Australian Multiculturalism and Aboriginal Australians

Možek, Lucija

Undergraduate thesis / Završni rad

2016

Sveučilište u Zadru
Universitas Studiorum
Jadertina | 1396 | 2002 |

Repository / Repozitorij:

University of Zadar Institutional Repository

zir.nsk.hr

dabar
DIGITALNI AKADEMSKI ARHIVI I REPOZITORIJI

Sveučilište u Zadru

Odjel za anglistiku

Engleski jezik i književnost

Lucija Možek

Australian Multiculturalism and Aboriginal Australians

Završni rad

Zadar, 2016.

Sveučilište u Zadru

Odjel za anglistiku

Engleski jezik i književnost

Australian Multiculturalism and Aboriginal Australians

Završni rad

Student/ica:

Lucija Možek

Mentor/ica:

doc. dr. sc. Mario Vrbančić

Komentor/ica:

doc. dr. sc. Senka Božić Vrbančić

Zadar,2016.

Izjava o akademskoj čestitosti

Ja, **Lucija Možek,** ovime izjavljujem da je moj **završni** rad pod naslovom **Australian Multiculturalism and Aboriginal Australians** rezultat mojega vlastitog rada, da se temelji na mojim istraživanjima te da se oslanja na izvore i radove navedene u bilješkama i popisu literature. Ni jedan dio mojega rada nije napisan na nedopušten način, odnosno nije prepisan iz necitiranih radova i ne krši bilo čija autorska prava.

Izjavljujem da ni jedan dio ovoga rada nije iskorišten u kojem drugom radu pri bilo kojoj drugoj visokoškolskoj, znanstvenoj, obrazovnoj ili inoj ustanovi.

Sadržaj mojega rada u potpunosti odgovara sadržaju obranjenoga i nakon obrane uređenoga rada.

Zadar, 18. rujan 2016.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Australian Multiculturalism and Aboriginal Australians

SUMMARY

My final paper will deal with the concepts of multiculturalism, nationalism and racism in Australia. Moreover, I will discuss the notion of *imagined nation* or *imagined community* which people employ while carrying out racist practices and in what ways are these racist practices manifested in Australia. Also, I will deal with questions: Why are people in Australia so opposed to multiculturalism? What were the reasons behind the introduction of The White Australia Policy? Furthermore, I'll discuss the role of spatial power and spatial management in connection to racist violence, e.g. people of other ethnicities told to „go home"and classified as undesirable by Australians. Aboriginal Australians, as the oldest culture in Australia, did not satisfy the ideal of White Australia fantasy and thus have experienced all forms of violence. Sadly, the consequences of their ill-treatment are still recognized in present. With all that said, it is understandable that many are dubious about the fact that Australia had become a tolerant multicultural society despite its racial past.

KEY WORDS: multiculturalism, nationalism, racism, tolerance, White Australia fantasy, Aboriginal Australians

Multikulturalizam u Australiji i Australski Aboridžini

SAŽETAK

Moj završni rad će se baviti pojmom multikulturalizma, nacionalizma i rasizma u Australiji. Osim toga, analizirat ću pojam imaginarne nacije ili imaginarne zajednice kojim se ljudi služe kod vršenja rasističkih postupaka i na koje načine se ti rasistički postupci očituju u Australiji. Također ću se baviti pitanjima poput: Zašto su ljudi u Australiji poprilično protiv multikulturalizma? Koji se razlozi nalaze iza uvođenja Politike bijele Australije?. Nadalje ću raspravljati o ulozi prostornog upravitelja i upravljanju prostora u svezi s rasističkim nasiljem, kao što su npr. situacije u kojima se ljudima druge narodnosti kaže neka idu doma i klasificira kao nepoželjne. Australski Aboridžini, kao najstarija civilizacija u Australiji, nisu zadovoljili ideal Fantazije o bijeloj Australiji i zbog toga su doživjeli sve vrste nasilja. Nažalost, posljedice njihovog lošeg postupanja su vidljive i danas. S obzirom na sve rečeno, razumljivo je da mnogi sumnjaju u činjenicu da je Australija postala tolerantno multikulturalno društvo usprkos svojoj rasističkoj prošlosti.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: multikulturalizam, nacionalizam, rasizam, tolerancija, Fantazija o bijeloj Australiji, Australski Aboridžini

1. INTRODUCTION

In my final paper I will focus on discussing problems and important aspects of multicultural Australia. It will provide an overview of Australia's multicultural policies throughout its colonial and postcolonial history and draw attention to state multicultural policy frameworks and how they reflected on the lives of Australia's peoples, especially its oldest population, Australian Aboriginals. Despite the fact that Australia today is ranked among the highly developed countries of the world, there are certain social issues that have not been solved since it has been founded. With the population of 23 million (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2013), Australia makes one of the world's strongest economies and possesses a rich cultural heritage. Not only that, but Australia is home to one of the world's oldest living cultures, with Aboriginal communities established nearly 60,000 years before European settlement. According to Koleth, multiculturalism has been a contested policy and concept since its introduction in Australia in the 1970s (1). Australia has been culturally and racially diverse from the beginning, since the first settlers arrived in the 18th century, who were for the most part, of white and British origin. The government was not always ready to make efforts to mediate between different cultures and help different nations integrate into the society, instead, it tried to stop them in the start, prevent them from settling the continent. The aim of this final paper is to show how the government's policy towards multiculturalism has been changing according to the nation's economic and political interests and who were the less privileged in the process of change. Also, owing to what ideas and values were many Indigenous people, as well as the members of the "inferior" race marginalized and cast aside by the other Australians? Why did it take Australia 200 years to reject racist beliefs and begin implementing the equality multicultural policy of their own? As Andrew Jakubowicz from The Institute of Race Relations in London suggests, the continuous reiteration that Australia is

a tolerant and multicultural society, and that the vestiges of racism exist amongst only a small minority of the older Anglo-Australians, should be thoroughly re-examined before taken lightly (1).

2. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

2.1. The History of Multicultural Development in Australia and the position of Aboriginal peoples

According to Lois E. Foster, four essential periods of immigration into Australia should be distinguished because there is a general agreement that immigration had substantial social, politic, economic and cultural consequences for Australian society (7). Following this division, three respective dominant policy approaches to migrant settlement can be singled out: assimilation, integration and multiculturalism (*History of the Dep.* 53).

The first period begins with claiming of Australian territory by Englishman Lieutenant James Cook 1770, who took possession of the east coast under instruction from King George III of England, naming eastern Australia 'New South Wales' (Australia.gov.au). Australia was deemed an empty continent for a great deal of time and referred to under the concept of "terra nullius", i.e. the land rights of Indigenous people were dismissed as invalid. Therefore, the land was free to be claimed. Early Australia was dominated by British and Irish settlers, Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, until other nations came and settled the continent, among which Asians were the largest ("Immigration Nation"). The British regarded their new colonial outpost as an ideal location for a network of penal colonies to replace the loss of colonies in America, which had served as a repository for Britain's law breakers until the American War of Independence brought an end to British control (*History of the Dep.* 4). Immigrants, who dreamt of new life in Australia, fed the

nation's economy ("Immigration Nation"). In particular, the new arrivals, or immigrants, have contributed significantly to the working life of Australia – from goldfields, the Overland Telegraph, the sugar cane fields, vineyards and construction sites through farms and pearling lugers to factories, fashion, cafes and many other business (Australia.gov.au). This had many effects on the social life of Australia, one of them being the emergence of Australian „labour aristocracy". The ruling class benefited from the stratification of the Australian labour force as the secondary market, filled with non English speaking immigrants, was characterized by lower paid, less secure and dirty jobs. This all led to ethnic specification of lower level jobs (qtd. in Jakubowicz 2).

