



Sev Ozdowski*

Australian Multiculturalism: Its Emergence, Development and Highpoint (1972–1996)

[Australijski model wielokulturowości – początki, rozwój i okres szczytowy (1972–1996)]

Abstract

This paper describes federal legislative and policy measures that Australia used to overcome White Australia and assimilation policies and replace them with non-racial immigration and multiculturalism as critical foundations of social cohesion. It examines the development of federal migration, settlement, and multicultural legislation, policies, and programs between 1972 and 1996. The paper also links the impact of international human rights laws to the legislative changes in Australia.

Keywords: multiculturalism, immigration, Australia, racism, social cohesion, social integration, assimilation.

Background—the White Australia and Assimilation Policies

Aboriginal heritage, British institutions, and mass migration are the key contributors to the character of contemporary Australia. By Federation in 1901, the total population was close to 3.8 million, of whom one in four was born overseas and included 117,000 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.

* **Sev [Seweryn Antoni] Ozdowski** – PhD, lawyer (LLM) and sociologist (MA), graduate of Adam Mickiewicz University (Poznań, Poland); he holds the academic appointments of Professor at Western Sydney University (affiliation) and of Honorary Professor at the School of Philosophical and Historical Inquiry, University of Sydney since 2006 and was awarded an honorary doctorate from Melbourne's RMIT University in 2004; Australian Human Rights Commissioner (2000–2005), President, Australian Council of Human Rights Education (2006–2021), Chair, Australian Multicultural Council (2014–2022); <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0114-6470>; s.ozdowski@westernsydney.edu.au / dr nauk społecznych, prawnik (LLM) i socjolog (MA), absolwent UAM w Poznaniu; od roku 2006 profesor Western Sydney University (afiliacja) oraz profesor honorowy w Szkole Filozofii i Historii Uniwersytetu w Sydney, w 2004 r. otrzymał tytuł doktora h.c. Uniwersytetu RMIT w Melbourne; australijski komisarz ds. praw człowieka (2000–2005), prezes Australijskiej Rady ds. Edukacji o Prawach Człowieka (2006–2021), przewodniczący Australijskiej Rady ds. Wielokulturowości (2014–2022).

Australia's diverse population and resulting conflicts that developed along racial, ethnic, and religious lines required government management to secure social cohesion. The 'White Australia' policy was legislated first in the state of Victoria after conflicts developed between European and Chinese miners in the goldfields during the 1850s. The White Australia policy was established for all of Australia by the Federal *Immigration Restrictions Act 1901 (Cth)*.¹ Its objective was to maintain social cohesion by excluding non-British migration (Ozdowski, 2016, 2020).

In 1947 "Australia could claim to be 99% white and 96% British ..." (Jupp, 1998, p. 132). The post-Second World War 'populate or perish' cry and dire labour shortages resulted in a considerable immigration boom. It was initiated by Labor's Immigration Minister, Arthur Calwell, with bi-partisan support, aimed at net annual immigration intake equal to one per cent of Australia's population.

A federal Department of Immigration was created in July 1945, and on 2 August 1945, Calwell addressed parliament as the first Australian Minister for Immigration. Between 1947 and 1975, over 3.3 million new settlers arrived in Australia (Wilson, 1978, p. 165). Some 55 percent of them were of non-British heritage.

New immigrants included first the Holocaust survivors and their relatives, and after signing a number of international agreements, so-called 'Displaced Persons' from countries that, after Second World War, came under the Soviet Union's control, such as Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary; migrants from Southern Europe, including Italy, Greece, Malta, and Yugoslavia; from Germany, Scandinavian countries, and Holland; but also people from some non-European countries such as Turkey, Lebanon, Egypt, and Syria. (Jupp, 1988, pp. 102–105).

The Commonwealth Parliament enacted *The Nationality and Citizenship Act 1948 (Cth)* (now *The Australian Citizenship Act 1948*), establishing Australian citizenship for the first time. In contrast, before, Australians had only British subject status. The *Immigration Act 1948 (Cth)* also amended earlier immigration legislation. Although the eligibility migration criteria for migrants with Non-English-Speaking Backgrounds (NESB) were broadened, the racial criteria continued to affect migrant selection, excluding migration from Asia and most of Africa. For example, Immigration Minister Calwell

¹ The Immigration Restriction Act 1901 (Cth) enabled the Commonwealth Government to exclude any person who "when asked to do so by an officer fails to write out at dictation and sign in the presence of the officer, a passage of 50 words in length in a European language directed by the officer". The Dictation Test could be administered to any migrant during the first year of residence. In 1905 this was changed to "any prescribed language" to lessen offence to the Japanese. From 1932 the Test could be given during the first five years of residence and any number of times. The Dictation Test was administered 805 times in 1902–03, with 46 people passing and 554 times in 1904–09, with only six people successful. After 1909 no person passed the Dictation Test, and people who failed were refused entry or deported.

sponsored the War-Time Refugee Removal Act 1949 (Cth), removing from Australia some nine hundred allied refugees of Asian origin who fled to Australia to escape the Japanese army (Price, 1979: 202).

Abandoning the White Australia policy has proved to be a gradual process. In late 1941, the Curtin Labor government ceased to use the White Australia term (Whitlam, 1985: 487; Zubrzycki, 1995), although this made no significant difference to migrant selection practice until the mid-1960s. In late 1949, Calwell's successor in the Menzies Coalition government, Immigration Minister Harold Holt, reversed the Calwell decision and allowed the wartime non-white refugees in Australia, primarily Chinese, to apply for residency and allowed Japanese war brides to migrate and settle in Australia.

From 1956, non-Europeans residing in Australia could attain permanent residence and Australian citizenship. The Migration Act 1958 (Cth) abolished the controversial dictation test, a central feature of the *Immigration Restriction Act 1901* (Cth). In 1960 the Liberal Party removed the White Australia policy from its federal Policy Platform, and the Department of Immigration was permitted to start removing barriers to immigration for people from non-European backgrounds. Several inter-governmental agreements were established to bring in non-British migrants despite criticism by the Labor Opposition Leader, H. V. Evatt, that they undermined the British character of Australia.

In March 1966, after formally reviewing the policy on non-European immigration, the Holt Government introduced the Migration Act 1966 (Cth) which allowed migrants to be chosen on "their suitability as settlers, their ability to integrate readily and their possession of qualifications which are in fact positively useful to Australia" regardless of their race or nationality (Lynch, 1971, p. 3).

The new arrangements allowed applications for permanent residence by well-qualified non-Europeans and permitted them to bring their immediate families. Following the 1966 reforms, the number of non-European migrants gradually increased from around 750 arriving in 1966 to over 6,000 arriving by 1971 (Lynch, 1971, p. 1). The reforms also reduced the naturalisation residence period for non-Europeans to five years. In addition, they repealed discriminatory laws denying non-Europeans access to various social services and pensions.

The post-Second World War migration boom delivered unprecedented cultural diversity, becoming one of this country's most defining contemporary characteristics. Moreover, it established a multicultural Australia in a demographic sense. By 1971, 39.65 per cent of Australia's population was either born overseas (20.2 per cent) or had one parent born overseas (19.43 per cent), and 12 per cent of the nation's population were born outside of Australia and Britain, compared with only 3 per cent in 1947.

To secure social cohesion, programs were established to assist with integrating NESB migrants into Australian society. Funds for teaching migrants English language were first made available in 1947. Since 1950, annual citizenship conventions have been held to publicise the achievements of migrants and to remind newcomers that they should become Australian citizens. (Jupp, 1988, p. 101) The non-British migrants were also expected to conform to the bi-partisan assimilation policy to create a uniform Australian monoculture grounded on British heritage. The expectation was that these non-British, mostly European migrants would soon melt seamlessly into Australian society. They would adopt the Australian lifestyle quickly, become local patriots, and abandon their past national allegiances and cultural “baggage”. In James Jupp’s words:

Assimilationism meant the abandoning of all characteristics that made individuals visible in the crowd. This included the public use of languages other than English, the wearing of unusual clothing, gestures not normally used, physical appearance and anything which prevented the individuals from becoming invisible to the majority. (Jupp, 1998, p. 134).

