Jock Collins

Immigration and Immigrant Settlement in Australia: Political Responses, Discourses and New Challenges

**IMER
INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION
AND ETHNIC RELATIONS**

MALMÖ HÖGSKOLA

Jock Collins

Immigration and Immigrant Settlement in Australia: Political Responses, Discourses and New Challenges

Australian society has been shaped more by immigration and immigrants than most countries in the world today. This paper examines the changes to the character and composition of Australian immigration in the post-1945 period and analyses the impact of these changes on the public discourses and policy responses related to Australian immigration and settlement philosophies and practices in Australia today. It first looks at the Australian immigration experience, and how immigration policy has changed in recent decades as a result of globalisation. It then outlines the changing composition and character of the Australian immigration intake as a consequence of these policy changes, and at the key discourses about Australian immigration that have accompanied these changes. The paper then examines the way in which immigrant settlement or integration policies and practices have changed in light of the impact of globalisation on the political, economic and social climate in Australian society, with a particular emphasis on the debates about Australian multiculturalism. Finally, the paper addresses the new challenges for government policy makers and for decision makers in the private and non-government sectors of Australian society that are a consequence to the changing dynamics of the Australian immigration experience in a changing global world.

Keywords: immigration, immigrant settlement, multiculturalism, Australia, globalisation, discourses, policy

1. Introduction

Australian society has been shaped more by immigration and immigrants than most countries in the world today. Australia has the greatest proportion of permanent immigrants of all contemporary western societies with the exception of Israel and Luxembourg. In 1999, 23.6 per cent of Australia's population were first generation immigrants (that is, were born overseas). This exceeds that immigrant presence in Switzerland (19.2%) and Canada (17.4%) and greatly exceeds the immigrant presence in USA (10.3%) Germany (8.9%) France (5.6%) and the United Kingdom (3.8%) (OECD 1998: 36). Since white settlement immigration has been a major source of labour force and population growth. In the post-1945 period alone, some 5.6 million immigrants have arrived in Australia. Today nearly one in four of the Australian population of 19 million people were born overseas. These first generation immigrants, together with their Australian-born children - the second generation - comprise over half of the population of Australia's largest cities of Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide and Perth.

The key feature of the Australian immigration experience is that immigrants are invited to Australia as new settlers, to become part of the Australian society, with citizenship freely available and encouraged after two years. Many immigrants have brought their families with them or, through a process of chain migration, have been reunited with parents and children in Australia over time. This 'family' or group characteristic of Australian immigration is similar to the experience of immigrants in the USA, Canada and New Zealand but in contrast to the 'individualistic'

characteristic other immigration to countries in Europe and the Middle East where immigrants were/are wanted only as temporary "guest workers" on short-term contracts and, when they stayed on, their citizenship rights denied or constrained (Castles and Miller 1993). In order to deal with settlement issues that accompany immigration intakes, Australian political parties adopted a bipartisan policy and philosophy of multiculturalism in the mid-1970s.

But Australian immigration policy has changed quite considerably over the past half-century. Immigration intakes peaked in the late 1960s, and since that time, with fluctuations, have been in relative decline. Moreover, the way that immigrants are chosen has changed from an explicitly racist selection policy – the white Australia policy that existed from Federation in 1901 till 1972 – to a non-discriminatory policy with immigrants selected for their economic attributes via a points-test system. Despite the white Australia policy and the desire to fill the country with mainly British immigrants, Australia's immigrants have come from all corners of the globe. People from more than 180 nationalities have been caught in the Australian immigration net. Over time, there has been a change in the source countries of Australia's immigrants. Immigrants from Britain and New Zealand still dominate, but many immigrants now come to Australia from Asia. The balance of the immigration intake has, in recent decades, swung away from family and refugee intakes – regarded by the current Australian government as humanitarian and economically useless – in favour of independent and business migration categories, where economic impact becomes the driving rationale of immigration policy. Most of today's immigrants to Australia are highly skilled and well educated, an indication of, and a response to, the way in

which globalisation has changed the Australian economy in general, and immigration policy in particular.

Australian policies towards immigrant settlement or integration have also changed considerably. The assimilation policy, which featured until the last half of the 1960s, gave way – after a brief interregnum of a policy of integration - to a policy of multiculturalism, introduced in the late 1970s. Multiculturalism remains the official policy for immigrant settlement, though it has undergone many changes and is in crisis today. The other key feature of the Australian immigration experience to note at the outset is that Australian immigration and multiculturalism policies have been very controversial over the past two decades, not coincidently the two decades that have seen the sharpest impact of globalisation on the Australian economy and society.

Debates about Australia's immigration and multiculturalism policies have played a central role in Australian national politics, as evident in the national elections in November 2001. In this election, the issue of unauthorised boat people seeking refuge in Australia was a decisive factor in the re-election of the conservative Howard Coalition Government. Refugee and undocumented immigration is but one of the new challenges to Australian immigration policy. Post September 11 2001, there has been renewed concern about the links between immigration, terrorism and national security to add to well-established concerns about the economic and environmental impact of immigration. At the same time, the social impact of immigration and the adequacy of multiculturalism as a philosophical and policy framework for immigrant settlement is being increasingly questioned. This concern has been exacerbated by the link between immigrants and crime in Australia,

particularly linked to Middle Eastern and Asian immigrants. All this has occurred at a time when the centenary of Australiana federation and the end of the Millennium have led to passionate debates about Australian national identity. The result is that Australian immigration and settlement policies are facing new challenges in an uncertain and emotionally charged political and economic environment.

This paper examines the changes to the character and composition of Australian immigration in the post-1945 period and analyses the impact of these changes on the public discourses and policy responses related to Australian immigration and settlement philosophies and practices in Australia today. It first looks at the Australian immigration experience, and how immigration policy has changed in recent decades as a result of globalisation. It then outlines the changing composition and character of the Australian immigration intake as a consequence of these policy changes, and at the key discourses about Australian immigration that have accompanied these changes. The paper then examines the way in which immigrant settlement or integration policies and practices have changed in light of the impact of globalisation on the political, economic and social climate in Australian society, with a particular emphasis on the debates about Australian multiculturalism. Finally, the paper addresses the new challenges for government policy makers and for decision makers in the private and non-government sectors of Australian society that are a consequence to the changing dynamics of the Australian immigration experience in a changing global world.

2. Characteristics of the Australian immigration program

Five decades of post-war immigration (1947-1975)

The post-war Australian policy of settler immigration began in 1947 by the Labor government with two clear objectives. One was a numbers objective, that is, to add one per cent to Australian population growth, to 'populate or perish'. The first Australian Minister for Immigration, Arthur Calwell, claimed that "we must fill this country or lose it" (AIPS 1953: 25). Once the immigration target intake was set, the other objective was a 'racial purity' objective, that is, to manage the immigration program by ensuring that the composition of the migrant intake would maintain a white Australia: Calwell promised that nine out of every ten Australian post-war immigrants would be British or Irish (Collins 1991:12). But from the outset, this grand plan ran into problems. Given the shortage of shipping after the war, the Australian government could only get half the numbers of planned British and Irish migrants. In order to fill immigration targets, the Australian government was forced to take in an almost equal number of refugees from Eastern Europe. While "white", these immigrants - called "reffos" or "Balts" - were certainly not British. Australia's post-war immigration policy was almost in tatters before it had begun. The battle between "labour supply" versus "racial purity" aspects over the size and composition of Australia's immigration program had been won by those who saw to need to fill jobs as the critical issue.

Immigrant workers were therefore to be a critical latent reserve army of workers for Australian capitalism in the post-war period (Collins 1984; Lever-Tracy and Quinlan 1988). But a "two-class" immigration

model had been established in the uncertainty of the moment during these first years. Australia would continue to seek as many migrants from Britain, Ireland and other English-speaking countries (or ESB immigrants), using the "assisted passage" - for the British the "ten quid" cost to travel to Australia by boat - as a financial carrot. But it would also be necessary to "top up" immigration quotas with immigrants from non English-speaking countries (or NESB immigrants) who would generally have to pay their own way and make their own arrangements through the "chain migration" process. NESB immigrants were considered solely as manual labour or "factory fodder" to fill the undesirable, low paying, dirty jobs in the male and female work force. In contrast, ESB immigrants demonstrated employment profiles similar to the Australian-born, including a presence in skilled trades, the services sector and managerial and professional occupations.

The 1960s were the last years of the "long boom" that had emerged since the mid-1940s (Collins and Brezniak 1977). The 1960s were to be the peak years of post-war Australia immigration, with intakes in the latter half of the 1960s averaging 104,228. More than half of these immigrants came from Britain and Ireland. A diluting of the white Australia policy emerged in the 1960s as exceptions were made for educated and professional Asians - mostly from Commonwealth countries - to enter Australia. But Asian intakes were small and averaged only 8% of the total immigrant intake for the 1960s (Collins 1991: 24-5).

The 1970s were a watershed in post-war Australian immigration history. In the 1970s the long boom was replaced by a period of economic crises, induced largely by the international capitalist recessions of 1974-5, 1981-2 and the 1990s. These cyclical economic crises occurred at a time

of fundamental restructuring of the international capitalist system. The new international division of labour that emerged was to have fundamental implications for the Australian economy and for Australian immigration policy. Multinational capital began to restructure global investment patterns in order to relocate manufacturing plants from their markets such as Australia into third world countries - particularly in Asia - where labour costs were much lower, financial inducements higher and trade unions non-existent or weak. In the face of these changes, Australian manufacturing capital had to invest highly in new technology to compete with imports, while many firms moved offshore to the Asian region. As a consequence, employment in the manufacturing industry - which peaked in the mid 1960s - began to fall irrevocably. Moreover, the remaining jobs in manufacturing - the employer of most NESB migrant labour hitherto - became increasingly skilled. The demand for unskilled manual labour of the past decades had fallen dramatically, with recession generating domestic sources of surplus labour.

In these new national and international circumstances, immigration targets were cut, averaging 60,000 per annum in the 1970s as immigration policy was changed to gear migrant intakes closer to the changing employment needs of the economy. The 1970s saw the final death of the White Australia policy with the election of the Whitlam Government in 1972, first Labor Government in twenty-five years. A non-discriminatory immigration policy was introduced with bi-partisan political support. But it was not until the fall of Saigon in 1975 that "non-whites" began to feature in Australia's immigration intakes in a large way as Vietnamese refugees arrived in large numbers by the end of the 1970s. Australian immigration history had turned full-circle from more than 100 years of

White Australia. Since then Australia's immigration patterns have an demonstrated an increasing reliance on immigrants from Asia (Coughlan and McNamara 1997), mirroring the trends in the other major immigration countries of Canada, New Zealand and the United States (Castles and Miller 1993).

