Centre on Migration, Policy and Society

**Working Paper No. 11,
University of Oxford, 2005**

Theoretical Fashions in
Australian Immigration
Research

Ellie Vasta

WP-05-11

Abstract

The main aim of this paper is to provide, for the past 55 odd years, an overview of the trends in theoretical approaches and the areas researched within the broad area of Australian immigration and ethnic relations. This review reveals a high degree of national specificity with regard to theoretical and methodological approaches as well as underlying assumptions on the relationship between migration, the state and society. It appears that Australian social scientists are heavily influenced by national traditions and historical experiences–such as colonialism, previous migration experience and assumptions on race, ethnicity and culture. Social scientists are also influenced by disciplinary fashions of the times in which they research and write, though the disciplinary fashions bring an international logic to the analyses. Moreover, policy makers in Australia have tended to structure research-funding mechanisms to select and privilege the types of research seen as politically or administratively desirable.

Author
Ellie Vasta is a Senior Researcher and Head of the Programme on Integration and Social Change at COMPAS. Email: ellie.vasta@compas.ox.ac.uk

PART I

Introduction

Since colonisation in 1788, Australia has been a country of immigration. Over the centuries, new settlers have often encountered hostility from British settlers, intent on keeping the country British and white. Like virtually all highly developed countries since 1945, Australia experienced large-scale immigration and ethnic diversity. Initially, this was largely unexpected and unplanned, and had quite unforseen effects on the society, culture and on political institutions. Throughout the post-war period, anti-immigration and anti-minority sentiments have waxed and waned. Periodically, discriminatory or exclusionary attitudes to anyone who is perceived to be different dominate the social and political landscape. Such sentiments have been based on a number of fears such as increases in unemployment, growth in Asian immigration, and fear of too large a population to be sustained by public services or the natural environment.

Although in the early post-war years people began to embrace the idea of a systematic immigration programme, to this day fears and questions remain about the economic and social consequences on Australian society of the continuing immigration programme. Over the years this has led to a strong research agenda that has had a significant effect on immigration and settlement policies and on the policy consequences for both migrants and non-migrants. The social sciences have played a crucial role in introducing and defining immigration issues, as well as informing public opinion and policy development. This chapter provides a systematic analysis of the phases of migration, the major policy issues and the role of the social sciences in constructing and defining knowledge about the immigration process since 1945.

From the early post-war years, social scientists have been engaged in academic research and political debates about the social and economic consequences of immigration. Some have worked closely with governments producing necessary data, while others have used their expertise to help develop a non-discriminatory policy. Over the years, many have played a vital role in the development of both entry and settlement policies. On the other hand, some researchers have carried out social science research that has remained quite distinct from policy needs.

These have concentrated more on a critical analysis of the effects of migration and the settlement process as experienced by migrants and other groups in the society.

The state has played a central role in the regulation of immigration, the management of racial and ethnic differences and the construction of ethnic pluralism. On the whole, the relationship between the institutional needs of government and academic research has been a fruitful one for immigration in Australia. The social sciences have not only contributed ideas and knowledge to the development of policy, they have also provided systematic data and critical analysis which has countered misleading populist beliefs about such issues as economic growth, unemployment, racism and the environment.

There have been three types of academic involvement in immigration research. One type has been consultancy research commissioned by the government of the day to provide them with necessary statistical data, and with descriptive material covering a wide range of issues regarding migrants, their communities and policy matters. Typically, the commissioning body would shape the research questions depending on their needs. Although much of this research was necessary in order to build up necessary information, in the 1980s consultancies became a lucrative area of research for social scientists. It became apparent that some researchers had very little expertise in the area of immigration, raising some concern about their ability to maintain a critical stance to their work. A related involvement concerns social scientists' input to government boards and policy development. Social scientific knowledge has been legitimated through the invitation of academics onto government review boards, advisory committees and the like. Again, this has raised the age-old contradiction of ensuring that a critical distance is maintained by social scientists when they enter the political arena.

A second type of research is that conducted by researchers in the academy. This research, funded by university research funds, public and private research bodies, and by the Australian Research Council (ARC), has provided some of the more systematic and critical knowledge in the area. This research has not only helped provide migrants with a voice, but has also influenced government policies. Unfortunately, academic research has become more and more

dependent on diminishing funds. Often, funding bodes are more likely to fund research topics that fall within the definition of the 'national interest'. Further, funding bodies influence the types of research methods used. For example, longitudinal research is not readily funded by government or university funding bodies as it is seen to be too costly or does not fit the government's need for quick results. Nonetheless, the Department of Immigration has supported a major Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia, which carried out repeated interviews with two waves of new arrivals: LSIA interviewed 5192 Primary Applicants who arrived between September 1993 and August 1995, while LSIA 2 interviewed 3124 Primary Applicants who arrived between September 1999 and August 2000.

The third type of research is that conducted within the non-governmental and community sector. Within this sector, accumulated knowledge is recorded through needs-based assessments and the numerous reports and proposals prepared for funding. Small projects are also conducted. The knowledge that is accumulated within the community sector is vital to our understanding of the migration and settlement process, yet there is very little funding available to systematically publish the wealth of information gathered within this sector. There are continued attempts for policy makers, NGOs and academics to pool their skills and resources, though this process often suffers from a lack of clearly stated goals. Academics and NGOs often find that the focus of their research questions differ. For example, NGOs need to be protective of their clients and often expect that not only payment but also policy returns should be forthcoming from the research process. Furthermore, NGOs often claim that academic researchers are asking the wrong questions. Not all academic researchers, however, are involved with policy issues. Many will be concerned with analysing cultural, social or political issues that do not have direct policy relevance, but that contribute to an accumulated knowledge about immigrants, their cultures and their settlement experiences.

As comparative research reveals, there is a high degree of national specificity with regard to theoretical and methodological approaches as well as underlying assumptions on the relationship between migration, the state and society. It has become evident that social scientists are heavily influenced by national traditions

and historical experiences, including the processes of colonialism, previous migration experience and assumptions about race, ethnicity and culture. Social scientists are also influenced by disciplinary fashions of the times in which they research and write. Moreover, policy makers have tended to structure research-funding mechanisms to select and privilege the types of research seen as politically or administratively desirable for the policy arena. As will be noted more fully below, often social scientists were influenced by theoretical paradigms that were dominant in their disciplines at the time of their research. In some cases, a theoretical tradition such as that of assimilation (following the Chicago School) coincided with the common sense ideologies held by the society at large. At other times, as with the introduction of multiculturalism and the influences of the new social movements, social scientists provided the theoretical foundations for what was considered a necessary basis for a culturally plural society.

In Australia, some discourses persist throughout the fifty-five year period. At certain periods, some discourses have been more dominant than others. For example, racist and assimilationist perspectives continue in various guises. In the early post-war years, the White Australia Policy and assimilationism dominated the discourse at various levels. Even in the late 1970s and early 1980s, multiculturalism had a strong assimilationist element, particularly in policy discourses. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, ethnicist and cultural analysis, concerned with the development of multiculturalism, became influential especially within policy development. Although a few lone voices in the late 1960s had begun to provide a critical analysis of immigration issues, it was in the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s that critical Marxist and feminist analyses dominated academic and community sector debates. Marxist structural analyses, focused on class issues, also influenced educational and labour market policies while feminist analysis also studied these matters as gender issues. Marxist and feminist research often challenged the approach based on human capital theory that tended to concentrate on individual characteristics and ignored the structural disadvantage experienced by migrants and their children. In the 1990s, with the effects of globalisation, the weakening of the welfare state and the demise of the new social movements, the grand theories of structural analyses were overtaken by the disparate and fragmented notions of power in post-structuralism.

The paper is divided into two parts. The first part sets the scene and begins with a brief historical overview of the economic, political and social issues influencing Australian immigration. A summary follows of the policies and changes that have occurred over the years. Part II examines the development of social science research in three main phases, starting with the period of organised large-scale labour migration from 1947 to 1972. As noted earlier, this was a politically conservative time in Australia, where the White Australia Policy and a policy of assimilation were accepted by much of the Anglo-Australian population. With the changes occurring in the international economies, the rise of the new social movements and unprecedented numbers of migrants returning to their home countries, the tide began to change towards the end of the 1960s. The period that followed, from 1972 to the 1990s, saw the institutionalisation of research on immigration, settlement and ethnic diversity. With the effects of globalisation hitting hard in the early 1990s, social and political schisms began to appear. By the mid-1990s, with the return of a conservative government, immigration research appeared to have dropped to an all-time low. Thus, there are three main periods that provide the basis for the analytical division of part II. These are from 1945-1972; 1972-1990; and 1990 to the present. This time frame is overlaid by the main social issues of the day and by the theoretical orientations of the social sciences. Within these three time periods, the main topics, questions and debates are listed in sub-sections. Each of the sections outlines the various theoretical approaches adopted by social scientists. The conclusion provides an analytical overview of the influence on immigration research of various theoretical traditions that have emerged over the past 50 years.

This chapter will not deal with research about Australia's Indigenous people – the Aborigines. Both in research and in policy, the position of Indigenous Australians requires separate attention as their experiences and needs, on the whole, have been and continue to be different from that of immigrants. The reasons behind this division are historical and political. One reason is based on the disciplinary nature of Anthropology which has concentrated on the 'study of tribes' and indigenous peoples. The other reason was political. As Aborigines found their voice during the 1970s and later, they insisted their situation was unique and needed to be approached separately. Thus, many believed that research and

policy matters for Indigenous Australians should be kept separate from research and policy for other ethnic minorities. The exceptional circumstances of Australian Aboriginals remain. However, since the early 1990s, there has been some change, particularly with the increase in interdisciplinary research.

Finally, the research and publications discussed or referred to here have been selected in relation to the focus of the paper. It does not provide a comprehensive list of all the possible works within the topic. Nor is it meant to be a review of all the available literature. Clearly, it is not the task of this paper to include all works within certain key areas nor to review the complete work of any one person. The main aim is to provide, for the past 50 odd years, an overview of the trends in theoretical approaches and the areas researched within the broad area of Australian immigration and ethnic relations. Some bodies of disciplinary research, such as the psychology, health and educational literature, will be omitted altogether as this would require more specific knowledge about those disciplines.

Brief Historical Overview

From 1788, the Australian colonies developed as a white settler society, closely linked to Britain, and integrated into the economic system of the Empire. Australia's indigenous peoples — the Aborigine and Torres Strait Islanders – stood in the way of colonisation, and were decimated, dispossessed and socially marginalised. Their number fell from an estimated 500,000 in 1788 to just 50,000 by the late 19th century (Reynolds 1987). The majority of immigrants came from Britain, with a substantial minority from Ireland. However, from the outset, people also came from European countries such as Germany and Italy. These immigrants often encountered hostility and discrimination (de Lepervanche 1975). But racism was strongest against non-European immigrants, particularly the Chinese who came in the Gold Rushes of the 1850s, and South Pacific Islanders, recruited as cheap labour by plantation owners in the late 19th century.

Immigration was a major focus of class struggle in the 19th century. Employers called for recruitment of non-British labour to keep down wages and restrict the power of trade unions. Organised labour was strongly opposed to such immigration, demanding wages 'fit for white men'. By the late 19th century, such class conflicts were submerged by an emerging Australian nationalism, based on stereotypes of the 'yellow peril' — the fear of an Asian invasion of the sparsely populated continent. There was a close link between racism and the emerging feeling of Australian identity and nationhood (MacQueen 1970), creating a new egalitarian society while maintaining British culture and heritage. By the time of Federation in 1901, the White Australia Policy was seen by most Australians as vital for national survival. One of the first laws passed by the new Federal Parliament was the Immigration Restriction Act, designed to exclude non-Europeans.

Due to economic conditions, immigration was relatively low from 1890 to 1945. However, some Southern Europeans (especially Italians and Greeks) did enter in this period. Queensland farmers recruited Italians as sugar-cane workers, to replace Pacific Islanders sent away after 1901. These immigrants experienced much discrimination, including laws against buying land, or carrying out certain occupations. On the eve of the Second World War, Australia was a white society proud of its British heritage, and highly suspicious of foreign influences. The Second World War changed Australians' view of the world. Japan's initial victories made it clear that Britain could no longer defend Australia. Policy-makers became convinced that Australia needed a larger population and a stronger manufacturing sector to safeguard national sovereignty. A Department of Immigration was set up to encourage mass immigration. The slogan used to sell this policy to a suspicious population was 'populate or perish'.

The postwar immigration program was designed to keep Australia white and British; in hindsight, it achieved the opposite. The first Immigration Minister, Arthur Calwell, promised the Australian public that there would be ten British immigrants for every 'foreigner'. But by the late 1940s it had become clear that immigration from Britain would be insufficient to sustain demographic and economic growth. The Department of Immigration began recruiting refugees from Baltic and Slavonic countries, who were perceived as both 'racially

acceptable' and anti-communist. Altogether 180,000 Eastern Europeans (mainly refugees) migrated to Australia between 1947 and 1951, making up 37 per cent of migrants in those years (Collins 1991). There was also considerable immigration from Germany, the Netherlands and Scandinavia.

By the 1950s, British and Irish immigrants only made up one third of all entries, while immigration of Eastern and Western Europe declined substantially. Australian authorities were reluctant to admit Southern Europeans, who were seen as culturally unacceptable and politically suspect, due to the strong communist parties in Italy and Greece. But the pressing need for labour led to recruitment agreements, and in the 1950s and 1960s most migrants came from Italy, Greece and Malta. A two-class system of immigration developed: British migrants, and many Northern Europeans too, were given assisted passages, could bring their families at once and had full labour-market and civil rights upon arrival. Those from Eastern and Southern Europe were less likely to get an assisted passage, had no automatic right to family reunion, were frequently directed into undesirable jobs and were generally treated as inferior (Collins 1991). But there was a third, invisible, class: those who were not admitted at all. The White Australia Policy still kept out all non-whites, and was applied so zealously that even the Asian wives of Australian soldiers who had served overseas were excluded. Trade union opposition to non-British immigrants was overcome by promises that they would be tied to unskilled jobs for two years and would not displace Australian workers. Immigrant workers were assigned to large-scale infrastructure projects, like the Snowy River Scheme, or to steelworks or production-lines. Migrant workers, both male and female, became heavily concentrated in the expanding manufacturing industries of Melbourne, Sydney and Adelaide (Lever-Tracy and Quinlan 1988).

Immigration remained high throughout the 1950s and 1960s, and was a major cause of Australia's prosperity. But it was becoming hard to attract Southern European workers, and many were returning to their homelands. The result was a series of measures to attract and retain migrants: further liberalisation of family reunion and recruitment in Yugoslavia and Latin America. Turks were no longer classified as Asian, thus allowing them in as Europeans. The White Australia Policy was also relaxed: exceptions were made for educated and

professional Asians — mostly from Commonwealth countries — to enter Australia (Collins 1991).

If research on departure rates and migrant poverty in the 1960s had begun to question the conventional wisdom that 'immigration was good for Australia' and that 'immigrants were assimilable', a number of new factors in the 1970s were to make immigration and its consequences for society even more controversial. The result would be a rapid expansion of social scientific research in this area. In brief, these factors were:

- The end of the long boom, which was followed by a series of recessions, accompanied by trends towards the internationalisation and restructuring of the economy. The result was growing unemployment and increased social inequality. Unskilled migrants could no longer count on rapid integration into the labour market.

- The diversification of immigration, with regard both to areas of origin and skill levels. By the end of the 1980s, 40 per cent of immigrants were coming from Asia. The old stereotype of the immigrant as an Eastern or Southern European manual worker was replaced by a much more complex picture.

- The politicisation of immigration, as more and more people began to question its benefits on economic, social, cultural and environmental grounds.

- The growing realisation that ethno-cultural difference was not a passing phase, but a long-term feature of Australian society. Many NESB (non-English speaking background) immigrants were not assimilating, but forming ethnic communities, in which the language and culture of origin were maintained and–at least to some extent–transferred to the next generation.

- The politicisation of ethnicity, as politicians came to see immigrants as members of distinct groups in specific locations with special needs and demands. Recognition of the electoral potential of immigrants led parties to compete for their votes, which in turn encouraged the formation of ethnic

associations and lobby-groups. Immigrants also began to play a part as government officials and as academics.

- The new social movements of the 1970s underscored a period of dramatic social change. People were more prepared than earlier generations to be involved in civic participation as well as in highlighting social rights issues.

All these trends went side-by-side. The Australian Labor Party (ALP) began to realise that immigrants were a significant section of the electorate in working class areas and specifically targeted the 'migrant vote' from about 1970. This played a significant role in the 1972 election. Once in power, the ALP had to include immigrants in its new welfare state model, 'the Australian Assistance Plan' (AAP). The result was a plethora of officially commissioned surveys and inquiries, in which social scientists played a leading role as researchers and consultants. The AAP moved away from the old notion of welfare recipients as individuals, instead targeting 'communities' which were to be active participants in defining their 'special needs' and working out how to allocate resources to meet these. 'Migrant task forces' were set up to allow immigrants to participate in working out welfare plans. Similar trends were to be found in other key areas of migrant disadvantage, particularly education. The result was a growth and politicisation of welfare associations, which often worked closely with social workers and social scientists (Martin 1978).