The ‘New Australians’, as the NESB migrants were then called, were told to learn English, not live in cultural ghettos, and marry into the Australian-born community. It was generally believed that a policy of assimilation would deliver a cohesive monoculture within a generation “without self-perpetuating enclaves and undigested minorities” (Lynch, 1971, p. 7). However, despite official government endorsement and the spelling of the assimilationist message in welcoming materials, the assimilation policy was never well-defined and lacked the resources for any meaningful implementation.

The reality of settlement was somewhat different. Upon arrival, the non-British migrants did not dissolve easily into the Anglo-Celtic melting pot. However, they established lively communities with churches, sporting, youth, cultural clubs, associations, language schools, welfare, and financial institutions. They founded these to maintain their culture and provide self-help in the settlement process.

The New Australians also developed their organisational leadership and print media and started to advance some political demands. By the early seventies, it had become evident that cultures brought to Australia by migrants were not going to fade away and that the nation would be better served by accepting diversity rather than trying to eradicate it. The term New Australians, which initially meant to show a welcoming attitude and affection, started to be challenged as a derogatory term implying inferiority of status.

As early as the 1960s, the assimilation approach started losing support as the ideals of racial equality were gaining acceptance, social integration of non-British migrants progressed well, and no ethnic ghettos emerged.

A culinary revolution and a high intermarriage rate (around 50 percent) also played a role in this process. A small number of politically active academic researchers, such as Professors Jean Martin, George (Jerzy) Zubrzycki, James Jupp, and, to a lesser degree, Charles Price of the Australian National University and Jerzy Smolicz of the Adelaide University, pointed out that the policy of assimilation did not work well for many. Ethnic rights activists, such as Des Storer, George Papadopoulos, and George Zangalis, and people concerned with the welfare of migrants, such as David Cox, Walter Lippmann, and Alan Matheson, supported this view. Some researchers suggested that assimilationist policies delivered poor labour market outcomes, persistent welfare problems, created poverty and mental health issues, and thus slowed the integration of non-British migrants into Australian society.

There was also growing NESB migrant demand for improved economic and cultural opportunities. As a result, a wide range of alternative ideas and change proposals were produced to deal with migrant rights, welfare, cultural identity, and class structure, with Zubrzycki's concept of "cultural pluralism" or "integrative multiculturalism" gaining broader acceptance.² The expectation that immigrants must culturally assimilate for Australia to maintain its social cohesion lost its dominance. It was time to acknowledge the cultural plurality of Australian society formally.

These developments and an extended period of economic growth provided a strong stimulus for policy change. First, the Liberal government abandoned assimilation policies and embraced a new 'integration' policy. It reflected a greater awareness of the difficulties faced by migrants in the settlement process and acceptance that migrants may not wish to lose their national and cultural identities and can integrate successfully without doing so. As early as 1964, the Assimilation Branch of the Department of Immigration was renamed the Integration Branch.³

The official departure from assimilation to an integration ideology provided an essential stepping-stone for ushering in multiculturalism as a normative ideal of how a diverse society should be organised to stay cohesive and capture the benefits of cultural and religious diversity. Since 1968 we see the occasional use of the term "multi-culturalism" borrowed from Canada in academic and activist circles.⁴ Interestingly, the Coalition Immigration Minister,

² For a comprehensive description of assimilation policy and for analysis of different schools of thought and personalities contributing to the development of ideas that led to the establishment of multiculturalism in Australia, see Lopez (2000). See also: Naraniecki (2013) for information about Jerzy Zubrzycki's evolving approach to multiculturalism.

³ James Jupp sometimes calls it "Section" and sometimes "Branch" of the Immigration Department (Jupp 1998, pp. 138 & 190). However, Lopez (2000, p. 62) calls it: "Branch". Most likely, the name "Branch" is correct.

⁴ Canada is regarded as the first country to develop the policy of multiculturalism under Pierre Trudeau during the early 1970s. The development of Canadian multicultural policies and programs was informed by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, established in 1963 and its subsequent 1970 Re-

Bill Snedden, criticised “... multi-culture activities within Australian society ...” as early as June 1969.

The move towards adopting multiculturalism as a national policy was slowed down by ethnic communities focussing more on the unique needs of each given community rather than on pan-ethnic objectives or networks. Furthermore, Lopez suggests that:

Most ethnic organisations had ethnocentric leaders who sought improvements in migrant welfare for their retrospective communities through individual deals for government grants or general improvements to the broader social welfare system. (Lopez, 2000, p. 163).

Furthermore, most New Australians before 1972 tended not to participate in political parties, trade unions (other than paying obligatory union dues), and other critical majoritarian institutions. This lack of participation was partly fuelled by the relatively low naturalisation rate amongst New Australians, and it was partly an outcome of what Wilson calls “migrant depoliticisation” or a “political castration process” (Wilson, 1978, p. 164). The lack of political participation observed by Wilson existed despite well-documented dissatisfaction with the poverty levels amongst NESB migrants, discrimination in workplaces as illustrated by occasional industrial militancy outbursts, discrimination in access to social welfare, and difficulties with access to education and recognition of overseas qualifications.

Nevertheless, in 1972, Australia was one of the most culturally and linguistically diverse nations globally, with many different religious traditions and over 200 languages spoken. Australia’s challenge was developing a system that accepted differences while promoting social cohesion.

The Whitlam Government (1972–75) – Advent of Multiculturalism

As the Deputy Opposition Leader (1960–67) and then the Opposition Leader (1967–72), Gough Whitlam was critical in combating racism and anti-migration attitudes amongst the trade union and Labor movement. In 1965, the Labor Federal Conference decided to remove the White Australia policy from the ALP platform and replace it with a statement focussing on an expanded immigration program to be:

port. Canadian multiculturalism is now enshrined in law through the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* of 1988 and section 27 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Canadian multiculturalism aims to address the under-representation of French Canadians in positions of power and provided access to government services in the French language, with other linguistic groups assigned a minority status. (Ozdowski, 2020).

... administered with sympathy, understanding and tolerance. The basis of such policy will be: (a) Australia's national and economic security; (b) the welfare and integration of all its citizens; (c) the preservation of our democratic system and balanced development of our nation; (d) the avoidance of the difficult social and economic problems which may follow from an influx of peoples having different standards of living, traditions, and cultures. (Whitlam, 1985, p. 492).

However, focus on migrants' needs and aspirations or criticism of the White Australia and assimilation policies were virtually absent from Whitlam's 1969 election policy speech. According to Whitlam, "Calwell's presence on the backbenches from 1966 to the 1972 election inhibited the FLP (Federal Parliamentary Labour Party) from mounting general debates on immigration". (Whitlam, 1985, p. 494).

Only in the period leading up to the 1972 election was the existence of an ethnically diverse Australia recognised by Labor as a demographic and political reality and as a potential game-changer. According to Whitlam: "The percentage of migrants was much greater in electorates which the ALP held or could win than in the electorates which the Liberals could not lose." (Whitlam, 1985, p. 495) In June 1971, the ALP finalised its immigration policy, representing a significant win for anti-racist reformers. It was launched in Perth on 24 October 1971 by Whitlam, who said:

"The welfare of people, the people who are already here and the people who may come, must be the primary consideration, not mere numbers... [T]here must be no discrimination on the grounds of race, colour or nationality" (Wilson, 1978, p. 182).