The Fraser Government (1975-82) introduced a points test for selecting immigrants, developed from the Canadian model, to replace selection procedures based on racial origin or appearance. A Business Migrant category was introduced at this time and the points test system was fine-tuned to attract very highly educated and skilled immigrants, many of them from Asia. Immigration numbers were increased so that by 1981-82 the immigration intake exceeded 100,000 per year, the highest annual intake since the late 1960s. In 1982-83 Asia was the largest source of Australian immigrants for the first time on over a century: 36% of the annual intake came from Asia in that year, compared to 27% from Britain (Collins 1991: 27).

The emphasis of Australian immigration policy began to shift from populate or perish to one of maximising the economic impact of new immigrants. During this period, the contradictions of increasing globalisation emerged with the international recessions of 1974-5 and 1980-81, which hit the Australian economy with a slight time lag. Rising Australian unemployment was one consequence of these recessions – the rate of unemployment exceeded 10 per cent for the first time in fifty years in 1983 - leading to a concern of continuing high rates of immigration under these circumstances. At the same time, globalisation continued to restructure the Australian economy, particularly evident in the further decline of the Australian manufacturing industry, once the

major employer of immigrant from a non-English Speaking background (NESB immigrants). This decline was enhanced by the Hawke Labor Government (1982-92), which enthusiastically embraced globalisation and adopted many economic rationalist policies, including a deregulation of the Australian finance sector and exchange rate and the reduction of tariff protection to local manufacturing industry. The high unemployment rate of the 1982-3 recession led to a reduction of immigration in the first years of the Hawke government, but this was increased to 115,000 by 1986-87 following economic recovery. During this period family reunion continued to dominate the migrant intake.

The start of the 1990s saw a Labor government in power attempting to deal with an economic recession in which unemployment rates exceed 11 per cent. The 1990s have been relatively low years for Australian immigration. As Table 1 shows, immigration intakes were reduced following the 1990-91 recession, falling below 70, 000 in net terms in 1993-4. While the numbers have gradually increased since, they remain less than half that of the annual intake for the high water mark years of the late 1960s (Collins 1991: 24-25). These relatively low immigration intakes to Australia can be contrasted to the Canadian case where immigration intakes remained high in the 1990s despite economic recession for the first part of that decade.

Table 1

Australian immigration intakes in the 1990s

Settler arrivals and Net immigration

Year	Settler arrival numbers	Net permanent migration
1991-92	107 400	78 300
1992-93	76 300	48 400
1993-94	69 800	42 500
1994-95	87 400	60 500
1995-96	99 100	70 500
1996-97	85 800	55 900
1997-98	77 300	45 300
1998 -99	84 100	49 000

Source: www.immi.gov.au/facts/02key-1.html#2

The election of the Howard conservative coalition government in 1996 led to further reductions in the Australian immigration intake, as Table 1 also shows, partly a result from the anti-immigrant politics that accompanied his rise to political power that was derived from the increasing economic uncertainty generated by the accelerating globalisation of the Australian economy. Under the Howard Government, and his immigration minister, Phillip Ruddock, the family component of the immigrant intake has been consciously reduced and the independent and skilled components have been increased as the Howard government seeks to fine-tune immigration policy to the changing needs of a now

globalised economy. At the same time, refugee intakes have been reduced in real terms – that is, as a proportion of the immigration intake – and politicised in a way that had not occurred in the past five decades of Australian immigration history. This aspect will be taken up later in the article.

Overall post-war immigration trends

Since 1945, around six million people have come to Australia as new settler immigrants. They have had a marked influence on all aspects of Australian society. Immigration has added about half of all the population growth in Australian (Collins 1991: 32-35) from about 7 million in 1947 to around 19 million today and about half of the extra workers added to the Australian workforce (Collins 1991: 77-78) in this period. While most arrived as free settlers, over half a million (more than 590 000 people) arrive under humanitarian programs, initially as displaced persons and more recently as refugees. About one million migrants arrived in each of the four decades following 1950: 1.6 million between October 1945 and 30 June 1960; about 1.3 million in the 1960s; about 960 000 in the 1970s; about 1.1 million in the 1980s. The highest number of settlers to arrive in any one year since World War II was 185 099 in 1969-70. The lowest number in any one year was 52 752 in 1975-76 (Collins 1991: 28-32). The 1990s was a decade of relatively low annual immigration intakes to Australia.

The remarkable feature of the Australian immigration experience is the diversity of backgrounds from which Australia has drawn its immigrants. While the initial intention was to have most immigrants come to Australia from Britain, and to continue the tradition of White Australia,

the reality was otherwise. While the UK and New Zealand remain the largest groups taken in to Australia as immigrants today, the Australian immigrant net has been cast to all corners of the globe. As Table 2 shows, over 1 million Australian immigrants have come from the UK and Ireland, with large immigrant intakes also from southern European countries of Italy, Greece and the former Yugoslavia. The end of the white Australia policy for the past three decades has seen more than 1 million immigrants arrive from Asian countries. Smaller numbers have come from the African and American continents.

Table 2

Australia's Immigrant Population by birthplace (thousands)

Country of birth	1971	1981	1991	1996
Europe	2 197	2 233	2 300	2 217
UK & Ireland	1 088	1 133	1 175	1 124
Italy	290	276	255	238
Former Yugoslavia	130	149	161	n.a.
Greece	160	147	136	127
Germany	111	111	115	110
Other Europe	418	418	457	618
Asia (incl. Middle East)	167	372	822	1 007
New Zealand	81	177	276	291
Africa	62	90	132	147
America	56	96	147	151
Other and not stated	18	36	75	95
Total	2 581	3 005	3 751	3 908

Source: Castles and Zappala 2001:2

The characteristics of Australia's permanent immigrants are changing. People with low formal education and poor English language skills, who dominated the immigration intakes into Australia in the first three decades after the Second World War, are now missing out on immigration selection. In recent decades, immigration flows have increasingly comprised of highly educated and qualified people with good English language skills. This has been accompanied by an increasing immigration to Australia from the Asian region and from Afric and the Americas, with the number of immigrants from European countries – the backbone of the first three decades of post-war immigration – increasing very little over the past quarter of a century.

This change in the composition of Australian immigrant intakes is seen clearly in Table 3, which shows the immigration intakes by region for the 1998-1999 year. Most recent immigrants to Australia – about one in three of the total intake - came from the Asian region, mostly from Southeast and Northeast Asia. Over the past decade immigrants from Southeast Asia have declined in relative terms, while those from Northeast Asia and South Asia have increased. This reflects the increasing importance given to the education and employment background relevant for the 'new economy', a further indication of how globalisation is shaping Australian immigration trends. Next in importance in recent immigration trends are immigrants from New Zealand or the Pacific Islands (Oceania). This partly reflects the fact that New Zealand is the only country whose citizens can migrate to Australia at will. People from all other countries must apply and be selected through the points system within the annual quota. There is no quota for New Zealanders, so that

this intake is the 'wild card' in Australian immigration policy (Collins 1991: 247-248).

Table 3

Australian Settler arrivals by region of birth,

July 1998 -June 1999 intakes compared to July 1988-June 1989 intakes

Region of Country of Birth	Numbers 1998-99	Per cent 1998 -99	Numbers 1988-89	Per cent 1988-89
Oceania	22 501	26.7 %	28 000	19.3 %
Europe & former USSR	19 608	23.3 %	42 400	29.2 %
Middle East & North Africa	5 195	6.2 %	8 000	5.5%
Southeast Asia	10 934	12.9 %	31 700	21.8 %
Northeast Asia	10 869	13.2 %	15 900	10.9 %
Southern Asia	5 316	6.3 %	7 000	4.8 %
Northern America	1 624	1.9 %	3 100	2.1 %
South America, Central America & the Caribbean	773	0.9 %		
Africa (excl. Nth Africa)	7 246	8.6 %	4 300	3.0 %
TOTAL (including 'not stated')	84 143		4 800	3.3 %

Source: www.immi.gov.au/facts/02key-1.html#2

But table 3 also shows the diversity of the recent Australian immigration intakes. About one in four were from Europe and the former USSR, while nearly one in three immigrants in 1998-9 were born in Asian countries. Smaller but significant intakes came from the Middle East and Africa, with immigration from the latter nearly trebling in a decade. Only a trickle of immigrants to Australia has come from North America and Latin America in the past decade.

Table 4

Major source countries of settler arrivals, by country of birth,
July 1998 to June 1999:

New Zealand	18 677	22.2 %
United Kingdom	8 785	10.4 %
China	6 133	7.3 %
South Africa	5 024	6.0 %
Philippines	3 318	3.9 %
Fed Republic of Yugoslavia	2 912	3.5 %
India	2 557	3.0 %
Indonesia	2 491	3.0 %
Vietnam	2 137	2.5 %
Hong Kong (SAR)	1 918	2.3 %

Source: www.immi.gov.au/facts/02key-1.html#2

Regional figures hide the detail of Australian immigrant links to particular countries. As Table 4 shows, the while the 84 143 immigrant settlers

arriving in Australia between July 1998 and June 1999 from more than 150 countries, most were born in New Zealand (22.2%), the United Kingdom (10.4%), China (7.3%), South Africa (6%), Philippines (3.9)% and the former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (3.5%). they were followed in numerical significance by immigrants from India, Indonesia, Vietnam and Hong Kong.

Temporary Immigration to Australia

One of the impacts of globalisation on Australian immigration is an increase in the importance of short-term immigrant flows as distinct from long-term flows. Put another way, globalisation has increased temporary immigration to Australia compared to past decades, when settler immigration was of more significance. During the 1998-99 financial year, for example, more than 109 000 people received visas for temporary entry to Australia to undertake specific work, conduct business, entertain, play sport, or (for young people), a working holiday. This number, which excludes students and visitors, exceeds by about 25% the size of the permanent immigration intake of that year. Temporary residence is mainly for people with key employment skills or who can contribute in the fields of cultural or international relations, such as diplomats, working holidaymakers, and people who come to Australia under exchange agreements. Between July 1998 and June1999 a total of 136 308 temporary residence visas were granted. Of these, 37 024 were issued in the economic (skilled based) visa sub-classes, 17 165 in the social/cultural subclasses and 71 242 in the international relations visa subclasses. In 1999-00, 121 825 people received temporary residence visas to Australia.

In the past decade the number of overseas-born students studying in Australia at secondary and tertiary level has increased dramatically. This is part of the successful exporting of Australian education, with the peculiar feature of this export being that it actually comes to the country that exports it. Foreign students are an important injection of funds into an Australian tertiary education sector that has to educate more students with less government allocation. It represents the globalisation of Australian tertiary education. In order to facilitate the entry of foreign students to Australian educational institutions, the Student Visa Program was introduced. This provides for the entry of overseas students who want to undertake full-time study in registered courses in Australia.

