalism emphasised early education of people from NESBs (mainly children) in English while allowing them to continue with their own language and cultural beliefs. Smolicz (1981, p. 5) believed that 'its purpose was to help children keep up their academic knowledge, while they are still learning English. Once this was acquired, the ethnic props could be knocked away and education could proceed in English alone, or perhaps with the addition of a "traditional modern" language, for "intellectual" purposes'. The creation of bilingual societies and cultures was best explored by American governments during the 1970's who tried to put this method of transition into their schools for minority groups. There was, however, a feeling that transitional multiculturalism was just a temporary measure put in place to allow a stronger implementation of the English language, which also leads to the destruction of a person's native tongue.

In Australia, the use of transitional multiculturalism had been one of the main driving points in Australia in the 1970's too. Smolicz (1981, p. 11) found 'a large number of parents from the Anglo-majority group appeared to be in favour of transitional multiculturalism'. Smolicz, however, felt that transitional multiculturalism was more of a stumbling block to true cultural pluralism as it allowed the cultural majority to have control over the ethnic minorities. This occurred through the use of the immigrants'

native tongue as a way of transitioning that person into an English speaking class, thus nullifying their own language and replacing it with the language of the dominant majority. These ideas were implemented in various forms during the late 70's and early 80's. Perhaps the best example of their implementation was in Australia's first multicultural policy report, the Galbally report.

The Galbally report was written in 1978 and was the first clear outline of how multiculturalism would be implemented in Australian society. Its key principals were to allow all Australians 'equal opportunity to realise their full potential and...have full access to programs and services; every person should be able to maintain his or her culture without prejudice or disadvantage; migrants should...be met by programs and services available to the whole community but special services and programs are necessary...to ensure equality of access and provision; services and programs should be designed and operated in full consultation with clients and self-help should be encouraged as much as possible' (Galbally, 1981, p. 2-1). This report outlined the key concepts to multiculturalism, which have been continued to some extent, in present policies, along with other strategies to manage multiculturalism. The positioning of this report among the theory was set squarely in pluralism. For example, when examining education in a multicultural context, English as a Second Language (ESL) students are taught separately from other, more English literate students. This strategy was employed because it was believed that 'knowledge of the English language is a critical factor in enabling successful settlement in Australia...both to children and adults' (Galbally, p. 4-2). Criticisms of the pluralist model began to appear in the early 80s by theorists such as Jakubowicz (1984) who felt that the pluralist model was not impacting on certain areas,

mainly regarding welfare of ethnic-minorities. This was also the first attempt to shift away from a pluralist model towards one that focused more on 'access and equity' and 'mainstreaming'.

Jakubowicz – criticisms of a pluralist model

Jakubowicz, in his 1982 paper, written with the assistance of Mitchell (1982) explored areas in which state government policy (NSW) was lacking. Of these, Jakubowicz and Mitchell felt that culture was an area which appeared to be misunderstood by Government policy even though it could play a large part in shaping the welfare of immigrants. Various differences, such as language and the differentiation of beliefs to those of the dominant culture affected those in the majority group who may not have a full understanding of the issues at hand. In Australia, the addition of ethnic groups had created a new welfare group, which was also influenced by cultural differences. Rather than having an 'Anglo-Celtic' view of welfare and class, the addition of ethnic cultures had injected new dimensions into Australia 'which may be formally exotic to the providers of services' (Jakubowicz & Mitchell, 1982, p. 20). The working class then, had a sub-group, which, as automation stepped up in industry, became an excuse for joblessness. This, linked with an increase of welfare 'handouts' to ethnic-minorities (through the identification of support needed for new settlers) created social problems and raised serious questions about the amount of support needed and being given to ethnic minorities. This put further strain on NESB family systems, which was seen through levels of employment and education. Jakubowicz (1984) continued his research into education systems and presented a paper to the 'National Advisory and Co-

ordinating Committee on Multicultural Education', which examined problems with the education system for NESB students and ways in which to improve it.

The report presented by Jakubowicz examined ethnic-minorities in Australia and the amount of education that a NESB student had received and its affect on their social mobility. He found that a lack of education can cause difficulties for people from NESBs, from not having a full understanding of English, through to discrimination from the Anglo-majority. 'There is evidence of discrimination against such immigrants, but once their children learn English and manage to stay at school for extended periods, their possibilities of social mobility increase' (Jakubowicz, 1984, p. 6). According to Jakubowicz Lack of parent input for NESB children also appeared to make it harder for them to do well at school and may have accounted for higher than usual drop-out rates for these children. Education then, just like the education system for Smolicz, plays an important part in multiculturalism for Jakubowicz as it was most likely the first port of call for NESB children to learn the new language and learn about their new surroundings and culture. Unfortunately, this seems to be only one-way, as Australian culture is taught to the child, which leaves a deficit in their own cultural learning and understanding. This can then lead to poverty and the need for special services to be implemented.

Early studies of poverty among immigrants in the 60's and 70's examined by Jakubowicz, found that 'the chances of a household being in poverty significantly increased if the breadwinner was a working-class non-English speaking recent immigrant, and if something untoward affected family circumstances – e.g. desertion, injury or death, unemployment etc' (Jakubowicz, 1986, p. 15). Research in the 80s focused more on global labour markets and found that the main factors in immigrant

disadvantage in the labour market was 'education, skill level, workforce experience, and of course fluency and literacy in English. In education, there was apparently no significant negative performance differences for most longer established ethnic minorities' (Jakubowicz, p. 15). This indicates something that earlier research could not. That is, children of ethnic-minority parents who are second generation Australians, would find it easier to cope with life in Australia. Jakubowicz's report, however, did not verify if those second generation children did actually find their social mobility increased or if their culture had been strengthened or weakened by a change in their social status.