Labor regarded the NESB migrants as victims of disadvantage and injustice. In his speech to a meeting of ethnic organisations in Sydney in July 1975, Whitlam said:

"My government was the first to identify migrants as one of the prime disadvantaged groups in society. Our policy has been to rectify a long tradition of injustice and deprivation, to give migrants the same rewards and opportunities as other Australians." (Whitlam, 1975, p. 5).

Al Grassby, Shadow Minister for Immigration, conducted the first nationwide consultations with leaders of ethnic organisations before the 1972 election. Labor then adjusted its campaign strategy to better communicate ALP policies with non-British migrants. Whitlam's all-important 1972 election policy speech mentioned two issues of direct relevance to the migrant community. Firstly:

"We will change the emphasis in immigration from government recruiting to family reunion and to retaining the migrants already here. The important thing is to stop the drift away from Australia." (Whitlam, 1972: 4). And secondly: "All Australian residents who have gained the right to receive any Australian social service will continue to enjoy that right wherever they choose to live. This concerns principally aged, invalid or wi-

dowed migrants who choose to return home, but it will apply to all Australians.” (Whitlam, 1972, p. 13).

Later, in his 1977 policy speech, Whitlam claimed that in 1972 the ALP created the first election manifesto “in which a political party attempted to genuinely appeal to ethnic groups” in large cities (Wilson, 1978, p. 182). In Whitlam’s judgment: “Largely as a result of my Government’s reforms in immigration and ethnic affairs, the bulk of migrants have since preferred the ALP to the Liberals” (Whitlam, 1985, p. 498).

However, Whitlam’s 1972 policy speech did not mention issues such as multiculturalism, White Australia, assimilation, or a pro-migrant, anti-racial discrimination agenda. Nor did Whitlam, in the extensive list of his government’s achievements which he tabled in the House of Representatives on 5 December 1974, make mention of multiculturalism, immigration, or migrants, except for migrant English language education (Whitlam, 1974). Similarly, there was no mention of multiculturalism in the index to Whitlam’s book, *The Whitlam Government, 1972–1975*. (Whitlam, 1985)

After winning the government on 3 December 1972, the Whitlam government established a range of policies to end the White Australia policy, moved from assimilation to an integration approach in settlement policies, and established several social justice and cultural programs.

In 1973, the Whitlam Government passed amendments to the Migration Act 1958 (Cth) to ensure that race is disregarded as a component in assessments for immigration to Australia. The amendments concluded the legislative process of gradually dismantling the White Australia policy. Instructions were sent to overseas posts to ignore race as a factor in the selection of immigrants. Changes were also introduced to remove the privileged treatment of British migrants.

To demonstrate internationally, and particularly to Australia’s Asian neighbours, that the White Australia policy had ended, the Easy Visa System was introduced and promoted by the Immigration Minister, Al Grassby (1972–74), on his tour of several Asian countries in June 1973. The system expanded the simplified three-month tourist visa access scheme, previously reserved for Britain and some other Western democracies. However, Clyde Cameron, who became Labour and Immigration Minister following the 1974 election when Grassby lost his seat, had to cancel the Easy Visa System in January 1975 because of significant system abuse by overstayers (Price, 1979, p. 204).

Labor also ratified the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, which came into force in Australia on 13 December 1973. In practical terms, it meant that, for the first time, Australia accepted its obligations to protect people displaced in Asia, Africa, or elsewhere without regard to their racial origins.

All these changes to immigration laws were, however, of little practical impact between 1972–75 because the inflow of immigrants and refugees was

significantly cut to erase ‘structural labour imbalances’ or, to put it simply, unemployment, as the economic recession deepened, and the Whitlam Government focused on the protection of domestic employment opportunities. As a result, in the budget year 1975–76, the immigration intake was only 52,748, and the net immigration outcome resulted in “a mere 13,000 in 1975” – the lowest intake in the post-Second World War years (Price: 208). As a result, “despite all the rhetoric of eliminating racist policies, there appeared to be little difference in the type of immigrant who arrived on these shores compared to the previous Liberal government” (Wilson, 1978, p. 172).

Whitlam’s treatment of Vietnamese refugees after the collapse of South Vietnam in April 1975 was a particular failure. Initially, Whitlam “... refused outright to help with the 130,000 refugees evacuated by the USA to Guam and the Philippines ...” (Price, 1979, p. 208; see also Kalantzis & Cope, 2013, pp. 247–8). After lengthy delays, the Whitlam Government relented to pressure. It allowed settlement in Australia for a few hundred Vietnamese refugees, mainly those with family relatives who had already settled in Australia. However, it was Whitlam who, because of his deep prejudice against South Vietnamese, personally vetoed a Vietnamese refugee intake following the fall of Saigon (Price, 1979, pp. 207–208). Clyde Cameron, in his memoirs, approvingly quotes Whitlam as saying: “I’m not having hundreds of fucking Vietnamese Balts coming into this country with their religious and political hatreds against us!” (quoted in Colebatch, 2014, p. 11 and in Kalantzis & Cope, 2013, pp. 247–8).⁵

In addition to removing race from immigration legislation, the Whitlam Government also outlawed all domestic racial discrimination in Australian laws and practices. On 30 October 1975, *The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination* (CERD) came into force in Australia. To implement Australia’s obligations under CERD, the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* (RDA) was enacted, which made using racial criteria for any official purpose illegal and prohibited racial discrimination in any State or Territory legislation. It also created the Office of Commissioner for Community Relations, later incorporated into the Australian Human Rights Commission established by the Fraser government.

RDA has been a measure of particular significance to people of non-majoritarian ethnic, religious, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds as it assisted with removing all racially discriminatory provisions from Australia’s laws and practices. It helped to redress past injustices and meant *de iure* acknowledgment of cultural pluralism. It also ensured migrants’ better access to

⁵ The reference to “Balts” may not, however, indicate a racial prejudice towards post-Second World War refugees from the Baltic states, but rather Whitlam’s annoyance with demonstrations by Australians of Baltic and Eastern European descent after Whitlam had decided to recognise the Soviets *de iure* occupation of Baltic countries while his Foreign Affairs Minister Senator Willesee was overseas.

welfare services. In addition, through High Court decision, RDA confirmed the Commonwealth's power to make laws concerning external affairs under s. 51 (xxix) of the Constitution and has also played a significant role in securing land rights for Australia's Indigenous population.⁶

Although the ALP statements embraced the ideas of cultural pluralism and equality in settlement policies, multiculturalism as a well-defined and officially endorsed, public policy was not a part of the ALP program nor defined by the legislation. Professor Zubrzycki's attempts (as a social policy chair of the Social Patterns Committee of the Immigration Advisory Council to the Whitlam Labor Government) failed to include multiculturalism in the Labor policy. According to Jupp: "Despite attempts to define multiculturalism by advisers to the government such as Professor George Zubrzycki, the term remained rather vague until the 1978". (Jupp, 1998, p. 138).

Whitlam's Minister for Immigration Grassby never proposed a precise definition of multiculturalism. His speeches suggest that for him, it was a rather vague combination of different ideas, concepts, and policies associated with national unity, equality, cultural identity, and social cohesion as applied to non-British migrant settlement. His concept of "the family of the nation" came close to being the first official definition of multiculturalism:

"In a family, the overall attachment to the common good need not impose sameness on the outlook or activity of each member, nor need these members deny their individuality and distinctiveness in order to seek superficial and unnatural conformity. The important thing is that all are committed to the good of all." (Grassby, 1973, p. 5; see also Grassby, 1973a, p. 19).

After reviewing the critical policy speeches delivered by Grassby, the word "multiculturalism" could only be found in the title, not the text, of one of his speeches, *A Multicultural Society for the Future* (Grassby, 1973). Mark Lopez argues that this could be explained by the fact that Grassby wanted the term "family of the nation" to be seen as his personal contribution to public policy, and he, therefore, resisted the official adoption of the terms multiculturalism and cultural pluralism (Lopez, 2000, pp. 210 and 224–7). Other public statements by Grassby reflected the language of integration ideology that was dominant in the early seventies. Prime Minister Whitlam referred to Australia as a "multicultural nation" only at a ceremony proclaiming the RDA.