Thus, the 1970s were a watershed in immigration history. Employment in manufacturing began to fall, while the remaining jobs became increasingly skilled. The reaction of the Whitlam ALP Government of 1972–75 was to reduce immigration numbers to less than 50,000 a year — the lowest level since 1947. The old idea of the migrant as unskilled labour was gone. Now applicants had to have a high level of skills in demand in Australia. At the same time, the early 1970s saw the final death of the White Australia Policy: the Whitlam Government introduced a non-discriminatory immigration policy with bi-partisan political support. But it was not until the late 1970s, under the Fraser Government, that 'non-whites' began to feature significantly in Australia's immigration intakes as Vietnamese refugees began to arrive in large numbers. Immigration history had come full-circle after more than 100 years of White Australia. In the 1960s, the

great majority came from the UK and other European countries. By the mid-1990s, Asian and Pacific countries predominated.

Immigration And Settlement Policies[1]

Entries of permanent immigrants have varied over the years depending mainly on economic and political factors. There were high intakes in the boom years like 1950 (185,000) and 1989 (145,000); and relatively low in recession periods like 1976 (53,000) and 1984 (69,000) (BIR 1991,28). An average of about 90,000 a year for the 1990s represented a slight decline in numbers compared with previous decades. But the Program targets for 2002-03 and 2003-04 of 100,000-110,000 indicate a return to higher levels.

Australia's immigration program has significantly changed the size and composition of the population. The 1947 Census counted 7.6 million people, of whom 90 per cent had been born in Australia, while most of the overseas-born came from the United Kingdom and Ireland. The 2001 Census figures put the overseas-born population at 4 million, 23.1 per cent of a total population of 18.8 million. In 1971, 85 per cent of the immigrant population were from Europe, of which half were from the UK. By 2001, the European share had fallen to 52 per cent, while those from the UK were only 25 per cent of the total immigrant population. These older groups were declining, while the share of persons born in Asia and the Middle East was up to 29 per cent. New Zealand-born people made up 9 per cent, and were increasing fast. There were also 400,000 Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders (2.2 per cent of the total population) – the only true 'non-immigrants' in Australia.

---

[1] The term 'settlement' policy or process is used in Australia to denote two main aspects of migrant integration into Australian society. Firstly, it provides principles for a social policy for migrant settlement and secondly, it is also concerned with the relationship between cultural diversity, ethnic and national identities.

Australia's post-war immigration programme dramatically changed the ethnic composition and social structure of the Australian population. But a change to the composition of the population led to the alteration of government settlement policy from one of open racism, through the White Australia Policy and the policy of assimilation, to an official policy of pluralism – multiculturalism - in less than thirty years. This required a major intellectual shift to redefine the nation and its ethnic boundaries and this process continues to this day.

The intention of Australia's post-war immigration policy was to create a culturally homogenous and cohesive, white society. However, as it became apparent that not enough British immigrants wanted to come, recruitment was broadened to other parts of Europe, including Italy, Greece and Spain. In its determination to maintain cultural homogeneity and to allay popular fears, the solution was found in assimilationism: the doctrine that immigrants could be culturally and socially absorbed, and rapidly become indistinguishable from the existing Anglo-Australian population[2]. During the 1950s and 1960s, migrants were meant to find work, settle and became citizens. However, labour market segmentation and residential segregation, together with inadequate schooling and experiences of racism, provided the conditions for community formation and cultural maintenance. This was a politically conservative time in Australia when politicians and the population generally agreed with a policy of assimilation, the continuation of the White Australia Policy and with massive racism against Australia's indigenous people. Much research of this time was heavily influenced by this dominant ideology. It was in this context that the ALP Government of 1972-75 developed a new model for managing ethnic diversity.

Successive governments have continued with multicultural policies, although each one has tended to give these a new character to fit wider political agendas.

---

[2] This term is commonly used in Australia for people born in Australia of British descent – the Australians whose parentage might go back to the earliest years of colonisation. Increasingly, this term became popular in the 1970s as a way of distinguishing Australians of British descent from migrants of non-English speaking background. The term is used rather loosely as it can also include the descendants of Irish settlers as well as post-war British migrants.

There have been four main policy phases of multiculturalism. The first phase from 1972 to 1975 was concerned with *migrant rights* and *participation* based on a welfare state model. The aim of the ALP (Australian Labor Party) government was to redress class and ethnic minority disadvantages by improving educational facilities and social services, and ensure that immigrants could gain access to these. Recognition of cultural difference and working with ethnic community associations was vital to the reform of social policy. For the first time, migrants were involved in planning and implementation of relevant policies. Ethnic communities, community sector associations, the trade unions, and sections of the ALP called for full participation of immigrants in society, and argued that it was the duty of the state to provide the conditions needed to achieve this.

The second phase from 1975 until the mid-1980s saw the development of the *ethnic group model.* Multiculturalism was seen as a way of achieving national identity (usually referred to as social cohesion) in an ethnically diverse society. The Liberal-Country Party Coalition's strategy was to redefine multiculturalism with emphasis on cultural pluralism and on the role of ethnic organisations in the provision of welfare services. Such funding structures locked ethnic organisations into dependency on the government. The official concept of the ethnic group was based on a reductionist and static view of culture, emphasising language, tradition and folklore. There was a predilection for supporting ethnic cultural and social associations. Men generally led these organisations, often ignoring the needs of women, children, youth and other minorities in their communities.

A third phase, from the mid-1980s until 1996, moved towards a *citizenship model of multiculturalism*. The ALP government used the concept of 'productive diversity' to argue that a multicultural population was better placed to respond to the challenges of increased international trade and communication, and above all to provide the opening to Asia which was seen as crucial to Australia's future. 'Mainstreaming' was introduced as a general principle for restructuring government services so that specific migrant services would be integrated into all government agencies and would be accessible to everybody (Castles 1997). The effects of globalisation led to major debates on national and ethnic identities and the role of the nation state in these relationships. Much of this research continued to contribute to the nation-building process of the migration program.

Migrant disadvantage, gender and ethnicity as well as institutional and community racism were highly debated issues.

The most significant statement of this approach to multiculturalism was the *National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia* (OMA 1989). Multiculturalism was essentially seen as a system of cultural, social and economic rights and freedoms. These rights, however, were limited by an overriding commitment to the nation, a duty to accept the Constitution and the rule of law, and the acceptance of basic principles such as tolerance and equality, English as the national language and equality of the sexes. The program contained in the document was based on the recognition that some groups were disadvantaged by lack of language proficiency and education, together with discrimination based on race, ethnicity and gender.

Despite such recognition, by the early 1990s, after twenty years of a very active women's movement, migrant women were still sidelined. One case in point is the 1994 National Multicultural Advisory Council's - *Towards and Beyond 2000: Multicultural Australia -The Next Steps* (NMAC 1995), an evaluation of the 1989 *National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia* (OMA 1989) mentioned above. The Association of Non-English Speaking Women of Australia (ANESBWA) wrote a submission to the Council pointing out that the report was, with the exception of a couple of references, totally gender blind. One major problem was that ANESBWA had not been involved either in the production of the *National Agenda* or in the review process of the National Multicultural Advisory Council. In its final version, *Towards and Beyond 2000* contained very little of significant worth about NESB women. Part of the problem was that the ethnic group model still prevailed in that ethnic organisations such as Federated Ethnic Communities Council of Australia (FECCA) were legitimated by the Department of Immigration while the claims of NESB women, both in these male-dominated institutions and in policy, were always secondary to the ethnic claim.

Similarly, women's instrumentalities also posed problems for NESB women. For example, the Office of the Status of Women (OSW) had a very superficial understanding of NESB women's issues. This was revealed when the Australian government produced its report for the UN Fourth World Conference on women,

reviewing progress about immigrant women's issues over the previous 10 years since the Nairobi Conference. NESB women were mentioned throughout the report. However, it was overshadowed by an overall lack of analysis of the position of NESB women in Australian society. The relationship between class, gender and ethnicity received too little serious attention. Instead, NESB women were added on to broad strategies as one of a multitude of specific groups that needed attention. There was clearly very little collaboration between the women's policy area and ethnic affairs policy area. As a result, NESB women were not only marginalised in the ethnic group model, but they were also caught in the interstices of the ethnic group model and women's policy model.

The fourth and current phase marks a restricted and sceptical view of multiculturalism. During the March 1996 Federal election, several Liberal and National party candidates criticised provision of special services for immigrants and Aboriginal people, indicating that in fact these groups did not deserve such services. In one Queensland electorate, the Liberal Party Candidate, Pauline Hanson, attacked services for Aboriginal people in such an extreme way that she was dis-endorsed as a candidate by her own party. Despite this, she won the seat as an Independent, with one of the biggest anti-Labor swings in the country. This was widely taken as a signal that anti-minority discourses were now seen as acceptable by a large share of the population. Hanson quickly set up the One Nation party, which sought to build on such feelings. In her inaugural speech in Federal Parliament, Hanson attacked Aboriginal people, called for a stop to immigration and the abolition of multiculturalism, and warned of 'the Asianization' of Australia. Such issues became 'racialized' so that immigrants (especially Asians) and Aboriginal people suffered an increase in personal abuse and attacks after Hanson's speech (Vasta 1999).

Both the Liberal-National Coalition and the ALP were slow to condemn Hanson's politics. Prime Minister Howard's initial silence seemed to signify to the nation that he condoned Hanson's views, which were consistent with his own past stance against Asian immigration and multiculturalism. There was no clear moral or political rejection of bigotry. The trend towards racialization of politics had immediate effects on policy. Howard could not deliver a cut in Asian immigration because that is where many of the skilled and business migrants, as well as full-

fee paying Asian students were coming from. Rather the tightening of immigration policy was targeted at categories that were claimed to be hurting national interests: family reunion and asylum seekers. The result was a much more hostile climate towards immigration and multiculturalism.

During and after the March 1996 election, the Liberal-Coalition government declared that the needs of 'ordinary Australians' (by implication a sort of Anglo-white mainstream) should be put above minority needs. Although many thought multicultural policy would be dropped (Howard had previously indicated his dislike for multiculturalism), in December 1999 the government launched *A New Agenda for Multicultural Australia* (DIMA 1999) that stated its clear support for the retention of the term 'multiculturalism', as it best described the significance of Australia's cultural diversity. Although the *New Agenda* largely endorsed the principles of the ALP's 1989 *National Agenda*, the core values were re-worked as 'civic duty, cultural respect, social equity and productive diversity'. It argued that multiculturalism must be an inclusive concept in terms of nationhood and identity 'for all Australians', stressing the importance of the links between multiculturalism and citizenship as a set of rights and obligations by citizens towards the state. Multiculturalism had been incorporated into the 'third way' ideology based on the Coalition's social policy of 'mutual obligation' for welfare recipients.

An important message of the *New Agenda* lies in its attempt to counter the anti-minority backlash that had been encouraged by the Government's hostility to multiculturalism and its failure to effectively combat racism in the 1996-99 period. The *New Agenda's* attempt to support cultural respect through the notion of 'inclusiveness', without coming to grips with the increasing social inequality and exclusion in Australian society, is unlikely to have much effect (Jupp 2001; Jupp 2002a; Jupp 2002b). The position of immigrant women has become even more marginalised with the closure of ANESBWA. Since the mid-1990s immigration research has lost much funding and institutional support. The Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA) and the Bureau of Migration and Population Research (BIMPR) were also closed down. Immigration research has tapered off due to the return of a conservative government where activists and intellectuals

alike are compelled to re-think their political actions as well as theoretical analysis and language.

From the mid-1990s, there was not only a growing antagonism towards migrants and multiculturalism, but a hostile environment ensued in relation to undocumented entrants. These fell into two main groups: Chinese people being smuggled in mainly for purposes of undocumented work; and asylum seekers from the Middle East and South Asia (Iraqis, Afghans and others) being brought in from Indonesia, usually by fishing boats chartered by middle men. Numbers were not high by international standards, never going much above 4000 in a year, but it provoked media campaigns and popular outrage. The reaction of the Government has been to modify Australia's refugee and asylum policy to such an extent that it has been accused of contravening the 1951 Geneva Convention and of damaging Australia's non-discriminatory policy.

Immigration Minister Ruddock attacked the asylum seekers as 'queue jumpers' claiming that they took places from 'genuine' refugees who applied for resettlement through the UNHCR. He declared that boat-people arrivals were a threat to Australian sovereignty, and announced measures to deter arrivals and to limit the right of those who did arrive. Australia has put in place three main deterrents. First, in 1999 the government introduced the 3-year Temporary Protection Visa (TPV). The TPV confers no right to permanent settlement or family reunion. Another more dramatic deterrent has been to stop boat people from landing on Australian shores, and to try to send them back to Indonesia. A third deterrent is to place them in isolated and remote detention camps, where they have been barred from making phone calls, talking to solicitors, the media and supporters. They can languish in mandatory detention for anything up to 3 years. Hunger strikes, riots, self-inflicted injuries and even suicide have become commonplace. The Federal Government has also introduced a series of legal measures to limit the right to judicial review in asylum matters (Crock and Saul 2002).

Immigration came even more strongly into the spotlight in August 2001, when the Norwegian freighter *MV Tampa* picked up over 400 asylum seekers (mainly originating in Afghanistan and Iraq) from a sinking boat off Northern Australia.

The Government refused the captain permission to land the asylum seekers, and the *Tampa* anchored near the Australian territory of Christmas Island. This was the start of a saga involving international diplomacy, heated public debates in Australia, and feverish political activity. A country previously noted for its openness to refugees rapidly adopted a set of draconian laws designed to exclude asylum seekers. Australia tried to export the asylum seekers to its Pacific neighbours, Nauru and New Guinea – and was willing to spend vast sums of money to do so. Asylum became the central issue in the November election, giving victory to Liberal-National Prime Minister Howard. Before the *Tampa* affair, a Labor victory had been predicted. Events since 1996 have tarnished Australia's reputation as an open and tolerant society, and as a 'good international citizen'. However, at the time of writing, a political movement against the new intolerance seems to be emerging led by the churches, humanitarian groups like Amnesty International, some farmers and regional Australians and elements of the ALP and the trade unions. It gives some hope that the pendulum will once again swing to more open policies in the future.

PART II

Issues And Approaches In Immigration Research 1945-1972

In the early post-war years, many western countries began to expand their social science research. In Australia, industrial growth and immigration became major issues of concern for the post-war reconstruction. Three main issues about the immigration programme in the early post-war years were hotly debated:

- the economic effects of migration on Australian society;
- the desire that Australia should remain a white nation even though the British had colonized a territory inhabited by indigenous black people;
- the idea of British dominance which dictated that migrants, once allowed in, should assimilate.

Economics of Migration

Inflation was considered a matter of some concern during the early 1950s though Harold Holt, then Minister for Immigration, denied that the immigration programme was inflationary. Others, such as Copland, an economist, claimed that the immigration programme was inflationary but would have to be accepted as a necessary measure of economic growth. He concluded that a degree of inflation, shortages of goods, record wool prices, low productivity, risks and inconveniences would have to be accepted since our migration programme was closely linked to development (Copland 1951).

Another major concern was the link between migration and unemployment. The debates on this issue during the 1950s and early 1960s were mainly approached from the point of view of economic absorption and demography. One report on the economic implications of immigration suggested that labour was a commodity and so migrants were helping us avoid the inflationary effects that a general shortage of labour would cause. Further, it claimed that the rate of economic activity was higher among migrants than among workers in the Australian population generally and that short term migrant work contracts avoided bottlenecks and labour shortages in industry. Finally, migrants provided a mobile labour force (Holt 1956, 7).

Despite ongoing economic problems, immigration policy was defended by academics such as Borrie (1955), a demographer, who contended that the greatest contribution of non-British settlers was in the economic sphere. Migrants also benefited the economy because they cost the Australian government very little in terms of social services. Australia was aware that it got its migrants 'on the cheap'. During a time when there was a call to reduce numbers, the government was not convinced that it should cut immigration numbers, so it began to commission research reports as a means by which to sell immigration policy. In 1965 the first of these, The *Report of the Committee of Economic Enquiry* (Vernon 1965), detailed the economic effects of immigration on the population and the workforce. This report presented a very superficial review of the macro-economic effects of immigration on the Australian population and workforce, and did not provide any substantial understanding of the effects of migration on the migrant population itself. Further, in this study as with others

which followed, no distinction was made between English speaking migrants and non-English speaking migrants (Collins 1991). One major outcome, however, was that the report defended immigration in terms of a better quality of life for all Anglo-Australians.

A Tradition of Racism and Exclusion

In the early post-war years, numerous academic authors were aware of the problems created by the White Australia Policy (WAP), but many sought to legitimate it and so reproduced the racist ideologies articulated by the state. For instance, Greenwood strongly suggested that the need for the White Australia Policy was based on economic and not racial factors (Greenwood 1947, 289). Borrie (1949), while not explicitly stating that he supported the White Australia Policy, did provide the argument that increased Asian migration would not help the countries of origin. He continued that they could not accuse Australians of racism when in fact those countries conducted a similar restrictive policy and also that Australia had to consider the vast amounts of non-arable land and its levels of technology. He did, however, approve of the entry of students, traders. Harris was prepared to spell out more clearly the prevalent attitude, 'We do not want anybody who looks, speaks or thinks very differently from ourselves' (Harris 1947, 137). He suggested that, along with increasing our natural growth and inducing those who were less willing or able to come, we should discard our prejudices "so that we learn to assimilate those types less like ourselves". He claimed the only unassimilable types were the Italians and that there was prejudice against Jewish refugees.