Culture and language then, become an important way for NESB families to express themselves. Jakubowicz suggested that these links to their cultural past are mainly formed at home with the family and at school in the education system. 'While numerous studies have identified schools as loci of social power within which wider social relations are created, contested, reinforced or transformed, government policy and programs have tended to avoid these issues' (Jakubowicz, 1984, p. 4). The lack of policy regarding multiculturalism in schools, as highlighted by Jakubowicz, can then be seen as having significant affects on social interactions between Anglo-Celtic and NESB children. First, the lack of English education in schools for NESB children can be seen as a major stumbling block. If a child is taken out of a class and put in a 'catch-up' class, then a lack of social interaction and alienation from the other children can ensue. Secondly, this removal of NESB students from mainstream classes could have also created further problems, including alienation from other students, which would not help ethnic-minority children in their education.

Ethnic welfare was also only a recent addition to Australian government policy so may have lacked depth in the fields of education and cultural identification programs for ethnic-minorities. Jakubowicz and Mitchell (1982) found that ‘prior to 1974, there was no category within the social welfare programmes of the NSW Government which discussed, let alone focused on, the specific needs of ‘ethnic’ communities or individuals’ (Jakubowicz & Mitchell, 1982, p.9). Prior to this, Government programs were focused more on the assimilation of immigrants into the Australian mainstream rather than work with their special needs. However, multiculturalism in a mainstreaming form, attempted to stop the creation of ethnic disadvantage created through lack of education and welfare systems. Jakubowicz and Mitchell (1982, p. 14) highlighted several changes which were needed at that time that would ensure that the employment of Anglo-Celtic males would drop and allow others, especially in senior positions to be employed, regardless of ethnicity. Staff training, too, was considered another important step towards this goal, which would incorporate the needs of others, rather than those of Anglo-Celtic backgrounds exclusively. There were also arguments to allow better access for ethnic-minority groups to receive community funding and support groups with greater ease. These are just some strategies that were suggested by Jakubowicz and Mitchell as a way of bolstering government policy, which at that time, appeared to be lacking a clear insight into the needs and wants of the ethnic community.

There were also differing views among the various theorists on what would ‘unify’ Australia so that it was a wholly multicultural country. Some theorists, including Jakubowicz, were in favour of ‘mainstreaming’ multiculturalism and believed that ‘only when there is no resentment of the dominant culture on the basis of extirpation of

minority culture, and when economic opportunity is untrammelled, will the overarching values of the core society be gratefully incorporated into the ethnic value system, and a balanced bicultural, bilingual Australian emerge' (Jakubowicz, 1986, p. 18). Culturalists, like Smolicz, however, would argue that it is the 'right of the individual to be individual' (Jakubowicz, p. 18). Different theoretical groups also had their own opinions on how multiculturalism should operate. Jakubowicz's theoretical approach best fits into a Marxist system, which believed that people must work together and come up with common beliefs that all can relate to.

Jakubowicz (1986) also discusses multiculturalism through a feminist viewpoint, which recognises that women in patriarchal societies are important, for example, the removal of patriarchy from cultures which have continued to oppress women would have a positive affect on those women's lives. The affects of family life on ethnic-minorities in a country that accepts women to be an equal part of society was another issue that Jakubowicz criticised pluralist models for. When using a pluralist model, discrimination against women in some cultures would continue and create a 'clash of cultures' as some are more male dominated than others. Jakubowicz criticisms of ethnic pluralism's views on this issue were that their theory 'necessitates societal acquiescence to quite unacceptable domination by men over women' (Jakubowicz, 1986, p. 17).

Chapter 2

Governmental changes to policy and another new direction in Australian Multiculturalism

By the mid-80s, continued debate surrounding multiculturalism started to move away from Government multicultural policy. Public opinion of multiculturalism was starting to fall, media commentators were becoming increasingly nervous about immigration, and multicultural policy was beginning to be pushed back in the Federal Governments' agenda. Examining the work conducted during this period, it becomes clear that cultural pluralism did decline in popularity, most likely due to the cost involved in setting up ethno-specific schools and welfare and social interaction systems. By the mid 80s, multicultural policy began to shift to a policy of 'access and equity', spearheaded by theorists such as Castles (1986), who tended to move away from pluralism and began to highlight problems with the then current policies. At this time, Jupp (1986) presented ways in which multicultural policy could be changed, that would allow it to move on from pluralism, towards a seemingly fairer system for ethnic-minorities.

James Jupp – recommendations for multiculturalism

Jupp, in his 1986 paper entitled 'New Directions for Research' which was presented at the 'Ethnicity and Multiculturalism 1986 National Research Conference' examined various directions for research and made recommendations on how these could best be implemented. The lack of basic knowledge about the ethnicity of Australians was of major concern for Jupp. At this time, Multiculturalism as a Government policy had been around for 8 years. Programs had been developed to assist people from NESBs in

their transition to life in Australia, however, research on the NESB demographics and well-being of ethnic-minorities was not as strongly pursued through research as one would have thought. The main centre for research into ethnic affairs was AIMA (Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs) during the 80's. This institute, however, did eventually fail in its attempts to provide a path forward for Australian multiculturalism and was in turn replaced. It was felt by Jupp that 'AIMA...was not using its comparatively vast resources to assist general research, but rather was acting as an ancillary to government' (Jupp, 1986, p. 2). There was also a feeling that research which was vital became 'distorted by the immediate needs of government' (Jupp, p. 2). As a repercussion, basic questions about ethnic-minorities in Australia were left unanswered, which further reduced the conceived viability of AIMA.

By the end of his paper, Jupp (1986) felt that it was very important for stronger research to be conducted into the various fields of ethnicity. He recommended that greater emphasis should be put in place to analyse cultures and languages of immigrants in Australia and the context in which it is held. Jupp also felt that fieldwork was important to conduct as it was the only clear way to understand how people from NESBs were feeling about their time living in Australia. This included examining overseas studies and implementing them into an Australian system. Jupp also hoped that this would lead to an examination of public government policy regarding ethnic-minorities and help to get their cultures defined within Australia. This would allow a chance for better interactions and understanding of ethnic-minorities regarding Australian culture, as this system would work for all cultures and hopefully draw them all together. This would have then created better conditions through a greater understanding of cultural

differences (Jupp, 1986, p. 8). These recommendations highlighted various research paths that were influenced by discussions during the early 80s. These ideas, however, had progressed and had allowed for a better implementation of the theory into policy.