⁶ In 1983, the Queensland government challenged the validity of RDA 1975 in the *Koowarta* case. The High Court, by a majority of four judges to three, held under the external affairs section 51 (xxix) that the RDA 1975 is valid. As a result, the laws made by the Commonwealth to implement the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination were found to apply to the state jurisdictions, despite the fact that "race" was not mentioned in the Federal Constitution.

The Whitlam government, however, established a range of programs that ushered in the emergence of multiculturalism in the late 1970s. In this context, Al Grassby must be acknowledged as the key architect of the ALP approach to ethnic communities. Unfortunately, the Whitlam Government did not officially confirm the policy direction outlined in Grassby's speeches. Lopez observes that Al Grassby was:

“... passionately opposed to the Anglo-conformism of hard-line assimilationism. He was also vehemently anti-racist in his beliefs. Grassby regarded national unity as of supreme value. His opposition to Anglo-conformism was, to a degree, an expression of his desire to remove what he perceived as obstacles to bringing diverse Australian communities together. This aspect of Grassby's thinking had much in common with integrationism ...” (Lopez, 2000, p. 245).

Grassby's reforms were to be implemented by the Department of Immigration, which in addition to its initial responsibility for migrant recruitment, was tasked with meeting the settlement needs of migrants, such as English language training, welfare, and citizenship services. In 1973 the Settlement Services Branch was established in the Department. It also upgraded communication about welfare services for non-English-speaking settlers and public relations campaigns supporting ethnic tolerance.

In 1973 the Australian Citizenship Act was amended to remove inequality between British and non-British settlers. Before 1973, migrants from non-Commonwealth nations had to reside in Australia for five years before becoming eligible for citizenship. In contrast, Commonwealth migrants could qualify after one year of living in Australia. The 1973 legislation meant that all immigrants could obtain citizenship after three years of permanent residence, regardless of their origin. As a result, under Whitlam, naturalisations rose significantly. “In 1972, a total of 42,361 applications for citizenship were received. This rose to 57,188 in 1973 and 115,213 in 1974. Figures so far for 1975 suggest a total between 130,000 and 140,000.” (Whitlam, 1975, p. 6). The legislation also abolished favourable conditions for Britons to obtain re-entry permits and participate in local voting. Australian passports no longer referred to British subjects. Australia cancelled the deportation of naturalised Australians who committed crimes in their country of origin.

The Emergency Telephone Interpreter Service, developed and announced under the previous Coalition Government, commenced operations in early 1973. In addition, a National Council on Interpreting and Translation was formed, and steps were taken to establish interpreting and translating services and standards for the accreditation of interpreters and translators.

The Whitlam Government also supported the 1970 Child Migrant Education Program through its *Immigration (Education) Act 1973* (Cth). Additional teachers, learning spaces, and specialised classes were funded to teach

English to minority migrant children at schools (Price, 1979, p. 504). Migrant Education Centres were expanded in most State capitals to deliver adult English services, focusing on English tuition to women and a home tutoring scheme.

The Whitlam Government continued to support the Commonwealth-funded nationwide network of Good Neighbour Councils created in 1950 to welcome and assist the influx of refugees and settlers. The Councils had been popular with British migrants and Displaced Persons but not with southern European migrants. The Whitlam Government also encouraged and supported the emerging alternative pan-ethnic networks of migrant organisations created first on the State level and then nationally. Ethnic Communities' Councils were formed in Victoria in 1974 and New South Wales in the following year, with the national Federation of Ethnic Communities' Councils of Australia established in 1979 under the leadership of Bill [Wadim] Jegorow after The Good Neighbour Councils were ultimately abolished in 1978.

After Grassby lost his seat at the 1974 federal election, Whitlam decided to abolish the Immigration Department and mainstream its functions by relocating its responsibilities to other departments. The responsibility for migrant intake was allocated to the Department of Labour, with Clyde Cameron becoming the Minister for Labour and Immigration. He supported assimilationist values and showed little interest in immigration and multicultural ideas. Cameron's key focus was on the high unemployment rate amongst native-born Australians. He did not implement Grassby's proposed Ethnic Heritage Program. Cameron abolished the Immigration Advisory Council, advocating for the adoption of multicultural policies, and replaced it in February 1975 with a National Population and Immigration Council to monitor longer-term demographic trends and limit immigration intake.

Bill Hayden, Minister of Social Security, took over the welfare and settlement issues from the Immigration portfolio and continued with reforms that Grassby had initiated. Hayden established a Welfare Rights Officers Program. Some forty multilingual welfare officers were employed nationwide to assist migrants with access to social services. Ethnic Liaison Officers were also used to promote Whitlam's introduced Australia's first national health insurance scheme, Medibank. Although a multicultural approach was incorporated into health, welfare, and education policies, no administrative unit was created to manage cultural diversity. The dismemberment of the Department of Immigration also denied migrants the benefits of having one authority responsible for their interests.

In June 1975, the Whitlam Government sponsored the establishment of experimental multi-language radio stations 2EA and 3EA in Sydney and Melbourne as a pilot for an initial period of three months. To create the radio stations, the government had to remove a legal restriction that limited

foreign-language broadcasts to 2.5 per cent of station broadcast time. The legislative change was achieved in late January 1974, and additional public broadcasting frequencies were established soon after. In addition, the ethnic press gained financial support through government departments placing advertisements about government programs in community languages.

Initially, these reforms won considerable support amongst some migrant communities. However, after the 1974 election, despite the continuation of many gestures of goodwill, it appears that Labor gradually began losing support across ethnic communities because the government's ability to communicate with ethnic communities had diminished after Grassby's departure and the disappearance of the Immigration portfolio. It was also due to credibility problems associated with the growth in unemployment and inflation, low pay, and poor working conditions that had a more profound impact on non-British migrants and the inability to effectively address the existence of migrant poverty as demonstrated by the 1975 Henderson inquiry's report, *Poverty in Australia* and the low immigration intake stopping family reunions.

To sum up, the Whitlam Government's reforms that focused on the rights and equality of opportunity for NESB groups have helped acknowledge cultural and racial differences as part of broader social policy and prepared the ground for establishing multicultural Australia in its current form. However, the claim that the Whitlam Government created a fully-fledged policy of multiculturalism and programs to support it cannot be sustained. In the judgment of Kalantzis and Cope:

"Whitlam was not noticeably an ardent multiculturalist: he saw the cultural diversity of his seat and the comings and goings of immigrants at the local migrant hostel through the Labor prism of disadvantage and access to services; disadvantage needing to be rectified by policies and access to education, medical services and employment possibilities to everyone in Australian society." (Kalantzis & Cope, 2013, p. 246).

According to Jupp, the practical end of the White Australia policy took place after the fall of the Whitlam Government in November 1975:

"The decisive year in a breakdown of White Australia was essentially 1976. The first Vietnamese 'boat people' arrived in Darwin in April, and special concessions were made for those escaping from the civil war which had begun in Lebanon." (Jupp, 1998, p. 120).

However, the Whitlam era left a lasting impact on how Australians think about and manage both immigration and community relations. Some of the reforms initiated by Labor remained in place, often re-engineered by successive governments, a long time after Whitlam's departure in 1975 and continue to be relevant to contemporary multicultural Australia. Whitlam's determined attack on racial discrimination and legislating to end the White Australia remains his government's key and long-lasting achievement.