Between July 1997 and May 1998 56 983 student visas were granted to foreign students (DIMA 1998), down on previous years. In the 1998-99 program year, a total of 67 130 student visas were granted offshore, an increase of six per cent over the number granted in 1997-98. In 1999-00 73,867 student visas were issued. The major source countries for foreign students are shown in Table 5. Indonesia was the largest source for the period 1996-99, followed by Japan, Malaysia, USA, India, Singapore, China and Korea. Student intakes from countries such as Korea and Malaysia were reduced following the Asian economic collapse of the late 1990s.

There have been a number of reviews of Australia's student visa system. A number of claims, anecdotes and reported cases of students using this as a way of illegal entry into Australia has led to a tightening up of provisions under the student visor category. This is a manifestation of the tension between the economic imperative for foreign students and the constant government concern of undocumented and so-called 'illegals'.

Table 5

Overseas Students Granted Temporary Visas, 1996-67 to 1998-89.

Overseas students	1996/97	1997/98	1998/99
Indonesia	7 890	7 913	9 112
Japan	5 950	5 558	4 915
USA	3 426	4 144	4 891
Malaysia	6 074	4 909	4 771
India	2 742	4 113	4 518
Singapore	3 726	3 634	4 006
China, PR	1 934	2 368	3 563
Korea, Rep. of	9 527	5 100	3 032

Source: www.immi.gov.au/facts/02key-1.html

Another feature of the impact of globalisation on Australia is the increasing magnitude of tourism, which brings millions of people into Australia each year. In 1998-99, for example, 2799 369 non-business visitor visas were approved, adding to the cultural diversity on the streets of Australia's largest cities. In 1999 international tourism to Australia generated export earnings of $17 billion (Department of Industry Science & Resources 2000). In 1999-00, 3.23 million visitor visas to Australia were granted. Table 6 shows the major countries of citizenship for non-business visitors (primarily tourists). This shows that there is a similarity between foreign student flows and overall tourist flows to Australia, with Japan, Korea and USA the countries prominent in both Australian foreign student lists and tourist lists. Other countries to feature strongly among Australian tourist intakes were the UK, Singapore, Taiwan and Germany.

Tourist flows are volatile. Intakes from Asian countries dipped following the Asian economic collapse of the late 1990s, but increased strongly during the 2000 Olympic year. Officials hope that the media spotlight that was on Sydney and Australian during the 2000 Olympic Games will result in a growth in short to medium term tourism to Australia.

Table 6

Visitors Visas to Australia, 1996-97 to 1998-99.

Tourists (mainly)	1996/97	1997/98	1998/99
Japan	722 713	716 575	687 502
UK	358 102	407 379	496 056
Korea, Rep of	222 526	123 123	80 600
USA	216 476	261 466	352 694
Singapore	145 420	170 110	154 867
Taiwan	132 831	137 502	124 692
Germany	116 846	120 586	135 452

Source: www.immi.gov.au/facts/02key-1.html

2000-01 Migration Program

The most recent immigration period, 2000-01, indicates recent trends in immigration intakes overall and in the composition of the component immigration categories. The migration program for 2000-01 planed to bring in 76 000 immigrants to Australia, slightly more than the 70 000 who were planned for 1999-00. This is a level comparable with, though perhaps at the high end of, the intakes of the 1990s, as Table 2 shows. The program planning level set by the Government continues the shift towards

skilled migrants and away from family migrants. More than 50 per cent of new migrants planned to arrive in 2000-01 come from the Skilled Stream. The components of the planned 2000-01 intake are: family 34,000; Skill 40,000 (of which business skills 6700); Special Eligibility 1600 and Humanitarian 1200 (www.immi.gov.au/facts/02key-1.html).

This trend to reduce the proportion of family migrants in Australia's intakes that has been evident since the election of the Howard Government in 1996. Immigration Minister, Phillip Ruddock, has argued that the family program is a humanitarian one that is out of place in an immigration program that has shifted emphasis from family reunion and resettlement in Australia to one more geared to immigrants with skill but without their family. The problem with this direction of Australian immigration policy is that it devalues the critical role that family reunion has played in solving settlement issues for new immigrants. It also wrongly depicts the family stream as humanitarian and without economic merit. Studies of ethnic entrepreneurship in Australia have found that the family stream – or family reunion stream as it was once known – is critical to the replenishment of immigrant entrepreneurs in Australia. Collins et al. (1997) surveyed over 1500 entrepreneurs – mainly immigrants - in Melbourne Sydney and Perth in the mid-1990s.

The program planning level set by the Government ensures that the shift towards skilled migrants continues. In the 2000-01 Australian immigration program, 40,000 places have been reserved for the skill stream, As Table 7 shows, more than half of these will come under the independent category of the skills stream. In addition, some 6700 will have business skills (the new name for the revitalised and redesigned business migration program), while 5800 will come from the Employer

Nomination scheme, the Labour Agreements scheme and the Regional Sponsored Migration Stream. These schemes – as well as the Skilled-Australia linked component of nearly 6000- are designed to tie skilled immigrant intakes directly into occupational or regional shortfalls. The latter is an attempt to direct new skilled immigrants to regional areas – where populations are in decline and skilled and professional workers are hard to attract - rather than metropolitan areas, where the opposite is the case. This will be a test for the attempts to direct new immigrants to regional areas. In the past fifty years, the government left it up to the immigrant as to where in Australia to settle, and immigrants became the most urbanised part of the population of one of the most urbanised nations in the world (Collins 1991: 35-42). The problem here is that without jobs in regional areas, immigrants will not want to stay there.

Table 7

Australian planned Skill stream intakes, 2000-01

ENS/Lab/RSMS*	5 800
Business Skills	6 700
Distinguished talents	170
Independents/STNI	21 350
Skilled-Australia Linked	5 950
1 November onshore	30

* ENS - Employer Nomination Scheme. Lab - Labour Agreements. RSMS - Regional Sponsored

Migration Scheme.

Source: www.immi.gov.au/facts/02key-1.html

Between July 1998 and June 1999, 11 310 people were granted Humanitarian Program visas, comprising 3 940 refugees, 4 350 Special Humanitarian, 1 190 Special Assistance visas granted overseas, with another 1 830 issued to refugees already in Australia. In the planned 2000-1 immigration program, the Humanitarian Program intake will comprise 12 000 places - of which 8 000 will be used for those in humanitarian need offshore. 1600 places are reserved for the Special Eligibility category. The balance of the 12 000 places, along with any unused places, will be available for people found to be refugees onshore. Offshore places may be supplemented by any unused places onshore during the remainder of the year.

It is this refugee component of the Australian government's immigration policy that has been most controversial in recent years. Despite a history of being, in relative terms, the nation most generous to refugee needs (Collins 1991: 47-74) this generosity has turned into a nasty intolerance of those who arrive directly on shore to apply for refugee status. The Howard government has introduced legislation to allow them to imprison those who arrive 'illegally' into Australia to claim asylum, and is the only western country to do so. This has led to the establishment of privately-ran camps/prisons in remote parts of the country to contain these 'boat people'. There have been many instances of riots in these camps and a number of successful efforts by those imprisoned in this way to escape. Welfare, church and other community organisations have long decried the conditions in the camps, the fact that women and children are locked up – in some cases for years – and the lack of human rights of this direction in immigration policy by the Australian government. This issue will be discussed in more detail later in this paper.

3. Key immigration debates

Australian immigration has always been a controversial issue. Questions of 'how many immigrants?' and 'from where?' have always ignited debate, sometimes overheated, in the pubs, kitchens and television and radio studios of the nation. This debate centres on differing views as the effects – economic, social, political and cultural – of Australian immigration. There have been a number of debates about Australian immigration and multiculturalism in the past two decades and longer. The most significant has been the Blainey debate of 1984, the Bicentennial immigration debate (1988) and the debate ignited by the rise of Pauline Hanson in 1996 are perhaps the sharpest examples of this. As Australia approached the centenary of Federation in 2001 and a possible Republic and a new constitution, the issues of immigration, cultural diversity and multiculturalism are once again the subject of much debate. These debates centre on the economic and environmental impact of immigration.

An overview of the effects of past immigration requires a critical overview of this debate, which is outlined in this section. It is often difficult to separate out immigration issues from settlement issues. Critics of immigration are also generally critics of multiculturalism, the policy adopted by Australian governments of different political persuasions. The debate over past, present and future settlement or integration policy will be discussed in the next section of this paper.

The economic debate

Since immigration has been mainly, though not solely, for economic reasons - particularly to fill labour shortages - it is not surprising that there has been a debate economic impact of immigration for most of the post-war period. Debates in the 1950s and 1960s focussed on the impact of immigration on inflation, the balance of payments, capital shortage and the standard of living in Australia (Mitchell 1969). Most early studies found it difficult to praise immigration on economic grounds (Collins 1991: 101). In the last twenty five years, a period of three post-war economic recessions, the debate has centred on the link between immigration and unemployment, although poor productivity and the persistently high current account deficit and foreign debt have all been linked to immigration (Castles, Foster, Iredale and Withers 1998: 50-73). Indeed, according to some critics of immigration (Blainey 1984; Joske 1989, Rimmer 1991, One Nation 1998) immigration is the cause of many of the economic problems that face Australia.

The most important debate is about the relationship between immigration and unemployment. Australian immigration history shows that immigration levels are increased during periods of economic boom and reduced during periods of economic recession (Collins 1991: 19-32). But immigration intakes have not increased significantly during the period of economic recovery from 1991 to the present. This is because unemployment rates remained above eight per cent for all the 1990s until March 1999. The 1990s have thus been years of economic insecurity that accompanied a 'jobless recovery' and the restructuring of the Australian economy. The processes of globalisation have led to a decline of jobs in the manufacturing industry – the traditional site of employment of NESB

immigrant men and women - and eroded jobs in services industries such as finance and banking. In the 1990s, for example, there have been 1000 bank closures and 20 000 jobs lost to the Australian banking sector, while the clothing footwear and textiles industries have literally been decimated by a reduction of tariff protection and the influx of cheap imports from Asia. Most new jobs created in the 1990s have been part-time with uncertain weekly hours to match the uncertainty of future employment for many.

Pauline Hanson's *One Nation* party, which had a dramatic rise to political influence following the 1996 Federal election, drew from this insecurity to fuel support for anti-immigration and anti-Aboriginal policies. In uncertain economic climates, scapegoats are sought. The claims that immigrants take Australian jobs and that immigration is the cause of the unemployment and therefore economic insecurity falls readily on some ears nurtured by racist and xenophobic attitudes of the past. It is not a coincidence that the first national debate of immigration and multiculturalism was ignited by Geoffrey Blainey in 1984, immediately following the 1982-3 recession when unemployment rates reached double figures in Australia for the first time since the 1930s.