Stephen Castles – Problems with Australian Multiculturalism

Castles, who wrote along the same lines as Jakubowicz, was another theorist who highlighted problems with multicultural theory in the mid-80s. He felt that a society or nation cannot be defined correctly if that society is split into multiple groups, depending on their cultural background and/or preference. To do this, would further drive a wedge between the people multicultural policy was trying to help and the people advocating the dismantling of the same policy. 'Multiculturalism as a principal of social policy was based on social research on the situation of migrants, which concentrated on their actual situation in Australian society' (Castles, 1987, p. 3). As Castles focused mainly on socio-economic class issues in relation to people from a NESB, he felt that multiculturalism at that time 'did not look at migrants in general terms of ethnicity and culture, but rather tried to identify particular areas of socio-economic disadvantage' (Castles, p. 3). This view did not follow a cultural pluralist ideology of multiculturalism being based on culture and ethnicity, which in some ways can alienate individuals just by mentioning their name. By attempting to change the socio-economic position of ethnic-minorities, Castles allowed them to be more socially mobile in a reformed economic and social structure.

By the mid-80s, multicultural funding had been cut and the main multicultural department, the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs (AIMA) had been abolished. A merger of the ABC and SBS television networks was also planned. 'The only

substantive innovations had been the establishment of an Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA) in the Prime Minister's Department and the appointment of an Advisory Council on Multicultural Affairs to advise the Prime Minister' (Castles, 1987, p. 1). Policies that were being used at this time were also becoming dated and did not seem to fit in with the ideals that government had put forward. The move away from a cultural view of Multiculturalism had left a hole and no clear path for policy to follow. The disintegration of AIMA, a department set-up to create policy and further multiculturalism in Australia, had failed and other recommendation reports, like 'Don't Settle for less – Report of the Committee for Stage 1 of the Review of Migrant and Multicultural Programs and Services' (also known as the ROMAMPAS report or Jupp report) (Castles, 1987), failed to change any views of politicians and policy makers. Castles felt then that there were now only two ways that multiculturalism could travel; 'a "new laissez-faire" in ethnic affairs, or a reassertion of the policy of social justice for minority groups' (Castles, 1987, p. 7). Of these two policies, it appears that the laissez-faire way was how the government felt it could best handle NESB inadequacies in finding and keeping working-class jobs (as a large majority of people from a NESB were unskilled workers). This situation most likely arose from Australia's attempt to create a free market, not just financially, but socially. In this way, Castles felt ethnic-minorities had become a commodity rather than an under-represented minority group.

However, in the ever changing climate of Multiculturalism in Australia, the Hawke government began to increase funding (albeit slowly and only marginally) due to a decline in the ethnic vote and created the ACMA (Advisory Council on Multicultural Affairs) and the OMA (Office of Multicultural Affairs). 'A central aspect of this ...

policy is the emphasis on consultation' (Castles, Cope, Kalantzis & Morrissey, 1988, p. 77). Castles, however, felt that the attempt to include consultation was flawed, as the government could pick and choose who it wanted to 'consult'. This cycle of policy changes seemed to ebb and flow around election time, perhaps to win the votes from ethnic-minorities.

Racism and Multiculturalism

The continued control that the government had over people from NESBs, through cultural, economic and political paths, according to Castles, highlighted a rather racist tone, which appears to exist in Australian dominant culture. During initial attempts at Multiculturalism, there appeared to be public support for more diversity and the beginning of a more tolerant Australia. However, by the mid-80s this had begun to fade away as old habits began to reappear. Geoffrey Blainey (1984), an Australian historian, who was criticised by Castles (1987), was one of the most vocal respondents to Australia's Immigration policy during the mid-80s. He called for a slowing of Asian immigration which in-turn created heated debate. Social commentators grabbed the issue and ran with it, while some conservatives in Australia supported Blainey's views regarding immigration and multiculturalism. During 1984 – 1985, Australian public opinion began to shift away from the view of ethnic-minorities as a valued member of Australian society to a minority who were 'flooding' Australia with cheap unskilled labour and accepting Government handouts, which were supplied by Australia's hard-working, white, taxpayer. This could also have been fuelled by the recession in 1982 – 1984 (Castles, 1986).

The creation of this new, conservative and suspicious view of immigrants undoubtedly led to cuts from the government who no longer saw multiculturalism as a viable policy, so, in-turn, tried to tone down and step back from the policies which were in place, perhaps leading to stronger resentment towards ethnic-minorities by the 'Anglo'-majority.

A good example of mid-80s multicultural thought would have to be the 1988 Australian Bicentenary. This was regarded as an event for all Australians to revel in sheer Australianness. 'The Bicentenary itself is likely to be forgotten soon enough. It is one of history's one-night stands. But it is part of a long tradition of attempts to define Australia, and what it means to be Australian' (Castles 1989, p. 93). Castles felt that unclear boundaries can make it difficult to determine exactly what an 'Australian' is. The superiority of the Anglo-Celtic ruling class had been put under threat by the arrivals of people from NESBs, which may have left the ruling class feeling somewhat less 'Australian'. If this is the case, then Castles felt that it was feasible to argue that a country must redefine its concept of nationhood if it wishes Multiculturalism to be successful. However, "those who have the power to create and rule a nation-state, have the most influence in defining the "national character"" (Castles, p. 93).¹

Another factor that was alluded to by Castles (1989) was the way in which Australians define their country. The creation of the 'Immigration Restriction Act' (more popularly known as the White Australia Policy) in 1901 and its continued use for another 50 years highlights, again, Australia's xenophobic attitude. The threat of foreign invaders taking over vast spaces, namely the threat of the 'yellow peril' is another classic example of Australia's somewhat racist attitude towards ethnic-minorities. While these feelings

had subsided during the 70s, recession and the increase of NESB groups had led some to believe that the new arrivals were to blame. This has led 'the populists like Blainey and the intellectual "New Right" (to) represent revived versions of a racist conception of Australian identity...Partly reminiscent of the glories of English colonial ideology, both inject an element of English-ness into their characterisation of this society' (Castles, 1989, p. 100).