The Fraser Government (1975–1983) – Establishment of Ethno-Specific Multicultural Policies, Institutions, and Programs

Malcolm Fraser's conservative coalition government came to power in late 1975. Fraser's interest in multiculturalism dates back to the mid-1960s. Initially, prime minister Harold Holt appointed Fraser to the ministry as Minister for the Army (1966–1968). This appointment established Fraser's conservative credentials but also enhanced his interest in Asia. When Fraser took over the Education and Science Department in February 1968, he: "...promoted the teaching of Asian languages, and worked to encourage public acceptance of the demographic fact of multi-culturalism and the recognition that Australia's future was bound up with that of her Asian neighbours." (Ayers, 1987, p. 134).

In 1969 Fraser, as a minister in the Gorton government, used the word 'multiculturalism' for the first time in an Australian Parliament. (Fraser & Simons, 2015, p. 426) In November 1969, Fraser addressed the State Zionist Council of NSW on a subject of "A Multicultural Society", in which he stressed the importance of preserving one's cultural ties with the country of origin. In Ayer's view: "The speech clearly signalled Fraser's preference, already clear in 1969, for a policy of multiculturalism rather than the older policy of assimilation of immigrants." (Ayers, 1987, p. 138).

Fraser's commitment to multiculturalism led to an open conflict with the then Immigration Minister Snedden and with the leadership of the Liberal Party, which in May 1971 re-adopted an immigration policy that was assimilationist and focussed on a large intake of immigrants but failed to address settlement and welfare issues adequately. Only after Malcolm Fraser took the party leadership from Billy Snedden on 21 March 1975 and became Leader of the Opposition, the Liberal Party embraced ethnic voters and multicultural ideas. With Grassby's departure from politics in 1974, Fraser realised that Labor's direct connection with the ethnic electorate had gone astray and put forward a set of attractive policies to ethnic communities for the 1975 election.

Fraser's prime ministership (1975–83) was characterised internationally and domestically by strong anti-racism and support for human rights. Internationally, he supported the Commonwealth in campaigning to abolish apartheid in South Africa. Fraser also strongly opposed white minority rule in Rhodesia. Domestically, Fraser established Australia's first Human Rights Commission, introduced laws providing freedom of information, and set up a permanent women's body to advise the government on women's affairs. He also legislated to give Indigenous Australians control of their traditional lands in the Northern Territory but resisted imposing land rights laws on state governments.

One of the first things the Fraser government did after its election victory in 1975 was to re-establish the Department of Immigration under its new name Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (DIEA), with Michael Mackellar as the new immigration minister. Australia's refugee and immigration policies were significantly changed to expand immigration from Asian countries and allow more refugees to enter Australia. The immigration laws were finally reviewed to remove all racist migrant selection practices and procedures entirely, and in 1982 Australia adopted the Numerical Migrant Assessment System (NUMAS) that disregarded race in migrant selection.

Following the fall of Saigon in 1975, boats with Vietnamese refugees started arriving in Australia. Between 1976–79 2,029 refugees arrived by boat. Public opinion welcomed them, with some 73 per cent of Australians wanting refugees arriving by boat to be allowed to stay. (Phillips & Spinks, 2013) In 1977 the Fraser Government adopted a humanitarian refugee resettlement policy which opened Australia's door to the orderly migration of Indochinese, resulting in some 70,000 of them settling in Australia. The settlement of Indochinese refugees changed the ethnic mix of the Australian population forever with: "Entry of refugees together with family reunion programs meant that by 1995 there were 238,000 first- and second-generation Indochinese living in Australia – more than 1 per cent of the population." (Fraser & Simons, 2015, p. 421). The government also adopted a compassionate approach to Timor-Leste refugees, predominantly Muslim refugees fleeing the war in Lebanon and those from other conflict areas.

In addition to re-establishing DIEA, Fraser established an ethnic affairs unit in his own Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet – a forerunner to Hawke's Office of Multicultural Affairs. The Population and Immigration Council was 'reconstituted' with broad membership, including the then Australian Council of Trade Unions President and future Labor Prime Minister Bob Hawke. The Council produced a green paper on Immigration Policies and Australia's Population by March 1977. It advised on the annual immigration intake and settlement strategies to achieve integration and social cohesion by giving the new migrants "the opportunity to preserve and disseminate their ethnic heritage." (Fraser & Simons, 2015, pp. 165 and 428).

In March 1977, Fraser Government established the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council under the leadership of Jerzy Zubrzycki. The Council produced a report on Australia as a multicultural society which recommended the adoption of a policy of multiculturalism based on three principles: "social cohesion, cultural identity and equality of opportunity and access." The government accepted the recommendation, and thus in 1977, Australia formally adopted the policy of multiculturalism. Prime Minister Fraser was convinced that "love of and loyalty to Australia were in no way incompatible with differences in culture and affection for the homeland." (Fraser &

Simons, 2015, p. 165). In other words, ethnic diversity was no longer seen as a threat to social cohesion; on the contrary, diversity was seen as Australia's strength. In 1982 Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs (ACPEA), also with Zubrzycki as chair, proposed the fourth principle: "equal responsibility for, commitment to and participation in society." (ACPEA, 1982, p. 12).

Fraser also believed that the policy of multiculturalism requires a range of specific settlement programs targeting migrants with non-English backgrounds and that it is the government's responsibility to deliver them. Accordingly, in May 1977, Fraser established a review of post-arrival programs and services to migrants to be conducted by Melbourne barrister Frank Galbally. The inquiry was to report directly to him and was supported by his Department, not the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs.

The December 1977 election Liberal platform firmly focussed on ethnic affairs issues and the rights of individuals:

"After pointing to the increased number of interpreters, translators and resource centres which his government was providing to the ethnic communities, Fraser promised to establish Ethnic Television, a national channel to give real and exciting substance to his support for the concept of multiculturalism which went back to his portfolio of Education and Science in late 1960. He also promised to establish Human Rights Commission, to introduce laws providing freedom of information, and to set up a permanent Women's Body to advise the government on women's affairs." (Ayers, 1987, p. 327)

During Fraser's second term as Prime Minister (1977–80), the multicultural programs were significantly advanced. Within 4 months of the election, ethnic liaison officers were employed in all Commonwealth Departments and agencies whose programmes and services affected the affairs of immigrants. From mid-January 1979 they should be generally available in their respective States to assist the Minister for Ethnic Affairs in promoting direct relations between the Federal Government and the ethnic communities. On 29 April 1979, the Prime Minister launched ethnic television on an experimental basis, with transmissions initially restricted to Sundays. In September, he appointed his adviser, Petro Giorgiou, as Secretary of the Ethnic Television Review Panel. (Ayers, 1987, p. 373)

The Galbally Review of *Migrant Programs and Services* was reported in May 1978 (Galbally, 1978) and it played a decisive role in further defining multicultural policy and Australian settlement programs. The Report was tabled in parliament in multiple languages, with the Prime Minister Fraser telling the parliament that Australia was:

"... at critical stage in developing a cohesive, united multicultural nation. The government accepts that it is now essential to give significant further encouragement to de-

velop a multicultural attitude in Australian society. It will foster the retention of the cultural heritage of different ethnic groups and promote intercultural understanding.” (Fraser & Simons, 2015, p. 435).

The Galbally Report provided “Guiding principles” of multiculturalism to lead the development of Australia as “a cohesive, united and multicultural nation,” where all members have equal opportunity to realise their full potential and equal access to programs and services. The report declared that all Australians have the right to maintain their culture without fear of prejudice and that the maintenance of diversity enriches Australia’s culture. It also created several ethno-specific rights, mostly dealing with access to government services to reduce the disadvantage experienced by migrants. The report also recommended the creation, where necessary, of special programs and services for migrants to ensure equality of access and provision.

Government adoption of the Galbally Report ensured that multiculturalism emerged in Australia for the first time as a well-articulated and government-endorsed policy based on an ideal of a society embracing the principles of social cohesion, equality of opportunity, and cultural identity. It is possibly essential to note here that multiculturalism was initially a policy oriented toward successfully settling migrants of non-English speaking backgrounds.