Do immigrants take 'our' jobs? The evidence suggests otherwise. First, immigration adds jobs for the Australian-born (Withers and Pope 1985). This occurs because new immigrants add to economic demand as well as adding to labour supply (Collins 1991: 107-110). New research, most of which was funded by the *Bureau of Immigration Multiculturalism and Population Research* (BIMPR) supported the conclusion that the impact of immigration on the Australian economy was either positive or benign (Wooden et al. 1994). However, most of this research was

conducted within the conservative, neo-classical economics framework that either cannot or will not address many economic dimensions of cultural diversity. This leads to the economic contribution of immigration being underestimated.

For example, the strong immigrant presence among the small business sector of the Australian economy and the role of immigrant entrepreneurs in creating wealth, jobs and exports (Collins et al. 1995a, Collins 1996c) indicates a strong economic contribution of immigration. But this has been excluded from all econometric modelling of immigration's economic impact. In addition, some immigrants have made a *'rags to riches'* transition in Australia to rise to take a place among the wealthiest 200 Australians. Included here are people like retailers Solomon Lew and Frank Lowy, builders Rino and Bruno Grollo, heavy engineering giant Franco Belgiorno-Nettis or Larry Adler in insurance and finance (Collins 1991: 154-156). This positive economic impact of immigrant entrepreneurs in small business and the corporate sector has never been adequately considered in the neo-classical research on the economics of immigration.

When considering the impact of immigration on unemployment it is important to remember that it is immigrants themselves - particularly those from non-English-speaking countries (NESB) - who bear the greatest burden of unemployment in periods of recession (Ackland and Williams 1992) and recovery (Collins, Morrissey and Grogan 1995b). Unemployment data for August 1997 shows that while the unemployment rate of the Australian-born was 8.1 per cent, it was 10.9 per cent for NESB immigrants (Castles, Foster, Iredale and Withers 1998: 21). Unemployment rates for Vietnamese, Lebanese and Turkish immigrants -

particularly for youth - have been about three times the national average for more than a decade (Collins 1996c).

Many of those NESB immigrants who are hired are often employed at levels below their capacity because the Australian labour market penalises rather than rewards *cultural capital*. As a consequence an *accent ceiling* has developed which acts against many NESB immigrants reaching the highest levels of the corporate structure (Collins 1996b). The evidence suggests that the "market" fails to adequately respond to or reward cultural diversity, with strong evidence supporting the existence of racial discrimination in the Australian labour market (Foster, Marshall and Williams 1991; Collins 1996a). This has an adverse impact on immigrants themselves, but also has an adverse impact on the performance of the Australian economy.

In other words, the Australian economy would be stronger - and job creation greater - if the market were to respond fully to the potential of immigrant human capital. To then blame these immigrants for unemployment or poor economic performance is clearly a case of blaming the victim. But scapegoats are eagerly sought in times of economic or social insecurity. Given Australia's long history of formal and informal racism and prejudice (Markus 1994), it is not surprising that many Australians will take solace in the view that immigrants are to blame for unemployment.

Other claims link immigration to Australia's growing foreign indebtedness, low levels of labour productivity, inflation, falling standards of living, rising house prices and almost every other economic problem. But the evidence does not support this view. As Castles, Foster, Iredale and Withers (1998: 73) concluded in their recent overview of the current

Australian immigration debate, 'The evidence is that immigration has been generally beneficial for the Australian economy and for the employment prospects and incomes of Australian residents'.

Environmental debate

Another immigration debate that emerged by the late 1960s in Australia related to the impact of immigration on 'quality of life' issues such as the environment. Environmental critics have argued that immigration, which leads to population increases particularly in large cities, has caused problems of pollution, congestion, sewerage-disposal problems, acid rain, the greenhouse effect, holes in the ozone layer, species extinction, erosion and every other environmental problem (Ehrlich 1968, Ehrlich and Ehrlich 1990).

In Australia, the most urbanised of countries, critics have linked immigration to congestion, pollution, the standard of living in Australian cities and the poor state of the environment (AIPS 1971, One Nation 1998). Groups such as Australians for an Ecologically Sustainable Population (AESP) and Australians Against Further Immigration (AAFI) (Hage 1998: 165-178) and mainstream environmental groups such as the Australian Conservation Federation have been very critical of immigration on environmental grounds. At the 1996 federal election *One Nation*, *Australian Democrats* and the *Greens* advocated a policy of zero net migration.

But the link between immigration and environmental problems is not as simple and apparent as the green critics of immigration think. The causes of environmental problems - which are very real - are complex. A given immigration rate to Sydney, for example, will have a very different

impact on Sydney's population and environment depending on a number of factors. These include the rate of "out-migration" of Sydneysiders, patterns on new immigrant settlement (urban fringes or inner and middle-ring suburbs), and levels of investment in public infrastructure, including public transport.

The Australian 'market' systematically encourages environmental deterioration by putting either zero or low prices on environmental resources. Blaming immigration for environmental problems merely diverts attention from the real (complex) causes and solutions. Moreover, blaming immigration - and, by association immigrants - for environmental problems merely feeds on and reproduces xenophobia: immigration becomes a convenient scapegoat for complex environmental problems. This distorts attention from the causes of environmental destruction that are related to the activity of private enterprise in Australia and to the poor track record of government environmental legislation and public infrastructure (including transport) expenditure (Collins 1991: 316-319).

4. Changing Australian policies and discourses on immigration settlement

Assimilation

From the beginning of the post-war immigration program in 1947 till the late 1960s Australia adopted assimilation as the philosophy to guide governments in developing policies for immigrant settlement and to guide the Australian people as to what to expect of immigrants themselves. The

assimilation policy, which preceded it, was based on the central assumption that new immigrants should shed their difference (cultural, linguistic, religious, dress, food) and become the same as Australians (Martin 1978; Castles et al. 1988). This sameness might appear to be an enlightened policy when compared to the European experience (Castles and Miller 1993), particularly when it was accompanied by easy access to citizenship, at that time after five years settlement (Castles and Zappala 2001). However, the fact that immigrants were not to be treated any differently to anyone else meant that they were not to be aided in this assimilation process. In the first decades, the prevailing philosophy of assimilation effectively excused a lack of immigrant-specific services. In practise immigrants were left to sink or swim in Australia, even though their needs - particularly with respect to language - were obviously different. The roots of assimilation policy were thus found in the same prejudice and xenophobia that sought public support for post-war immigration by maintaining the White Australia, though both assimilation and White Australia were severely flagging by the end of the 1960s.

This is evident in the case of education policy under the assimilation regime. From the late 1940s till the 1960s in Australia new immigrant children, many from a non-English speaking background, entered Australian schools. But assimilation meant that there was no provision in the education sector for translation, no texts or teacher training for a multi-lingual classroom, no bilingual material produced and no special resources located to overcoming migrant difficulties in settlement (Collins 1991: 228-230). The official line was that assimilation was working well in the education system, with the NSW Director General of Education claiming that as NESB children had made "such

rapid progress with the language they have little need for special reading material" (cited in Collins 1991: 230). However, a growing body of research had pointed out that NESB immigrant children were, in fact, performing very badly. Ethnic communities joined with Teachers Unions to push for programs and services to help overcome the learning difficulties of educate children. Similar developments occurred in the fields of health, welfare, law and housing, where assimilation policy denied the establishment of programs and services to respond to the different needs of new immigrant settlers. Assimilation clearly wasn't working and many immigrant groups became clearly disadvantaged according to traditional socio-economic indicators (Collins 1991: 153-197). The end to Australian assimilation was a product of a changing international context for Australian society, recognition of the potential of the migrant vote, the inherent contradictions of assimilation itself, and the agency of ethnic community groups and community organisations such as the Teachers Federations for fought against these contradictions (Martin 1978).

For a brief period of from the late 1960s to early 1970s a model of "integration" was adopted to replace the discredited assimilation model as settlement issues associated with immigration began to emerge more prominently and cultural differences began to gain more prominence. Governments began to channel funds to immigrant communities through ethnic community organisations. However, most of these developments were insufficient, ad hoc responses. As Jeannie Martin (1983: 133) argued, Australian integration was not much more than a two-stage assimilation process that recognised that, because of cultural differences, assimilation would take a little longer to achieve.

Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism first emerged in Canada in 1971 as Prime Minister Trudeau attempted to come to grips with increasing ethnic diversity brought about by immigration on the one hand, and the bicultural and bilingual problems of a British/French Canada (Fleras and Elliott 1992). Australia followed Canada by adopting the multiculturalism model of immigrant settlement. In 1973 Al Grassby, the flamboyant then Minister for Immigration under the Whitlam Labor Government, issued a statement titled *A Multi-Cultural Society for the Future* which set out the concepts of ethnic heterogeneity and cultural pluralism and stressed the contribution of migrants to Australian society and of the need to recognise, rather than dismiss, their distinctiveness (Grassby 1973: 4). The concept of Multi-Culturalism, minus the hyphen, was adopted by the conservative Fraser Government (1975-83). Under multiculturalism, the cultural backgrounds of Australia's immigrant communities became a matter of celebration, not shame.

Australian multiculturalism is an elusive, multifaceted and changing concept. It means at least four things. One is the demographic reality of an increasingly culturally diverse Australian society, the product of immigration. The second is a philosophy that outlines the rights of, expectations of and place of, immigrants and cultural diversity in Australian society. The third is a set of policies, programs and services designed to respond to the needs of immigrant settlement. The fourth is the institutional embodiment of multiculturalism. All of these aspects have undergone transformation over time. Overlaying all these, and responding to them, is the public discourse about multiculturalism,

including criticism from both Right and Left, over the past three decades. Multiculturalism became a bipartisan model and philosophy of immigrant settlement embraced by both major national political parties, the Conservative Coalition and Labour.

Under the Fraser government, immigrant communities were encouraged to celebrate their culture and their background and to maintain their different cultures, languages and religions. This is referred to as the four D's of multiculturalism: dance, diet, dress and dialect. This was a marked change from the days of assimilation, when difference was denied. Importantly, this philosophical change in the place of immigrants in Australian society was matched at the level of government resources. Many programs and services for new immigrants - including SBS television and radio, child and adult migrant education programs and programs and services in the areas of health, housing, welfare and the law - were introduced by the Fraser government, following the watershed Galbally Report of 1978 (Collins 1991: 234-236). The *Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs* was established in 1979 as the institutional embodiment of multiculturalism.