This definition of Australia was continued through the attitudes of 'Anglo'-Australians in the early 90s and became a cause of concern. There was a feeling that ethnic-minorities were getting an unfair advantage over 'real' Australians through welfare handouts. The main target for media commentators were the 'Asians' who were apparently 'swamping' Australia and were receiving unfair handouts from the government. This led to the creation of policies which treated ethnic-minorities as a problem, while putting aside theoretical work conducted by researchers like Castles.

Policies that were implemented for ethnic-minorities at this time were on one level non-racist but, strangely at the same time overtly racist on another level which relied on the media and dominant culture. Castles (1990, p. 32) called this 'Commonsense racism...The received ideas of racist culture are transmuted into 'commonsense' notions, for instance about the inevitability of conflict and competition between different 'races''. This type of racism can be seen in some of the current Howard government policies towards refugees, where the 'commonsense' thing to do would be to turn back or place the refugees into detention to stop them 'flooding' Australia. Popular culture and media outlets used this kind of racism as a way of justifying racist attitudes and reinforcing the level at which the Anglo-majority sits and the ethnic-minority lie.

This has slowly led towards a multicultural policy that focuses on border control and immigration flows, rather than theoretical aspects of multiculturalism in Australia. These issues will be discussed later in this thesis.

In the mid-90s, Pauline Hanson continued this trend away from multiculturalism, towards an emphasis on immigration policy by re-igniting the 'race debate' by picking up where Geoffrey Blainey had left off. However, Asian immigrants were not the only people on her list. Aboriginals were targeted too for receiving Government handouts and unfair treatment over non-Aboriginal people. 'She represented herself as speaking on behalf of 'mainstream Australians' who were unrepresented by the main political parties' (Ricklefs, 1997, p. 51). The lack of comment by the Government seemed to further inflame the situation which split public opinion (with many of the older generation supporting her views i.e. The then Victorian RSL President, Bruce Ruxton). This further widened the gap between the minorities and the dominant majority. This move away from issues raised by theorists in the mid-80s highlights the governments' approach regarding multicultural debate in Australia and is further strengthened by media outlets, encouraging this perceived shift.

Multicultural representation in the media

This leads us to the issue of media representation of multiculturalism. Media outlets represent the common public opinion of what a 'real' Australian is. Research conducted by Coupe, Jakubowicz and Randall (1992) found that out of 61 groups, 47 of these viewed an Australian as "only white", 'Anglo-Saxon', 'blond and blue eyed' and 'fair skinned'. Other responses of this type were 'tall, thin and tanned', 'Paul Hogan' and 'Lisa Curry and Grant Kenny'. This research highlights the media in Australia had

strong representations of white Australian values and cultures, but lacks any clear understanding of ethnic cultures. People from NESBs seem to only appear on television in comedic roles where they play the stereotypical 'wog', which appeals to the dominant culture as it puts the ethnic cultures at a sub-par level to 'Anglo'-Australians and regurgitates previously held beliefs about NESB Australians. The media should also reflect the multicultural aspect of Australia but does not appear to do this as most appearing on Australian television are white 'Anglo'-Australians.

With the exception of the SBS network, there are really no people from a NESB working as a television personality. The best way to highlight this is through examination of news programs. There are no current news presenters that have or at least show ethnic ties. As news presenters are meant to enter the home every night and present the news, this may show that Anglo-Australians do not want a non-Anglo Australian in their house. This situation can lead to people from NESBs 'feel(ing) that they were different to or excluded from Australian society' (Coupe, Jakubowicz and Randall, 1992, p. 19).

The reporting of certain events can also create feelings of exclusion for some ethnic-minorities. Various reports highlighted the treatment received by people from the Muslim community after the September 11 attacks on America. The media sought out Muslims with extremist views and then proceeded to put them on television as a representative of the Islamic community and then waited for public backlash to begin. This inflaming of an already volatile situation did not help as incidents of violence on people looking Muslim were reported. Attempts for stable multiculturalism seem to have stalled substantially in the 90s. Rather than proceeding forward towards a unified country where everyone is treated equally, Australian multicultural policy has stopped the

implementation of a 'mainstreaming' model and has put a greater emphasis on the arrivals into Australia, rather than supporting the ethnic-minorities already within Australia.

Chapter 3

Governmental policies – a shift from the cultural to the economic

New policies were created and implemented to give clear guidelines about Multiculturalism and its proper implementation into Australian society. In the late 80s, these policies attempted to distance themselves from the racist tone that appeared to be taking over. This situation continued into the 90s and further pushed ethnic-minority issues to the back of peoples' minds. Policies in the mid-90s also began to incorporate multiculturalism into the concept of neo-liberal ideals. That is, trade and employment now began to be more important factors in multicultural policy as ethnic-minorities increasingly became a commodity. Security threats and border protection have become more of a concern, especially through the media, thereby displacing issues to do with welfare and fair treatment of ethnic-minority groups.

In 1989 the then ALP government released a guide to Multiculturalism entitled 'National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia'. This agenda identified 'three dimensions of multicultural policy' which included 'cultural identity', 'social justice', and 'economic efficiency'. Cultural identity is simply the way in which all Australians could share their own heritage freely. This includes language and religion. Social justice allows all Australians to equal treatment, however, all Australians must come under the same rule of law, regardless of their ethnicity or cultural beliefs. Economic beliefs were a part of these dimensions that highlighted Australia's shift towards a market driven society. This covers the migration of skilled workers into Australia and continued to be a major influence on multicultural policy from the late 80s to Australia's current policies (Castles, 1992, p. 15). These highlight the Agenda's main issue, that is, the rights of people from

NESBs. The removal of a pluralist theoretical view from this Agenda highlighted the move to an 'access and equity' model, which focuses on the equality of all. This, however, could not be fully achieved while public opinion remained against immigration and multiculturalism. Luckily, the Australian model has been successful in allowing many different ethnic groups to gain citizenship.