Multiculturalism was never intended as a policy to guide governments in forming immigration policies. The Report proposed the creation of a range of additional ethnic-specific services and programs, including the Multicultural Education Program, the English as a Second Language (ESL) program, Migrant Resource Centres, and the significant extension of existing services such as the Grant-in-Aid scheme, the Adult Migrant Education Program, the Bilingual Information Officer program, translating and interpreting services and government communications. Although no significant structural transformation of the existing centralised government departments and agencies was proposed, government agencies were to adjust their mainstream programs, employ ethnic liaison officers to provide better access to support general services and improve communication with migrant communities.

The Galbally Report also recommended the creation of the Special Broadcasting Service (SBS) – permanent radio and TV services to replace the experimental ethnic radio stations set up toward the end of the Whitlam era and the establishment of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs (AIMA) – “a government-funded, independent research and advocacy body with a brief to assert pluralism and ensure that it was a source of strength rather than a treat.” (Fraser & Simons, 2015, p. 436).

The Fraser government promptly implemented the above recommendations with the help of specially created by the then Immigration Minister

Ian MacPhee taskforce of senior government officials.⁷ In 1979, parliament legislated the *Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs Act 1979 (Cth)* to establish a body whose objectives included raising awareness of cultural diversity and promoting social cohesion, understanding and tolerance. In addition, in 1981, the Fraser government created the first federal Human Rights Commission to implement the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* provisions domestically.⁸

Perhaps SBS, a government-legislated radio and television service with the principal function spelled out in its charter, “to provide multilingual and multicultural radio and television services that inform, educate and entertain all Australians and, in doing so, reflect Australia’s multicultural society” (*Special Broadcasting Service*, 2016), has been a standout, unique, and long-term educational success of the Fraser reforms.

Initially, Prime Minister Fraser intended that the Australian Broadcasting Commission (ABC) would establish permanent ethnic broadcasting. However, after almost a year of negotiations with the ABC, the government withdrew the offer and amended the *Broadcasting and Television Act 1942* to form the *Special Broadcasting Service*. This legislation came into force on 1 January 1978 and SBS TV began test transmissions in April. SBS TV started its regular daily broadcasting on its own Channel 28 on 24 October 1980. (Fraser & Simons, 2015, p. 438). When launching SBS TV, the Prime Minister emphasised that:

“These programs are not going to be designed for one particular group at one moment, and for another particular group at another moment, [but] designed to appeal to a very wide cross-section of people within Australia, designed in such a way that all Australians would want to see the programmes that are conducted on multicultural television. In that sense, multicultural television is not something that divides or sets apart, as just a foreign language broadcast would tend to do; rather it is something that tends to unify and have people understand better what this Australia is about. /.../ It is important that all Australians understand as much as possible of the backgrounds, the history, the culture, of other Australians. (Ayers, 1987, p. 373).

In 1991 the government passed *The Special Broadcasting Service Act 1991 (Cwlth)*, which came into effect on 23 December 1991 and established the *Special Broadcasting Service* as a separate corporation. This Act gave the SBS a clear charter, setting it as a second to ABC national broadcaster. (*Special Broadcasting Service*, 2016)

⁷ Despite the existing financial austerity measures, the government allocated an extra \$50 million over three years to secure implementation. The program was paid for by the revenue resulting from the removal of tax deductibility for money sent by migrants to support families overseas.

⁸ Of particular importance was ICCPR Article 27, which states: “In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their religion, or to use their own language”.

Fraser government also created effective consultation networks with ethnic communities and gave their leaders unprecedented access to government. He promoted with his parliamentary colleagues and Federal departments the development of an ongoing liaison and direct relations with ethnic communities. In May 1981, the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council, the Australian Population and Immigration Council, and the Australian Refugee Advisory Council were merged to form the Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs under the leadership of Professor Zubrzycki. It was also when states and territories established multicultural agencies, policies, and programs. State-managed school education systems put in place a range of multicultural policies and programs seeking to address cultural and linguistic diversity and to win support for the policy of multiculturalism in the broader Australian community. School curricula were reformed to acknowledge and respond to the multicultural nature of Australian society. (for more: Chodkiewicz & Burrige, 2013) Also, community-based ethnic schools started to flourish after securing extra government resources.

Malcolm Fraser took pride in his multicultural policies and regarded them as one of the key achievements of his prime ministership. Fraser's attitude is reflected in his autobiography *The Political Memories* (Fraser & Simons, 2015), which devotes some thirty pages long chapter called "Leadership. Immigration and Refugees" to his achievements in this area. Fraser's government policies established a lasting place for the policy of multiculturalism on the Australian political scene, and many of Fraser's multicultural initiatives lasted and were built upon by all successive Federal governments.

Regrettably, Fraser's positive approach to the intake of Vietnamese and Lebanese refugees, robust multiculturalism, and support for Aboriginal land rights was only sometimes appreciated by the elements of Australian public opinion and some of his parliamentary colleagues. Ayers argues that: "the image of the Fraser government suffered because of these progressive policies and the emerging hard mood of economic rationalism." (Ayers, 1987, p. 470) and contributed to his election defeat in 1983.

The Hawke/Keating Labor Government (1983–1996) – Mainstreaming of Services, National Identity and Economic Focus

Although the Labor Whitlam Government created an environment and the opportunities to develop a new multicultural approach to managing cultural diversity, it was only during Labor's 1979 Conference that multicultural concepts were officially introduced into the party platform.

Labor was returned to government in 1983 under Bob Hawke's leadership and initially started dismantling some of the multicultural institutions and programs created by the Fraser government. First, a review of AIMA was commissioned in 1983, resulting in the repeal of the *Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs Act 1979* and the closure of the Institute in 1986. (Committee of Review of the AIMA, 1983) Then, preparations for the forthcoming budget revealed a proposed merger between SBS and ABC broadcasters that would effectively disband SBS, a significant reduction in funding for the English as a Second Language program, and the abolition of the Multicultural Education Program. Public protests followed and forced the government to change its approach.

In December 1985, a Committee of Review of Migrant and Multicultural Programs and Services (ROMAMPAS) was created under the leadership of Dr James Jupp to advise on the federal government's role in assisting migrants to achieve equitable participation in Australian society. The Committee reported in August 1986 (Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, 1986). It adopted four guiding principles that aligned with the Galbally 1978 principles. The key differences with Fraser's approach were the implementation proposals.

The main ROMAMPAS recommendation was to move away from an ethno-specific service delivery model to the mainstream service model, providing, where possible, services to migrants through government mainstream service agencies under the new policy of 'Access and Equity' (A&E).⁹

There were also several recommendations for cost-sharing between federal and state governments, including a proposal about the progressive introduction of agency-user-pay arrangements with state governments to use Telephone Interpreting Service. In addition, the Hawke government implemented the A&E framework and established procedures to ensure that the onus is on the government departments to provide equitable access to services to all Australians, regardless of their ethnic backgrounds.

Another key outcome of the Report was the establishment in 1987 of the Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA) in the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet and of a prime ministerial advisory body, the Australian Council of Multicultural Affairs (ACMA). In addition, in 1989, the government established the Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research within the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (to fill the vacuum created by the closure of AIMA).

The establishment of OMA as a central coordinating agency for multicultural policy and programs under the dynamic leadership of Professor Peter Shergold created a golden era in Australian multiculturalism and ensured that the years of Hawke/Keating governments were characterised by a high-pro-

⁹ For more about the A&E concept, see the Access and Equity Evaluation Report. (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 1992) and Cross-Portfolio Evaluation (Ozdowski, 1992).

file expansion of multicultural narrative and linking it to the mainstream with a maxim that “multiculturalism is for all Australians”. Throughout the Australian Bicentenary in 1988 and afterwards, constant efforts were made to link multiculturalism to Australian identity and values. Strong educational efforts were made to “place multiculturalism within a national narrative where cultural diversity and tolerance were part of Australian national identity.” (Koleth, 2010).