Like Australian immigration, Australian multiculturalism has been very controversial. Following the economic recession of the early 1980s, prominent historian, Geoffrey Blainey (1984), ignited a national debate when he argued that the combination of Asian immigration and multiculturalism in Australia was a recipe for social conflict. With developments in Europe and North America reported as demonstrating the apparently inevitable links between ethnic diversity and social conflict, critics have raised the same concerns in Australia. As Des Keegan (1985) wrote in *The Australian*, 'Racial hatred has erupted everywhere the

mixture has been too disparate'. Geoffrey Blainey predicted that Australia would face of blood on the streets in the 'front-line' suburbs of immigrant settlement as neighbours try to defend themselves from (cultural) invasion (Blainey 1984). Multiculturalism was seen as part of the problem. According to Blainey, 'Multiculturalism…is a recipe for trouble, but coated with platitudes and golden syrup' (*Melbourne Herald*, 30 August 1984) and 'our current emphasis on granting special rights to all kinds of minorities is threatening to cut this nation into many tribes' (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 January 1986). Other critics joined in. Australian economist Stephen Rimmer, for example, argued that "multiculturalism costs Australia \$7 billion per year, or \$410 for every Australian... Federal and State Governments lavishly spend \$2.0 billion dollars on multicultural 'vote buying' programs"[1].

The left in Australia has also been critical of multiculturalism, but from a different standpoint, namely the use of multiculturalism as a means of conservative incorporation and containment of immigrants as a political force (Jakubowicz 1984) and as an effective means of social control (de Lepervanche 1984). More recently, Stephen Castles and his colleagues (Castles et al. 1991: 145) argued that multiculturalism had a number of guises. In its "neo-conservative" form multiculturalism "trades on such regressive elements as aspects of a divide-and-rule strategy for social control of a multi-ethnic society". Even in its social democratic variant multiculturalism "is based on a construction of community through a celebration and fossilization of differences which are then subsumed into an imagined community of national cohesion". Castles et

---

[1] Media Release: "Multiculturalism Costs \$7 Billion", Embargo 11.00 am, 9 July 1991.

al. (1991: 146) conclude that multiculturalism is an ideology too contradictory and restricted to succeed. In particular, "it fails to address the fundamental dimensions of inequality: the ways in which ethnicity overlays class and gender". Cultural pluralism, they argue, can preserve and deepen inequality through ethnic separatism.

The Hawke Labor Government (1983-1992) was an enthusiastic supporter of multiculturalism, and extended its institutional framework and broadened its philosophical underpinnings. The Hawke government abolished by the *Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs* in 1987 and replaced it with the *Office of Multicultural Affairs* (OMA), located in the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, the new institutional site of policy dealing with immigrant settlement issues. In response to this growing criticism of multiculturalism, particularly from the right, the Hawke government set up the *Bureau of Immigration and Multicultural Research* in the late 1980s to fund independent research to challenge the arguments of the critics. Following a number of reviews of multicultural programs and services (AIMA 1982; ROMAMPAS 1985; CAAIP 1988), the philosophical scope of multiculturalism was also broadened under the Hawke government to include the access and equity of immigrants to all areas of economic, social and political life in Australia (OMA 1992). Multiculturalism was further redefined for *all* Australians in the *1989 National Agenda for A Multicultural Society*. Three dimensions or planks of multiculturalism were elaborated in this document: cultural identity (the rights to maintain cultural religious and linguistic freedom in Australia); social justice (the right of all Australians to equality) and economic efficiency (the economic advantages that immigration and

cultural diversity brings if this productive diversity (Cope and Kalantzis 1997) or diversity dividend is recognised and rewarded.

The Keating Labor government was a strong verbal supporter of multiculturalism (Collins 1995), though his government withdrew the eligibility of new immigrants to receive basic welfare rights like unemployment benefits and sickness benefits was withdrawn by first Howard government for the first six months of settlement. This was a landmark retreat for Australian multiculturalism: hitherto new immigrants were treated in exactly the same way as other Australians in terms of welfare rights and entitlements. Keating also took issue with one of the weaknesses of multiculturalism, that is, the place of Aboriginal people within the multiculturalism rubric and tackled issues of national identity in a culturally diverse society. He pushed, unsuccessfully, for reconciliation with the Aboriginal people, for a new Australian Republic, a new national flag and an Australian identity based on diversity. He lost the 1996 national election to the conservative Coalition's John Howard. This meant a deepening in the crisis for Australian multiculturalism.

Howard's political tenure has been coterminous with the rise of Pauline Hanson's One Nation Party and the emergence of yet another national multiculturalism debate. Like many New Right anti-immigration parties that have emerged in Europe over the past decade, One Nation's rise to prominence centred on its critique of immigration, multiculturalism and the alleged preferential treatment given to new immigrants and Aboriginal people, all mixed with a 'common sense' anti-politician, anti-political correctness and anti-globalisation populism.

The *One Nation* party argued that "economically immigration is unsustainable and socially, if continues as is, [it] will lead to an ethnically

divided Australia". Moreover, multiculturalism leads "our people [being] divided into separate ethnic groups" and a destruction of "our unique Australian culture and identity" (One Nation 1998: 23, 10). Journalist Paul Sheehan puts a more populist spin on the anti-multiculturalism theme. In his best seller *Among the Barbarians*, Sheehan is critical of the 'multicultural industry', which is "one of tax-fed lawyers, political operatives and racial axe-grinders that has grown like an enormous parasite out of Australia's heroic commitment to cultural diversity" (Sheehan 1998: x). The issue of national identity in a culturally diverse society also concerns him as he strongly rejects "the notion that Australia does not have a distinct national culture that binds and forms society" (Sheehan 1998: xiv).

The Howard government's attitude to multiculturalism has been at best lukewarm. John Howard hardly used the term 'multiculturalism' in his first term of office. His inept dealing with the rise of Pauline Hanson – he mainly defended her right to have her anti-immigration and anti-multiculturalism view without disputing that view - could also be interpreted as a consequence of his sympathy with many elements of the *One Nation* platform, including its strong critique of immigration, multiculturalism and its strong association with concerns about Asian immigration.

It did not take long for the Howard Coalition government, elected in March 1996, to mark its stamp on immigration policy. Two of the main institutional embodiments of multiculturalism were axed or severely dismembered. The Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research, as it was finally called, was criticised as being too close to the Labor government's immigration policy (*Weekend Australian*, 18-19

February 1995), and was axed by Phillip Ruddock, Howard's Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs. The Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA) was also a casualty of John Howard's uncomfortable attitude towards multiculturalism. It was gutted and removed from its influential positioning in Department of Prime Ministers and Cabinet under Labor to a very small section in the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMA). Indigenous affairs were later added to this portfolio.

In an apparent concession to the anti-immigrant and anti-multiculturalism lobby, the entitlement of new immigrants - other than refugees and special humanitarian intakes – for eligibility to receive basic welfare rights like unemployment benefits and sickness benefits was withdrawn by first Howard government for the first two years of settlement. This is despite the fact that most problems of immigrant settlement occur during this initial settlement phase. Funds have been cut from adult migrant education, health and human rights areas, while the privatisation of welfare and unemployment services is part of the Howard government's reshaping of – read dismantling of – the Australian welfare state. This is matched by a deregulation of the labour market and the dismantling of labour market programs for immigrant and other workers. Both moves have had a strong negative impact on newly arrived NESB immigrants. Intending immigrants face increased charges and greater scrutiny. At the same time, immigration intakes have been reduced and reshaped to favour skilled immigrants at the expense of family reunion immigrants.

In June 1997, the Howard Government established the National Multicultural Advisory Council (NMAC) to develop a report that recommended a policy and an implementation framework for the next

decade, aimed, the government argued, at ensuring that cultural diversity was a unifying force for Australia.

This report, *Australian multiculturalism for a new century: Towards inclusiveness*, which made 32 recommendations on how to improve and refocus multicultural policy, was launched by Howard, on 5 May 1999. It. In response to this report, the Australian Government launched its multicultural policy statement, *A New Agenda for Multicultural Australia*, in Parliament on 9 December 1999. The New Agenda stresses that, in order for multiculturalism to be a unifying force for the nation and to be inclusive, multicultural policies and programs are not to be solely identified with immigration issues and developed for minority ethnic communities. It added the principle of civic duty to cultural respect, social equity and productive diversity that had been established by the Previous Labor governments as the core principles of Australian multiculturalism:

- **Civic Duty**, which obliges all Australians to support those basic structures and principles of Australian society which guarantee us our freedom and equality and enable diversity in our society to flourish;

- **Cultural Respect**, which, subject to the law, gives all Australians the right to express their own culture and beliefs and obliges them to accept the right of others to do the same;

- **Social Equity**, which entitles all Australians to equality of treatment and opportunity so that they are able to contribute to the social, political and economic life of Australia, free from discrimination,

including on the grounds of race, culture, religion, language, location, gender or place of birth; and

- **Productive Diversity**, which maximises for all Australians the significant cultural, social and economic dividends arising from the diversity of our population (http://www.immi.gov.au/multicultural/ agenda1.htm #foundation)

These are essentially the same principles as established by the Hawke government, except that the first core principle, civic duty – the obligations placed on immigrants - has been added to the cultural identity (the rights to maintain cultural religious and linguistic freedom in Australia) principle, though the latter has been renamed 'cultural respect'.

After successfully contesting the 2001 national election, largely on the basis of an anti-illegal immigrant anti-refugee stance, Howard took multicultural affairs out of the immigration portfolio. He established a (junior) Minister for Citizenship and Multiculturalism, separate from the responsibilities of the Minister for Immigration and Indigenous Affairs.

Since that time, Howard has tried to rebuild the bridges with Asian and other ethnic communities in Australia. Yet he retains a reputation of being very uncomfortable with multiculturalism. In other words, multiculturalism as a philosophy and practise in Australia is full of contradictions. It purports to be for all, but fits uneasily with indigenous peoples and many of the white Anglo-Celtic majority, especially the disadvantaged and unemployed. The strength of Australian multiculturalism has been its inclusiveness of cultural aspects of

immigrant diversity, but it has often ignored economic aspects of inequality. To put it another way, multiculturalism in Australia has often emphasised lifestyle - dance, dress, dialect and diet - to the neglect expense of economic equality or life chances. Moreover, formal and informal aspects of racism and prejudice in the workforce and society are often swamped by the pasta and polka versions of multiculturalism. But Australian multiculturalism has attempted to embrace anti-racism, and is not the conservative anti-racist alternative that it is seen to be in Britain. Nevertheless, Australian multiculturalism is at a crisis point.