The second immigration period began with establishment of Commonwealth of Australia in 1901, which was widely supported by different ethnic communities. The new Federation's aim was creating a society that would be a working man's paradise. However, soon after Federation was proclaimed, fear of deterioration of white race and „racial contamination" was expressed by high-ranking officials. Non-white immigrants were simply „too many" in comparison to the number of Europeans. It is important to keep in mind that Australia strived to source the majority of immigrants from the British Isles in an apparent effort to keep the population as racially and culturally British as possible (History of Dep. 7). The passing of Immigration Restriction Bill followed. Under the Immigration Restriction Act 1901, non-Europeans intending to enter Australia could be required to write out a dictated passage, not less than fifty words in length, in any European language. The Act was amended in 1905 so that officers could apply the test in any prescribed language at their discretion, which enhanced the capacity to exclude 'undesirable' applicants (History of the Dep. 12). Those who failed to correctly write out the dictated passage were refused entry (Stacker 62). For non-Europeans, entering Australia was made an almost impossible task. New Australian Government introduced the suite of measures that included the Immigration

Restriction Act 1901, the Pacific Island Labourers Act 1901 and a few years into Federation the Naturalization Act 1903. These laws provided the legislative framework for what eventually became known as the 'White Australia Policy' (History of the Dep. 12). This restrictive policy had its entry criteria based on racial characteristics and it effectively excluded non-whites from entering Australia as immigrants (Foster 8). R. Dixon, a member of the Australian Communist Party, in his article *Immigration and the "White Australia Policy"* from 1945 cites a text from Australian newspaper "The Age". The text contains the words of the then Prime Minister referring to the creation of "White Australia":

> „This policy of building up in Australia a "British race" and of "solidifying and strengthening the Empire", which is the essence of "White Australia," runs through the various statements of Governments of this country right down to the present day. Thus Mr. Bruce, Prime Minister of Australia, in a statement on June 23, 1926, after describing the White Australia policy as "Fundamental and vital" to Australia, went on to say: "Australia was an undeveloped country, and economically the eyes of the world were upon it. They had to be in a position which was unchallengeable, to have a national aspiration, and with that to maintain the British character of the Australian people. Australia was 98% British and was determined to remain so." (qtd. in Dixon: "The Age," Melbourne, 25.6. 1928.)

Covert and sometimes overt feelings of racial superiority combined with fears of unfavorable consequences stopped the migrants flow into Australia (Foster 8). Japanese were particularly offended by this policy and sought racial equality from Australia which they were denied ("Immigration Nation"). After The First World War, a lot of migrants arrived to Australia under a scheme funded by British government. Australia had a shortage of man power so immigrants were again needed for post-war development. Farmers,

domestic workers and juveniles were especially sought after by Australia. *A History of the Department of Immigration* also states that there were increasing numbers of Greek, Italian and Yugoslav migrants arriving in Australia during the 1920s, joining the small groups who had arrived pre-federation, especially during the gold rush (18). Comparing to the wider community who were mainly of British origin, their numbers remained small. However, they represented sentinels for larger migration flows following World War II and played a significant part in shifting concepts of 'whiteness' to pave the way for greater diversity (History of the Dep. 18). Pre war-migration (World War II) resulted by 1945 in a total population of something greater than 7.5 million. The ethnic majority of this small population was British, with the remainder divided among Northwestern Europeans (about 7%), Southern Europeans (about 1%), other whites (about 1%) and a further 1% of non whites, mainly Aborigines (Foster 7). White Australia Policy was still in force. The Baltic States and people displaced after Second World War were welcomed to settle Australia, as they represented no threat to White British identity. Similarly, Australia developed campaigns to attract new settlers from Britain in order to reinforce "whiteness" within the nation ("Immigration Nation"). For the first time in history, non-British immigrants came to be regarded as a viable migrant source. The desirable nationalities were, in order of preference: Americans, Scandinavians (Norwegians, Swedes, Danes), the Dutch, Belgians, the Swiss, Yugoslavs, Greeks and Albanians (Rutland 1). Peter Skrzynecki, the child of a Ukrainian mother who was adopted by his Polish father at the age of three, describes this experience in The Sparrow Garden:

> "Displaced persons were bound under a two-year contract to undertake any work that was found for them in Australia, unless sponsorship had been arranged. This was the experience of my parents and the hundreds of others who arrived with them on 11 November 1949. Their exile had been officially recorded into the

annals of Australia's history. Not convicts. Not squatters. Not landed gentry. Just refugees - reffos, wogs, dagoes, bloody Balts". (qtd. in Jacobowitz 78)

A History of Australian Migration tells us that the Australian authorities expected the assimilation of migrants into the community will be quick and easy, what was not the case (53). A strong focus was put on English language training and meeting the immediate material needs of migrants. Less attention was paid to cultural differences of various nationalities settling the continent, so later this approach proved unsuccessful (Ibid). Furthermore, in the matter of German and Austrian Jews trapped in Europe, who were desperate to escape Europe, Australia was quite reluctant to make commitment, with the Australian delegate T.W. White noting, 'as we have no real racial problem, we are not desirous of importing one' (History of the Dep. 20). Fears were expressed that Jews would take housing away from others who needed it, operate sweatshops, undermine manufacturing by working for low wages and introduce criminal elements. They were also scorned as moneylenders who controlled banks and the media. There were attacks against Jews and Jewish property, particularly in Jewish neighborhoods in Melbourne and Sydney (Rutland 3). Until 1945, the Commonwealth government did not have a department specifically related to immigration. The Department of the Interior dealt with all immigration matters and official policy maintained the concept of keeping Australia ninety-eight per cent Anglo Saxon and Anglo Saxon (Rutland 1). In the first few years of the Department's existence, the priority was to maintain focus on Britain as the primary source for immigrants. Arthur Calwell reassured the public that, 'for every foreign migrant there will be ten from the United Kingdom' (History of the Dep. 27). Protests were held against

White Australia began in the 50-s and 60-s, but the policy was abandoned fonly when Whitlam[1] government was dismissed.

Third immigration period from 1947 – 1972 is marked by a huge increase in migrant flow, with the emphasis on long term migration (Foster 8). From the early 1970s to the election of the Hawke Labor government in March 1983, the growth of the concept and the policy of multiculturalism is noted (Foster 1). This allowed for the development of services by the Department that focused on the cultural and linguistic needs of new migrants, as well as their physical needs, to aid their integration into the community (History of the Dep. 53). Moreover, government began to accept the possibility that migrants could integrate successfully in Australian society without losing their national identities completely (Kenneth 2). By the early 1970s "multicultural" was entering common discourse within the fields of immigration and ethnic affairs, (Grassby, 1973) and was the preferred establishment alternative to the threatening possibility of a multiracial Australia (Jakubowicz et al.3). Multiculturalism has served a variety of goals over the years, including, the pursuit of social justice, the recognition of identities and appreciation of diversity, the integration of migrants, nation-building, and attempts to achieve and maintain social cohesion (Kenneth 2). By 1975 citizenship status had become far easier to achieve, and this resulted in the enfranchisement of hundreds of thousands of non-British immigrants. Preliminary steps were taken to satisfy the rising call for ethnic rights. These steps included the expansion of central government grants to ethnic groups to employ welfare workers, the beginning of state-funded radio broadcasting in ethnic languages, a multicultural education program, and a concerted effort to expose the problems that thirty years of migration had exacerbated (Jakubowicz 3). Overall, immigration was a significant factor in Australia's population growth, for example in excess of 2.5 million migrants had arrived by the end of 1972 (Foster 8).