The most thorough and open appraisal of the WAP in the early post-war years came from Elkin, an anthropologist, in an article entitled 'Is White Australia doomed?' (Elkin 1947). He claimed that clashes centred around two recurrent events, the importing of coolie labourers and the arrival of the Chinese on the goldfields. These were the two principles on which WAP was based. Elkin argued that racism was based on fear of economic competition and on beliefs of racial superiority. Further, he suggested that the fundamental factor on which prejudice was based was cultural difference and not colour (Elkin 1947, 233).

Very little changed in the debate until the early sixties when one of the most informed arguments was published by the Immigration Reform Group (Rivett 1962) whose main organiser was Rivett, an economist. They proposed a system that would accept non-European migrants through inter-governmental agreements of the kind Australia had with a number of European countries, with the same economic and assimilation factors taken into consideration. They attempted to demonstrate the false assumptions on which 'nationality' was based (Rivett 1962, viii-ix).

But just as assimilation, in the late sixties and early seventies was no longer tenable, for reasons mentioned below, so too was the ideology of a White Australia no longer feasible, especially since Australia's main trading partners were now Japan and other Asian countries. In addition, as reports emerged from anti-racist groups and from migrants themselves, Australian racism began to be confronted openly. The Labor party agreed to abolish the White Australia Policy and this issue brought to an end the bi-partisan agreement between the two major parties on immigration matters. With the election of Labor in 1972 and the beginning of multiculturalism, the critical research which had begun in the mid 1960s continued unabated.

The Race Relations Cycle and Assimilationism

The first post-war Minister for Immigration, Arthur Calwell, advised Australians that the Australian government would only allow British and northern European migrants since they were considered to be most like Australians and readily assimilable. Influenced by ideas developed in America about assimilation, Calwell, with the aid of social scientists, developed an Australian policy of assimilation that remained in force until 1972. In the 1940s, it had been widely believed that non-British immigration would threaten national identity and social cohesion (Borrie 1947). But once it had become clear that non-British immigration was vital for demographic and economic growth, it became necessary for the government to find a way of maintaining homogeneity, and of allaying popular fears. The solution was found in *assimilationism*: the idea that immigrants could be culturally and socially absorbed, and rapidly become indistinguishable from the existing Anglo-Australian population.

Social scientists began to work out which potential migrant groups could be regarded as 'assimilable', and what policies and institutional frameworks were needed for assimilation. In 1946, the Australian Institute of Political Science held a Summer School to discuss population policies. The conclusions were pessimistic as speakers saw considerable problems in 'filling Australia's empty cradles' (Borrie 1947) and the 'assimilable types' of migrants would be hard to come by as the British were unwilling to come, there were too few Scandinavians, and Central Europeans were likely to be secret Nazis. Jews and Southern Europeans were unacceptable (because of popular anti-semitism and anti-Italian feeling), and people from the 'human ant-hill' of Asia were totally unwelcome as the White Australia Policy was still firmly in place (Harris 1947).

A close working relationship was established between social scientists at the Australian National University and elsewhere and the Secretary of the Department of Immigration (Wilton and Bosworth 1984). Such relationships were influential in devising policies for immigration and assimilation for Australian society. Demographers like Price (1956) and Borrie (1949) promoted the dispersal of immigrants to prevent ethnic segregation and the quick learning of English thus discouraging of the use of native languages. They also promoted the idea that immigrants should be permanent settlers who would bring their families and strongly supported the notion that migrants become Australian citizens. Schooling was seen to have pivotal role in ensuring that the second generation would reflect only the culture of Anglo-Australia.

Psychologists Taft and Richardson devised 'scales of Australianism' to allow individual measurement of the absorption process (Wilton and Bosworth 1984). For both, Australian English language proficiency indicated the degree of success of their assimilation. For example, Richardson's '20 item slang test' was used to test immigrant children's assimilation and adjustment (Wilton and Bosworth 1984). Borrie and Price produced works which reinforced the ideology behind assimilation and the selection of 'desirable types'. For example, Borrie's (1954) research on the assimilation of Italians and Germans in Australia suggested that although Germans retained their traditions and customs for several generations, they did not compete with Australians for work and did conform to economic standards. Italians, however, did not conform to either social (lack of English

22

language competency being one) or economic standards (they accepted lower wages). Such 'cultural differences' were considered by Anglo-Australians as being far greater between themselves and Italians than compared with German migrants. Repeatedly, the dominant representation was that the more assimilated migrants became, the less prejudiced Anglo-Australians would be towards them (Price 1956, 28).

One of the first analytical appraisals of the notion of 'assimilation' came from sociologist Morven Brown. He warned of the dangers of pushing migrants too fast into assimilation, for while it was a national objective that migrants should assimilate, it need not clash with the rights of migrants to maintain their own national cultures and identities (Brown 1961, 23). Brown contended that assimilation was not simply a matter of language or ordinary habits or even tastes or interests but asserted that Australians had to be committed to certain principles if real integration was to be achieved. These included equality of opportunity, the right to a 'fair go', the right to social and legal justice, and the right to a standard of living for all that allowed a decent family life and pursuit of happiness under conditions that guaranteed human dignity to all (Brown 1961, 24). Brown did, however, claim that Australia should have neither extreme cultural conformism nor cultural pluralism. for all should share the same values that bind together Australians of all classes.

Although Brown differed from most, the general position adopted by these early Australian social scientists is similar to the urban sociology of the Chicago School. The Chicago School's thesis was that the host society has a generally accepted and coherent set of values, norms and behavioural patterns which vary from those of the newcomers which results in a lack of communication and is likely to cause conflict leading to problems of 'race relations'. The cause of inter-group hostility is not seen as racism on the part of the majority population but rather as a process of maladaptation of the minority population which can be overcome through a process of 're-socialisation'.

This process is summed up in Park's definition of the 'race relations cycle' in which groups pass through several stages: contact, conflict, accommodation and assimilation (Park 1950). The commonsense concepts which arise from this

position are that migrants must assimilate to the dominant culture's way of life, that maintenance of ethnic cultures is problematic and that it leads to ghettos. It was this theoretical position which informed the assimilation policy for the following twenty years. In the 1950s and 1960s, social science research began to gain legitimacy as 'scientific' in character. This notion of scientificity emerged as an integral part of the empiricist methodology of social science research engendering the idea of objectivity. In addition, social scientists throughout the fifties and sixties were informed by the theoretical perspective broadly defined as functionalism, heavily influenced by the Parsonian model of the social formation.

However, by the 1960s, the basic contradiction of assimilationism was becoming obvious: 'New Australians' were meant to speak English, live among Anglo-Australians and behave just like them, but at the same time labour market segmentation and social segregation were emerging — often as a result of discrimination. Government policies caused migrant workers to become concentrated in unskilled jobs. Even highly-skilled migrants were often forced into unskilled work by official refusal to recognise their overseas qualifications, a problem that continues to the present. Migrants settled in the industrial suburbs and the inner-city areas close to their work, where housing was relatively cheap, while Anglo-Australians moved out to new suburbs. Many migrants encountered racist attitudes and discriminatory behaviour by Anglo-Australians (Vasta 1993d).

Studies found that many migrants were living in isolation and relative poverty (Henderson, et al. 1970). Migrant children were failing at school, often due to lack of support in learning English. Departure rates were increasing and it was becoming harder to attract new immigrants. The result was a series of policy changes between 1965 and 1972 designed to improve the social integration of immigrants and their children (DIEA 1986). Such measures, however, did not mean abandonment of the aim of assimilation. By the mid 1960s the basic contradiction of assimilationism was becoming obvious. The operation of the labour and housing markets led to high degrees of concentration in inner-city manufacturing areas. Together with the xenophobic climate, this partial segregation provided the preconditions for community formation, based on national groupings. Ethnic businesses, schools, churches, political organisations,

social and cultural groups and media were emerging. The various groups developed their own infrastructures and leaderships. At the same time, educational and welfare professionals were beginning to see the situation in terms of a problem of migrant deprivation or disadvantage.

A new generation of social scientists began to analyse the situation, basing their approach on the debate on ethnic identity, pluralism and the inadequacy of the melting pot model adopted in the US. For example, Jerzy Zubrzycki (1968) introduced the notion of 'structural assimilation' claiming that 'behavioural assimilation' had occurred to a large degree amongst migrants but that structural assimilation had not been very extensive. The implication was that firstly, migrants were bringing their class position with them and secondly, as he claimed, migrants were remaining at the lower end of the labour market because they were segregating in their ethnic enclaves and were having language difficulties. His suggestion was that Australia should attempt to attract migrants with skills and accept professional qualifications so that the upper strata would also be filled out by various migrant groups, lest it be perceived by Anglo-Australians that the majority of migrants were peasant types, unskilled, unsophisticated, less intelligent and belonging to the 'lower classes'. Rather than recommend that migrants should be trained, this functionalist/stratificationist model accepts structural inequalities as inherent to the system.

On the other hand, James Jupp, a political scientist, was one of the first social scientists to critically outline the problems migrants experienced in settling in Australia and to question the racist nature of assimilationism. Jupp's *Arrivals and Departures* (1966) was significant in relating immigration and settlement to wider issues of social structure in Australia. He articulated the racism which informed the policy of assimilation. Social science discourse was moving from assimilation to integration: migrants were to be seen not as individuals to be absorbed, but as groups who were distinctive in socio-economic and/or cultural terms, and who would remain so for a transitional period. Social scientists were to bring to the attention of governments the fact that migrants were not assimilating, and that it was no longer tenable, desirable nor advantageous for assimilationist policy to be continued. Jupp and others were also referring to the high rate of returnees from the mid 1960s. As European economies were growing

and standard of living was increasing dramatically, many migrants were deciding to return to their countries of origin where at least they did not have to suffer racism, language difficulties and other problems.

In the early to mid 1970s a number of changes occurred, influencing both policy and the theoretical frameworks adopted by immigration researchers. First, there was a growing body of research which indicated that large groups of migrants were falling into a poverty trap (Henderson, et al. 1970). In other words, the policy of assimilation was not assimilating migrants. Secondly, the new social movements of the late 1960s and 1970s asserted that gender and ethnicity and other social characteristics, which had previously been ignored, were sources of disadvantage for numerous social and cultural groups in Australia. Thirdly, in the early 1970s the conservative government of 22 years' standing was voted out of office. The change of government opened the way for a reformist social and political agenda. This resulted in a flourishing of immigration research that continued until 1996.

The intensification of immigration research occurred not only in academia, but also in terms of policy-oriented academic research carried out through consultancies, inquiries and position papers resulting in reports and specific policy documents. In a sense, we can call this the institutionalisation of social science research, though we should keep in mind that frequently there was an overlap between consultancies, policy-oriented research and university-funded research. The following section concentrates on the research that contributed more directly to policy development since 1972.

Institutionalisation Of Immigration Research 1972-1990

In the early post-war years, the Australian government set up a series of advisory councils to advise on settlement and economic issues. The first was the Immigration Advisory Council in 1947 concerned mainly with settlement issues. Over the years, but particularly from 1972, successive governments have changed, amalgamated or closed down these councils as they saw politically fit. Often, these councils were invited to pursue various inquiries to develop or refine

policy (Jupp 2002b). The period from 1972 can be seen as a period of institutionalisation of research on immigration and ethnicity, in the sense that many government commissions and inquiries provided an incentive to academics to carry out research in this field, while at the same time providing them with definitions of the problems, and influencing their methods and theoretical approaches.[3]

In the subsequent period of conservative Coalition (Liberal and National parties) government (1975-83), this institutionalisation of social scientific research on immigration and ethnicity continued. The Liberal leaders could not ignore what was now called 'the ethnic vote', but did not want to link it to class as the ALP had (Jupp 1984). Instead they sought a way of understanding ethnicity that would fit in with their ideas on economic deregulation and privatisation. The emerging ethnic middle class of small business owners, with their conservative and patriarchal attitudes and their emphasis on family values corresponded closely with the conservative agenda. This group saw themselves as natural leaders for ethnic cultural, religious and social organisations, who could be coopted into ethno-specific welfare delivery and governmental consultative arrangements.

The work of the Polish-born sociologist Jerzy Zubrzycki (1964) and educationalist Jerzy Smolicz (1981) was to play a major part in the development of this conservative model. Zubrzycki had already written extensively on ethnicity. His own theoretical position was mostly an eclectic mix of a Parsonian functionalist definition of a homogeneous and cohesive society, a primordialist understanding of culture and ethnicity, and a very loose adherence to the notion of employment disadvantage within a Weberian stratification model of society. The culturalist position which defined ethnicity as a natural, primordial category could not deal adequately with the relationship between the constitutive aspects of class, gender and other power relations. Zubrzycki saw ethnicity as a set of values and

---

[3] For a thorough overview of the role of the consultative process, see Chapter 4 of **Jupp, J.** 2002a *From White Australia to Woomera*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

cultural practices specific to each of the ethnic communities that made up Australia's multicultural society. Ethnicity was the result of early socialisation, and was irreversible, so that cultural assimilation was never complete. This allowed cultural leaders to claim to speak for the community. All these diverse communities were held together by a set of 'overarching values', seen as common to all Australians, which made national identity possible despite cultural diversity.

Such ideas became highly influential because they provided a way of conceptualising and managing diversity which matched the dominant conservative notions of family and private initiative. At this stage, the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs had only a small research and statistics section that did little original work. Social scientific research and advice was tapped by government through consultancy work and advisory bodies. Zubrzycki was the chairman and leading theorist of a number of important advisory bodies, such as the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council (AEAC) and the Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs (ACPEA), which formulated the new notion of multiculturalism (ACPEA 1982).

In 1982 the Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs (ACPEA) publication *Multiculturalism for all Australians: our developing nationhood* (ACPEA 1982) was prepared by an Ethnic Affairs Task Force chaired by Zubrzycki. This paper was not dissimilar to the earlier 1979 APIC/AEAC (Australian Population and Immigration Council and the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council) paper (APIC and AEAC 1979) except that it attempted to clarify some concepts and applications. First, multiculturalism/ethnic affairs policy became a policy for *all* Australians. The reason for this approach was to repackage multiculturalism to make it attractive to Anglo-Australians who were beginning to complain that they were being discriminated against as some felt migrants were being overfunded for welfare programmes.

A number of bodies were established to put these ideas into practice, notably, the Special Broadcasting Service (SBS) and Australian Institute for Multicultural Affairs (AIMA), a multicultural 'think-tank', set up to provide social-scientific research on multicultural issues as well as to publicly promote multicultural

ideas. The 1977-78 Review of Post-Arrival Services and Programs to Migrants, the Galbally Report, also commissioned several research studies to examine welfare issues for immigrants. It provided a blueprint for a partly privatised welfare model in which ethnicity was seen as a major factor and ethnic community organisations were given a broad role (Galbally 1978).

Thus the stage was set for diverging social-scientific approaches to immigration and ethnicity in the 1980s and 1990s. The conservative ideas and objectives underlying the model of multiculturalism developed in the late 1970s made many people on the left highly suspicious of the notion of ethnicity and indeed of multiculturalism(de Lepervanche 1984; Jakubowicz 1984). On the other hand, traditional right-wing commentators rejected multiculturalism as a threat to national identity and unity. At the same time, many social scientists rejected ethnicity as a subjective variable that could not be satisfactorily measured. Studies on education and the labour market using human capital theory and multivariate analysis of such indicators as years of education and work experience claimed to show that country of origin (or country of origin of parents) was not an important indicator when it came to measuring social status or mobility (Evans, et al. 1988), (Baker and Miller 1988), (BLMR 1986).

The ALP Government from 1983-96 put considerable effort into rethinking theories of multiculturalism and ethnicity, and social scientific research played a major role in this. At first, the ALP was suspicious of policies based on ethnicity, and seemed to be moving back to a social policy model linked to the notion of immigrants as workers, as in 1972-75. One result of this was the appointment of political scientist James Jupp of the Australian National University to carry out a comprehensive study of welfare policies and services for immigrants. Jupp commissioned a number of economists, sociologists and other social scientists to prepare specific studies. These flowed into his final report (Committee for Stage 1 of the Review of Migrant and Multicultural Services 1986), which was highly critical of the system created following the Galbally Report eight years previously. However, by the time this report was released, policy agendas were changing fast.

Two factors were making a new approach necessary. The first was the new context for welfare created by the ALP's policies of economic deregulation and internationalisation. The resulting squeeze on state expenditure made generalist welfare policies based on the Northern European model impossible. Instead, the shift was to a residualist welfare model, which rejected general redistribution of income in favour of targeted benefits and services for disadvantaged groups (Castles 1994). In the immigrant area this meant the phasing out of special services for immigrants as a category, and their replacement by measures to bring immigrants into mainstream services on the basis of need (Castles 1998). This in turn required new types of research designed to examine the specific factors which led to labour market or social disadvantage of immigrants and to find appropriate measures to deal with them. Such research could vary in approach, including studies concerned with ethnicity, racism and gender, as well as human capital approaches. The second factor was the increasing politicisation of immigration and multiculturalism which became evident with the 'Blainey-debate' of 1984, in which a prominent historian launched a polemical attack on multiculturalism and the 'Asianisation of Australia' (Blainey 1984).