Despite these fears, the evidence suggests that Australia's cultural diversity has been remarkably successful in terms of minimal social conflict between cultural or religious groups (HREOC 1991; Collins 1993). While there are always exceptions to this rule, Australia has been remarkably free from ethnic conflict. Studies in the 1980s have found higher degrees of tolerance in suburbs of high migrant density than in other suburbs (DIEA 1986: 29). Since that time there have been very few incidents of conflict between religious or cultural groups in Australia. But contradictions abound. Growing tolerance and goodwill towards immigrants of diverse backgrounds co-exists with enduring xenophobia and prejudice (HREOC 1991). Moreover, large sections of the public remain opposed to immigration and immigrants (Markus 1988; Goot 1988). In these circumstances, ssocial cohesion is a considerable achievement given the extensive cultural diversity of Australian society. Fears of the nation becoming 'many tribes' rather than a unified, homogenous 'British' nation (Rimmer 1991; Blainey 1984) are based more on what Hage (1998) calls a 'White Nation fantasy' about the past and the present than on historical evidence.

Critics of multiculturalism from the left see a completely different multicultural reality. *One Nation* and other critics of multiculturalism suggest it has gone too far and given immigrants too much because funding is 'given on the basis of ethnicity and race rather than need' (One Nation 1998: 9). On the other hand, those on the left criticise multiculturalism for concentrating too much on 'life style' and not doing enough to improve the socio-economic circumstances or 'life chances' of immigrants (Collins 1991: 239-241; Jayasuriya 1984). *One Nation* and others see multiculturalism as conferring great power and influence to 'ethnics' and 'the multicultural industry': 'through the power of the ethnic lobby …we see the power of the minority directly influencing the policies which affect the majority' (One Nation 1998: 10). But the major critique from the left in the mid-1980s was that multiculturalism is essentially about ethnic containment and preserving the existing (i.e. Anglo-Celtic) social order (Jakubowicz 1984). More recently, Hage (1998) has criticised 'white multiculturalism' as being an expression of 'white empowerment'.

5. New challenges for managing Australian immigration

Australian immigration and citizenship issues have come into focus in recent years as the landmark dates of the end of the Millennium and the centenary of Australian Federation in 2001 has put a spotlight on issues such as Australian national identity. Since Australia has had one of the largest and most diverse immigration programs of any country in the past fifty years, it is not surprising that the immigration issue has been very

controversial. Debates about Australian immigration and multiculturalism have regularly emerged over the past two decades. Some of this debate settles on the issue of so called 'illegals', that is, undocumented flows of boat people who have arrived in Australian shores seeking asylum. The attitude to Australia's reputation on immigration is being battered by the current Howard Government's political opportunism in the area of undocumented migrants and refugees. This issue was given international prominence during the Tampa boat crisis of late 2001. In addition, the issue of the Australian government's policy towards, and treatment of, asylum seekers remains an international issue that has broad widespread condemnation. An analysis of these issues allows a number of challenges related to undocumented immigration, citizenship and national identity in Australia to be exposed.

Another emerging challenge for Australian immigration and settlement policy is the issue of immigrant crime in Australia. It is this issue that has propelled European Right wing anti-immigration to prominence in recent years. The future of Australian multiculturalism policy is also a key challenge facing Australian society. Finally, the issue of racial discrimination in Australia, in its individual and institutional, indirect and direct forms, remains a key challenge to cosmopolitan Australian society and the place of, and opportunities for, immigrant minorities within it. These issues are addressed in this final section.

Boat people, undocumented immigrants and refugees
In late August, 2001 the Australian Prime Minister, John Howard, refused to allow a boatload of 433 asylum-seekers -- rescued by the Norwegian cargo ship Tampa in Indonesian waters -- to enter Australia and land on

Christmas Island, the north western landing post for those seeking asylum on Australian shores. The captain of the Tampa had responded to calls from Australian rescue authorities to pick up the asylum seekers and was persuaded by their threats of jumping over board to agree to set his boat for Australian waters. In a bizarre antipodean's twenty first century version of John Wayne sending in the cavalry in numerous Hollywood westerns, Howard sent in the Australian navy and special military personnel (the SAS commandoes) to prevent this from happening.

In 2001 Australia was experiencing an increase in the number of boat people trying to reach Australian shores, mainly comprised of people from the Middle East. Between 1 December 1999 and 3 January 2001, 59 boats were intercepted of the north and north west of Australia, carrying 3 796 people from a number of countries in the Middle East (Source: Australian Immigration Fact Sheet People Smuggling, www.immi.gov.au/ facts/83people.html). This was more than the combined total of illegal boat arrivals in the previous three years. Most of these boats are organised by people smuggling operations, though most so-called illegal migration to Australia involves jumbo jets rather than leaky boats: In 1998-99, more people arrived illegally by air than by sea - 2 106 air travellers compared with 926 people arriving on 42 boats (see Fact Sheet 81 *Unauthorised Arrivals by Air and Sea*). Many of the undocumented immigrants arriving in Australia by plane or boat are seeking political asylum in Australia, so that the issue of undocumented migration and refugee intakes are very intertwined.

At 31 December 1999, there were about 54 800 people unlawfully in Australia having overstayed the length of their visas (34 400 males, 20 400 females). This is an increase of nearly 4 000 since December 1997

but is still below the peak of 69 600 in June 1994. Most arrived as visitors (79%) and about 28% have been unlawfully in Australia for nine years or more. As Table 12 shows, the highest number of overstayers came from the United Kingdom and the USA. Despite this fact, the overstayers and 'illegals' debate is not focussed on white, western immigrant groups but on immigrant minorities so that it is the rate at which visitors from other countries – particularly from Asia and the Middle east - who remain unlawfully in Australia that is the prime focus of the current debate. Compared to the number of visitors who arrive each year, the number of overstayers from these countries is well below the global average.

Table 8

Visa Overstayers in Australia, 31 Dec 1999 (numbers and per cent)

Country	Number	Per cent of all overstayers
UK	5561	10.1
USA	4557	8.3
China	3527	6.4
Indonesia	3462	6.3
Philippines	3290	6.0
All countries	54 800	

Source: www.immi.gov.au/facts/02key-1.html#2

Over the past decade or so boat arrivals to Australia were relatively small in number. About 8 289 people have arrived in Australia by boats since 1989. Of that number, 3 218 arrivals had left Australia to return home or to travel to other countries; 1 106 had been granted permanent residence

as refugees, and 93 had been granted permanent residence on other humanitarian grounds (www.immi.gov.au/facts/02key-1.html#2).

Refugee inflows to Australia have been a relatively minor part of the total Australian immigration intake for the past fifty years. However, they have been very significant for the symbolic role that refugees have played in Australian immigration history particularly since attitudes to refugee intakes also provide some litmus test for attitudes to immigration as a whole. The first major wave of refugees to Australia was that of the so-called 'Displaced people' who were mainly eastern Europeans from Poland and the Baltic States who were refuges from the Second World War. Some 180,000 Displaced people arrived in the late 1940s, accounting for approximately half of the immigration intake for these years (Collins 1991: 53-9). This refugee intake was the first critical test for the newly-introduced post-war immigration policy. Its architect, Arthur Calwell, the first Minister for Immigration has sold the mass immigration program to the Australian people on the promise that immigration would not alter the predominantly British character of the Australian people. But as it turned out, only half of the intake in these first years were British, the others being refugees from Eastern Europe. In other words, there was a critical struggle between the numbers and the racial purity objective of the (then new) immigration program. The (relatively) successful experience of the Eastern European refugees proved that Australia could handle non-British immigrants, despite promises and concerns to the contrary. The Eastern European refugees were then the vanguard to intakes of immigrants from a non-English-speaking-background (hereafter NESB immigrants). Many of these refugees – the first boat people who arrived in Australia aboard large

ocean-going liners – later became multi millionaires and leaders of the Australian business community (Ostrow 1987; Collins et al. 1995a).

The second major wave of Australian refugee intake and the first of the modern refugee "boat people" to come directly to Australia in small boats were those Vietnamese seeking asylum following the fall of Saigon in 1975 (Collins 1991: 60-71). This second wave was also a critical moment in Australian post-war immigration history, since these were "Asian" immigrants arriving in a country whose immigration legislation was, for the previous hundred years or so, designed to keep Asians and other 'coloureds' out of Australia. Here was the first crucial test of the political consensus of a non-discriminatory Australian selection policy.

While the Whitlam government was initially sceptical of their plight, the Conservative Fraser government, elected in December 1975, was to provide a generous welcome for these Vietnamese boat people. Like many instances of Australian refugee policy and practice, it was political interests that won the day. These might have been Asian refugees, but they were our political allies in the fight against the Viet Cong. Despite public opposition, the Fraser government – which was to govern from 1975 to 1983 – opened Australian shores and Australian society up to the boat people. Stories of the trauma that they experienced at sea in making this remarkably risky journey to Australia soon won over many Australians to support their arrival in Australia although the Blainey debate of the early 1980s and the bicentennial immigration debate in 1988 showed that large pockets of Australian society were opposed to this second wave of Australian boat people. Overall, 2,059 boat people came to Australia from Vietnam during the period 1975-82 (Collins, 1991: 64) with most Vietnamese refugees arriving that period (55,711) arriving by

jumbo jet from refugee camps as part of the family reunion program rather than come by boat.

The Tampa was not the first boat carrying asylum seekers to the Australian shores. But it was the first one to be turned away, to be refused permission to land on Australian territory. It is not co-incidental that this occurred in the weeks leading to the national election. John Howard had played the race card, opportunistically drawing on a public antipathy to so called illegal migrants and refugees that had been entrenched following the destruction of New York's twin World Trade Towers on September 11, 2001. The big change to Australia's boat people history in recent years is the increasing role of snakeheads and people smugglers in attempting to profit from the traffic in people wanting to flee their circumstances for various reasons and try to get to Australia by by-passing normal official channels. The other big change is the source country of this latest wave of Australian boat people. Whereas the first wave was comprised of Eastern Europeans and the second wave of Indo-Chinese, this latest 'wave' – the term used in the pubic discourse on these matters itself emotionally and politically laden - is mainly coming from China and the Middle East. The largest numbers were from Iran and from Afghanistan, ironically many escaping the repressive Taliban regime that had become the target of American and Australian armed intervention following September 11. There is also a change in the religion of the boat people. Whereas most of the first wave was Catholics or Orthodox and the second wave were Buddhist or catholic, most of this third wave are Muslims from the Middle East. This fact has helped shape the (negative) public opinion on the matter.

The boat people of the Tampa never made it to Australian shores. They, like the undocumented immigrants on the boats that tried to enter illegally after the interception of the Tampa, were taken to pacific island states like Numea and New Guinea who had become part of the Howard government's 'pacific solution' to the boat people problem. In effect, the Howard government has paid large sums of money to Pacific Island states to take undocumented immigrants who were intent in seeking asylum in Australia. This stance, together with the policy of jailing refugee applicants once they arrive in Australia, has proved very costly to the Australian government.