---

[1] Edward Gough Whitlam was the 21st Prime Minister of Australia, serving from 1972 to 1975.

In the fourth immigration period, from 1973 – 1987, the views towards immigration were mixed, with regards to the political changes in Australia (election of two federal Labor governments separated by a seven-year period of conservative government (Foster 11). Both Liberal and Labor party stood against racial and ethnic discrimination and voted for selecting migrants on "objective grounds" as a predictor of "successful settlement" (Foster 12). Whereas the conservative parties focused on allotting migrants to business and independent migration, the labor administration tend to favor, for example, the categories of family reunion and refugees (Foster 12). During the Grassby [2] years, more emphasis was put on settlement policies, for example employment of bilingual personnel and the introduction of an "easy visa" system (which had to be abandoned because it resulted in an increase in illegal migration (Foster 13). The seeds of multiculturalism can be found in Grassby's vision of a new society in Australia – "the family of the Nation" which accepted pluralism as normal and desired (Foster 13). As a result of high ethno-cultural diversity of Australian society which emerged due to mass immigration following World War II, multiculturalism as a concept and policy was devised. This marked the abandonment of racially restricted immigration policies in the 1960s, in a way that overcame the limitations of previous approaches of assimilation and integration (Koleth 1). Today, Australia still leads battles with illegal immigration. Well - known Tampa incident in 2001 shows that Australia has to work harder if it is to preserve its fair image in the international community.

Aboriginal people, despite being Australia's original inhabitants, were not exempted from the Commonwealth racially oriented policies. Many traditional indigenous communities have become dysfunctional under the burdens of colonization and are plagued by unemployment, illness, and alcohol and drug abuse (Levey, ch. "Conflicting Australian Imaginaries"). Kevin M. Dunn et al. argue that at present, under the umbrella concept of cultural diversity,

---

[2] Al Grassby – Minister for Immigration in the period 1973-1975.

Indigenous Australians are assumed to be one ethnic group amongst a myriad of ethnic groups in Australia who have equal opportunity and equal claims to belonging (19). They emphasize that categorizing Indigenous people as simply another ethnic group, neglects the fact that their experience differentiates from those of immigrants, and diminishes their position as the original inhabitants, their history of dispossession and genocide (20).

The Australian Bureau of Statistics estimated that in 20111 there were 548,370 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples living in Australia, approximately two and a half per cent of the total Australian population. Overall, Indigenous people make up 2.5% of the total Australian population (Dudgeon et al. 25). There were approximately 300,000 Aboriginal people living in Australia when the British arrived in 1788 (Commonwealth of Australia, 1998). At the time of colonization there were approximately 260 distinct language groups and 500 dialects (Dudgeon et al. 4).

European settlement moved from Botany Bay outwards, as settlers claimed land for economic purposes. It was not long when the first wars over land between Aboriginals and colonizers escalated. European goal was to clear as many as lands as possible to enable development of land (Dudgeon et al. 7). It is of great importance to notice that European and Aboriginal notions of land carry fundamentally opposed meanings. Aboriginal concept of land is based on the fact that each individual belongs to certain territories within the family group and had spiritual connections and obligations to particular country (Dudgeon et al. 4). Hence land was not owned; one belonged to the land. Boundaries were fixed and validated by the Dreaming creation stories:

> „We are part of the Dreaming. We have been in the Dreaming for a long time before we are born on this earth and we will return to this vast landscape at the end of our days. It provides for us during our time on earth, a place to heal, to restore purpose and hope, and to continue our destiny". (qtd. in Dudgeon et al. 4)

The effects on Aboriginal family life cannot be overemphasized. Since the beginnings of alien settlement in the country, Aborigines have been subjected to experiences that have overwhelmed them or left them stranded as isolated persons and groups within the wider society. Only a minority were able to remain in their own home territories, more or less intact traditionally (qtd. in Bourke 59). Aboriginal family life has been irreversibly changed in most of Australia. Many of the changes have come about merely by the presence of Europeans; others are attributable directly to the colonizers' actions, which were aimed at taking control of the land, thus destroying family life as it existed in pre-colonial Aboriginal society (Bourke 48). Destroying kinship, the social cement of Aboriginal society, had devastating effects on the community (Broome 12). The importance of kinship for Aboriginals is visible in the great questions upon their meeting: What is your country and who are your kinfolk? (Broome 12). Kinsfolk were friends and all beyond a language group were enemies (Broome 12). One of the world greatest navigators, Lieutenant James Cook searched the Pacific in 1770 for the great southern land of European imagination and that is when it the colonizers and the colonized first met (Broome 13). The cultural encounters were marked by misunderstandings. Language, even gestures, can be misinterpreted, as winks and handshakes in one group are mere twitches or touches to the other. For example, Governor Phillip observed cuts on Eora [3]women's temples, which were the marks of mourning, but to him they were signs of Aboriginal men's brutality to their women (Broome 17).

Aboriginals were faced with the disappearance of traditional values, way of life, family structure and spiritual loss. After colonization Aboriginal families lost their economic base but, even more importantly, their spiritual life was tragically broken and disconnected. No longer could people be comforted by the knowledge that their relatives assisted the great spirits in maintaining the creation of life (Bourke 60). Further control over daily life and

---

[3] The Eora, the original owners of the foreshore that became Sydney.

forcible removal of Aboriginal children left an indelible imprint on many Aboriginal Australians.

More information about Australian policy towards Aboriginal peoples will be given later in this paper in a separate section.

2.1.1. Racism in Australia

The omnipresent racism in Australia has been subject to many research papers and presented a challenging task for scholars trying to define it and find sources of its origin. The ongoing racism poses a threat to the development of tolerant multicultural society in which cultural diversity is nourished, not rejected. I will provide the perspective of Ghassan Hage, a writer of *White Nation* who deals with the concept of White Australia, with special attention to racism. Besides, I will provide the viewpoints of other authors on this subject too.

Racism, racial, racist are words which meaning every one of us have heard and a vague explanation lays in the back of our mind. But what do these words really denote and what is their origin? One definition of racism describes it as an overt rejection of other groups and their members, as hostile and malevolent, as underpinned by a belief in the superiority of one's own group over others, and as a feature of individuals (Dudgeon 15). Words racial and racist are derived from "race" and they describe person's attitude to others who are not like themselves (qtd. in Van Den Berg 34). Racism encompasses the belief that some races are naturally more superior than others. This belief is rooted in the theory of Social Darwinism Theory about races which served as a guiding star to self-named "superior" societies. The Anglos widely embraced Darwin's theory that evolution was progressive, and that the white races—especially the Europeans—were evolutionarily more advanced than the black races, and laid it for the corner stone of their racism-governed colonization process (Rose 1).