The response of the Government was at first to vigorously criticise racism, but at the same time to severely cut multicultural services, especially in the 1986 budget. One of the casualties was AIMA, increasingly seen as tied to a conservative notion of ethnicity. However, electoral losses at the state level soon convinced the ALP that there was still a powerful ethnic lobby. The result was a change in policy, marked especially by the creation in 1987 of the Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA), within the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet. OMA was charged with the task of rethinking multiculturalism to fit ALP policy objectives, while at the same time improving relations with ethnic communities.

OMA immediately commissioned a large number of research studies on various aspects of the situation of immigrants and ethnic communities. Academics and consultants were invited to tender for work on a series of 'issues papers'. These projects were part of the process of preparing a major policy statement to lay down a new approach to managing diversity: *The National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia* (OMA 1989), which was launched by Prime Minister Hawke in 1989.

The availability of paid government contracts encouraged private consultants to compete with university researchers in this field. Such consultants included academics working on their own account, former government officials using their old contacts to secure work, independent social researchers and large management consultant firms. At the same time, universities–now called upon to act like entrepreneurs and earn money to cover their costs–began to establish centres specifically to compete for such work. Typically, such centres were relatively small, interdisciplinary groups of academics with research interests in this field, such as the Centre for Multicultural Studies at the University of Wollongong, the Centre for Immigration and Multiculturalism Studies at the Australian National University, the Multicultural Centre at the University of Sydney, or the Centre for Intercultural Studies at Monash University. Government-commissioned research tended to be limited in scope, for objectives, methods and even sometimes the findings were strongly influenced by the contracting body. The type of work produced was often narrow in focus, a-theoretical and mainly descriptive. It did not necessarily become part of academic discourse and was not subject to normal peer review processes. However, some of the university centres managed to link consultancy work to broader theoretical and analytical concerns.

Issues And Approaches In Immigration Research 1972-1990

In the academy, ethnicity and multiculturalism were also hotly debated. The key theoretical issue – the relationship between class, ethnicity and gender - became the basis of academic immigration research in the seventies and especially the eighties. In the brief period of radical reformist government (1972-75), some social scientists (especially those of immigrant background) took on the Gramscian role of the 'organic intellectuals' (Gramsci 1971), working closely with politically-mobilised sections of ethnic communities to achieve social and political change. The study of gender relations and the specific position of women became a part of the broader politics of the women's movement. Left-wing social scientists, influenced by the Marxist tradition, tended to emphasise class, while other researchers, influenced by Weberian theory, as well as ideas derived from

anthropologists like Geertz, put more stress on ethnicity. The class/ethnicity debate was also influenced by the ethnic background of the researchers. Many researchers, some of migrant background, while concerned with class, also emphasised the importance of cultural hegemony, racism and discrimination as factors leading to marginalisation of migrants.

As will be revealed in this section, the social and political climate of the time lent itself to critical analysis not only of entry and settlement policy, but academics also examined institutional and informal racism experienced by migrants in many social contexts. In academia, by the late 1970s, the importance of functionalist analysis had greatly diminished and was being replaced by Marxist, Weberian and feminist analyses, providing a far more critical base for the interrogation of problems on immigration. Nevertheless, other theoretical traditions continued and this provided very active and rich debate at the time. Throughout this period much critical research was also conducted within a framework of what could be called the politics of immigration, covering such topics as migrant voting trends, migrant participation etc. During the late 1980s there emerged a raft of research influenced by post-structuralism and cultural studies. Much of the changes that occurred from the earlier Marxist and feminist analyses to the later post-structuralist critiques rested on how the notion of power was to be defined.

Class and Stratification

One of the first analyses of the political economy of Australian immigration of the 1950s and 1960s was conducted by political economist and sociologist Jock Collins who argued that a link had emerged between the rise of a local labour aristocracy and a migrant reserve army of labour. He concluded that migrants were structured into a segmented labour market (Collins 1975, 106). Collins detailed that between 1947 and 1961 migrants had contributed 69.3 per cent of the increase in the manufacturing industry's workforce. There was also a strong concentration of migrant women in this section of the labour market (Collins 1975, 111-113).

His analysis of the 1972 recession concluded that it was recently arrived migrants who bore the brunt of unemployment with a rate of 10.9 per cent

compared with 2.1 per cent for the Australian-born. The overall migrant unemployment rate was 3.2 per cent and the Southern European migrant unemployment rate was higher (Collins 1975, 117). He also connected labour market segmentation to 'race', ethnic and gender division within the Australian population, with high skilled jobs with good conditions and job opportunities occupied mainly by Australian, UK and northern European males. The low skilled jobs with poor working conditions and associated high unemployment rates being occupied by southern European males; followed by females then male Aborigines and lastly female Aborigines (Collins 1984; Collins 1978). According to Collins, migrant exploitation was functional for capital, and class was given a prime explanatory value. In this model, class retained prime explanatory value such that patriarchy was defined as emerging from the bourgeoisie, thus missing the deep-rooted and complex power of gender discrimination. Feminist analysis, as we shall see below, indicated that both gender and ethnic relations must be given equal analytical value in order to understand clearly their effects.

The reserve army of labour theory drew criticisms from both Marxists and non-Marxists. Some empiricists researchers who use large data sets and human capital theory. For example, Evans and Kelley (1986) and Evans (1984) claimed that migrants were not disproportionately disadvantaged in Australia. Birrell and Birrell (1981, 32-41) attempted to dismiss the reserve army thesis by suggesting that 'southern migrant workers' were specifically sought by Australian employers and that the purpose of immigration was as explicitly stated in government policy - simply to build up the Australian population. From a 'Marxist' stance, (Lever-Tracy 1981) criticised the thesis, asserting that Marx's term can only be used if it is applied specifically to migrants overseas who formed a 'latent' reserve. Castles, Morrissey and Pinkstone (1988b) however, demonstrated that there were some migrant and Anglo-Australians groups who could be categorised as a reserve army.

The critical discourse of political economy exposed the class and racist exploitation of migrants and that the post-war immigration policy was designed to obtain 'factory fodder'. Later research also concluded that there was a split between Anglo-Australian workers and migrant workers (Lever-Tracy and Quinlan 1988; Morrissey, et al. 1992; Morrissey and Trompf 1986; Nicolaou

1991). It was not only employers, but trade unions, Anglo-Australian workers and the state who exploited migrant workers in the labour market. By the late 1980s it became apparent that migrant small businesses had received little attention. Collins et al (1995) researched the dynamics of ethnic small businesses and found their results were similar to research carried out in other migration countries. For example, they found that employment mobility of migrants is often blocked through structural constraint and the process of racialisation. In their analysis a framework of racialisation was taken as the starting point with the research focusing on how the intersection of ethnicity, gender and class shape the work settlement experience of migrant in Australia.

During the 1980s, there emerged a competing analysis between the Marxists who claimed that disadvantage had to be understood through the analysis of class and ethnic relations, and the empiricists, using large data sets and human capital theory, who attempted to show that neither ethnicity nor being a migrant were factors which brought about disadvantage. The empiricist construction of migrants and its political implications were best understood through the works of Kelly and McAllister (1984) and Evans and Kelly (1986). Their research mostly focused upon the social status of migrants compared with that of native-born Australians with status measured through a number of variables such as occupation, labour market participation, income and occupational mobility. Within this discourse, social data assumed the role of 'social facts'. Jakubowicz states (1986, 3):

> The major methodological problem becomes the creation of instruments sufficiently refined that they will be able to distinguish real facts from confusing side effects. Differences are quantifiable and quantified, with factors given values which allow them to be plotted, analysed and assessed in terms of their apparent influence one upon another … [e]mpiricism is also known as stratification research … [t]he focus is upon the individual acting in the market. Each individual has attributes (skills, education, gender, occupational status, ethnic background, immigrant status, experience in the labour force etc) to which can be assigned a numerical value.

The empiricists' methodology tends to 'correct away the qualitative differences between groups, and to compare individuals who vary only in quantitative characteristics' such as years of schooling (Castles, et al. 1988a). Offering a significant and competing discourse on immigration, Evans, Kelly and McAllister concluded that migrants and Anglo-Australians have an equal chance of success in the Australian labour market. Evans and Kelley calculated the intergenerational mobility of 'native-born Australian' and immigrants by concentrating only on working males aged 25 to 64. By ignoring women and the unemployed they were able to conclude that there is no 'ethnic underclass' since, '[i]n Australia, workers are judged by their productivity, not their ethnicity: those who trace their heritage to the First Fleet have no edge on those who arrived on the last' (Evans and Kelley 1986, 203).

The type of data sets used often refers to demographic, economic, labour market experience, and policy issues (Wooden, et al. 1994). Nevertheless, it is this type of research which is the prevailing model in Australia partly because, unlike in France and Germany, the census data sets are available. There is an epistemological issue here as well. These social scientists rely on the idea that census data alone can explain social reality, following the Durkheimian idea that 'social facts' explain social reality.

In the 1990s, a different approach to the overview provided by Wooden et al (Wooden, et al. 1994) was the research conducted by Castles et al (1998)for the Housing Industry Association. The Association believed that since the abolition of the Bureau of Immigration and Population Research (BIMPR) there was little adequate material on the latest data and debates regarding immigration. They required some up-to-date clarification on the myths and realities of immigration. These researchers presented controversial questions such as 'Do immigrants add to unemployment? What will be Australia's future ethnic composition be? Is immigration a danger to the ecosystem? What are the consequences of immigration for welfare provision? Does immigration undermine social cohesion and national identity? The authors then proceeded to systematically test these questions against the research literature.

One question which was challenged is the idea of the 'ethnic enclave' or 'ghetto' which is often presented as a problem (Birrell 1993; Healy 1996). After an analysis of the literature especially based on the work of Burnley who used 1991 census data, Castles et al. concluded that '[t]he situation is thus one of concentration of disadvantaged groups, rather than ethnic concentration. There are no areas of almost complete segregation of one ethnic group from the rests of the population' (Castles et al, 1998:97).

This empiricist position which stated that migrants' occupational and income status was equal if not better than the Anglo-Australian born is echoed by another group of researchers concerned with educational achievements of second-generation migrants, namely Birrell and Seitz (1986) and Bullivant (1986). They presented data on retention rates, occupational mobility and motivation/aspiration of school students and the ethnic backgrounds of university students. They concluded that migrant children stay at school longer; that there was considerable intergenerational mobility into white-collar work; and that the children of Anglo-Australian blue-collar workers were remaining within the manual working class. These authors explained their findings in terms of an 'ethnic work ethic' in that motivation makes the most of an education system which enforces 'egalitarian, non ascriptive values' (Birrell and Seitz 1986, 28). The problem with this analysis was that they failed to mention that many had not become upwardly mobile. Second generation Italians were still somewhat disadvantaged in occupational terms, compared with the total population (Vasta 1992).

The neo-assimilationist position of Birrell and Seitz (1986) and Bullivant (1986) indicated that all multicultural education, except English language classes for migrant children, should be dropped. On the other hand, the research findings of historians and educationalists Kalantzis and Cope (1984) demonstrated that multiculturalism as interpreted by some schools had trivialised migrant student disadvantage by placing too much importance on cultural artefacts and practices. They argued that multicultural education needed to be improved by concentrating on developing migrant students' conceptual processes.

In the 1990s, Birrell and Khoo (1995) revisited the issue of upward mobility. For example, they showed that there is mobility in the second-generation compared with the parent generation. The implication of their research is that migrant school children no longer require multicultural education programs to bring them up to par to the local population. Cahill's research, on the other hand, indicates that this type of research ignores the fact that upward mobility is not the case for a number of groups such as the Maltese, Turkish, Khmer, Dutch and children of German origin. Cahill criticises 'the methods used in much of the research...the use of inconsistent definitions, narrowly focussed data which hide considerable variations within and between groups' (Cahill 1996).

Ethnicity and Multiculturalism

As noted earlier, Zubrzycki had significant influence over the state's construction of ethnicity and multiculturalism during the period of conservative government from 1975-1982. His position was critically challenged by migrants, academics on the left, and in reports commissioned by government institutions. Some adopted a Weberian analysis, concerned with the social basis of social action, achieved and ascribed status especially as it relates to ethnicity and is mediated by ethnic leaders. On the other hand, Marxist analysis referred to the structural disadvantages suffered by migrants and the role of the state, ideology and class relations in the construction of migrants through ethnicity and multiculturalism. These two perspectives, along with feminist analysis, provided a systematic analysis of the relationship between class, gender and ethnicity, including a critical and systematic analysis of uneven power relations in Australia.

McCall et al. (1985) adopted a Weberian framework, defining ethnicity as an ideology constituted by an 'ethny' (ethnically based social category, a representation of belonging) which assumes five characteristics, namely: solidarity, common origin, language, history and beliefs for action (McCall and et.al. 1985, 17). Thus, ethnicity was defined as 'that form of named rhetorical distinctiveness that emphasises a transgenerational commonality of symbolic meaning, sustained and reinforced by recurring social actions' (McCall and et.al. 1985, 13). Ethnicity, according to McCall et al. 'represents a claim for the recognition of groups which are not based on class, occupation, organised

economic interest or sexual dimorphism' though at times 'the analysis of class divisions is only possible if it is combined with the recognition of ethnic divisions, as indicated by the studies of labour markets segmented along ethnic lines' (1985, 10). The ethnic group (which they prefer to call an 'ethny') is a status group which forms a type of social closure as defined by Weber (see (Parkin 1982) and uses legitimate means, as any other status group, to compete for scarce resources (McCall and et.al. 1985, 30).

One problem with this analysis was that despite being concerned about notions of power and interests, their definition of status group assumed that migrant groups had sufficient power or status to make adequate gains when competing for basic economic and social rights. This problem stemmed from Weber's own analysis where he suggests that ethnic status groups via social closure are able to gain high status and hence other forms of privilege (Parkin 1982, 99-100). Nevertheless the value of this position was their attempt to understand that ethnic identities can be constructed separately from class relations and that class interests expressed along ethnic lines need not be seen as epiphenomenal of capitalist development (Gilroy 1987).

One of the first systematic critiques of Australian post-war settlement policy was conducted by Jean Martin (Martin 1978). She aimed to establish how and by whom public or social knowledge is created or generated and 'how the distribution of knowledge is related to the distribution of resources and power ...' (Martin 1978). Martin's theoretical position was based on a notion of the construction of power and knowledge, drawing on Foucault, and on the idea of human agency and interests mostly from a Weberian approach, adopting a social construction of reality perspective where those with power are the chief definers and those with little power are defined on discriminatory and exploitative grounds on account of their structural position. She attempted to show how migrants tried to gain a better deal through setting up their own pressure groups and by enlisting the help of 'ethnic professionals'.

Martin suggested that policy had moved from one of assimilation, where migrants were mostly ignored, to a 'definition of migrants as a social problem' (Martin 1978). Further, she argued that Anglo-Australian professionals who had

direct experience of migrant's problems 'developed the concept of migrants as a disadvantaged group'. However, this was translated by institutions as migrants being problems. Martin looked at the institutional response in three areas - child migrant education, migrants health and the trade unions. Basically, the institutional responses were extremely poor, falling into the assimilationist model and, when this broke down, into the 'migrant as problem' model. She analysed the inability of Australian institutions to come to grips with the realities of the 'migrant presence'. Martin's work laid the foundation for the debates on 'ethnic rights' and 'migrant disadvantage' which were significant within welfare and community organisations in the late 1960s and the 1970s.

In the early 1980s some Marxist social scientists working in the area of ethnicity and multiculturalism were concerned that multiculturalism and multicultural policy were too easily defined on the basis of 'cultural differences'. They suggested that the concept or category 'ethnicity' should be analysed in relation to class and gender relations. Marxist scholars were concerned that migrants would be seen as problems due to their migrant status, their language and other cultural characteristics, rather than basing analysis on the structural disadvantage to which they were subjected. Class and other social disadvantages were exacerbated for migrants due to their experience of institutional and personal racism. This problem could affect the delivery of multicultural policies in various sectors.

It was from this position that Kalantzis and Cope (1984) analysed how multiculturalism was being put into practice in five particular schools. They found that four of the five schools had interpreted multiculturalism as simply a matter of attitudes, feelings, stress on festivities, food and dance, and community representation. The authors asserted that in catering to the perceived need of the migrant communities, these schools were in fact reproducing structures of class inequalities and traditional gender roles (Kalantzis and Cope 1984, 91). The fifth school had, however, recognised that there were serious language problems among its students, even though the majority of the students had done most of their schooling in Australia. Instead of focusing on the 'pretty or traditional differences' as the other four had, this school focused on developing social

science and language curricula structured specifically to meet the needs of the students (Kalantzis and Cope 1984, 92).