Problems with this Agenda ranged but tended to focus on differing degrees of racism within Australia. As highlighted by Castles (1992, p. 18 – 20), Australia has been lucky in the past due to its isolation, but this is likely to change. This is currently occurring in Australia with large numbers of refugees attempting to seek asylum but being turned back or detained, as policies have been geared towards exclusion. This, included with the movement of labour forces, which is now a worldwide market and the implementation of tougher entry requirements, indicates more difficulty will ensue.

The change in policy had finally completed its move from basing multiculturalism on an individual's culture and ethnicity to allowing all citizens of a country to be involved, hence allowing it to become mainstreamed, an idea put forward by various theorists, including Jakubowicz and Castles. 'Thus cultural rights are not seen as pluralism, let alone separatism, but as an aspect of citizenship, to be restricted only when they infringe other rights, such as the rule of law, tolerance of others or equality of the sexes' (Castles, 1992, p. 19). The lack of social policies in regard to ethnic minorities, however, tends to stray too far from some of the good points in pluralism. By not expanding services to minorities, they are left with too much pressure on themselves to cope with their changed circumstances. Castles (p. 19) argues, 'basing service delivery on ethnicity tends to segregate and marginalise migrants, but ignoring ethnicity and catering

for migrants only within general services can mean neglecting special needs and perpetuating structural discrimination'. The need for extended support rather than support in the first 12 – 24 months of arrival is also important, as not all people from NESBs can adjust as quickly as others. Their needs too, must be examined, for example, a person from a NESB who intends to return home after 5 years may have different needs from an asylum seeker or a long term immigrant.

Current Australian Government policy – Population flows, protection of borders and new agendas

As has been discussed, the current Federal Government has taken an increasingly exclusionist and nationalistic stance towards multiculturalism and immigration. While controversies regarding the 'swamping' of Australia by Asians seem to be behind us for now, governmental policies have, in the public eye at least, appeared Anglo-Australian biased while trying to encourage aspects of Multiculturalism. In December 1999, the current Federal Government released 'A New Agenda for Multicultural Australia' (Commonwealth of Australia, 1999), which replaced the Agenda of the previous Labor Government. This outlined the Government's stance on Australian Multiculturalism and its responses to recommendations made by the 'National Multicultural Advisory Council', which highlights various government policies designed to help Multiculturalism.

The current Australian government sees four principles needed to allow Multiculturalism to work. These are all based around Australia as a democratic country. These set of principals are actually rhetorically quite similar to the old agenda laid down by the Hawke Labor government in 1989. These include 'civic duty' which sets down

certain structures that allow Australian society to operate; ‘cultural respect’, which allows all Australians to express their cultural beliefs without fear of persecution. These, however, must be conducted within the laws of Australia; ‘social equity’ allows equal opportunity for all Australians and protects Australians against discrimination. This would also influence ‘cultural respect’, as some actions by people may infringe on their civic rights; and finally, ‘productive diversity’, which is quite similar to a key point outlined in the 1989 ‘Agenda for Multicultural Australia’, but includes an emphasis on the diversity of Australia and how that can create better opportunities for all Australians (Commonwealth of Australia, 1999, p. 6).

While the rhetoric of multiculturalism has stayed the same over the past ten years, the current Federal Government has put a greater emphasis on the individual and economic rationalisation. The current Federal Government outlined how they intended to implement these principals. These include; the creation of partnerships within the Australian government by creating a home page dedicated to Multiculturalism networking; implement a public information and education strategy which intends to raise the public’s awareness of cultural diversity in Australia; promote productivity and performance improvements that can be created through diversity strategies; and promote an ‘Outreach’ program to help create better relationships between people of different cultural backgrounds. (Commonwealth of Australia, 1999, p. 8). Some of these steps have been taken (for example, the home page, entitled ‘Diversity Australia’ does actually exist) while some do not appear to have been implemented to their full extent. This may be due to events that have taken place since the inception of this ‘new’ Agenda or may have just been too difficult to implement fully. The Agenda also includes

recommendations by the 'National Multicultural Advisory Council', which made 32 recommendations regarding multicultural policy to the Government. Most of these recommendations were supported by the Government and implemented in some way. However, while most recommendations were supported, they may not have been implemented in a way that was intended by the Advisory Council.

Government multicultural policy at this time also began to distance itself from an 'access and equity' model towards a more neo-liberal, economic rationalised model. While multicultural policy does still exist, it would appear that the current government is reintroducing a pluralist policy, as for example, individual services and schools are being created. Possible exclusion of ethnic-minorities may have also returned in these policies as the Federal Government continues the rhetorical line of 'mateship' and 50s style conservatism. This would appear to only apply to white, Anglo-Australians. A way to bypass debate regarding changes to multicultural policy would appear to have been by emphasising issues regarding border protection and immigration flows. The increased pressures of the September 11 terrorist attacks on America also allowed border protection to become a major issue. This makes statistics regarding immigrants, both legal and illegal more interesting, as these appeared to have been, and still are, major points for the current Government to argue against expanding immigration policy in Australia, and continue to look over issues regarding multiculturalism by ignoring the theory and removing its importance from the public eye.