The English were the most powerful colonists over the centuries, and by usurping lands they spread their dominant ethnocentric culture in the countries they established the British Rule. The culture of the colonized was scorned and eventually suppressed. Natives, especially indigenous people were not seen as people with their own cultures and societies, but rather as "beasts of burden" (qtd. in Van Den Berg 47). In reality, desire to civilize barbarians have often been used as pretexts for oppressing and exterminating them John Beecham noted already in 1838 (25). Looked at as animals with no education, no "real" knowledge, or culture, Aboriginal race was left to die out due to inability to co-exist with the "advanced" world. Exclusion of Aboriginals from the national census in Australian Constitution is an undoubtedly a racist act. Section 51 stated that the Commonwealth Parliament could legislate with respect to "the people of any race, other than the aboriginal race in any State, for whom it is deemed necessary to make special laws". The goal was to create a national community of members (stemming from English background) who would be equal under the law, and the other, people of „special problem"races, and Aboriginals (Irving 116).

In chapter one of his book Ghassan Hage talks about spatial-national dimension of racist violence, as one of its categories. Hage discusses racism in terms of national space, masters of this national space and the ethnic/racial other as only objects to be moved/removed from this space. This is best expressed in the example of Australian Aboriginals. White people took it for their natural right to persecute and dispossess Aboriginals of their land, heritage, and traditions for years. Similarly to the British who regarded Australia an empty land, the German Nazi conquerors regarded the East as an enormous tabula rasa that could be redesigned according to their own conceptions (Moses 55). Furthermore, Hage emphasizes the role of territory in racist practices and talks about the imagined relation between race, ethnicity or culture and national space conceived as its own. Therefore, a term nationalism encompasses the term racism, because people can be racism oriented but to actually mark

someone/something as undesirable within their nation and physically attack him (for example a case of forcibly removing a Muslim woman's scarf) means that people are worshipping the image of idealized nation, nation which is associated only with a certain race, ethnicity or culture and whose homely character is endangered by multiculturalism. This imaginary homely nation serves as an aim to nationalist practices. Nationalist sees himself as possessing a greater size and power than an ethnic other, and he/she feels it is his/her responsibility to protect the nation's homely character. By inhabiting the national will and identifying with it, nationalist assumes a role of spatial manager in a national space.

Hage poses a question: who is up to decide who can stay and should be kept out of Australia? In Hage's view both racists and "multiculturalists", believe that they are, to some degree, masters of national space who share the right to move/remove national objects – Aboriginal people and non-white "ethnics" according to the White national will (16, 17).

Kennedy examines racism in terms of social cohesion, saying that eliminating difference and „the other"is a way of achieving cohesion (1). Jakubowicz also stresses that he most important issue in the immigration debate is not the numbers of immigrants; but their source and a significant change in street faces that might have for the level of harmony and cohesion in the community (5). But it is just the opposite; it is not the migrants who distort the harmony, but racist thinking which made it more difficult for newcomers to integrate into society

A disgraceful form of racism example in politics occurred during the 1990s when Pauline Hanson and her One Nation party made a splash in the media. Her political activity is considered to have reignited racism and hate in Australia. Manne calls her first Australian anti-politician (345). Hanson was a candidate for the Liberal party, but was expelled soon after her racist remarks about Aboriginals and Asians. Nevertheless, she made the seat as independent, and her maiden speech in the House of Representatives

caused an national outcry. In the speech she referred to the problems of multicultural Australia and warned against the special treatment for racial minorities at the expense of mainstream Australia (Clarke 361). The government coalition and Prime Minister's lack of proper criticism directed at Hanson led to Asians, Aboriginals and other migrant communities coming under open attack. Hanson led a campaign in which she attacked the alleged 'special treatment' of Aboriginals and advocated for halting of Asian immigration because, in her opinion, Australians were endangered by the amount of Asian immigrants. She also called for the immediate abolition of social policies associated with multiculturalism (Stephenson 141). Hage explains why Pauline Hanson *credibly* claimed that her discourse was not a racist one. The key category to her discourse is a spatial category 'presence', not a racial category. Hanson states that it is not Asians as race that worry her, but their vast presence in Australia. According to her logic of what racism is, if she had problem with Asians as a race, she would be opposed to any kind of Asian presence. To conclude, Asians are welcome as long as they are not too many. Moreover, Hanson assumes the role of a worried guardian of the nation: "I can invite who I like into my home, but I have no say in who comes into my country. This must change." In the same manner, Ron Casey [4] denies that he is a racist, saying he believes that all races are created equal and that no race is superior to the other. He is only anxious about social harmony being distorted due to unrestricted number of Asians coming to Australia "with no intention of assimilating into the ways of old Australia". But, he doesn't see that by assuming a role of a spatial manager of a nation and the anxiety about a loss of capacity to control, he asserts himself as a racist (Hage 188).

Discourse of decline is recognizable in Hanson's and Casey's perspectives. In Hage's words, discourse of decline is a specific instance of White nation fantasy in crisis.

---

[4] A former television presenter, sports journalist and [talk-back]() radio host based in Sydney.

Proponents of discourse of decline are, above all, concerned with "mix" and "balance". Firstly, they believe that the harmony and balance once existed in old Australia has been destroyed by the uncontrolled flow of immigrants. Secondly, they distance themselves from racism by expressing their concern with national spatial control and not with race as such (Hage 186). The difference between *Hansonities,* how Hage calls them, and White Multiculturalists lies in their vision of nation. Whereas Hansonities see the national balance as lost, White multiculturalists work on its maintenance (189). Therefore, Hansonite fantasy contained in statements: *"*Mainstream Australia must be allowed to have a say in how this country will look in a hundred years' time!*"* and "All I want is an Australia for Australians" is a clear negation of the established order and the prevailing everyday multiculturalism in Australia (Hage 231).

Another thing that Hage warns about is the concept "racist practice". Racist incidents of expressing hatred in public - in places such as our trains and buses, shopping centers, neighborhoods, might not be racist after all. The belief in the existence of races, or that there is a hierarchy of races, some superior and others inferior, is not in itself a motivating ideology to commit a racist act (Hage 32). People can be racists without ever feeling the need to act towards members of other ethnicities and communities. However, when a person begins to feel threatened by the number of immigrants, and think about whether they live in their street, do their kids go to the same school as his/hers, etc., then a person creates a special connection between self and territory. Thus, shouting at somebody „to go home" or „we don't need wogs in Australia", is better classified as a nationalist act.

2011 Challenging racism project report has shown that 27.9% of Australians demonstrate racist attitudes towards Aboriginal Australians. 85.6% of Australians agreed that 'Something should be done to minimize or fight racism in Australia" (qtd. in Awofeso 2). In comparison to non-Indigenous respondents, Aboriginals had a stronger recognition of racism what only

reflects their historic and continuing experiences of racism ... (qtd. in Dunn et al. 9). The national Overcoming Indigenous disadvantage report (2005/2007/2009) shows that Indigenous people are the most disadvantaged group in Australia. Among the collected data are these findings: The life expectancy of Indigenous people is around 10 years lower than that of other Australians, the average Indigenous income is lower, a much lower proportion of Indigenous people own their home, suicide death rates are much higher, etc. (Dudgeon et al. 13). Racism towards Aboriginals is distributed on an individual and institutional level in unequal access to social determinants of health, particularly, health care services, education, criminal justice, housing and employment (Awofeso 7).