John Howard had a resounding victory in the 2001 national elections, with most political pundits agreeing that the hard line stance on the Tampa boatpeople and on refugees in general was the decisive factor. But herein lies a challenge to the future of Australia as a nation of immigrants. By playing the card of prejudice in an opportunistic attempt, albeit successful, to win votes and retain government, the Howard government has attracted considerable international opprobrium and dissipated much of the international good will directed to Australian following the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games. But perhaps even more importantly the Howard government has given an imprimatur to intolerance of asylum seekers, particularly those from the Middle East. This threatens something more important and enduring than the tourist dollars flowing into Australia: it challenges the social cohesion in Australian society by agreeing with the critics of Australian immigration and multiculturalism. Indeed, it is no coincidence that at the 2001 national elections, that the Pauline Hanson One Nation Party collapsed. Howard had, by moving to the far right on issues of immigration, stolen her

thunder and her votes. It also threatens to lead to an escalation of racist attitudes and actions towards immigrants from the Middle East, an issue that is at the heart of the ethnic crime controversy in Australia to which we now turn.

Related to the issue of boat people and undocumented immigrants to Australia is the controversial matter of Australian refugee policy. Most undocumented migrants, when detained, claim asylum in Australia under the 1955 Geneva refugee convention. Australia is the only country that has introduced mandatory detention for refugee applicants. In addition, it has created a series of refugee camps in remote, desert parts of South and Western Australia that have been likened to concentration camps by civil rights critics. These camps are many hundreds of kilometres away from any community support. There have been many riots, with a number of instances of the burning of buildings, hunger strikes and the sewing of lips by those interned. As a response to the growth of undocumented boat arrivals to Australia, the Australian Parliament passed a series of new laws in September 2001 that it said were "designed to strengthen Australia's territorial integrity and to reduce incentives for people to make hazardous voyages to Australian territories" (http://www.immi.gov.au/ facts/65humanitarian.htm). These new laws takes away the rights of people who arrive at an "excised offshore place" – such as Ashmore and Cartier Islands, Christmas Island, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, staging points for boat smugglers - from making a valid visa application and allows for the possible detention and removal from those places of unauthorised arrivals.

In this way, and through their general handling of the issue of undocumented migrants to Australia, the Australian government has

contributed to a very negative discourse about 'illegals' and refugees. This has added to the growing acceptance of the anti-immigration discourse in Australia.

The ethnic crime debate

One recent development in Sydney in the late 1990s has been a focus in the media and public debates relating to the link between immigration, ethnicity and crime. Following the fatal stabbing of a young Korean schoolboy on the streets of south western Sydney in later 1998 and the drive by shoot up of the nearby Lakemba police station two weeks later, the newspapers of Sydney have been inundated by newspaper headlines and statements of conservative opinion makers on radio and television that link ethnicity to crime. These manoeuvrings took place in the lead-up to a NSW state election campaign in which 'law and order' would be a major platform of the Carr Labor Government. In November, the NSW Director of Public Prosecutions, Mr Nick Cowdery, QC, publicly criticised what the *Herald* termed 'the State Government's law and order push, describing many of its policies as "ill-conceived" and potentially dangerous.

More specifically, the concern had been about Lebanese and Middle Eastern criminals and gangs (Collins et al. 2000). This debate is not new for multicultural societies, with similar debates – particularly about policing in multicultural societies and police racism – evident in the USA, Canada and the United Kingdom. But what has happened in Australia has been the shift from the criminality of a few to a criminality of a culture. Police in NSW use racial descriptors such as "Middle Eastern appearance" when reporting crimes. The media has had a field day on the

ethnic crime issue, leading to a moral panic about immigration and crime in general, and Middle Eastern immigrants and crime in particular, despite a lack of criminological data to support such accusations (Collins et al. 2000). Since all of those from the Middle East are Arabs, and many of those are Muslims, this ethnic crime debate in Australia has been racialised, feeding into deep-seated opinions and fears of xenophobia and prejudice among both the immigrant and non-immigrant population. This association between Middle Eastern, Muslim and criminal helps us to understand the latest controversy about Australian people, the boatpeople arriving on Australia's north west coast seeking asylum.

These events in Sydney in October 1998 heralded the onset of a moral panic in Sydney and the state of new South Wales about the issue of ethnic crime and ethnic gangs, particularly related to Lebanese and Middle Eastern immigrants in Sydney. This moral panic about 'Middle Eastern crime' continues today, amplified by the events in New York of September 11 2001 that have escalated anti-Muslim feelings in Australia (Hage 2002). But the concern about the relationship between (especially coloured) immigrants and crime in Australia is not new. The historical couplet that relates immigration and immigrants to crime has occurred regularly throughout Australian history. Despite claims that some ethnic groups are involved in criminal gangs, which no doubt some are, the criminological evidence does not support the view that immigrant groups are over-represented in criminal activity. New research that has emerged in the 1990s confirms that there is no clear-cut relationship between ethnic minorities and criminality. Data o rates of incarceration by birthplace show that, while immigrants born in the Lebanon, Vietnam, Turkey and New Zealand are over-represented in prisons compared to the

Australian-born, others born in Greece and Italy are under-represented. The conclusion is that there is no simple correlation between ethnicity and crime in Australia: some birthplace groups of first generation immigrants are over-represented, others under-represented.

Extra caution is required in using these statistics to make any firm conclusions about the relationship between ethnicity and crime in Australia. To make a claim about the criminality of different ethnic groups or "cultures" in Australia from data on rates of incarceration of different immigrant groups is valid *only if* it can be assumed that the foreign born have an equal probability of apprehension and are treated equally by the judicial system (Borowski and Thomas 1994). Police attitudes influence how far individuals who are apprehended in alleged criminal acts go in the criminal justice system. In Australia, like in other culturally diverse societies like Canada, the USA and the UK, there is a long history of police racism and corruption.

But despite these facts, there is a growing climate of public concern or panic about immigrant crime. Fear of crime is widely reported in Australian cities and towns. It appears to be part of the fabric of the current age of uncertainty that has emerged in the last few decades in Australia, characterised by increasing globalisation, rising unemployment and growing economic insecurity. It is also clear that fear of crime is constructed through the racialised prism of fear of the "Other". This fear of ethnic criminality and its link to past, present or future immigrants confirmed the views of the supporters of the *One Nation Party* and other anti-immigration groups, of the economic, social and environmental evils of immigration, one of the most controversial and politically significant issues in Australia of the 1990s. Indeed, the very existence of the public

controversies about immigration, Asian immigration, Australian national identity and multiculturalism in the latter half of the 1990s provided a climate in which incidents of "ethnic" crime would be irresistible to newspaper editors and radio talk-back show producers.

The experience of ethnic crime in Sydney in the last few years is the readiness of politicians to exploit fear of crime for their own political purposes. Political parties in Australia, as in many other countries, appear to fight to be tougher on crime than their opponents, even when so called progressive parties, such as the Labor party in NSW, are involved. Moreover, the media, particularly the tabloid newspapers, are eager to give great headline space – often on their precious front pages – to crime, particularly ethnic crime, because it sell papers. Political opportunism and newspaper sensationalism have a vested interest in beating-up the ethnic crime issue.

It is partly for this reason that an investigation into Lebanese or Middle Eastern crime in Sydney is at the same time an investigation into *racialisation* of crime. That is, attitudes of racial prejudice, directly or indirectly, shape practices of individuals and institutions, including the labour market and the police. This is not to say that everything is a consequence of police or media racism. To think this would be naïve. But in order to understand the complex issue of "ethnic crime" in Sydney, it is necessary to consider how the social construction of "ethnic" - say Lebanese - produces a discourse about ethnic crime that often reproduces racist stereotypes rather than challenges them.

While the discourse about ethnic crime in Australian has been largely confined to Sydney, it has the potential to spread across Australia's cosmopolitan cities. Dealing with the issue in a way that does

not reproduce racial stereotypes and a moral panic is one of the key challenges facing Australian policymakers and Australian society today.

6. Conclusion

Australian immigration is at a critical historical watershed. For the last half of the twentieth century, Australia was one of the few countries of large-scale settler immigration and took proportionately more immigrants than the two other great post-war immigration countries, Canada and the USA. During that time, Australia overcame the two greatest obstacles barring it from becoming one of the world's most successful cosmopolitan societies: racist immigration policies that were the legacy of the White Australia policy and assimilationist settlement policies that denied immigrants their rights to be different but equal. In their place emerged a non-discriminatory immigration policy and multiculturalism. Despite contradictions and shortcomings, Australian society had been transformed from a predominantly Anglo Celtic society to one of the most successful culturally diverse societies in the western world today

But at the beginning of the twenty first century, these successes are in danger of fragmenting and dissipating, blown away by the hot wind of anti-immigration sentiment and politics that also blows strongly today throughout Europe and North America. Convergence appears to figure strongly on the international immigration landscape. Europe has become, perhaps reluctantly and belatedly, a continent of immigration – just like Australia and North America. But at the same time Europe and North

America share the growing Australian anxieties about immigrant crime, immigrant terrorists, undocumented immigrants and asylum seekers. Europe is appearing to extend the hand of citizenship and civil and political rights to the immigrant minorities that many countries had pretended did not exist.

Australia had always wanted its post-war immigrants to become citizens – after a few years of settlement - and had also been increasingly willing to confer on them rights of access to the welfare state on an equal basis to other Australians. Multiculturalism meant a respect for the cultural, linguistic and religious difference of immigrants and a set of programs and services to help them in the difficult process of settlement in a new, strange and distant land. Goals of access and equity to immigrants to institutional and political power were also enshrined, if not necessarily achieved. Cultural difference also began to be recognised as an economic resource, though market failure and racial discrimination hampered the realisation of the fruits of this diversity dividend. But in the last decade, a witheringly rapid retreat was underway. Welfare rights were denied to new immigrant for the first two years of settlement. The institutional fabric of Australian multiculturalism began to be rapidly dismantled, a product of growing negative public discourse of about immigration and multiculturalism that found a place in the heart of the conservative Australian Prime Minister, John Howard and his government that has ruled since 1996. The bi-partisan political stance on immigration and multiculturalism, in place since the mid-1970s, was overturned, replaced by a political opportunism that took root in the moral panic about crime and undocumented 'boat people', the economic insecurities

engendered by globalisation and the insecurities that took root following the events of September 11, 2001.

Rather than being challenged, negative immigration and immigrant discourses are being embraced by Australian federal and state governments and their opposition parties for their political advantage. In many ways, Australia seems to have lost the heart that it had for the past half century when it embraced large scale immigration, introduced multiculturalism and attempted to establish the triumph of tolerance for difference over the historical legacy of racism and prejudice. In recent years immigration numbers have stayed low despite strong economic growth, humanitarian and social considerations of immigration policy have been eschewed in favour economic advantage while the institutional and policy support for settlement programs has been continuously dismantled. Long-term social cohesion has been replaced, and is threatened by, a myopic mirage of short-term political and economic advantage. In this way, Australia in recent years has demonstrated its convergence with Europe and North America on matters related to immigration and immigrant settlement, throwing away decades of experiences and policies that could be a model for new immigration countries in Europe and many other parts of the world in the twenty-first century. This means that Australia, perhaps the most significant immigrant country in the western world today, is facing new challenges to maintain social cohesion and pubic support for immigration and multiculturalism.