An examination of figures for arrivals of both the migration and humanitarian immigrants must be split into two groups, Non-humanitarian and humanitarian arrivals. The report 'Population flows: Immigration aspects' (2000) outlines, almost instantly, that

‘the size of the migration program in the last eight years has been significantly below the levels of the late 1980s when the program peaked at 124,000 in 1988 – 89. The outcome of the 1999 – 2000 program was 70,200, which is 3.4 per cent higher than the 1998 – 1999 outcome of 67,900’ (DIMA, 2000, p. 16). Of these, 35,330 visas were issued to the ‘skill stream’, which encompasses people from NESBs who come to Australia seeking work who ‘can help address skill shortages in Australia and enhance the size, skill level and productivity of the Australian labour force’ (DIMA, p. 17). The family stream allowed 32,000 immigrants in, which is designed to allow family reunions of, for example spouses of immigrants. A further 2,850 made up a ‘special eligibility’ stream, of which an explanation is not given as to what it encompasses. Visas are also issued to selected people who are already in Australia on a temporary visa. ‘Permanent visas may be granted onshore to applicants for most family stream categories, except fiancés, and to some skill stream categories’ (DIMA, p. 23). Of these, 17,340 people were granted Australian residence after they applied for a permanent visa. Since 1998 -99, there has been a 15.2% increase in this type of migration into Australia.

The humanitarian program that is run in Australia grants 12,000 places to refugees. This program has two components; ‘onshore’ and ‘offshore’. ‘The onshore component of the Humanitarian Program allows Australia to fulfil its international obligations under the United Nations’ 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 protocol relating to the Status of Refugees’ (DIMA, 2000, p. 24). Within the offshore category, there are two other categories, which class the type of entrant. The first is a refugee category, which includes 4,000 places, including 420 places for women at risk. The second category is the ‘Special Humanitarian Category’ and the ‘Special

Assistance Category' which allows entrance to a person who is outside of their country of residence and needs to find a new country to live in. A requirement of this category is that the person from a NESB has ties within Australia. The SAC was however, being wound down during 2000 (DIMA, p. 24).

Onshore applications for Protection Visas are given to people who meet the criteria for protection under the UN regulations regarding the status of refugees. During 1999 – 2000 there was an increase in applications for protection visas by 'unauthorised arrivals in 1999 – 2000, reflecting the substantial increase in numbers of unauthorised boat arrivals in that period' (DIMA, 2000, p. 27). There had also been an increase in the number of unauthorised arrivals in Australia over the past 4 -5 years. During 1999 – 2000, a large number of the refugees were arrivals from Iraq and Afghanistan, which would have obviously increased over the past year.

As part of Australia's immigration program, the arrival of illegal immigrants on boats has caused major debate in the media and in parliament. In 2001, the Commonwealth Government released a book outlining its policy regarding asylum seekers and methods taken to stop illegal boatloads of people arriving in Australia or islands in its territory. While some illegal immigrants do attempt to gain entry into Australia by flying in, most of these people are deported within 72 hours. So, our focus will be on illegal arrivals on boats as this has caused the most concern and debate. In 1999 – 2000, there were 4175 unauthorised boat arrivals. This compared to 926 in 98 – 99 and 157 in 97 – 98 highlights a significant increase in numbers. These boats were also most likely to embark from Indonesia, which explains efforts by the Government to work with the Indonesian Government to stop 'people smugglers'. The arrivals of 'boat people'

mainly contained people from countries experiencing war or civil unrest. For example, Iraq and Afghanistan were the countries of origin for many of the boat people. It would be suspected that this number may have increased with the wars that have plagued the Middle-East in recent times. However, with a change in detention policy in Australia (illegal immigrants are now detained off-shore) newer figures may show a decrease in illegal immigrant numbers (DIMA, 2001, p. 45). While these figures appear to be extremely compelling by highlighting a ‘major problem’ with Australian border security, none of these government documents highlight the reason why the illegal immigrants actually fled their country.

Another chapter of this report examines the actual detention of illegal immigrants who are kept in detention camps around Australia. Again, this section of the report argues that the detention of illegal arrivals is not a breach of human rights (three paragraphs of argument). It also outlines requirements for release from detention which include ‘There are safeguard provisions in place to release people from detention if an exceptional circumstance exists and they: are under 18 years or over 75 years; have a medical condition which cannot be adequately treated in detention; or are the spouse of an Australian citizen, Australian permanent resident or eligible New Zealand citizen’ (DIMA, p. 85). Note the detention of children under the age of 18. It would appear that the Government is not following policy or does not view the detention of 10 year olds as an ‘exceptional circumstance’.

These types of policies do not seem to be in the best interests of a Multicultural society. It appears that the current government has attempted to embrace multiculturalism, so long as it still has full control over it, through selection of ‘worthy’

candidates. The policy regarding asylum seekers is also letting down the view of Australia as a tolerant nation. Shutting the gates to asylum seekers and only giving them the opportunity to migrate if they apply through the 'proper' channels, which in most cases would be practically impossible, seems to defeat the idea of asylum seeking in the first place. Now, with government and media debate almost fully in support of detention of illegal immigrants and the availability of the security threat stigma, the government can now fully restrict asylum seekers. It would appear then, that the Federal Government has achieved its goal of restricting the amount of immigration into Australia. It could now be argued that with this type of government so determined to stop any type of immigration into Australia, how could they possibly fully support an unbiased multicultural policy? If this is the case, then it would appear that the government is more for assimilation of current ethnic-minorities rather than integration of cultures and people.

This situation has led to Multiculturalism no longer being a major policy for the current Federal Government. Cutting of funds to departments (or quite simply cutting the department altogether) and an ever changing policy on Asylum seekers has created much discussion. Again, the media has played a major role in depicting how the 'average Australian' must feel about these issues. This leads us back to issues that were encountered during the 50s when the 'White Australia Policy' was in operation. The destabilisation of multiculturalism has led many Anglo-Australians to view immigrants as a threat. The September 11 attacks on America have also had a huge affect on an already intolerant nation. Now, immigrants or asylum seekers can be turned back or labelled as a 'security threat'. Muslims have now been labelled as a 'race of terrorists' but still no-one in the media has spoken loudly against this notion (for every person who may speak out,

there are five who push the popular, uneducated, public opinion). The issue of racism in Australia has now led Multiculturalism back to arguments advocated by populist writers such as Blainey (1984) from the mid-80s. It has created a feeling of 'assimilation or leave' type attitude and has labelled large groups of our society unfairly.