2.2.   The History of Australian Policy towards Aboriginal Peoples

The Aboriginal question is still a subject of debate today because many occurrences concerning Aboriginal peoples around the world have remained unknown to wider public, unrecognized and suppressed into history by the government authorities. As already mentioned, Aboriginal peoples belonged to the group of racially and ethnically people undesirable to be part of the creation of new, powerful country. A variety of government and non-government policies and practices have aimed to eliminate Indigenous peoples, to "smooth the pillow" over what was seen as a dying race. Discriminatory history that Aboriginals were subjected to has impact on present generations too, in a way that they experience socio-economic disadvantages in modern Australia. However, it remains one of the mysteries of history that Australia was able to get away with a racist policy that included segregation and dispossession and bordered on slavery and genocide, practices unknown in the civilized world in the first half of the twentieth century until Nazi Germany turned on the Jews in the 1930s (Knightley 107).

The history of Australian policy towards Aboriginal peoples can be divided into four principal periods: 1) initial contact (1788-1930) 2) protected status (1860-1930) 3) assimilation (1930-1970) 4) integration (1967-) (Armitage 14).

Soon after arrival of the First Fleet, dispossession of Aboriginal land began and was one of the reasons for horrible violence committed against Aboriginals. Knightley points out that the number of Aboriginals killed by white settlers cannot be known for sure, as they were not included in the census by 1967, but it is estimated at over 50 000 people (108). In many states British took the possession of the land with the help of legal maneuver – concept of *terra nullius* („land belonging to no one") (Armitage 16). Interestingly, the British did not obey to International law of the 18th century, which required a new country to be taken only after permission was sought from the natives, unless the land was inhabited (Phelps 40). Instead, they reasoned their stealing away the lands. Under British colonial law, Aboriginal Australians had no property rights in the land because they were not deemed sovereign by British standards (Armitage 16). Two definitions of sovereignty are found in Oxford Dictionary: 1) The authority of a state to govern itself or another state and 2) A self-governing state. According to British government system, Aboriginals did not have an organized form of community system capable of governing people. They lived in small groups who were semi-nomadic, took no use of advanced tools or weapons, and wore no appropriate clothes. They did not have developed agriculture, which fully convinced the British that Aboriginals are primitive people, but it is less known that they survived for over 40 millennia with a non-agricultural economy, which suited the land, and was sustainable with the land (Broome 9). Their science was consisted in Dreaming, a metaphysical and geographical connection with all of the living and non- living beings, which explained how world came to be. British Crown used all this as a reason to take control over Aboriginals and their possessions. Knightley talks about killings that followed: „ In many states in the early days settlers cleared Aboriginals of

their land as casually as kangaroos"…"They shot them, poisoned them and clubbed them" (108). When colonizers took land from Aboriginals, they took the whole basis of Aboriginal life and culture (Armitage 16). Early Aboriginal resistance consisted mainly of raiding parties and guerilla tactics that included destroying livestock, raiding shepherds and their flocks and homesteads (Dudgeon et al. 7). From an estimated original population of 300 000, by 1930 there were only 60 000 Aboriginal people left in Australia ("Behavioral Psychology 189). They were perceived by the dominant society as hopeless remnants, clinging to what was left of their cultures and merely surviving (Dudgeon, et al. 7). Knightley quotes Australian writer who criticizes colonial authorities' intention to populate Australia with a mix of poor and ignorant criminals, when forced into close relations with the Aboriginals, they had no chance to ever comprehend. The writer concludes that that rape, abduction and violence were expected means by which two so distinct groups could get on (108.)

In 1869 The Aborigines Protection Act was issued in Victoria in order to protect Aboriginals from the problems of the British colony (alcohol, prostitution, crime), but it proved only to be an attempt to control the life of Aboriginal peoples. In 1901 Commonwealth was established. Aboriginals were mentioned twice in the Constitution, once excluding them from the national census and second time excluding them from the government's laws (Armitage 18). Of more significance to Aboriginal people was legislation that denied them the right to vote in federal elections. The scope of the federal franchise was determined after Federation by the Commonwealth Franchise Act 1902 (Williams 651). That Act extended the federal franchise to women, and it had been proposed that the Bill also extend the franchise to Aborigines (Williams 651). The Aborigines Act of 1905 was probably the most inhumane of all the acts. When this Act came into operation, whatever freedom Aboriginals had prior to this Act has been completely taken from them (Van Den Berg 66). Act contained employment rules for Aboriginals and employers, curfew for Aboriginals, their

relocation into reserves and removal of Aboriginal children. In the 1930s campaigns were led to highlight that Aboriginals were not in fact a dying race, as commonly supposed. Small groups of metropolitan Aboriginals, Christians, anthropologists, feminists turned at official policies in different states that practiced racial engineering in order to "breed out the color" and segregating Aboriginals until they "died out" (Moses 8).

Then the policy of assimilation followed. Aboriginals were still not extinct as expected, so more systematic assimilation of Aboriginals was needed, especially those of „light-caste"(Armitage 19). „Light-caste" or "half-caste" children were forcefully seized from their families and put into institutions where they suffered physical and psychological abuse (Knightley 112). Mudroo, or Colin Johnson by his non-aboriginal name describes being Aboriginal during his lifetime (1930-2000): "If you are an Aboriginal then you're discriminated against since the time of you were born … Because of the policies at the time, you lived in terror of being taken away from your parents. This is exactly what happened to my brothers and sisters and eventually happened to me. It's what I call the "stolen generation" (Docker, Fischer 96). Various reports such as *Bringing Them Home* have investigated this phenomenon of seizing Aboriginal children and shown that as many as one in ten Indigenous children were forcibly removed from their families and communities in the first half of the 20th century (Dudgeon et al. 12).

Aboriginals' integration into society began with the amendment of the constitution in 1967, when they were eventually included in the census. Since then, government has granted Aboriginals land rights, political equality and prohibited racism. In 2008 the Prime Minister Kevin Rudd publicly apologized to „The Stolen Generations" on behalf of the nation. Still, in everyday life Aboriginals have to fight against discrimination and struggle to recover their cultural identity (Dudgeon et al. 38). Since white people first came to Australia in 1788, Indigenous people have experienced displacement, been the targets of genocidal policies and

practices, had families destroyed through the forcible removal of children, and continue to face the stresses of living in a racist world that systematically devalues Indigenous culture and people. Such experiences have profound effects on health and social and emotional wellbeing, for individuals, families and communities (Dudgeon et al. 18).

3. AUSTRALIA AS THE IMAGINARY NATION

3.1. The „White Nation Fantasy"

The principal concept on which Australia racist history is based is what Hage calls „White nation fantasy". This section will explore Hage's view of Australian constructed imaginary. As earlier mentioned, some people manage to take up a managerial position within nation, and others do not. Why is that so?

In Australia, as in most nations, taking on a citizenship is considered to be an indicator of national belonging. Nevertheless, not everyone experience their national belonging to the same degree, i.e. some feel more at home and some less. This happens because granting someone citizenship is not a result of a general communal will, but the power to do that is delegated to the state (Hage 50). The gap between institutional-political acceptance and that of dominant community leads to discriminatory practices towards immigrants. If they are to improve their practical national acceptance at everyday level, they are compelled to improve their national profile by accumulating some of the cultural capital to become "real Australians". Some people regard themselves more Australian than others, because they've lived in Australia longer, or because they speak the national language better, or simply because they are white. For Bourdieu, the aim of gathering national capital is to convert it in symbolic capital valorized by the dominant community

within a nation. Language, looks, cultural practices could make one in advantage or in disadvantage;

Nick Mentis, a member of Greek community, recalls of his early years in New England:

"Back in those days, when I first came to Australia, we had an inferiority complex, well, I did, because well, I had black hair, black moustache, curly hair … The Australians weren't as broadminded as they are today … If you'd speak in those days, oh, they'd abuse you. They'd try to do something to stir you up" (qtd. in Wilton 115).