Ethnicity was also analysed as ideology. For example, de Lepervanche, an anthropologist, analysed the hegemonic definition of ethnicity. She claimed that the 'promotion of ethnicity … masks conflicting class interests and the nature of class relations' and that '[t]here are in fact no ethnics; there are only ways of seeing people as ethnics' (de Lepervanche 1980, 34-35). The problem with de Lepervanche's definition was that the notion of ethnicity as an ideology was considered to be manipulating and mystifying to migrants and operated as a dominant ideology. McCall et al. rightly criticised de Lepervanche for ignoring 'that people participate in the formation of their own consciousness and that ruling-class ideas are not merely foisted upon an ignorant and largely pliable mass whose function in society is to believe what they are told' (McCall and et.al. 1985, 28).

Jakubowicz (1981, 4) developed the argument that 'ethnicity as ideology mediates Australian class relations, by reifying the history of peoples into a static category of theoretical labelling'. Jakubowicz convincingly demonstrated how the state, through various policies and practices, undertakes this process. Jakubowicz also claimed that multiculturalism, due to its discursive primacy over class, became a means of social control of migrants but at the same time that multiculturalism would threaten Anglo-Australian cultural dominance (Jakubowicz 1981).

While this analysis illuminated how 'ethnicity' has taken on explanatory and political primacy over class, there were two problems with this argument. Firstly, although it is true that the ideology of ethnicity and multiculturalism can mask or act as an explanation for class disadvantages, he seemed to ignore the dynamics of culture and consciousness. Jakubowicz clearly was concerned with these constructs but they ended up forming part of a retreat in preference for the explanation of a dominant ideology inflicted by the ruling class and mediated by the ethnic petit-bourgeoisie and intelligentsia. The second problem was that migrants appeared to be totally constrained by their class location with a dominant ideology operating but with no room for them to construct their own

(separate or communal) identities through struggle and resistance. For Jakubowicz, the primacy of power rested in class and state relations and how ethnic relations are played out on those two terrains (Martin 1988, 392-408).

Ultimately, the Marxist and Weberian analyses were both significant to the debates on ethnicity and multiculturalism in Australia. One suggested that that there are dominant constructions of ethnicity and cultural differences which end up ignoring class issues. The other argued that the subjective and strategic construction of meaning and action is valid, and that migrants do not suffer from false consciousness to the extent that some claim. Nevertheless, by 1988 multiculturalism had become the dominant discourse. This was the bi-centenary year (the 200th anniversary of white settlement) and the question of identity had become prominent again. One group of researchers argued that national identity was either invented or weak. As early as 1981, Richard White argued that Australian national identity was an invention (White 1981).

Castles et al. in *Mistaken Identity* claimed that Australia had a weak national identity and that we were in a position to develop a post-national sense of communal identity. In other words, a 'community without nation' (Castles, et al. 1988a). On the other hand, some argued that however one defined national identity, the dominant Anglo national identity was not weak, but strong given the prevalence of racism in the community, among many leaders and also at the institutional level towards indigenous and migrant Australians (Vasta 1993d). In this debate, Smolicz (1997) continued to argue that ethnic identity and ethnic diversity should remain and develop within the overarching set of values which go to form the national Australian identity. It is this framework which continued to influence the Labor Party platform on multiculturalism until the Hanson backlash in 1996.

Gender Relations

With the revival of the women's movement in the 1970s in Australia, there emerged a focus on women-centred research. There was now a growing number of migrant and Anglo-Australian women working with and for migrant women at the grass roots level in health, welfare, trade unions and community organisations. Cox, Jobson and Martin (1976) produced one of the first reports

that focussed specifically on the position of migrant women in Australian society. This report, based on the findings of a large survey, was concerned with the problems faced by migrant women in the workforce. It also detailed their experience of issues such as cultural differences, family pressures, language skills, literacy, training, marital status, child care, socio-economic indicators, and reasons for working. The authors suggested that their study should be viewed as a 'bench mark study as so little is currently known about such women' (Cox, et al. 1976, 2). Recommendations to redress the problems highlighted in the study were detailed by the authors, who also suggested that the implementation of at least some of these recommendations would be 'a minimal and potentially important step towards the integration of these women in our society' (Cox, et al. 1976, 6). This study heralded the beginning of the identification of the problems migrant women experience and the neglect by the state of their difficulties and disadvantage.

Following and expanding on the pioneering work of Cox et al. (1976), Bottomley (1975; 1984), Jeannie Martin (1984; 1986); de Lepervanche (1984; 1990), Alcorso (2001a; 1993), Schofield (1991; 1993) and Vasta (1991; 1993b). All these women researchers have highlighted the need to consider migrant women's experiences in the family, the paid workplace, with participation, racism and the role of the state. All have stressed the importance of the relationship between gender, class and ethnicity in the Australian context as well as in their country of origin. Feminist research on migrant women operates as a corrective to the marginalisation of women in most of the research work done on migrants until well into the 1980s.

Jeannie Martin's critique of the government discussion paper – 'Multiculturalism for all Australians - our developing nationhood' (ACPEA 1982) – was that multiculturalism' as defined in this paper was a male construct. Her scathing observation was that 'it must be obvious to every woman and her dog that this is a *male* document about a male future where Nation-Family-Father-Son are united in their diverse control, and where the situation of women, far less a feminist alternative, barely rates a whisper' (Martin 1984, 57). Her analysis highlighted the maleness entrenched in the model of multiculturalism offered by the state. Feminist research since the 1980s has continued to provide a sound

basis for understanding the gender, ethnic, class and state power relations of Australian immigration. There is an expansive body of literature that deals with migrant women in all facets of Australian society and across disciplines and which goes part way to redressing the omissions of the past and current research. An overview of some of these is presented below.

With regard to the position of migrant women in the labour market, they form a vulnerable segment of the labour force, working under the threat of massive displacement from paid employment, even in jobs which are devalued by gender segregation and discrimination. Poor English language skills restrict the scope of job opportunities and training/retraining opportunities along with their ability to fully function in society. Ironically, it has been the necessity to take on the role of worker and mother which has excluded most migrant women from participating in English language courses (DIEA 1986).

Researchers using human capital theory and census data argued that their regression analysis showed little evidence of migrant women's disadvantage. For example, a study by Evans (Evans 1984), explored the workforce participation, education level, English proficiency, income and occupational status of migrant women in Australia. Evans' methodology of treating certain variables as social facts, ignored the historically racist, sexist and exploitative work conditions on the shop floor and discrimination in terms of hiring and firing. She concluded that (Evans 1984):

> The Australian labour market appears to be nearly blind to ethnicity, except that Mediterranean women having little education get better jobs than their Australian peers and highly educated Mediterranean women get somewhat worse jobs than their Australian peers. It is likely that in other aspects of life the 'host society' treats some immigrants much better than others, but the labour market treats everybody about equally.

In stark contrast to Evans, feminist researchers such as Martin (1984), Alcorso (1993; 2001b; 1993) have pointed to the exploitation of migrant women in the paid workforce where not only do they work in the poorest conditions but also receive the lowest wages in an atmosphere that constantly threatens dismissal.

Martin (1984) analysed the position of migrant women in production and social reproduction. She asserted that, as late as 1984, in the major debates on immigration and multiculturalism there was little independent analysis of migrant women nor any input from feminist thought (Martin 1984, 123):

> Here femaleness is separated out either as a particular aspect of the ethnic, one that carries specific non-relational disadvantages, or as a distinct category of disadvantage from the ethnic (ie, it belongs elsewhere). In the ethnicist argument, the first conception is underscored by a tendency to list 'migrant women' as one of the many problems afflicting ethnic groups - for example, along with health, children, education, unemployment and so forth.

Furthermore, she suggested that both Marxist and bourgeois accounts, which claimed that production is male and consumption/social reproduction is female, incorrectly relegated migrant women to that ideological split. Migrant women's participation in the paid labour force defied the 'neat sexual division of labour implied in policy' (Martin 1984, 112).

Later writings have tended to focus on the effects of the deregulation of the labour market on migrant women. In 1991 the then Labor government introduced changes to wages and labour market policies from that of a centralised and therefore somewhat protectionist system to a decentralised and deregulated wages system and labour market. The 1996 Workplace Relations Act – introduced by the newly elected conservative government – further deregulated and reformed Australian industrial relations. It has exacerbated the occupational segmentation and vulnerability of migrant women in the workplace. The emphasis of the new legislation was on the equality of the employment relationship in bargaining over wages and conditions in the workplace, while at the same time removing protective labour legislation and processes of regulation, oversight and appeal.

The deregulated and decentralised labour market further disempowers the already vulnerable segments of the labour market, especially migrant women who clearly do not enjoy equality with their employers during bargaining in the

workplace. As has been noted by a number of researchers (see for example, Alcorso 1993), the position of migrant women was not improved under a centralised industrial relations system with high trade union involvement. However, under a decentralised, workplace based industrial relations system, migrant women can only be further disadvantaged and disenfranchised as needs like work based child care, occupational health and safety and skills training and upgrading are left to be individually bargained.

In 1993, Alcorso rejected the deregulation of industrial relations and its resultant flexibility of the Australian workforce as a negative move for migrant women. She argued that the deregulation 'does not address the issues of most importance to one of the least powerful and most exploited groups in the labour force, NESB women' (Alcorso 1993, 62). She reasserted the call for examination and advocacy of 'the most important employment issues for NESB women' unemployment, discrimination, English classes, occupational injury and child care and for migrant women's issues to be addressed in the mainstream policy discussions and not as an afterthought. Fraser (1997), for example, looks specifically at the impact of contracting out on female NESB staff in government cleaning services.

During these years, much research was carried out on migrant women in relation to the state, the family and on immigrant women's identity. Martin (1984; 1991), de Lepervanche (1990), Parella (1993), Alcorso (1993), Cox (1993) and others all discuss the patriarchal structures of the bureaucracies and legal process with relation to childcare, welfare, health care, language training and education. One common theme throughout these works is the failure of the state to adequately provide services that are specifically designed and targeted at the needs of migrant women and not merely tacked on as an afterthought to mainstream policy.

A 1985 National Conference on Immigrant Women's Issues was held by the then Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs at which state and federal government ministers endorsed the following four main priority areas for action:

- Improved health, safety and working conditions for the female immigrant workforce;
- Improved access to language, education, training and retraining for immigrant women;
- Improved access to culturally appropriate child care;
- Improved services for aged and ageing immigrant women.

Its preamble states, in part, that 'the stress of immigration falls heavily on women. Their experience of disadvantage in this society clearly justifies the advocacy work proposed in this report and through implementation of government policy on affirmative action and equal employment opportunities' (DIEA 1986). Numerous researchers are still identifying these areas as ones of continuing disadvantage for migrant women. For example, Fincher et al (Fincher, et al. 1994), provide a systematic analysis of gender equity in immigration and settlement policy.

One seminal publication, *Ethnicity, Class and Gender in Australia*, edited by Bottomley and de Lepervance (1984) that appeared in the mid 1980s provided an analytical basis for the relationship between ethnicity, class and gender. This 'holy trinity' influenced much of the critical research that followed. Whereas class and ethnicity had become a respectable set of social relationships to examine, many researchers soon realised that gender issues had to be included in order to provide a systematic and true reflection of the position of immigrant women. Later *Intersexions* by Bottomley, de Levervanche and Martin (1991) added 'culture' to the 'holy trinity', examining these relationships within social and feminist theories.

In the 1980s, a number of immigrant women's organisations such as the *Immigrant Women's Speakout of NSW* and the *Association of Non-English Speaking Women of Australia* (ANESBWA) emerged to deal with NESB women's marginalisation. One of their main aims was to place immigrant women's issues on the political agenda as well as to help develop and deliver services sensitive to women's needs. These organisations encouraged a strong dialogue between the community, policy and academic sectors. Following the *Politics of Speaking Out: Immigrant Women Ten Years On* conference in 1992, the four main papers

prepared for the conference ((Alcorso 1993; Cox 1993; Parella 1993; Vasta 1993b) were published in *Australian Feminist Studies*. As Vasta noted in her editorial in this special issue, it was a significant move to have this special issue of *Australian Feminist Studies* devoted to *Gender and Ethnicity*, as it provided the space to highlight the relationship between gender and ethnicity, a relationship frequently ignored in mainstream feminism, as well as to bring together issues and debates from the various sectors (Vasta 1993c).

Research and debates on the position of immigrant women flourished throughout the 1980s and gender issues were placed firmly on the research map. By the 1990s, the research agenda began to change. Apart from changes in the women's movement and the massive reduction in research funding, post-structuralism became popular within feminist theory and began to pose a new set of analytical questions. This will be discussed more fully in a later section.

Racism

Research on racism began in earnest in the 1960s with the work of Jupp (1966), Rivett (1962) and the numerous authors that appeared in the three volumes edited by Stevens (1971; 1972a; 1972b). It needs to be emphasised that much of the research discussed in the sections above and below, deals with racism either directly or indirectly.[4] For example, the research on the position of immigrants in the labour market not only revealed class discrimination but the frequent racism migrants experienced in the labour market on account of their ethnicity, and for migrant women, their gender as well (for example, see Alcorso 2001a; for example, see Collins 1991). In the 1980s debates in Australia were influenced by the British debates on 'race' and racism (Phizacklea and Miles 1980). Similar debates appeared in Australia (Castles 1996; de Lepervanche 1980; Jakubowicz 1984; Vasta and Castles 1996). Thus, racism became more systematically analysed during the 1980s with influential works such as Collins'

---

[4] This section on racism is included here in order to alert the reader to the importance that racism has played as an analytical category in much of the research on immigration and settlement. Although not all research and analyses referred directly to racism, it is often explicitly or implicitly

work on the labour market, Jakubowicz on the state and Bottomley, Martin and de Lepervanche and Castles, Kalantsis, Hope and Morrissey on the relation between gender, class and ethnicity . There was much debate on whether class relations provided more explanatory power than gender or ethnicity in terms of discrimination, or whether gender and racial discrimination created more problems of marginalisation and exploitation for migrants than class relations (Vasta 1993a).

More recently, research on racism towards immigrants from Asia also reveals the ever present racism in Australian society (Jayasuriya and Kee-Pookong 1999; Ram 1996; Rizvi 1996). Discrimination also occurs against immigrants with professional qualifications where recognition of their overseas qualifications is very difficult to obtain on account of the closed-shop approach of Australian professional bodies(Iredale 1997). Policy analysis exposed the racism of assimilation policy as well as institutional racism inherent in multicultural policy. Problems with the notion of ethnicity as well as with the broader, nationalist Australian identity have been debated and researched over the years (Castles, et al. 1988a). Racism has been researched in relation to the police (Chan 1996) and is often the focus of research influenced by cultural studies (Perera and Pugliese 1997).

It is important to note that the work of social scientists throughout these years informed the public about community and institutional racism and significantly influenced the development of anti-discrimination legislation, the introduction of public institutions such as the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC), the commissioning of reports and provided direct influence to the development of policy on immigrant settlement. A more detailed review of research on racism since the 1990s will appear in the section below.

---

clear that various forms of discrimination operated within the social processes that were being analysed.

Issues And Theoretical Approaches Since The 1990s

The 'holy trinity' of ethnicity, class and gender had become an inherent part of much of the research of the 1980s. The decade of the 1990s and beyond, however, saw a proliferation of topics, analytical issues and theoretical orientations that centred on five main research trends. The first was concerned with the political – the politics of immigration, political participation and citizenship and globalisation. As an international and multi-disciplinary debate on this broad topic swept the social sciences, the issues of population movements, immigration and immigrant human rights were often central to the analysis. A second research trend was concerned with the relatively new theoretical approach of cultural studies, highly influenced by post-structuralism. Numerous social scientists, particularly sociologists, embraced some of its main tenets including ideas about the fragmentation of the subject and the death of grand narratives and grand theories. As a result, the 'subject' of the theoretical debates of the 1970s and 1980s became fragmented. In fact, migration research became more disparate in terms of theoretical and disciplinary orientation.

A third trend has centred on a number of critical debates. Whereas much of the research of the 1970s/80s was based on an analysis of pluralism, racism and other forms of discrimination and their effects on multi-ethnic societies such as Australia, in the 1990s an old trend re-emerged. Some research supported a return to exclusionary and assimilationist ideas of an earlier period. Certainly the post-1996 Howard Coalition government and the rise of the One Nation party provided a ready climate for such a return. Nevertheless, other research, particularly in cultural studies, has analysed racism with a new theoretical orientation.

A fourth trend less concerned with theoretical matters was in fact politically driven. In the early 1990s, as Prime Minister Keating attempted to convince many reluctant Australians that Australia had to become a major player in Asia, research on Asia – and especially on Australia's relationships with Asia – became one of the Australian Research Council's national funding priorities. As a result, a previously under-researched area of migration research began to flourish. An important framework for such research was the Asia-Pacific Migration Research

Network (APMRN), established in 1995 and coordinated from the University of Wollongong, which will be described below.

A fifth tendency. also politically driven, signalled the demise of institutional and policy immigration research. Since 1996, with the election of the conservative Liberal-National Coalition Government, immigration research has not been given the priority it had been given by previous governments. As a result, an important tradition of immigration research that had been established over the previous 25 years has been largely abandoned.