References

Ackland, R. and Williams, L. (1992), *Immigrants and the Australian Labour Market: The Experience of Three Recessions*. Canberra: Bureau of Immigration Research, Australian Government Publishing Service.

AIMA (Australian Institute for Multicultural Affairs) (1982), *Evaluation of Post Arrival Programs and Services*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

AIPS (Australian Institute of Political Science) (1953), *Australia and the Migrant.* Sydney: Angus and Robertson.

AIPS (Australian Institute of Political Science) (1971), *How Many Australians?* Sydney: Angus and Robertson.

Blainey, G. (1984), *All For Australia*. North Ryde: Methuen.

Borowski, A. and Thomas, D. (1994) "Immigration and Crime" in H. Adelman, A Borrowski, M Burstein and L Foster (eds.) *Immigration and Refugee Policy: Australia and Canada Compared*, Melbourne: Melburne University Press, pp. 631-652.

CAAIP (Committee to Advise on Australia's Immigration Policies) (1988), *Immigration: A Commitment to Australia: Report of the Committee to Advise on Australia's Immigration Policies*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Castles, S. and Miller, M. (1993), *The Age of Migration*. London: Macmillan.

Castles, S. and Zappala, G. (2001), "The Rights and Obligations of Immigrant Citizens and Non-Citizens in Australia", in A. Kondo (ed.), *Citizenship in a Global World: Comparing Citizenship Rights for Aliens*, pp. 136-157. Houndmills Basingstoke Hampshire: Palgrave.

Castles, S., Collins, J., Gibson, K., Tait, D. and Alcorso, C. (1991) *The Global Milkbar and the Local Sweatshop: Ethnic Small Business and the Economic Restructuring of Sydney*. Wollongong: Centre for Multicultural Studies University of Wollongong for the Office of Multicultural Affairs.

Castles, S., Foster, W., Iredale, R. and Withers, G. (1998), *Immigration and Australia: Myths and Realities*. St Leonards: Allen & Unwin.

Castles, S., Kalantzis, M., Cope, B. and Morrissey, M. (1988), *Mistaken Identity – Multiculturalism and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia.* Sydney and London: Pluto Press.

Collins, J. (1984), "Marx's Reserve Army of Labour: Still Relevant 100 Years On", *Journal of Australian Political Economy*, No.16, March.

---- (1991), *Migrant Hands in a Distant Land: Australia's Post-war Immigration*. Sydney and London: Pluto Press.

---- (1993), "Cohesion with Diversity? Immigration and Multiculturalism in Canada and Australia", *UTS School of Finance and Economics Working Paper No. 28*, March, 1993.

---- (1995), "Immigration and the Keating Government", in M. Hogan and K. Dempsey (eds.), *Equity and Citizenship Under Keating*, pp. 88-116. Sydney: Public Affairs Research Centre, University of Sydney.

---- (1996a), "The Changing Political Economy of Australian Racism", in S. Castles and E. Vasta (eds.), *The Teeth are Smiling: The Persistence of Racism in Multicultural Australia*, pp. 73-96. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

---- (1996b), "Vocational Education and Training and the Accent Ceiling", *Education Links* 51: 20-23.

---- (1996c), "Ethnic small business and employment creation in Australia in the 1990s", *UTS School of Finance and Economics Working Paper No. 71.*

Collins, J. and Brezniak, M. (1977), "The Australian Crisis: From Boom to Bust", *The Journal of Australian Political Economy*, No.1, Oct., pp. 1-35.

Collins, J., Gibson, K., Alcorso, C, Tait, D. and Castles, S. (1995a), *A Shop Full of Dreams: Ethnic Small Business in Australia.* Sydney and London: Pluto Press.

Collins, J., Morrissey, M. and Grogan, L. (1995b), "Employment", in *1995 State of the Nation: A Report on People of non-English Speaking Background*, pp. 45-100, Canberra: Federal Race Discrimination Commissioner, Australian Government Publishing Service.

Collins, J., Sim, C.-L., Dhungel, B., Zabbal, N. and Noel, G. (1997), *Training for Ethnic Small Business*, Sydney: University of Technology Sydney (UTS).

Collins, J., Noble, G., Poynting, S. and Tabar, P. (2000), *Kebabs, Kids Cops and Crime: Youth Ethnicity and Crime*. Sydney: Pluto Press.

Cope, B. and Kalantzis, M. (1997), *Productive Diversity - Work and Management in Diverse Communities and Global Markets.* Sydney: Pluto Press.

Coughlan, J. E. and McNamara, D. J. (eds.) (1997), *Asians in Australia: Patterns of Migration and Settlement.* Melbourne: Macmillan.

de Lepervanche, M. (1984), "Immigrants and Ethnic Groups", in S. Encel and L. Bryson (eds.), *Australian Society*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.

Department of Industry Science & Resources (2000), *Australian Tourism Commission Fact Sheet, August.* Canberra: Department of Industry Science & Resources.

DIEA (Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs) (1986), *Migrant Attitudes Survey: A study of the attitudes of Australians and recently arrived migrants from Asia and the Middle East in close neighbourhoods in Sydney and Adelaide*. Canberra: AGPS.

DIMA (Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs) (1998), *Key Facts in Immigration*, 16 June. Canberra: DIMA.

Ehrlich, P. (1968), *The Population Bomb*. New York: Ballantine.

Ehrlich, P. and Ehrlich, A. (1990), *The Population Explosion*. Sydney: Simon and Schuster.

Fleras, A. and Elliott, J. E. (1992), *The Challenge of Diversity: Multiculturalism in Canada*. Scarborough: Nelson Canada.

Foster, L., Marshall, A. and Williams, L. (1991), *Discrimination Against Immigrant Workers in Australia*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Fleras, A. and Elliott, J. E. (1992), *The Challenge of Diversity: Multiculturalism in Canada*. Scarborough: Nelson Canada.

Goot, M (1988) "Immigrants and Immigration: Evidence and Arguments from the Polls 1943-87" in CAAIP (Committee to Advise on Australia's Immigration Policies), *Commitment to Australia: Consultants' Report*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1.1.

Hage, G. (1998), *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society.* Sydney: Pluto Press.

Hage, Ghassan (2002) "Postcript: Arab-Australians Belonging after 'September 11'", in G Hage (ed) *Arab-Australians Today: Citizenship and Belonging*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton South, pp 241-248.

HREOC (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission) 1991 *Racist Violence: Report of the National Inquiry into Racist Violence in Australia*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service

Grassby, A. (1973), *A Multi-Cultural Society for the Future*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Iredale, R. and Nivison-Smith, I. (1995), *Immigrants' Experiences of Qualifications Recognition and Employment: Results form the Prototype Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia (LSIA)*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Jakubowicz, A. (1984), "Ethnicity, Multiculturalism and Neo-conservatism", in G. Bottomley and M. de Lepervanche (eds.), *Ethnicity, Class and Gender in Australia*, pp.28-48, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Jayasuriya, L. (1984), "Into the mainstream", *Australian Society*, 1 March, pp 7-14.

Joske, S. (1989), "The Economics of Immigration: Who Benefits?", *Background Paper from the Legislative Research Service*. Canberra: The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Keegan, Des (1985) "It's time for the silent majority to speak up," *The Australian,* 17 December.

Lever-Tracy, C. and Quinlan, M. (1988), *A Divided Working Class.* London: Routledge & Keegan Paul.

Markus, A. (1988), "How Australians See Each Other", in CAAIP (Committee to Advise on Australia's Immigration Policies)*, Commitment to*

Australia: Consultants' Report, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1.3.

---- (1994), *Australia's Race Relations 1978-1993*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
Martin, Jean (1978), *The Migrant Presence: Australian Responses 1947-77*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.

Martin, Jeannie (1983), "The Development of Multiculturalism", in The Committee of Review of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs, *Report to the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs*, Vol 11, Canberra, AGPS.

Mitchell, C. (1969), "A Herd of Sacred Cows (The Economic Case Against Immigration)", *Nation* of 18 October 1969.

Office of Multicultural Affairs (1992), *Access and Equity Strategy*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

One Nation (1998), "Pauline Hanson's One Nation Policy Document Immigration Population and Social Cohesion", 27 August 1998 (http//www.gwb.com.au/onenation/policy/immig.html).

Ostrow, R. (1987), *The New Boy Network*. William Heinemann Australia, Richmond.

Rimmer, S. J. (1991), *The Costs of Multiculturalism*. Bedford Park: Flinders Press.

ROMAMPAS (Review of Migrant and Multicultural Programs and Services) (1985), *Report to the Committee for Stage 1: Don't Settle for Less*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Sheehan, Paul (1998), *Among the Barbarians: The Dividing of Australia*. Sydney: Random House.

OECD (1998), *Trends in International Migration: Annual Report 1995*. Paris: OECD.

Withers G. and Pope, D. (1985), "Immigration and Unemployment", *Economic Record* 16: 554-63.

Wooden, M., Holton, R., Hugo, G. and Sloan, J. (1994), *Australian Immigration: A Survey of the Issues* (2nd Edition). Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

About the author

Jock Collins is Professor of Economics in the School of Finance and Economics, Faculty of Business,University of Technology, Sydney (UTS) Australia. His research interests include: Australian immigration and settlement experiences, debates and policy, ethnic entrepreneurship, comparative immigration studies, ethnic crime, ethnic precincts, and ethnic diversity in cities. ethnic diversity in cities.

Jock Collins is member of the editorial board of the journal *International Migration Review*. He is the author of *Migrant Hands in a Distant Land: Australia's Postwar Immigration* (Pluto Press, 1988/1991), co-author of a number of books, including *A Shop Full of Dreams: Ethnic Small Business in Australia* (Pluto Press,1995), *Kebabs, Kids, Cops and Crime: Youth, Ethnicity and Crime* (Pluto Press, 2000) and *Bin Laden in the Suburbs: The Criminalisation of the Arabic Other* (Federation Press, forthcoming) and co-editor of *The Other Sydney: Communities, Identities and Inequalities in Western Sydney* (Common Ground, 2000).

Jock Collins was Guest Professor in memory of Willy Brandt at IMER in Spring term 2002.

The Guest Professorship in memory of Willy Brandt is a gift to *Malmö högskola* financed by the City of Malmö, and sponsored by *MKB Fastighets AB*. It was established to strengthen and develop research in the field of international migration and ethnic relations, and to create close links to international research in this field.