To claim certain forms of dominant national belonging person would have to acquire some of highly valued capital such as "blonde hair", "blue eyes", "of British descent", Catholic". A research conducted last year by The Australian National University took a sample of 1200 respondents to find out what qualities Australians deem to be part of "Australianness" (Sheppard 2). The research revealed that more than nine in 10 Australians believe that the ability to speak English is important to 'being truly Australian', while fewer than half believe that being born in Australia is important. Respecting Australian political institutions and laws was on third place followed by possession of Australian citizenship (Sheppard 2). Whelan study showed that Australians attitudes towards culturally similar migrants were more positive than those towards culturally dissimilar migrants because the former group would easier "fit into" Australian society and way of life, thus it would not threaten the concept of homely nation (Ruggiero 111).

Those in possession of valorized national capital belong to the field of power, field that Hage decides to call "the field of Whiteness". Whiteness in this sense will not only refer to skin color, but to an ever-changing cultural historical concept. White as an ideal of the Western civilization cannot be achieved; one can only yearn for to settle in the field of

Whiteness (Hage 58). Those who succeed to take a place in this field, dominate over Third World-looking people who they classify as people with low national capital. The White Nationalists carry out nationalist acts because they firmly believe in a notion of an ideal imaginary nation, a fantasy nation. By engaging in nationalist practices, nationalists want to reaffirm themselves as the true protectors of the national order, to embody a fantasy of self as a fulfilled nationalist. Part of the process is converting "the other" into an object. Lacanian psychoanalysis explains us how a nationalist and fantasy mutually keep each other alive. Nationalist being part of the fantasy, holds a belief that he is meaningful, i.e he has to build a homely idealized nation. Furthermore, Lacan explains that the homely idealized nation can never be achieved because then the nationalist would cease to exist as a national subject. This is how a construct of "otherness" emerges. Nationalist must believe that there is an obstacle preventing him from reaching his goal, which is actually unattainable, or accept his "death" (Hage 73).

4. AUSTRALIAN TOLERANCE AND MULTICULTURALISM

4.1. Tolerance and power

According to one survey conducted on what is tolerance revealed that Australian-born participants put a much more positive spin on the word than those born outside of Australia. For participants born in Australia, tolerance meant diversity. For those born outside Australia, tolerance was seen as allowing diversity but not accepting it, in other words „letting ethnics do their thing"(Thomson).

The Australian mainstream culture is depicted as the liberal tolerant society, whereas nationalist practices, which are often incorrectly classified under "racist violence", are still considered an oddity and unrelated to the mainstream Australia (Hage 78). Hage specially

analyses the statement of the former Prime Minister Bob Hawke who addresses the problem of racism towards Australian Arabs in the wake of Gulf War. Hawke says: "I appeal to my fellow Australians to be understanding, to be charitable and to appreciate that these are loyal Australians entitled to differences of view, but they must be protected". Who is Hawke actually addressing and asking for charity and why is his proposal not formed in a right way? Preston King, author of *Toleration,* points out that those who are intolerant are being asked to become tolerant, do not have their power to practice intolerance removed from them, but actually their power is reasserted. The problem is that the appeal for tolerance did not remove the capacity to exercise the power of intolerance, but only affirm this power. Those who felt addressed by Hawke's appeal saw in it a confirmation of their power to be intolerant. Therefore, the call for tolerance leaves a particular group of people empowered, group which Hage earlier referred to as White Australians. This group has a strong sense of governmental belonging because they feel that whether people speak Arabic on the streets of wear their national clothing is dependent on their capacity for tolerance. In a some sort of guidebook for perspective immigrants to Australia it is written: "The Australian culture is a tolerant one. It can cope with many different attitudes to life, work and the family" (Australia's Multicultural Policy 28). What strikes the eye in this statement is word cope, a synonym of which Hage uses in his book when saying that those in dominated position (White Australians) do not tolerate, they just endure. However, contrary to King's argument that "to tolerate generally means to endure, suffer or put up with a person, idea or organization", Hage claims that tolerance presupposes control/power over what is tolerated. The guidebook gives further instructions to migrants: "The fact that Australia is a tolerant society does not, of course, mean that everything will be the same for you as in your country of origin. You will need to allow time for the family to adapt to the different style of living they will encounter in Australia" (Australia's Multicultural Policy 29). Having read this paragraph, I got the

impression that migrants' diversity will be tolerated as long as they are willing to assimilate to the "Australian way", or to put it in other words, if they not stand in the way of the White nation fantasy. Moreover, this proves that there is no tolerance without a setting of limits. The tolerated others are accepted only if they into fit into a particular setting of limits, they are part of our nation, but as long as we accept them (Hage 89).

Moreover, Hage argues that practices of tolerance are structured similarly to the nationalist practices of exclusion because they both include agents of nation with the same imaginary managerial capacity to move and remove objects within nation (79). Both are practices of spatial power. So, both tolerant and intolerant people share the same dominant role of a spatial manager, but the difference lies in their thresholds of tolerance, their capacity to tolerate. Nevertheless, both groupings consider themselves to be in the position of power over others.

4.2. Australian Multicultural Policy

Multiculturalism as a state policy in Australia emerged in the 1970s. An important feature of this policy is that it moved towards practices of assimilation and integration. Integration, more than assimilation, foreshadowed the succeeding policy of multiculturalism. While during assimilation period migrants were required to quickly adopt language and culture of Anglo-Celtic heritage and abandon the traditions of their own heritage, during integration period they were encouraged to keep them alive parallel with adopting new culture (Hage 82). Al Grassby, by many considered the father of the policy said that he aimed for creating a tolerant society that accepts cultural diversity (Hage 83). Bob Hawke, Prime Minister elected in 1984, describes what he means by "multicultural": ""Multicultural" is more than a descriptive term to designate a society made up of different ethnic groups… It designates a

society which supports a common group of institutions, legal rights and obligations, while leaving individuals free to maintain their religion, language and cultural customs (qtd. in Manzo 204). Owing to the work of Minister of Immigration Al Grassby and Fraser Government who stood for the improvement of post-arrival services and the fostering of the cultures Australia could finally cease to exist as an "Anglo-dominated racist colony" (Manzo 204). The years of Fraser Government (late 1975-early 1983) were perhaps most important in responding to migrant's growing unhappiness with their marginalized status in the society. They established public symbols of concern for ethnic affairs, such as the setting up of Australia's Institute for Multicultural Affairs, multicultural television, financial aid for ethnic schools, multicultural education, development of linguistic and culturally diverse programs in the fields of health and welfare, interpreting and translating, etc. (Foster 14). Despite the efforts, the Gabally report in 1978 showed that migrants of a non-English-speaking background particularly remained disadvantaged before the law as a result of language problems, cultural differences and the attitudes of the police, lawyers and courts and because of the dangers of stereotyping migrants as more prone to criminal (Foster 56).