The Politics of Immigration

A number of contentious themes have sparked off 'immigration debates'. One such debate comes from the environmental movement.One of the major environmental groups, the *Australian Conservation Foundation* (ACF) adopted a policy of 'population stabilization' in 1978, but then shifted to a more positive policy on immigration in the late 1980s. The policy shifted to cautious opposition to large-scale immigration by the early 1990s (Warhurst 1993). Other environmental groups, such as *Australians for an Ecologically Sustainable Population* (AESP), seem to have been specifically set up to campaign against immigration. This organization has strong links with *Australians Against Further Immigration* (AAFI), and with right-wing groups including the One Nation Party. Environmentalists opposed to immigration claim that Australia has a limited 'carrying capacity' due to lack of water and thin and nutrient-poor soils. Problems of waste assimilation, loss of bio-diversity and degradation of natural resources and amenities are also put forward (Jones 2001). There is considerable scientific dispute on all these matters. For instance some scientists argue that Australia's 'carrying capacity' is as high as 50-100 million, while others assert that the current 19 million is already unsustainable (Castles, et al. 1998).

Some researchers studied the links between ethnic rights, the community sector and the welfare state. Ethnic community groups pointed out that they were denied access to many educational and social services due to lack of information and culturally inappropriate modes of delivery. Despite formal rights to government services, they were excluded in practice. Such demands were articulated in the language of both *rights* and of *participation*. Both first- and

second-generation immigrants became involved in the development and delivery of services at the community level. Immigrant associations had been initially established in response to the cultural and social concerns of specific ethnic communities. The introduction of social policies aimed specifically at immigrants, first by the ALP and then by the Coalition Government, put a premium on ethnic mobilisation and formation of associations to speak in the name of immigrants (Jupp, et al. 1989; Vasta 1993a; Vasta 1993b; 1993d). There was a link between the emergence of multicultural policies and services, and the development of formalised ethnic lobby groups, of which the most important were (and still are, though with diminished significance) the state *Ethnic Communities Councils* (ECCs) and the *Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils of Australia* (FECCA). *The Association of Non-English Speaking Women of Australia* (ANESBWA) closed down in 1999 due to lack of funding. The development of ethnic associations helped end assimilationism and bring in multiculturalism. This caused some observers to imply that there was some sort of sinister 'ethnic lobby' which was having an illegitimate influence on politics as well as on family intakes (Betts 1993; Blainey 1984).

Most Australian political scientists, on the other, hand argue that there is no monolithic 'ethnic vote' which can be controlled by ethnic leaders to secure specific political outcomes (McAllister 1988). Immigrants have not constituted a united political force, mainly because the differences among them in terms of social position, interests and values are as great as among the Anglo-Australian population. According to Jupp (1993):

> Although its presence cannot be ignored, the ethnic lobby since 1988 has seemed peripheral to some of the major debates on immigration…The greatest weakness of the 'lobby' has probably been the absence of a sympathetic base in parliament comparable to those that exist for major ethnic groups in the USA or Canada. There are very few NESB immigrant politicians in Canberra.

The very success of multiculturalism led to a decline in ethnic mobilization by the early 1990s. At the same time, the concern of many Australians about the impact of globalization on their economic and social situation opened up the

51

cultural and political space for a resurgence of anti-immigration sentiments. This was the background to the emergence of the nationalistic One Nation Party and new exclusionism of the mainstream parties in the late1990s (Vasta 1999).

Political Participation

In the 1980s some researchers, in particular James Jupp, began to look at trends in political participation of immigrant groups in Australia. Ethnic representation in the mainstream parties, from the 1950s to 1980s was relatively low. In the 1960s some ethnic representation began to emerge at the local level, though again level of activity and representation was low (Jupp, et al. 1989). Nevertheless, by 1982, there were 17 NESB local council members in Melbourne and 10 in Sydney (Jupp, et al. 1989). This rate of representation at the local level has continued to grow, such that in some local government electorates with high levels of migrant density, NESB representatives may be in the majority. Although they may belong to different parties or are independents, as is the it is local level politics that has provided the best opportunity for ethnic representation in mainstream politics.

The State of Victoria, for example, has shown some advance. In 1996, it was the most multi-ethnic parliament in Australia with 14 per cent of its Upper House and 11 per per cent of its Lower House coming from non-English Speaking background people. Both major parties in Victoria have actively sought the incorporation of ethnic constituents such that there was a Vietnamese-Australian and a Cambodian-Australian in their parliament. Despite this example, representation in the federal parliament remains low. Between 1947 and 1989, for example, only 8 people born in non-English speaking countries (NESCS) had entered federal parliament (Jupp, et al. 1989). By 1990, there were only 7 NESB members (born overseas) in the House of Representatives, compared with 14 ESB (born overseas) and 202 Australian born (Jupp and Kabala 1993).

The reasons for such low representation are numerous. Some migrant groups come from countries where the formal democratic political process does not exist; in others, the vote counts for nought. Hence, formal political participation is not a priority. For others, educational levels and English proficiency precludes their involvement. Other reasons are due to the Australian political and social

system. For example, the pre-selection system in some mainstream political parties is problematic and discriminatory; safe seats are often kept 'in-house' for aspirants for Prime Ministerial or other top jobs; fear of racial abuse towards candidates of ethnic background; migrants may lack the connections and background for pre-selection (Jupp 1996; Jupp, et al. 1989). Overall, the latter reasons indicate that both formal and informal racism continues to operate in a rather insidious manner. Typically, this is problematic for immigrants of NESB background since recent research illustrates that ethnic MPs are more responsive to ethnic constituents (Zappalà 1997).

In one major study, Jupp et al. (1989) conclude that 'Australians of Non-English Background are marginal to the exercise of power and influence in Australia, especially if they are immigrants'. One result of the disempowerment experienced by migrants in the formal political structures is that they 'do' their politics elsewhere. Some immigrants of non-English speaking background have opted for other strategies. Jupp et al. found that one strategy of integration into the political system 'seems to be the leading role taken by community full-time workers paid from public funds. They have been able to forge their organisation into effective pressure points' (Jupp, et al. 1989). Another way in which immigrants of non-English speaking background, and especially women, participate is through collective action at the local community level (Thomas 1999; Vasta 2000).

Citizenship and Globalization

Although there was little interest in the notion of citizenship in the bi-centenary year of 1988, this was soon to change. Firstly, with the end of the Cold War, there emerged an international debate on citizenship and globalisation. Secondly, in Australia there were the periodic controversial debates again on multiculturalism. At this time, Stephen Castles (Castles 1994) and others (see (Davidson 1997b; Jordens 1995; Rubinstein 1995) began to analyse the relationship between multiculturalism and citizenship.

Castles (1995); (Castles and Miller 2003) has argued that there are three ideal types immigrant incorporation policy:

- *Differential exclusion,* in which migrants are incorporated into certain areas of the society, mainly the labour market , but excluded from others such as the political sphere;
- *Assimilation,* in which migrants are expected to give up their original languages, cultures and identities and become completely absorbed into the mainstream society and culture ;
- *Pluralism* (or *multiculturalism*), in which the state accepts that migrant groups retain their languages and cultures, while ensuring that migrants have equal rights in all spheres of society.

Clearly, Australia comes close to the model of pluralism in the way it treats immigrants and minorities, and seemed in the early 1990s to be moving towards a redefinition of citizenship as 'multicultural citizenship (OMA 1989). However, both Castles and Davidson (Davidson 1997a) argue that although Australia's citizenship laws are among the most liberal in western democratic states, they remain contradictory and incomplete, leaving the way open for many forms of discrimination against minorities. In any case, such reform agendas of the past appear to have been abandoned since 1996. It appears that the Coalition government is determined to make the gaining of citizenship more difficult than it was in the past by introducing more rigorous language tests, extending the residency requirement and by concentrating on migrant responsibilities rather than rights.

Debates on citizenship have been linked to attempts to define and study national identity. A number of social scientists have taken up the idea that we cannot concentrate on notions of ethnic identity in order to understand crises in national identity. Instead, Horne (1994) an historian, suggests that we need to concentrate on the idea of civic values and a national civic identity (this is not dissimilar to the French idea of republicanism). A similar position is held by Kukathas (1993), a right-wing libertarian, who suggests that we can talk of a national inheritance such as a history, which has different effects on different groups, and a common set of political and social institutions. Like Horne, he suggests that we cannot have a strong national unity in a society which is based on cultural diversity. Thus, he argues for a weak national identity. Sociologist Frank Jones analysed data from the 1995 National Social Science Survey (Jones

1996), and found that respondents fell into two main categories. The 'Australian nativists', about a quarter of the respondents, tended to be older, had lower levels of education and emphasised the importance of being born in Australia. The 'civic culturalists', over half of the respondents, belonged to a broader set of ethnic and other demographic characteristics, were younger and better educated and felt it important to feel Australian and to adhere to Australian laws and institutions (see also Betts and Rapson 1997).

Cultural Studies – culture, identity and power

It was in the 1990s that cultural studies began to gain legitimacy through its analyses on media studies, semiotics and post-structuralism. This research deals with topics like racism, space and place, identity, nationalism, various migrant groups, migrant bodies, multiculturalism (for example, see Ang 2001; Hage 1998; for example, see Perera and Pugliese 1997). In short, a refreshing and stimulating analytical turn has been applied to a plethora of previously researched issues and areas. Cultural studies, post-structuralist and feminist analyses have been concerned, among other things, with micro practices and have opened up a notion of power critical of what they call the the 'zero-sum notion of power' in some strands of structuralism. It has also opened up the notion of the subject and identity, introducing ideas about the body, space and place to migration issues.

For example, in her book on Vietnamese Australians, Mandy Thomas has a chapter entitled 'Vietnamese bodies in Australia'. Among other things, she discusses the power relations between Vietnamese and non-Vietnamese through an analysis of the discomfort and inadequacy experienced by a Vietnamese person, perceived to be small in stature, encountering the non-Vietnamese whose body is often bigger. Not only can discomfort arise in terms of body stature, but cultural contradictions can also emerge where in Vietnamese history 'bigger is not necessarily seen as better' (Thomas 1999). Thomas deals with such issues as 'marginality and the body', representations of the body, 'the body and social space' and 'Vietnamese embodiment'. Whereas in the past the discomfort triggered by someone else's physical size may have been analysed with as broad a brush as a practice of racism or sexism, here the relationship of power and many contradictions are teased out via the notion of the body. Similarly, Ien

Ang has opened up the notion of identity in an attempt to shift it away from the essentialism often characteristic of ethnic studies and of official multiculturalism in Australia (Ang 1993). In a later book, Ang uses her own experience (as a person who does not speak chinese but who is openly constructed as 'Chinese' by strangers simply based on her appearance) to analyse the vagaries and disjunctures of 'identity' (Ang 2001).

Within a broader cultural studies perspective, and heavily influenced by Bourdieu, Ghassan Hage (Hage 1998) in *White Nation* explores the politics of *whiteness*, particularly in Australia. One of the main innovations of his work is the elaboration of the idea of 'fantasy' and 'hope' in coming to grips with the notion of identity and nationalism within immigration debates in Australia (Hage 2002). Hage's work reveals a tendency to connect psychoanalytic ideas to the analytic categories of class, identity, racism and nationalism used in the social sciences. In *White Nation*, while dealing with similar issues to those of Belinda McKay (McKay 1999), who argues that all white people in Australia benefit from racial privilege, Hage pushes this further to provide a critique of multiculturalism as 'white multiculturalism' and the fantasy of a 'white nation'. In analysing how immigration is both a process of empowerment and of disempowerment to white Australians, as well as how multiculturalism is both inclusionary and exclusionary, he is especially aware of the contradictions that lie within these social processes and policies.

Hage argues strongly that being white leads to symbolic and political privileges in Australia (and indeed globally), but he somewhat neglects the struggles carried out by 'white' migrants over the past forty odd years, and their contribution to change (see also (Collins 1999). Until the 1980s, the overwhelming majority of immigrants were white, yet most came from underprivileged backgrounds (for instance in Southern Europe). They experienced exploitation and racism in Australia, and fought back through industrial struggles and community mobilisation. These white immigrants were the real architects of multiculturalism. Along with the many migrants of European background, the non-white immigrants who came later are also transforming multicultural principles and practices to meet their values and needs. It appears that part of the problem with post-structuralist analysis is a lack of historicity in the analysis as well as a

lack of due importance to the role of agency. Furthermore, economic and socio-political context has changed. Thus, not only are the migrants of the past twenty years different from those who came in the first thirty-odd years, but their needs are not necessarily covered by some of the basic strategies of multiculturalism.

Overall, in its attempt to overcome the perceived dogmatism of structuralism, the post-structuralism of cultural studies has created new analytical problems that are not easily resolved. The three analytical categories that suffer most from the 'post-structuralist turn' are the notion of 'power', that of the 'subject', and the issue of historical analysis. Post-structuralists are concerned with 'technologies of power' in which power is not concentrated in a central institutions but is more like a network with threads extending everywhere. In other words, post-structuralists are concerned with how power operates at the micro level. Power does not emanate from the state, from the capitalist mode of production, nor is it the property of an individual or class (Foucault 1979; Foucault 1982). Where research ignores historical processes, it will often appear piecemeal. Another related problem in post-structuralism has to do with the notion of the decentred subject. According to this position, there is no constant subject of history. Here again we end up with the relativity of subject positions where there is no intentional subject, thus undermining the notion of agency.

Some critical issues

As mentioned earlier, over the past three decades, researchers have placed much emphasis on racist practices and traditions within Australian society. Despite the emergence of a national multicultural policy, research has revealed how discriminatory institutional structures blocked equal opportunities for people of immigrant background. Multicultural policy was definitely a step in the right direction, but institutional racism continues to this day and academic research continues to highlight problems brought about by racism and racialization. In the book, *The Teeth are Smiling: the Persistence of Racism in Multicultural Australia,* Vasta and Castles (1996), brought together a number of researchers whose work revealed that, despite anti-discrimination laws andmulticultural policies, racism was alive and well in Australia. It is argued throughout the book that racism in multiculturalism is marked by contradictions that demand close attention. In this

work the problems experienced by Aboriginal and Asian Australians were highlighted.

In the past, much research on racism focussed on the experience of immigrants of non-English speaking background, mainly from European background. As more immigrants of Asian background arrived it became evident that these later arrivals were also experiencing racism in the schools, in institutional contexts and in society generally. The even stronger racism towards Australian Aboriginals has mostly been analysed separately from that against immigrants, though some research has attempted to show that both are part of a broader institutional and societal problem (Vasta 1996). One strand of Vasta's work has outlined both institutional and everyday racism, and migrant resistance to it. This has been illustrated either through the direct action of immigrants such as setting up immigrant women's organisations (Vasta 1993b) and starting a multi-ethnic party - the Unity Party (Vasta 1999)) or through the incorporation of cultural practices and multiple identities (Vasta 1993d).

In the late 1980s, extreme right-wing groups in Western Australia, New South Wales and other places started a campaign of racist violence, including arson and murder, against Asian immigrants. The official response included police action, which led to the breaking up of neo-Nazi gangs and the imprisonment of some of their leaders. The Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission (HREOC) carried out a National Inquiry into Racist Violence, which held public hearings and commissioned a good deal of academic research. The Report of the Inquiry provide a valuable analysis of racism in Australia, as well as comparing international approaches to combating it (Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission (HREOC) 1991). Subsequently, HREOC'S Federal Race Discrimination Commissioner issued annual reports on the 'state of the nation'. These were mainly based on work commissioned from critical academics, and provided a valuable analysis of different aspects of racism in Australia (Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission (HREOC) 1993; Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission (HREOC) 1994; Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission (HREOC) 1995).

By the mid 1990s, with the emergence of populist racism and the rise of the anti-minority One Nation Party, research on racism became more important than ever. However, as we shall see in a later section, not only did limited funding create a gap in immigration research, but the critical analytical edge of both the community sector and researchers seems to have weakened. Thus, in the 1990s, and particularly in the latter half, there was a significant reduction in immigration research. Despite this, a broad range of economically, socially, politically and policy relevant topics were researched. No one theoretical approach dominated the analysis. Numerous reports continued to record the service needs of various groups in relation to education, health etc. Other research chronicled historical aspects of the migration process for various ethnic groups. The ethnic composition of Australia (Siew-Ean and Price 1996), where migrants live (Hugo 1995), and the demographic impact of immigration on Australia (Burnley 2001) were topics that continued to engage geographers and demographers as well as policy makers. Multiculturalism and multicultural policy remained important research topics as well (Inglis 1996).

While some labour market research from a political economy perspective continued (Alcorso 2001b; Collins, et al. 1995; O'Loughlin and Watson 1997), other research appears more attractive to the current right wing government. For example, some research argued that the migrant intake should be lowered, while claiming that recently arrived migrants were doing as well as the local population. According to Bridge (Bridge 2001)for instance, recently arrived immigrants appeaedr to have better labour-market outcomes. Those arriving since 1998 had higher participation rates than earlier cohorts. Changes to the Migration Program in the late 1990s led to an increase in the number of skilled migrants, and to migrants with greater English proficiency. There was also a closer alignment between migrant occupations and those listed as in demand in Australia. Bridge concluded that the changing Australian industrial structure as well as the influence of aging were the most important factors in the changing trends in the labour force participation rates of the overseas born (Bridge 2001).