Perhaps the most significant achievement of the Hawke government was the adoption—in 1989—of the “National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia. *Sharing Our Future*” developed by the Australian Council on Multicultural Affairs under the leadership of Sir James Gobbo. (Office of Multicultural Affairs, 1989) The Agenda was developed with the help of significant social and economic research and community consultations. The National Agenda identified and defined three dimensions of multicultural policy, namely:

(1) Cultural identity: the right of all Australians, within carefully defined limits, to express and share their individual cultural heritage, including their language and religion.

(2) Social justice: the right of all Australians to equality of treatment and opportunity and the removal of barriers of race, ethnicity, culture, religion, language, gender or place of birth; and

(3) Economic efficiency: the need to maintain, develop and utilise effectively the skills and talents of all Australians, regardless of background. (OMA, 1989, p. viii)

The National Agenda also for the first time defined the “limits of Australian multiculturalism” by stating that:

(1) multicultural policies are based upon the premise that all Australians should have an overriding and unifying commitment to Australia, to its interest and future first and foremost;

(2) multicultural policies require all Australians to accept the basic structures and principles of Australian society – the Constitution and the rule of law, tolerance and equality, Parliamentary democracy, freedom of speech and religion, English as the national language, and the equality of the sexes; and

(3) multicultural policies impose obligations as well as confer rights – the right to express one’s own culture and beliefs involves a reciprocal responsibility to accept the rights of others to express their views and values. (OMA, 1989, p. viii)

The National Agenda was a high-profile document and won bi-partisan support. It shifted the emphasis away from Galbally’s focus on migrants’ needs and entitlements in the settlement process to the broad principle that multiculturalism is a policy for all Australians that requires equity in access to government services and not ethno-specific services. It emphasised migrants having an overriding and unifying commitment to Australia and acceptance

of Australia's basic structures and principles. It represented a shift from an ethnic rights approach towards a citizenship model of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism was meant to be the national identity of all Australians. Nevertheless, it also meant a decline in the delivery of ethno-specific services, such as access to hospital interpreting services, and provided the government with some savings.

Some also criticised the Agenda, claiming that it did not address structural inequities or racism. They argued that equal opportunities alone might not be sufficient to deliver social justice for all NESB-background migrants and that some migrants may require special affirmative measures to achieve equality.

The Agenda also rejected the argument that the governments are responsible for providing funds to NESB communities to preserve their customs and traditions. Preserving minority cultures was seen mainly as a private group responsibility. In contemporary terms, it rejected what we would now call a "woke" approach to multiculturalism and migrant rights.¹⁰

The Hawke government's reduction of ethno-specific settlement services could be justified to some extent because the new labour market suitability and English language criteria were toughened for prospective migrants. Migrants selected under the 1979 introduced Numerical Multi-factor Assessment System (NUMAS) points system rating age, language, qualifications, skills, and family status have been vastly different from post-WWII migrants.

They must have English language skills and require much less settlement support; they also more often maintain active links with their countries of birth. In addition, a robust system of dedicated settlement support was created for people migrating under refugee or humanitarian entry programs.

Hawke's era was also characterised by the further enhancement of consultations with ethnic communities and by the strengthening of the links between ethnic leadership and the Commonwealth and State governments. In addition, a major educational effort was made to inform the Australian community about the nature of Australian multiculturalism, promote intercultural understanding, and combat racism. Teaching non-English languages was also enhanced (Lo Bianco, 1987) and interpreting and translating services were re-engineered.

When Paul Keating replaced Bob Hawke as Prime Minister at the end of 1991, he ditched the creation of an Australian Multiculturalism Act supported by Hawke. Keating regarded multiculturalism through the prism of his experience in the suburb of Bankstown, where he spent his youth and where

¹⁰ Kathrine Betts distinguished two meanings of multiculturalism. (Markus, A., 2011, p. 91) 'Soft' multiculturalism is based on the idea that we should be tolerant, and 'hard' multiculturalism means that in addition to welcoming cultural diversity, the government should provide resources to NEBS groups for cultural maintenance. The National Agenda and all post-Hawke governments clearly opted for a more popular soft version and avoided the hard version in their policies.

from he was elected to the House of Representatives in 1969 – it was a picture of tolerance and patriotic conformity:

“I lived in Bankstown where it had gone from Anglo-Irish to Greeks and Italians and then to Lebanese and Vietnamese and I lived there until I became treasurer in 1983 and I had never seen one nasty ethnic inspired event. I am not saying there hadn’t been some ... I thought the thread that held the place together, in the minds of the public, the tolerance of different cultures, religions and ethnic groups was the fact that they would and should commit first and foremost to the new adopted country, to its principles and standards, to Australia. And this was not too much to expect.” (Kelly, 2009, p. 156).

As the Prime Minister, Keating viewed multiculturalism as reflecting Australia’s national identity. He viewed it more as a big-picture policy that delivers conformity with Australian values and brings international connections. He expected that migrants would naturally be loyal to multicultural Australia accepting the basic principles of Australian society, including the Constitution and the rule of law, parliamentary democracy, freedom of speech and religion, English as a national language, equality of the sexes, and tolerance (Kelly, 2009, p. 156).

The novel element of Keating’s approach to multiculturalism was his attempt to link it more effectively to the benefits of globalisation by creating a ‘productive diversity’ policy that sought to promote a business case for better utilisation and economic management of diversity. It attempted to utilise multicultural diversity to increase the productivity of Australian workplaces and international trade. It assumed that, with proper management, a diverse workforce would deliver a broader range of skills, cultures, and experiences amongst employees, resulting in innovation dividends and higher productivity. It is also assumed that Australia’s multicultural character gives Australia a competitive edge in an increasingly globalised world. (Cope & Kalantzis, 1997).

In 1991, Keating also ordered OMA to undertake a major evaluation of the effectiveness of the 1985 Access and Equity Strategy (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 1992). The evaluation had a significant research budget and involved federal service departments. It brought mixed results and resulted in forty-three recommendations about better delivering mainstream Commonwealth services to ethnic clients. (Ozdowski, 1992). In 1994, a new National Multicultural Advisory Council was established to review and update Hawke’s 1989 National Agenda. Its Report, launched in June 1995, found that much had been achieved and recommended some further initiatives, but the concept of multiculturalism remained the same.

However, the high profile of multiculturalism brought some populist backlash towards the end of the Hawke/Keating era. Questions started to be asked if the multicultural society was indeed a desirable model for Australia. First

signs were noted as early as 1988, when a report brought by the government created an ad-hoc Committee to Advise on Australia's Immigration Policies, chaired by Dr Stephen FitzGerald, found

"a key problem in maintaining support for immigration was a profound distrust by Australians of the policy of multiculturalism." and that as the philosophy of multiculturalism was not widely understood, "... the ensuing uninformed debate (was) damaging the cause it seeks to serve." (FitzGerald, 1988).

Some also criticised the slogan that multiculturalism is for all Australians as reducing the mainstream Anglo-Celts to a status of ethnic group and demeaning their heritage and its right to primacy (Markus, 2011, p. 90). Graeme Campbell,¹¹ a maverick Labor member for Kalgoorlie, and some politicians and academics amplified the FitzGerald message and were further fuelled by emerging public criticism of the high immigration intake, an apparent lack of border control because of "boat people" arrivals,¹² and the fact that some of the most recently arrived humanitarian settlers from Vietnam and Lebanon were experiencing significant settlement problems.