The most recent Australia's multicultural policy *The People of Australia* was issued in 2011 and it has four principles that underpin it: 1) celebration and valuation of the benefits of cultural diversity for all Australians, 2) building an inclusive and socially cohesive society where everyone can participate in the opportunities that Australia, 3) welcoming the economic, trade and investment benefits, which arise from our successful multicultural nation 4) promotion of understanding and acceptance while responding to expressions of intolerance and discrimination (Australia's Multicultural Policy 6). It might seem that these four principles reflect Australia's willingness to accept immigrants with arms wide open, providing them with equal chances for „Australian dream" and expecting from then nothing in return but national loyalty. Hage, however, directs us to look at the bigger picture by producing

discourse of productive diversity and discourse of value. Various ethnicities inhabiting Australia are said to be enriching it with new foods, languages, and new ways of dressing, singing and dancing. Some customs are valued negatively (Muslim burka) and others positively, for example Thai or Chinese culinary specialty favored by many people. Nonetheless, by being involved in the process of valuation the value of these things impaired. The agent of valuation, dominant Anglo culture, is endowed with the power to value migrant cultures as enriching or not enriching. Having this power, the dominant culture is considered already enriched itself. Furthermore, whereas this dominant White culture unquestionably exists, ethnic cultures exist in relation to what their estimated value is. A White Australian stands in the role of valorizer and ethnics in the role of valued (Hage 118). Contrary to this, in the discourse of productive diversity illustrates multiculturalism as a source of exploitable resource. It is a duty of White valorizer to take use of symbolic value of ethnic cultures in the sphere of consumption. It means activating ethnic cultures and the values embodied in them in order to improve their consumption.

Having said all that, we can see that in the centre of Australia's multiculturalism is White multiculturalism.

Opponents of multicultural policy argue that Australia can only remain peaceful if migrants do not undermine "the long-established, Anglo-Celtic culture and institutions" (Manzo 206). They often emphasize the fact that Australia must protect its cultural landscape from a vast flow of immigrants from other countries, who might bring Australian values into danger. This anxiety for decline of Anglo-culture is expressed in questions such as: "What may happen if Islam constitutes 10% of Australia's population and 30% of the people living in one city?" or "What if by 2050 the Chinese, with their drive or virtues take much of Australian commerce? (Manzo 205). On the other side, supporters of the policy find it very valuable because it portrays the government's willingness to rewrite the national history by

introducing antidiscrimination policies, English-language programs and other necessary measures for successful pluralism in Australia (Manzo 206).

5. AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES TODAY AND THE FUTURE OF MULTICULTURALISM

Aboriginal people still lead an ongoing struggle for everyday equality and try to recover from effects of cultural genocide that caused the loss of language, family dispersion and the cessation of cultural practices. The consequences of colonization are reflected in contemporary life. Before anything else, it is important to state that the policy of forced removal of Aboriginal children has profound and enduring effects on Aboriginal emotional and social wellbeing. In the book "Working together" Dudgeon and colleagues address Aboriginals' struggle with racism, discrimination, social disadvantage, physical health problems and identity issues. To give some specific examples: Aboriginals experience poorer health outcomes than others and hospitalization rates for alcohol related conditions for Aboriginal people are two and a half times those of other people. Also, on the job market the Aboriginal employment rate remains 20 per cent lower than for other Australians; and justice system reveals that homicide rates are six times higher for Aboriginal people (Dudgeon et al. 13). A state funded program *National Empowerment program* was designed to help Aboriginals deal with substance misuse, domestic and child abuse and family violence, and other manifestations of people's disadvantage and distress, but results show that more programs and services should be developed in order to make the healing process more efficient.

Aboriginal people are generally found to be supportive of cultural diversity in Australia, but their greatest resentment is that they are often assumed to be one ethnic group amongst a myriad of ethnic groups in Australia (Dunn et al. 19). Edward J. Corbett argues that multiculturalism has only given the Aborigines more people who discriminate against them, explaining that the new people (ethnic groups) quickly pick up the values of those in power (qtd. in Van Den Berg 62). Survey Reconciliation Australia from 2008 has found that Indigenous youth are critical of non-Indigenous attitudes, skeptical of reconciliation and insistent that non-Indigenous Australians should show a greater level of respect towards Indigenous people and culture (Dunn et al. 21). This lack of respect made Aboriginal relations with Australian government strained for a long time due to the government decision not to apologize for its black history, especially the Stolen Generation. Younger generations of Anglo-Celtic Australians said that they had no part in the decision to remove Aboriginal children; therefore there is no reason for them to apologize. In fact, this refusal to acknowledge Australia's colonial history represents subtle form of racism (Van Den Berg 60). Majority of immigration debates deal with fears of invasion "boat people" and uncontrolled flow of humanity make the central focus. In the period 1999-2001 there was an increased flow of boat people, previously largely of Asian background, but asylum seekers arriving in this period were primarily Muslims from Afghanistan, Iraq, and Iran. Taking into consideration terrorist attacks in the US in 2001, arriving Muslims were labeled a threat to national security and suffered discrimination. As a result, Australians naturally began to be anxious and skeptic towards multiculturalism (Koleth 31). Howard's government then marked a shift from multiculturalism back to assimilation and integration that were necessary to reestablish Australian values at the core of society (Koleth 32). An obvious paradox then came to light in the fact that multiculturalism as a policy was designed in response to large cultural diversity, but in the period of greatest confluence of immigrants authorities abandoned the main

principles of the policy, Gwenda Tawan highlights (Koleth 36). Australian Multicultural Advisory Council, created by Rudd government in 2008 states that "multicultural" somehow become neglected by Australian political leaders who should not have difficulty in presenting "multicultural Australia" as an important part of the national identity (Koleth 38). Although Australian multiculturalism in unique, there are some similarities with other states: growing Muslim population, the unplanned arrival of refugees, the existence of socially disadvantaged Indigenous peoples (Jupp 24). Incidents like Cronulla riots that included alcohol-fuelled violence against people of 'Middle-Eastern appearance' by demonstrators clad in Australian flags, attacks on Indian students, and everyday nationalist practices that happen in places like public transport, workplace and schools, show that multicultural policy should be further refined. Now Australia faces a 'third revolution' in the form of a mass inflow of immigrants and refugees coming not only from crisis-ravaged parts of Europe, but also – and increasingly – from East and South Asia (including Afghanistan), from the war-ravaged Middle East, and from the destabilized parts of Africa (Pakulski, Markowski 8). Questions that impose themselves are Whether Australia's relatively open immigration policies and tolerant multiculturalism will survive the test of this third 'immigration revolution', whether multiculturalism plays a sufficient role in meeting the needs of diverse population and how can it develop to a higher level? (Koleth 54).

6. CONCLUSION

One can claim with certainty that the current state of affairs in Australia is much more open to diversity and tolerable to other ethnicities, races, languages and culture than it was two hundred years ago. While some refer to Australia as an ideal model of a country with wide-spread pluralism, others find its policy inadequate to deal with such a large number of

people with various backgrounds. On government level progress is noted because policies to deal with diverse communities are renewed every couple of years according to the needs of immigrants to make their process of integration less painful.

Struggle for reaching national cohesion might be an unreachable imagined goal in such a pluralist country like Australia. While multiculturalism might be a perfectly constructed concept, Jamrozik et al. points at failures of multiculturalism as a policy in practice - there are still clear links between ethnicities and socio-economic life chances (114). What's more, acceptance of cultural pluralism also runs the danger of creating separate and inferior educational and social systems for different groups; instead of achieving cohesion, excessive adaptation to migrants' needs could lead to just the opposite – segregation (Jamrozik 114). Moreover, the Anglo-Celtic heritage that Hage frequently theorizes, still occupies a dominant place in the hierarchy of cultures. That being the case, multiculturalism can never be a system of absolute equity, though the benefits of cultural diversity are celebrated and valued, but not as much as the values of dominant White Australian culture.