Some work has focussed on the immigrant selection system, which was reformed in mid 1999 to make the use of the qualifications gained by full fee-paying overseas students in Australian universities. The new selection system allocates

additional bonus points to those with Australian credentials. Whereas in the past immigrant graduates had to leave Australia and stay away for a two-year period before applying to migrate to Australia, they are now allowed to remain in the country as they pursue their immigration application. Many of these full-fee overseas students come from Asia and are heavily concentrated in the business and information technology (IT) fields. The other change is in the skilled categories where there has been an increase in the skilled intake both for those who fall into the 'shortages' category and for many who do not. Birrell suggests that the increase in business and IT skills has come from migration and that neither the previous Labor governments nor the conservative-coalition government is paying enough attention to training the local population in the trades and the 'elite occupations' (Birrell 2001).

Bridge and Birrell appear to ignore a number of implications. For example, the emphasis on language proficiency means that a new bias has entered the selection criteria, casting doubt on Australia's claim to have a non-discriminatory immigration policy. Furthermore, those who are trained in Australia are given preference over people trained elsewhere. The earlier policy of return had been created in order to reduce the brain drain from the sending countries. Another problem that continues is the non-recognition of overseas qualifications. Although there has been an increase in immigrants with professional and trade categories, there is no guarantee that these applicants will have their qualifications recognised. Overall, they conclude that the higher skills and education of recent immigrants as well as changes in access to social welfare have led to better labour market outcomes for new migrants.

In her critique of two reports – *New Settlers Have Their Say* and *The Labour Force Experience of New Migrants*, Alcorso (2001b) suggests a number of problems are ignored. She points out that firstly, both reports claim there are few differences between the experiences of men and women. Secondly, the high unemployment rates among the humanitarian entrants are inadequately explained. The analysis needs to include consideration of labour market discrimination experienced by women, the differences between certain ethnic groups and in particular the position of the skilled in the humanitarian category. Furthermore, she questions the success of recent migrants in the labour market

when only half are working in a job where they are using their highest post-school qualification.

If racism is taken into account, a different picture is revealed. Hawthorne found that while Australia is increasingly relying on overseas-qualified nurses, there is still discrimination against nurses of non-English speaking background who speak English – such as those from the Philippines. In an analysis of the 1996 census she found that only 37 per cent of Philippine women in Australia qualified as nurses were actually employed in nursing. By contrast 83 per cent of qualified nurses from South Africa and 72 per cent from the UK and Ireland had nursing jobs in Australia (Hawthorne 2001). Another study indicates that engineers who enter not through the targeted skill category but through family and independent categories, do not provide the 'brain gain' that some think they do. It is questionable whether they will be able to use their qualifications in Australia, often due to non-recognition by regulatory bodies and professional associations (Smith 2002).

Racism continues to be researched from various perspectives. David Ip reveals the conservative nature of 'social capital' as an analytical category when studying migrants who want to start up businesses. In research conducted in Australia covering three Chinese groups from China, Hong Kong and Taiwan, Ip found that, despite having much-wanted financial capital to be invested in Australia, they are still discriminated against to the point where many are finding it impossible to set up their businesses. He claims that they may have considerable social capital in their community, but ultimately are still unable to set up businesses due to the discrimination of authorities and culturally inappropriate rules (Ip 2003). Social capital, according to Ip, undermines a sharper political economy analysis that analyses racism in the Australian community and economy more generally.

Some researchers have analysed organised resistance to One Nation (Vasta 1999), others have examined asylum seekers and Australian law (Crock and Saul 2002) while Jupp (2002a) has gave an overview of Australian racism in his recent book *From White Australia to Woomera*. Jayasuriya and Kee-Pookong (1999) provided a poignant and informative book on the facts and fictions of the

'Asianization' of Australia. Others, such as Collins et al. (2002) have studied the fragility and racism of multiculturalism in their research on migrant youth and the role of the police in definitions of crime. Although there has been research on various migrant groups from Asia (Lever-Tracy, et al. 1996; Viviani 1996), in the 1990s with easier access to funding for research on Asia, Asian groups and communities, there has been an increase in research in this area. For example, while Lever-Tracy et al (1996) have studied economic activity both in mainland China and in the Chinese diaspora, while Iredale et al (2003a) have looked at the issue of internal migration in China.

One significant innovation was the establishment in 1995 of the Asia-Pacific Migration Research Network (APMRN) as part of UNESCO'S Management of Social Tranformations (MOST) Programme. The APMRN started as an initiative led by Stephen Castles at the University of Wollongong, with the support of researchers at other Australian institutions as well as universities in East and Southeast Asia and the Pacific. UNESCO support made it possible to establish a Secretariat in Wollongong, and to hold biennial conferences in cities around the region, including Bangkok, Hong Kong, Tokyo and Suva. The aims of the project were to encourage collaborative research between scholars in various countries, and to stimulate research on the long-term social and political effects of migration. This was designed to combat the predominantly economic focus of much migration research in Asia. Countries with strong migration research traditions – such as Australia, Philippines and New Zealand – were able to support capacity building in places where migration research was relatively new. One objective was to build national migration research networks – this was achieved in about half the member countries. Another objective was to link academics to policy-makers and NGOs. By 2000, the APMRN was working in 14 countries. Despite constant funding difficulties, it was able to stimulate cross-national collaborative research and to generate a considerable number of social-scientific and policy-oriented publications.[5] The project also influenced migration research within Australia. At

---

[5] Details of APMRN publications can be found on the UNESCO-MOST website. http://www.unesco.org/most/apmrn.htm#papers. A book based on APMRN research is: **Iredale,**

a time of cut-backs and fragmentation, it provided a framework for Australian academics to meet and discuss new approaches.

Another form of discrimination entered the immigration arena through the use of the concept 'productive diversity'. In the early 1990s, Australians were going through one of their ritual debates about whether immigration and multiculturalism were really necessary to Australian society and its way of life. The idea of 'productive diversity' was developed, initially by the Office of Multicultural Affairs (Cope and Kalantzis 1997) in order to make immigration and multiculturalism more palatable to the average Australian, especially since there had been a rise in the number of Asian migrants coming to Australia. Unlike earlier cohorts of immigrants, many of the newcomers had higher levels of education, qualifications and capital. It was thought that their skills and qualifications should be seen as having immediate benefits for the Australian economy by turning diversity into an economically viable immigrant characteristic. At the time, this was seen as a positive move. However, recent analysis by Hawthorne reveals the flawed logic on which this idea is premised and some of the problems emerging from this position.

Hawthorne suggests that productive diversity 'is rooted in an expectation of special trade benefits being conferred on NESB migrants – an expectation not matched in terms of any comparable expectation of ESB migrants'. Thus, she poses the question – why should NESB migrants have to justify their presence by trade benefits? Further, she suggests that the 'productive diversity' literature is flawed, with studies rhetorically rather than empirically driven, often characterised by small research samples or exceedingly low response rates to surveys (eg 18 per cent), intentionally skewed research samples, and at times over-reporting of 'positive' research findings alongside under-acknowledgement

R., Hawksley, C. and Castles, S. (eds) 2003b *Migration in the Asia Pacific: Population, Settlement and Citizenship Issues*, Cheltenham and Northampton MA: Edward Elgar..

of 'negative' findings' (Hawthorne, personal communication).[6] Similar flaws appear with the work of Bridge and Birrell, mentioned in an earlier section above. Hawthorne continues that 'the risk inherent in skewing of research finding is a serious underestimate of the ambivalence of Australian employers' responses, and hence the real extent and persistence of the employment/promotion barriers faced by NESB workers'. Finally, it is this type of research which the Australian government is currently funding in the name of 'productive diversity' and economic rationality.

The demise of Institutional and policy research

The politicisation of immigration and multiculturalism reached new heights in 1988 with the publication of the *Report of the Committee to Advise on Australia's Immigration Policies* (CAAIP) (CAAIP 1988). The preparation of this *Report* involved a number of commissioned studies by social scientists. The *Report* came out in favour of increased immigration levels, which were seen as conducive to economic growth. However, it also called for more efficient management of immigration, and argued that multiculturalism was poorly understood by large sections of the population. The result was a heated public discussion, with the then Leader of the Opposition (who became Prime Minister in 1996) John Howard arguing against Asian immigration and multiculturalism. Forced onto the defensive, the ALP Government implemented a main recommendation of the *CAAIP Report* by establishing a *Bureau of Immigration Research* (BIR) in 1989. This Bureau was to dominate institutional research in this field until 1996. In 1993 the Bureau was extended in scope to include population issues (*Bureau of Immigration and Population Research*, BIPR) and in 1995 multicultural issues were added (*Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research*, BIMPR)

---

[6] Further to the comments conveyed to me, Lesleyanne Hawthorne is exploring aspects of 'productive diversity' in a forthcoming paper entitled 'Picking Winners: The Recent Transformation of Australia's Skill Migration Policy'.

The Bureau represented the highest level of institutionalisation of research on migration and multicultural issues so far in Australia. Internationally, the only comparable government-funded effort is the Canadian Metropolis Program, which, however, gives more autonomy to its university-based 'Centres of Excellence' and is more comparative in outlook, with its annual international conferences. In its seven years of operation the Bureau produced hundreds of high-quality research reports and other publications (for an overview of research up to 1994 see (Wooden, et al. 1994) and for 1994-97: (Castles, et al. 1998) . The Director of the Bureau from 1989 until almost up to its closure by the coalition Government in 1996, Dr John Nieuwenhuysen, was determined to ensure high quality and credibility of its work. Although some research and statistical material were produced in-house, the great majority of research projects were contracted out to academics and consultants. Projects identified by the Bureau or by the Federal Government were put out to tender to a number of selected consultants, while a proportion of Bureau funds was set aside for projects suggested by outside researchers. Selection of projects was made on the basis of academic peer review processes, overseen by an Advisory Board representing government, academics and interest groups (ethnic communities, industry and trade unions). The initial Chairperson was economist, Glenn Withers, and he was succeeded by sociologist Stephen Castles. All Bureau work was published (again following peer review), usually as a Bureau report through the Australian Government Publishing Service. The Bureau also held large public research conferences every two years, as well as many smaller conferences and workshops.

At the same, OMA also commissioned a fair amount of research, although this tended to be even more directly related to policy formation than most Bureau projects. OMA projects concentration on issues of inter-group relations, equality of opportunities, cultural identity and citizenship. A special focus was on 'access and equity' in the delivery of government services to different groups of the population. The Bureau's approach guaranteed broad dissemination of migration research as well as a certain level of objectivity and balance in migration research. Nonetheless, the choice of research themes, the level of funding and the methods to be used were mainly determined by Government policy agendas. The Bureau selected the type of project useful to Government, and the type of

consultant likely to produce acceptable work. This did not altogether exclude critical researchers or diversity in methodologies, but overall there was a bias towards quantitative research using conventional methodologies such as human capital theory and multivariate analysis. The short-term nature of funding and the narrowly defined research questions imposed a narrow definition of knowledge related to administrative objectives, rather than to the general development of understanding in this field.

Overall, the Bureau provided an injection of research funding into the area, which encouraged increasing numbers of academics and private consultants to carry out studies on immigration and cultural diversity. Such funding ran parallel to the academic funding body – *the Australian Research Council* (ARC), which provided longer grants based on disciplinary themes and topics. This research was often less concerned with policy than with matters to do with institutional racism and everyday racism, culture and identity of immigrant groups and communities, multiculturalism and the issue of immigrant integration, the second generation, immigrant women and refugees. Not only did this research provide necessary descriptions and overviews, it frequently provided a critical analysis of the questions under review.

Upon coming to office in 1996, the Liberal-National Coalition Government quickly abolished both OMA and BIMPR. A small research section was set up within DIMA but with no capacity to carry out or fund original research. The Coalition had fought its 1996 Election campaign on a policy of reducing government expenditure in general and of cutting special services for minorities in particular. Prime Minister Howard was ideologically opposed to multiculturalism. Immigration was to be reduced and oriented towards economic goals rather than social and humanitarian ones. Thus the virtual destruction of Government research capacity in this area was consistent with overall policy objectives.

It now became clear how dependent research had become on the Government research bodies OMA and BIMPR. The commercial consultants quickly moved on to greener pastures, while university research units were closed down or reduced in size. For instance, the *Multicultural Centre at Sydney University* continued to exist in name, but without any paid staff. The *Centre for Multicultural Studies*

(CMS) at the University of Wollongong was closed down and replaced with a much smaller *Migration and Multicultural Studies* (MMS) Program within a larger research unit. MMS had a much-reduced staff, and had to seek funding from international sources. However, by 1998, academics interested in migration and multicultural research were beginning to re-orient, mainly by seeking funding through the ARC or from international sources. Researchers at the Universities of Wollongong and Newcastle won competitive funding to set up ARC Key Centre of Teaching and Research in 1999 – the *Centre on Asia-Pacific Studies and Social Transformation* (CAPSTRANS). This centre built on the concept of collaborative research with Asian academics successfully developed by the APMRN (see above). Research on migration in Asia and the Pacific was the largest and best developed of its four research programmes. Despite CAPSTRANS′ status as a Key Centre, funding was less than A$1 million a year for three years, so that most project funding had to be sought from other sources. Australian research funding for the social sciences had reached rock bottom.

Private industry has funded some work, such as a critical overview of migration research (Castles, et al. 1998). However, this has not filled the gap left by the cuts in government support and the decline of specialised university centres. The result of such trends has been a shift in research approaches, with more emphasis on theoretical and social-scientific objectives rather than on official policy agendas. More work is being done now on international comparative questions, especially with regard to Asia and the Pacific. The rise of the One Nation Party stimulated increased research interest in racism. Nonetheless, the demise of OMA and BIMPR led to an overall reduction in research activity on migration and multicultural issues. The conservative Liberal-National Coalition government placed very little value on such work. There is a sense in which this government promoted a certain brand of Australian nationalism that harks back to earlier days. The needs of the Australian economy and the goal of maintaining a narrow British-based Australian national identity dictate do not require a broad-based research agenda on immigration and ethnic relations.

In her article on the demise of BIMPR, Ruth Fincher argues that the closure of the Bureau revealed a new politics of nation-making pursued by the Liberal-National Party Coalition (Fincher 2001). The closure was symbolic of the new

politics that dramatically changed the core of immigration research. Fincher indicates that, over the years, there have been two opinion groups on the issues of immigration, cultural diversity, multiculturalism and the idea of a unified nation. The first centres around the idea that an 'ethnically diverse population, its growth fuelled by sustained and non-discriminatory immigration, benefits the "nation" by improving its economic resources, its social breadth, its international linkages, and its citizenship' (Fincher 2001, 28). This position is generally supported by a majority of the population, especially by those in the eastern states, and by recent Labour governments. The second opinion consists of the idea that an ethnically diverse society weakens the character of the Australian nation. She continues, 'Theirs is the view of essential Australianness that sees a national character as having been formed amongst Anglo-Australians from the time of English settlement' (Fincher 2001, 28). This was the view held by many in the Howard government, by the supporters of One Nation as well as by many Australians who had felt the effects of globalisation through a rise in employment and job insecurity.

There have been a number of damaging outcomes for migration research in Australia. First, with the continuing cuts in funding, there has been a decrease in the level of accumulated expertise that had built up over the previous twenty-five years. In fact, with the closure of other research centres around Australia, immigration research has become fragmented and disorganised. However, in 2003, an attempt to set a new immigration research network initiated by Mandy Thomas with ARC funding, attempted to turn the tide. Secondly, with the closure of the BIMPR and OMA, the immigration libraries housed in these two organisations, one in Melbourne and the other in Canberra, were also closed down. Thirdly, research funding has been channelled particularly towards research on economic issues. One sociologist, Bob Birrell, a critic of high levels of immigration and a proponent of the second position discussed by Fincher, is now in a position to influence government policy. He has influenced tighter restrictions on receipt of social benefits and on family reunion (Fincher 2001, 30).

Finally, Fincher indicates that the Howard government 'dumbed-down' government information about immigration and multiculturalism as it 'expresses

the federal government's concern to have its actions interpreted in terms of the simple questions of a set of people who seem electorally significant…The simplified "facts" in current use in the government's publicity material are also a management tool – part of the assurance that the government is managing the Migration Program so as not to harm some essential Australianness (with characteristics unspecified)' (Fincher 2001, 36). Rather than being concerned with the impacts of certain social processes, this government is more concerned to respond to the 'anti-Asian and anti-population-growth groups, and their apparent supporters in the national electorate' (Fincher 2001, 38).

In his recent book on the history and politics of Australian immigration, James Jupp (2002a) stresses the importance of the continuity of immigration policy as well as its contested nature. He suggests there are three main aspects to Australian immigration policy: the maintenance of British hegemony and white domination; the building of Australia both economically and militarily through selective migration; and the importance of the state in controlling this process (Jupp 2002a, 6). Jupp points out that Australia cannot be anything but a multicultural society and needs to abandon the ongoing myth of a homogenous white working-class society. The country has become more sophisticated, mobile, ethnically diverse and more oriented towards Asia. Unfortunately, neither the Coalition nor the Australian Labor Party are prepared to accept this reality. In a similar vein to Fincher, he believes that crude populism has replaced a scientific and humane approach to Australia's unique demographic and geo-political situation.