To deal with public criticism of immigration policies, in 1992, the Keating government introduced an indefinite mandatory detention system for unauthorised boat arrivals. Keating strengthened detention laws for persons entering Australia without a valid visa. To appease the ethnic communities, Keating also amended the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* by adding Section 18C, which makes it illegal to "offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate" people on race grounds. The Coalition had opposed section 18C on free-speech grounds.¹³

Conclusions

It took post-World War 2 Australia almost 50 years to create a non-discriminatory, modern immigration system and a set of measures to settle migrants and achieve social cohesion successfully. Various mechanisms were used to achieve this, including legislation and associated regulations, policy state-

¹¹ For his views, Campbell was expelled from the party on 30 November 1995 and, in June 1996, founded the Australia First Party. However, he was defeated in the 1998 federal election.

¹² Between 1990 and 1998, boats arrived at the rate of about 300 people per annum – mainly from Cambodia, Vietnam, and southern China.

¹³ Section 18C of the *Racial Discrimination Act* continues to create controversy. Its critics argue that 18C is too broad and too vague and should be repealed. They also claim that 18C targets language and emotions far beyond what the *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*, and Article 4 in particular, allows.

ments, bureaucratic directives, and budgetary measures. The current system is a living organism being adjusted daily to respond to the changing circumstances and political priorities.

Immigration and citizenship issues are the key targets of legislative and regulatory measures. Key legislation includes the Migration Act 1958 (Cth) (as amended) together with the Migration Regulations 1994 and the Australian Citizenship Act 1948 (Cth), which was replaced in 2007 by the Australian Citizenship Act 2007 (Cth).

Legislative measures to advance social cohesion focus on the Racial Discrimination Act 1975 (Cth) and the office of the Race Discrimination Commissioner located at the Australian Human Rights Commission. It is important to acknowledge here the role of the international human rights instruments in shaping Australia's immigration and anti-discrimination laws. Australia, however, is the only Western country without a statutory Bill of Rights.

Although multiculturalism provides a normative framework for migrant integration, Australia has no federal Multiculturalism Act like Canada. Multiculturalism is implemented through a set of national policy statements, administrative arrangements, and budgetary measures delivering, for example, settlement programs for refugees, interpreting services, or community grants, to name only a few. Access and Equity policy – the key architecture for service delivery through the mainstream agencies – was not legislated for. The only notable exception is the Special Broadcasting Service Act 1991 (Cth), which provides multilingual and multicultural broadcasting and digital media services.

Abstrakt

W artykule opisano federalne środki legislacyjne i polityczne, które Australia zastosowała w celu przezwyciężenia polityki „białej Australii” i polityki asymilacji oraz zastąpienia ich imigracją bez podziałów rasowych i wielokulturowością – jako filarami społecznej spójności. Przeanalizowano rozwój federalnych przepisów, polityk i programów dotyczących migracji, osiedlania się oraz wielokulturowości w latach 1972–1996. Artykuł ukazuje również wpływ międzynarodowych przepisów dotyczących praw człowieka na zmiany legislacyjne w Australii.

Słowa kluczowe: wielokulturowość, imigracja, Australia, rasizm, społeczna spójność, integracja społeczna, asymilacja.

REFERENCES

Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs – ACPEA. (1982). Multiculturalism for all Australians. Our developing nationhood. Australian Government Publishing Service (AGPS).

Ayres, P. (1987). Malcolm Fraser, a biography. Heinemann.

Chodkiewicz, A., & Burrige, N. (2013). Addressing Diversity in Schools: Policies, Programs and Local Realities. In Jakubowicz, A., & Ho, C. (eds). For those who've come across the seas: Australian multicultural theory, policy and practice, Australian Scholarly Publishing, 210–222.

Colebatch, H. (2014). The Whitlam Government and the Betrayal of the South Vietnamese. In Quadrant Online, LVIII(6) June.

Committee of Review of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs. (1983). Report to the Minister for Immigration And Ethnic Affairs. AGPS.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (1997). Productive diversity: A new, Australian model for work and management. Pluto Press.

Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs. (1986). Committee of review of migrant and multicultural programs and services (ROMAMPAS) report. AGPS.

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. (1992) *Access and equity evaluation report*. AGPS.

FitzGerald, S. (1988) Immigration: A commitment to Australia report. AGPS.

Fraser, M., & Simons, M. (2015). Malcolm Fraser. The Miegunyah Press.

Galbally, F. (1978). Migrant services and programs. AGPS.

Grassby, A. (1973). A Multi-Cultural Society for the Future. A paper prepared for the Cairnmillar Institute's Symposium: Strategy 2000: Australia for Tomorrow held on 11 August 1973. AGPS.

Grassby, A. (1973a). Australia's Decade of Decision: A report on migration, citizenship, settlement and population tabled in the House of Representatives on 11 October 1973, Canberra, AGPS.

Jupp, J. (1988). The Australian People. Its People and Their Origins, Angus and Robertson Publishers.

Jupp, J. (1998). Immigration. Oxford University Press.

Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2013). "Immigration and Multiculturalism" in Bramston, T., The Whitlam Legacy, Annandale: The Federation Press, 244–54.

Kelly, P. (2009). The march of patriots. Melbourne University Press.

Koleth, E. (2010). Multiculturalism: A review of Australian policy statements and recent debates in Australia and overseas. Research Paper No. 6, 2010–11, Parliament of Australia.

Lo Bianco, J. (1987). National policy on languages. AGPS.

Lopez, M. (2000). *The origins of multiculturalism in Australian politics 1945–1975*. Melbourne University Press.

Lynch, P. (1971). *The evolution of a policy*. AGPS.

Markus, A. (2011). Attitudes to multiculturalism and cultural diversity. In M. Clyne & J. Jupp (Eds), 2011, 89–100. The Australian National University E Press.

Naraniecki, A. (2013). Zubrzycki and multicultural governance in Australia. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 34(3), 246–261.

Office of Multicultural Affairs. (OMA) (1989). *National agenda for a multicultural Australia*. AGPS.

Ozdowski, S. (1992). Cross-portfolio evaluation. In Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, *Access and Equity Evaluation Research*, AGPS.

Ozdowski, S. (2016). Australia: Immigration and Multiculturalism. In *Krakowskie Studia Międzynarodowe*. No. 4 (xiii), 175–248. Kraków.

Ozdowski, S. (2020) History of Multiculturalism in Canada and Australia: its aim, successes, and challenges to national identity; Chapter 11 in Abe W. Ata (editor) *Muslim Minorities and Social Cohesion Cultural Fragmentation in the West*; Imprint Routledge, London; eBook ISBN 9781003044529.

Phillips, J., & Spinks, H. (2013). *Boat arrivals in Australia since 1976*. Parliament of Australia Research Paper (with Statistical appendix updated 23 July 2013).

Price, C. (1979). Immigration and ethnic affairs. In A. Patience & B. Head (Eds.), *From Whitlam to Fraser: Reform and Reaction in Australian Politics* (pp. 201–213). Oxford University Press.

Special Broadcasting Service. (2016). *Corporate: SBS Charter*, SBS Charter | SBS Corporate [accessed: 29.06.2023].

Whitlam, E. G. (1972). *It's time for leadership*. Australian Labor Party.

Whitlam, E. G. (1974). The Whitlam government: Ministerial Statement, *Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates*, House of Representatives, 5 December, Canberra: Commonwealth Parliament, 4654–7; 4666–86.

Whitlam, E. G. (1975). *Speech Notes for a Meeting of Ethnic Organisations speech delivered in Lower Town Hall on 27 July 1975*. Australian Labor Party.

Whitlam, E. G. (1985). *The Whitlam Government 1972–1975*. Viking.

Wilson, P. (1978). Immigrants, politics and Australian society. In G. Duncan (Ed.), *Critical Essays in Australian Politics*, 164–183. Edward Arnold.

Zubrzycki, J. (1995). *Making Multicultural Australia Arthur Calwell and the origin of post-war immigration*. Canberra: Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research.