When it comes to Aboriginals, one can see that the consequences of Australian racial history cannot be quickly erased, and that trauma passes on to further generations of Aboriginal people. Australia's government had refused to deal with issues of Aboriginal people for a long time, but instead denied their existence for many years supposing them a dying race, segregated them from the rest of society and practiced their containment. A both surprising and unsurprising fact is that by the late 1980s, the wider Australian community was still ignorant of the history of Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations in Australia (Gunstone 2) proves that Breaking "The Great Australian Silence" represents a first step towards reconciliation. Dudgeon et.al describes the process of restoring Aboriginal identity a complex one which involves re-connecting with family, land, culture, ancestors, spirituality and community (497). Aboriginal people were stripped of the traditions of their ancestors and in

contemporary times, they must integrate with white Australian culture in order to survive as racial and cultural discrimination still find their way to everyday life (Van den Berg 61).

7. WORKS CITED

Department of Immigration and Border Protection. *A History of the Department of Immigration: Managing Migration to Australia.* Commonwealth of Australia, 2015. Print.

Department of Immigration and Citizenship. *Australia's Multicultural Policy.* Commonwealth of Australia, 2011. Print.

Armitage, Andrew. *Comparing the Policy of Aboriginal Assimilation: Australia, Canada, and New Zealand.* University of British Columbia, 1995. Print.

Beecham, Jones. *Colonization: being remarks on colonization in general, with an examination of the proposals of the association which has been formed for colonizing New Zealand*. James Nichols, 1838. Print.

„Behavioural Psychology". *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict, volume 1 (A-E), 1999.* Print.

Broome, Richard. *Aboriginal Australians: A History Since 1788. 4th ed.,* Allen & Unwin, 2010. Print.

Bourke, Colin, and Robyn Hartley. *Families and cultural diversity in Australia.* ALLEN & UNWIN 1995. Print.

Clarke, Frank G. *Australia in a Nutshell: A Narrative History.* Rosenberg Publishing, 2003. Print.

Dixon, R. "Immigration and the White Australia Policy". *Comintern History. Australian Communist Party 1945*. Current Book Distributors, 1945. Print.

Docker, John, and Gerhard Fischer. *Race, Colour and Identity in Australia and New Zealand.* University of South New Wales, 2000. Print.

Dudgeon, Pat, et al. *Working Together: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Mental Health and Wellbeing Principles and Practice.* 2nd ed., Commonwealth of Australia, 2014. Print.

Foster, Louis E, and David Stockley. *Australian Multiculturalism: A Documentary History and Critique.* Multilingual Matters Ltd, 1988. Print.

Hage, Ghassan. *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*. Routledge, 2000. Print.

Jakubowicz, Andrew. "Racism, Multiculturalism and the Immigration Debate in Australia: A Bibliographic Essay". *The Institute of Race Relations, Vol.* 10 (3), 1985, pp 1-15. Print.

Jamrozik, Adam, et al. *Social Change and Cultural Transformation in Australia*. Cambridge University, 1995. Print.

Jupp, James, and Michael Clyne. *Multiculturalism and Integration: A Harmonious Relationship.* The Australian National University, 2011. Print.

Kennedy-Dubourdieu, Elaine. *Race and Inequality: World Perspectives on Affirmative Action.* Ashgate, 2006. Print.

Knightley, Philipp. *Australia: A Biography of a Nation*. Jonathon Cape, 2000. Print.

Koleth, Elsa. *Multiculturalism: a review of Australian policy statements and recent debates in Australia and overseas.* Parliament of Australia, 2010. Print.

Levey, Geoffrey Brahm. *Political Theory And Australian Multiculturalism. Berghahn Books, 2008.* Print.

Manzo, Kathryn A. *Creating Boundaries: The Politics of Race and Nation.* Lynne Riener, 1996. Print.

Moses, Dirk A. *Genocide and Settler Society: Frontier Violence and Stolen Indigenous Children in Australian History*. Berghahn Books, 2004. Print.

Irving, Helen. *To Constitute a Nation: A Cultural History of Australia's Constitution.* Cambridge University Press, 1999. Print.

Phelps, Kerryn, and Craig Hasse. *Joints and Connective Tissues: General Practice: The Integrative Approach Series.* 3rd ed., Elsevier Australia, 2015. Print.

Rose, Steven. „Darwin, race and gender“. *Embo reports, Vol.10 (4)., 2009.* Print.

Rutland, Suzanne D. *The Jews in Australia*. Cambridge University, 2005. Print.

Ruggiero, Giovanni Maria, et al. *Perspectives on Immigration and Terrorism. Ios P., 2010.* Print.

Sheppard, Jill. *Australian Attitudes towards National Identity: Citizenship, Immigration and Tradition.* Australian National University, 2015. Print.

Stacker, Julie and Peri Stewart. *Chinese Immigrants and Chinese–Australians in New South Wales* . National Archives of Australia, Commonwealth of Australia, 2004. Print.

Stephenson, Peta. *The Outsiders Within: Telling Australia's Indigenous-Asian Story.* University of New South Wales, 2007. Print.

The Department of Immigration and Citizenship. *The Australian Immigration Book: 2014. E*dited by Huiqing Guan. Autonet Pty Ltd, 2014. Print.

Thomson, Stanley Bruce. *Religion and Organizational Stigma at Work.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. Print.

Van Den Berg, Rosemary. *Nyoongar People of Australia: Perspectives on Racism and Multiculturalism.* Koninklijke Brill NV, 2002. Print.

.Wilton, Janis. *Different Sights: Immigrants in New England.* NSW Migration Heritage Centre NSW, 2009. Print.

Williams, George." Race and the Australian Constitution: From Federation to Reconciliation". Osgoode Hall Law Journal, 2000, Vol.38 (4), pp. 644-653. Print.

Web sources

Awofeso, Niyi. „Racism: a major impediment to optimal Indigenous health and health care in Australia". *Australian Indigenous Health Bulletin, Vol 11 (3), 2011.* http://healthbulletin.org. Web. 9 September 2016.

Dunn, Kevin M., et al. „Indigenous Australians' Attitudes Towards Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity, 'Race' and Racism". *Journal of Australian Indigenous Issues,* 2010, Vol. 13 (4), pp. 19-31. http://www.uws.edu.au. Web. 5 September 2016.

Gunstone, Andrew. "Reconciliation and the 'Great Australian Silence'". Australian Political Studies Association, 2012, pp. 1-2. www.auspsa.org.au. Web. 2 September 2016.

Jacobowitz, Susan. "Reffos, Wogs and Dagoes:" The Immigration Experience in Post-World War II Australia. *Ilha Desterro* , vol.69, n.2, pp.77-84., 2016. Web. 14 August 2016.

Pakulski, Jan, and Stefan Markowski. „Globalisation, immigration and multiculturalism: the European and Australian experiences". *Journal of Sociology,* 2014, Vol. 50 (1), pp. 3 – 9. www.jos.sagepub.com. Web. 27 August 2016.

„The changing face of early Australia". *Australian Government.* www.australia.gov.au. Web. 27 April 2016.

Documentaries

Immigration Nation: The Secret History of Us. Directed by Jacob Hickey and Ben Shackleton. Screen Australia and SBS Australia, 2010. Documentary.