Chapter 4

Multiculturalism in Australia – Where do we go now?

This thesis has attempted to pick up main theoretical ideas on multiculturalism at certain times over the past 30 years. It has left, however, the question of where Australia is headed to, say in the next 10 years of multiculturalism, open for discussion. This chapter intends to draw all of the ideas presented in this thesis together in an attempt to examine future implications and directions of Australian multicultural theory and policy.

It would be difficult to say now that cultural pluralism in Australia is dead. It has been replaced by mainstreaming, which would appear to be the better choice. However, pluralism does appear to be returning to policies as the current Federal Government continues to ignore multicultural theory. A lack of ideas about combining cultures and learning from each other appears to have stopped discussions on Multiculturalism which dominated the late 70s and early to mid 80s. This time was dominated by a cultural pluralist opinion of multiculturalism, but it still attempted to move away from Australia as an Anglo-majority dominated society, or at least this is what papers written around this time appeared to indicate. This attitude now appears to have eased considerably, as immigrants from certain middle-eastern countries are now viewed more as a threat than a blessing following the September 11 attacks. This allowed many media commentators to speak out against immigration. It also allowed the government a new way of stopping asylum seekers coming to Australia. Labelling them a security threat was much easier.

The actual benefits of the mainstreaming model appear to outweigh those of a cultural pluralist model too. The teaching of culture within schools would become part of the curriculum in a more streamlined fashion, as the cultures in a mainstreamed society

are merged together. It would be as though the students were being taught their own culture, something which may help define a culture that can be designated uniquely 'Australian'. There are also social implications that can affect ethnic-minorities which are addressed by the mainstreaming model. For example, by allowing cultures to blend, the minority group becomes socially mobile and is accepted as part of the majority (the use of 'minority' and 'majority' would also become obsolete). However, there can be problems with this type of model. Just as pluralism can create separatism, mainstreaming can cause assimilation. As ethnic-minority cultures merge together with the 'Anglo'-majority, some aspects of individual cultures can be lost in the process. This can then lead a mainstreaming model into an assimilationist model, as cultures become more like the mainstream, in our case, Anglo-Celtic culture. Governments like assimilationist models too, perhaps because it does not strip any power away from them and can allow the dominant culture to retain power and control over the minorities.

As has been highlighted, both of these models of multiculturalism are flawed. The safest recommendation would be to try combining both of these models as that would allow diversity and 'togetherness' of a culture. However, which parts of these theories would be included or excluded in their coming together? If a strong model is lacking, then multiculturalism will not be able to function, especially in a society like Australia where the public may feel disadvantaged by some of the current policies. As government appears to be unsupportive of immigration, this too will have an effect on how people from NESBs view Australia as a multicultural nation as there would appear to be restrictions for certain cultural groups. However, the future of multiculturalism is always going to be dictated by theory.

While the rhetoric of the theory has not changed significantly over the past 15 years, the actual implementation of the theory into policy has shifted towards a market-driven and individualistic approach, leading Australia away from mainstreaming and back towards a pluralist model. This has also led to a shift away from multicultural policy towards a border protection policy, which highlights the focus of the current Federal Government. Australia then, has moved back in multiculturalism by ignoring the changes made in the mid-80s to early 90s. A reintroduction of a mainstreaming policy may be in the best interest of Australia as the current policies do not appear in line with the theory, which it would appear, has been ignored.

As has already been discussed, immigration in Australia is being slowed by the current Federal Government. This is after a boom in the 80s which saw large numbers of people from NESBs arrive and public debates into the immigration policy soar. The influx of illegal immigrants and refugees has also slowed as tougher border protection policies block illegal entries. This has caused debates into Australia's role as a humanitarian care giver, which have all been rejected by the current government. While there has been some opposition to these policies from other minor political parties, the current government has been able to implement a rather harsh deportation scheme. The usual 'red tape' for those waiting to see if their refugee status has been accepted is another issue which has caused debate.

When examining the themes and policies of Australian immigration at the present, there is a feeling of an underlying throwback to 'White Australia'. The continual toning down of policies, lowering the number of immigrants into Australia and public opinion which appears more nationalistic every day, appears to have created a less than ideal

environment for multiculturalism to thrive. In fact, it could be said that multiculturalism has been surpassed by the urge of the government to assimilate ethnic-minorities into the dominant culture, rather than embrace other cultures (which may make the Australian culture whole, rather than fragmented), through the guise of a mainstreaming model. As no real attempts have been made to oppose this situation, it would be a fair assumption to say that future policies will continue down this line.

When examining the timeline that has been presented in this thesis, the 70s and early 80s were a boom time for multiculturalism, but the mid to late 80s saw a decline in public support for multiculturalism. This allowed populists like Blainey (1984) to create tension by suggesting that immigration levels were too high and that multiculturalism was not in the 'best interests' of Australia. While this was successfully overcome, there remained an underlying tone of scepticism among some, which reappeared in the mid-90s. This period highlighted everything that is wrong with Australia's multicultural policies, from racism to mismanagement of government departments and services. This would suggest a further decline in multiculturalism which would appear to lead to the re-introduction of a pluralist model.

Unfortunately, the lack of counter-attacks to these changes has only made it harder to build multiculturalism back to the expectations of the 70s and early 80s. The first change would be in rethinking the current policies surrounding the entry for people from NESBs into Australia, including asylum seekers, which should include more humanitarian entries and a back-down from the extreme border protection schemes currently in place. The second would be the re-focusing of immigration departments towards an 'access and equity' model which would allow for better welfare for ethnic-

minority groups as opposed to the current 'numbed' status of these departments. Thirdly, humanitarian issues and the detention of illegal immigrants needs to be rethought. As too does the 'red tape' they must face when they arrive into the country (or one of the other countries Australia ships their illegal immigrants off to). Finally, public opinion must be changed or else we run the risk of a new 'white Australia' where ethnic-minorities face animosity from Anglo-Australians. The 'Hansonites' are an example of where Australia may be headed if the current policies continue in this vein.

Australia, it would appear then, has always had racist undertones hiding in the dominant culture. While political correctness is the current trend, some have spoken out about what they view as unfair treatment of 'Anglo-Celtic' Australians. As there still is a large portion of the public who do not appear to understand, or for that matter, want to understand, multiculturalism, they will continue to be swayed by populist commentators and politicians. This feeling also appears to have grown over the past 2 years after the September 11 attacks, as xenophobic feelings continue to increase and undermine the hope for multiculturalism in Australia. While it would be ignorant to expect all cultural groups to co-exist peacefully, the gaining of support from Anglo-Australians would be crucial in creating a multicultural society. This would not appear possible when examining current government policy, which considers outsiders an increasing threat to Australia.

With these thoughts in mind, it would be easy to predict Australia as becoming a closed off, exclusionist nation. However, with the plethora of cultures within Australia, this would be extremely hard to do. The Australian public has learnt to become tolerant of some cultures, but has become intolerant of others. Asylum seekers are viewed as

'freeloaders' trying to sneak into the country so they can get welfare benefits to the despair of the 'hard working taxpayer'. Continually bombarding the public through free-to-air commercial radio, television stations and newspapers, with these types of thoughts and images, does not allow thought or discussion regarding immigrants' circumstances. This has not led to discussions regarding people from NESBs but rather has strengthened the view of ethnic-minorities as the 'other'. This appears to be in line with current Government policies, separating ethnic-minorities from the 'Anglo'-majority.

For Australia to become more open minded, it has to become aware of others' problems. It took over 100 years of lobbying by Aboriginal groups to gain support over attempted genocide of their culture and lives (which still is not fully supported), so it may take a few years for 'Anglo'-Australians to see past the newspaper reports and start to think about other issues affecting ethnic minorities. This would be a major hurdle in Australia's attempt to become a fully multicultural society as it would help to remove boundaries created by some people in our society who feel threatened or need someone to blame rather than looking to causes of problems a little closer to home. The move away from mainstreaming, where only the Australian 'culture' could be blamed for differences, has led to continued debates surrounding cultural 'differences' between the 'Anglo'-majority and the ethnic-minority. This theme of racism is unfortunately part of Australian culture, which cannot be removed quickly. However, through the gradual removal of these stigmas, Australia would be able to progress towards tolerance. If these issues are overcome, there is no reason why multiculturalism cannot function in Australia.

Bibliography

- Blainey, Geoffrey. (1984). *All for Australia*. Methuen Haynes: North Ryde.
- Castles, Stephen. (1986). Racism and Multiculturalism. *Tolerance*. November 1986(5).
- Castles, Stephen., Kalantzis, Mary., Cope, Bill., Morrissey, Michael. (1988). *Mistaken Identity: Multiculturalism and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia*. Pluto Press: Sydney.
- Castles, Stephen. (1989). *Migrant Workers and the Transformation of Western Societies*. Cornwell University.
- Castles, Stephen., Booth, Heather., Wallace, Tina. (1984). *Here for Good: Western Europe's new ethnic minorities*. Pluto Press: London.
- Castles, Stephen. (1987). A new Agenda in Multiculturalism? *Multicultural Australia Papers*. Paper 61: June. Clearing House on Migration Issues: Richmond.
- Castles, Stephen. (1992). The Challenge of Multiculturalism: Global Changes and Australian Experiences. *Working Papers on Multiculturalism*. Paper 19. University of Wollongong.
- Castles, Stephen. (1990). *Issues for a Community Relations Strategy: A report to the Office of Multicultural Affairs*. Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet: Canberra.
- Coupe, Bronwyn., Jakubowicz, Andrew., Randall, Lois. (1993). *Nextdoor Neighbours: A Report for the Office of Multicultural Affairs on Ethnic Group Discussions of the Australian Media*. Australian Government Publishing Service: Canberra.
- Galbally, Frank. (1981). Report of the Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services for Migrants. *Galbally Information Kit: The Galbally Report*. Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs: Canberra.
- Jakubowicz, Andrew & Mitchell, G. (1982). *Community Welfare services and Ethnic Minorities*. N.S.W. Department of Youth and Community Services.
- Jakubowicz, Andrew. (1984). *Education and Ethnic Minorities – Issues of Participation and Equity*. National Advisory and Co-ordinating Committee on Multicultural Education.
- Jakubowicz, Andrew. (1984). *Ethnic Welfare Policy in Australia – The Failure of Multiculturalism*. University of Sydney.
- Jayasuriya, Laksiri, & Pookong, Kee. (1999). *The Asianisation of Australia? Some Facts about the Myths*. Melbourne University Press: Carlton South.

Jupp, Dr. James (1986). New Directions for Research. *Ethnicity and Multiculturalism 1986 National Research Conference. May 14-16, 1986*. Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs.

A New Agenda for Multicultural Australia. (1999). Commonwealth of Australia: Canberra.

Population Flows: Immigration Aspects. (2000). Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs: Canberra.

Protecting the Border: Immigration Compliance. (2001). Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs: Canberra.

Ricklefs, M. C. (1997). The Asian immigration controversies of 1984 – 85, 1988 – 89 and 1996 – 97: A historical review. *The Resurgence of Racism: Howard, Hanson and the Race Debate*. Gray, Geoffrey & Winter, Christine (eds). Monash University: Clayton.

Smolicz, J. J. (1982). *Some Principals of Australian Pluralism*.

Smolicz, J.J. (1981). *Cultural Pluralism and Educational Policy: In Search of Stable Multiculturalism*.

Smolicz, J.J. (1980). *Education for a Multicultural Society*.