Concluding Overview

Since its inception, Australian immigration has challenged the concerns of a nation built on the near genocide of its indigenous people, on the settlement of a penal colony and on the need to populate with immigrants from many other nations. To this day, three main issues around immigration continue to be contested. Firstly, there is an ongoing concern with the state of the nation, where Australians belong and their national identity. Secondly, and allied to the first concern, is the question about sovereignty and who should be allowed in to settle in this country. Thirdly, debate continues about how Australians should

arrange for the social integration of migrants into Australian culture and institutions. In a broad sense, these three main concerns have formed the basis of immigration policy and much research.

With these questions in mind, there have been a number of significant influences on the study of immigration issues. One has been in terms of the migration process itself. It is clear that the uneasy decision to become a country of immigration compelled Anglo-Australians to question the many facets of their national identity. This in turn influenced their desire to retain a British identity and to expect migrants to completely integrate into the Anglo-society that they had developed over the previous century and a half. Migration policy has been one area in which there has been an interactive process between research and policy development, particularly after the election in 1972 of a reformist Labor government. Consecutive governments have consulted social scientists not only for statistical and descriptive data, but also for policy advice. Thus, social scientists have contributed not only to the development of parliamentary acts, but also to entry, refugee and settlement policies. The role of social scientists reached its heyday during the 1980s and early 1990s with a Labor government which provided strong support for immigration research.

The emergence of the welfare state has also contributed to this process. It made possible the development of a safety net for disempowered groups in the community. Migrants and their children, after Aborigines, were among the most disadvantaged people in the Australian community. The ideology on which the welfare state was based was the idea that the crippling aspects of capitalism were to be kept in check by a benevolent state. This lent itself to research on migrant poverty and other forms of social and political disadvantage. It also influenced the social policy aspect of multiculturalism where special programs were developed for migrants in order to redress the disparity between migrants and non-migrants. Equally, there was critical research, which analysed the role of a reformist capitalist state and the problems which emerged from this.

Immigration research was also influenced by the theoretical developments and fashions in the social sciences. It inherited the analytical problems inherent in the specific theoretical framework used. Since the time of the 'founding fathers',

sociologists have analysed the issue of value-free research. The founding fathers, beginning with the early positivists Comte and Durkheim, believed that objectivity could be attained through scientific methodology. Although Marx and later Althusser, for example, argued that sociology could be objective and scientific, Weber recognised that our values would influence the topics we choose to research. These issues became part of broader debates in immigration research. In the early post-war years, as mentioned earlier, the Chicago School had a strong influence on the social sciences in many western countries. Assimilation became a popular concept in the US, Canada, parts of Europe and Australia. Even the most liberal of social scientists inadvertently revealed some adherence to the ideology of assimilation. Some continue to be influenced by this ideology to this day.

From the late 1960s to the mid 1980s Marxism had a very strong influence in the Australian social sciences, as affecting sociology, geography and political science, political economy and socialist feminism. With the advent of the new social movements, there emerged a reformist atmosphere of progressive politics where class relations, agency, ideology and consciousness were debated in academic papers and at political meetings as well as in the community sector. Although one of the main problems with the early Marxist immigration research was its economic determinism, this was challenged by feminist theory as well as debates on the relationship between class, ethnicity and community. Ethnic relations along, with gender relations, became important analytical tools of daily political practice and of social scientific analysis. The use of 'ethnicity' as a sociological category, for example, revealed the complexity of various power relationships cutting across class, ethnicity and gender relations. Thus, the burning political questions of the time became the systematic analytical research questions of many social scientists. Similarly, the theoretical approach adopted by researchers became a marker for their political position. The politics of left-wing social scientists, some of whom were of non-English speaking background, was clearly evident, as many were also grass-roots activists.

The early stages of 'second wave' feminist theory can be traced back to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but the main body of feminist theories have been produced over the past fifty years. Feminist theories developed as a result

of the systematic bias and inadequacies in mainstream theories in which the position of women was either marginalised or ignored. Radical feminist theory emerged in the 1960s based on the premise that the 'personal is political', but feminist theory has also absorbed other theoretical traditions, leading to such approaches as liberal feminism, socialist and post-structural feminism. In turn, feminist analysis has contributed strongly to mainstream political and social theory. Feminist theory influenced much of the research on immigrant women and gender issues, while the work of activists provided some clarity to the areas that required systematic research. One issue that arose for immigrant women researchers and activists was that, even within a feminist framework, the issue of ethnicity often had to be struggled over and repeatedly put back on the agenda.

Left and women's politics were fairly prominent during this period. However, a competing perspective that was equally influential in policy came from functionalism and empiricism. The functionalist perspective was based on the idea of a cohesive society with an over-arching set of values. This was the perspective that strongly influenced the development of multiculturalism in the late 1970s and the 1980s. Functionalists tend to analyse society as always having the propensity towards equilibrium, stability and order, often ignoring the context of unequal power relations, which gives rise to conflict. It is teleological in that society is explained in terms of its consequences and not its causes. As a result, a stratified society is natural to functionalists because it already exists. This position explains Zubrzycki's call for 'structural assimilation'. Functionalism is often referred to as 'establishment sociology' and as Adorno stated, 'establishment sociology is the science of resignation to the status quo' (19??). Similarly, functionalists and empiricists often hide behind the mantle of value-free sociology. The main problem with empiricism is that the data collected are meant to explain all aspects of a phenomenon. The complexities of social life, better understood through a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis, are frequently ignored.

A more recent fashion is post-structuralist cultural studies which, although popularising a return to micro-research, has produced a new set of problems. The post-structuralist preference for play, fragmentation and differentiation

operates as a strategic device to unsettle the universal, foundational, essentialist power of the normalizing discourses of grand narratives and theories. Theorists such as Foucault, Lyotard and Derrida have contributed their deconstructive project in order to make 'space for difference', for the 'subaltern', for local forms of everyday life. One problem that emerges from the fragmented pluralism of post-structuralism is that, for example, racism and sexism end up being defined as discrete instances throughout institutions, or in the society, which can be discretely challenged. Post-structuralists, thus, abandon society-as-structure for a preferred society-as-process so as to move away from the notion of fixity and unitariness. As a result of this discreteness and fluidity an analysis of unequal, enduring discriminatory practices and the continuity of ideological structures over time is abandoned. Post-structuralist and cultural studies research has produced new insights into the field of immigration and ethnic relations research. However, is vital that we continue to question and analyse historically the capitalist, patriarchal and racialized structures and processes that inherently generate inequality. This is part of the grand narrative that post-structuralism dismisses.

Over time, such theoretical perspectives or fashions have been absorbed within many of the disciplines. For instance, in the 1970s feminism swept through the various disciplines, as did Marxism. Consequently, the closure of disciplinary boundaries has not been a major issue. On the other hand, as in many other western countries, in the 1990s researchers were informed by national funding bodies that interdisciplinary research proposals would receive favourable attention. Although interdisciplinary research had been carried out over the years in immigration studies, institutional support for it was perceived by many as a positive step. Interdisciplinary research using a range of theories, from pluralist to middle range theories as well as holistic grand theories, has become more prevalent. Around this time, researchers were also encouraged to develop international networks. Given their geographical distance, international networking has become much easier for Australian researchers with the development of the Internet. By the late 1990s, the situation had changed once again, alerting us to the problems arising when research funding is aligned too closely to the needs of political parties. Even though the Australian Research Council is supposed to independent of the government of the day, for the past 15

years or so, it has in fact worked closely with governments to identify the areas most relevant to the national interest.

In the 1980s and early 1990s, Australian researchers enjoyed giving a positive message at international meetings about migration: Australia had a relatively non-discriminatory immigration policy and the multicultural model combined recognition of cultural diversity with government measures to achieve equal opportunities for all. Australian multiculturalism seemed to offer valuable lessons for European countries. Today, Australian immigration scholars (those few remaining!) have the unenviable task of trying to explain the rise of the One Nation Party, Prime Minister Howard's hostility to multiculturalism, the ALP's inability to stand up for openness and cultural diversity, and the culmination of all this in the *Tampa* affair.

There are numerous explanations for this state of affairs, though two main schools of thought need mentioning. One argues that the current populist exclusionism is a reaction against the changes of the Hawke-Keating years. People were frightened by the rapid move towards an open, globalized society and need time to digest it; progress will resume in due course. The second view is that Australia has gone back to its historical norm of insularity, racism and fear of its northern neighbours. In this reading, the climate of the 25 years from 1972 to 1996 was a temporary aberration caused by a unique constellation of international and national forces. Howard's policies may hark back to a long defunct British empire, but they also fit into Bush's post September 11 world order. The migrant voice and immigration research have received a strong blow. Out of these circumstances, perhaps a new perspective will emerge.

REFERENCES

ACPEA 1982 'Multiculturalism for all Australians: Our developing Nationhood', Canberra: AGPS.

Alcorso, C. 1993 'Economic Stocktake: Trends and Issues for Non-English Speaking Background Women since 1982', *Australian Feminist Studies* (18): 49-66.

— 2001a 'Migrant and Refugee Women at Work in Australia: A Profile', *Speaking Out* (Summer 2001): 4-6.

— 2001b 'Recent Immigrants and Refugees entering the workforce: What is the Picture?' *Speaking Out* (Summer 2001): 7-8.

Alcorso, C. and Harrison, G. 1993 *Blue Collar and Beyond: The Experiences of Non-English Speaking Background Women in the Australian Labour Force*, Canberra: AGPS.

Alcorso, C. and Schofield, T. 1991 'The National non-English speaking background women's health strategy', Canberra: AGPS for the Office of the Status of Women, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

Ang, I. 1993 'Migrations of Chineseness: Ethnicity in the Postmodern World', *Cultural Studies:Pluralism and Theory* 2: 32-44.

— 2001 *On Not Speaking Chinese*, London: Routledge.

APIC and AEAC 1979 'Multiculturalism and its Implications for Immigration Policy', Canberra: AGPS.

Baker, L. and Miller, P. 1988 'The Economics of Immigration: Proceedings of a Conference', Australian National University Canberra: AGPS.

Betts, K. 1993 'Public Discourse, Immigration and the New Class', in J. Jupp and M. Kabala (eds) *The Politics of Australian Immigration*, Canberra: AGPS.

Betts, K. and Rapson, V. 1997 'Pride and Commitment: Patriotism in Australia', *People and Place* vol. 5(no. 1): pp. 55–66.

Birrell, B. 1993 'Ethnic Concentrations: The Vietnamese Experience', *People and Place* vol. 1(no. 3): pp. 26–32.

Birrell, R. 2001 'Immigration On The Rise: The 2001-2002 Immigration Program', *People and Place* 9(2): 21-28.

Birrell, R. and Birrell, T. 1981 *An Issue of People*, Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.

Birrell, R. and Khoo, S.-E. 1995 *The Second Generation in Australia: Educational and Occupational Characteristics, Statistical Report No. 14*, Canberra: AGPS.

Birrell, R. and Seitz, A. 1986 'The Ethnic Problem in Education: The Emergence and Definition of an Issue' *AIMA Research Conference*, Melbourne.

Blainey, G. 1984 *All for Australia*, Sydney: Methuen Haynes.

BLMR 1986 *Migrants in the Australian Labour Market*, Research Report No. 10, Canberra: AGPS.

Borrie, W. D. (ed) 1947 *A White Australia: Australia's Population Problem*: Australasian Publishing Co., for Australian Institute of Political Science.

— 1949 *Immigration: Australia's Problems and Prospects*, Sydney: Angus and Robertson.

— 1954 *Italians and Germans in Australia: A Study of Assimilation*, Melbourne: Cheshire.

— 1955 'Australia' *The Positive Contribution of Immigration*, Paris: UNESCO.

Bottomley, G. 1975 'Migrant Women', in J. Mercer (ed) *The Other Half*, Melbourne: Penguin.

— 1984 'Women on the move: Migration and feminism', in G. Bottomley and M. d. Lepervanche (eds) *Ethnicity, Class and Gender in Australia*, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

Bottomley, G. and de Lepervanche, M. 1984 *Ethnicity, Class and Gender in Australia*, Sydney: George, Allen and Unwin.

Bottomley, G., de Lepervanche, M. and Martin, J. 1991 *Intersexions*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Bridge, R. 2001 'Migrants in the Australian Labour Market - Some Trends and Developments', *People and Place* 9(1): 51-60.

Brown, M. S. 1961 'Prejudice and the Migration Programme' *Citizenship Digest*, Canberra: AGPS.

Bullivant, B. 1986 'Are Anglo-Australian Students becoming the New Self-Deprived in Comparison with Ethnics?' *Seminar Paper, Monash University*, Melbourne.

Burnley, I. 2001 *The Impact of Immigration on Australia: a demographic approach*, Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

CAAIP 1988 *Immigration: A Commitment to Australia: The Report of the Committee to Advise on Australia's Immigration Policies*, Canberra: AGPS.

Cahill, D. 1996 *Immigration and Schooling in the 90s*, Canberra: BIMPR.

Castles, S. 1994 'Democracy and multicultural citizenship: Australian debates and their relevance for Western Europe', in R. Bauböck (ed) *From Aliens to Citizens*, Avebury: Aldershot.

— 1995 'How Nation-States Respond to Immigration and Ethnic Diversity', *New Community* 21(3): 293–308.

— 1996 'The racisms of globalisation', in E. Vasta and S. Castles (eds) *The Teeth are Smiling: The Pesistence of Racism in Multicultural Australia*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

— 1997 'Multicultural citizenship: the Australian experience', in V. Bader (ed) *Citizenship and Exclusion*, London: Macmillan.

— 1998 'Einwanderung und Sozialpolitik in Australien', in M. Bommes and J. Halfmann (eds) *Migration in nationalen Wohlfahrtstaaten: Theoretische und vegleichende Untersuchungen*, Osnabrück: Universitätsverlag Rasch.

Castles, S., Cope, B., Kalantzis, M. and Morrissey, M. 1988a *Mistaken Identity - Multiculturalism and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia*, 1 Edition, Sydney: Pluto Press.

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

Castles, S. and Miller, M. J. 2003 *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*, Third Edition, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Castles, S., Morrissey, M. and Pinkstone, B. 1988b 'Migrant Employment and Training and Industry Restructuring', Canberra: OMA.

Chan, J. 1996 'Police Racism: Experiences and Reforms', in E. Vasta and S. Castles (eds) *The teeth are smiling: The persistence of racism in Multicultural Australia*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Clapham, K., Schofield, T. and Alcorso, C. 1993 'Managing the work injury of women from non-English speaking backgrounds', in N. W. s. C. Council. (ed), Canberra: AGPS.

Collins, J. 1975 'The Political Economy of Post-War Immigration', in E. L. Wheelright and K. Buckley (eds) *Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism*, Vol. Volume 1, Sydney: Australian and New Zealand Book Co.

— 1984 'Immigration and class: the Australian experience', in G. Bottomley and M. d. Lepervanche (eds) *Ethnicity, Class and Gender in Australia*, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

— 1991 *Migrant Hands in a Distant Land: Australia's Post-war Immigration*, 2 Edition, Sydney: Pluto Press.

— 1999 'Review Article, Ghassan Hage White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in Multicultural Society'', *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 34(4): 387-394.

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

Collins, J., Nobel, G., Poynting, S. and Tabar, P. 2002 *Kebabs, Kids, Cops and Crime: Youth, Ethnicity and Crime*, Sydney: Pluto Press.

Collins, J. H. 1978 'The Political Economy of Post-War Immigration', in T. Wheelwright and V. Buckley (eds) *Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism*, Edn 2 Edition, Sydney: ANZ Book Company.

Committee for Stage 1 of the Review of Migrant and Multicultural Services, R. C. J. J. 1986 *Don't Settle for Less*, Canberra: AGPS.

Cope, B. and Kalantzis, M. 1997 *Productive Diversity - A New, Australian Model for Work and Management*, Sydney: Pluto Press.

Copland, D. 1951 'The Economic Implications of Large-Scale Migration' *Citizenship Digest*, Canberra: AGPS.

Cox, E. 1993 'Policy Contest: Immigrant Women on a Flat Playing Field', *Australian Feminist Studies*(18): 25-41.

Cox, E., Jobson, E. and Martin, J. 1976 'We Can Not Talk Our Rights: Migrant Women 1975', Sydney: NSW Council of Social Services and School of Sociology, UNSW.

Crock, M. and Saul, B. 2002 *Future Seekers: Refugees and the Law in Australia*, Sydney: Federation Press.

Davidson, A. 1997a *From Subject to Citizen: Australian Citizenship in the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 1997b 'Multiculturalism and Citizenship: silencing the migrant voice', *Journal of Intercultural Studies* vol. 18(no. 2): pp. 77–92.

de Lepervanche, M. 1975 'Australian Immigrants 1788–1940: Desired and Unwanted', in E. L. Wheelwright and K. Buckley (eds) *Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism*, Vol. vol. 1, Sydney: Australia and New Zealand Book Co.

— 1980 'From Race to Ethnicity', *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 1(16): 4-17.

— 1984 'The Naturalness of Inequality', in G. Bottomley and M. de Lepervanche (eds) *Ethnicity, Class and Gender in Australia*, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

— 1990 'Holding it all Together: Multiculturalism, Nationalism and the State in Australia,' *XII World Congress of Sociology*, Madrid.

DIEA 1986 *Don't Settle for Less: Report of the Committee for Stage 1 of the Review of Migrant and Multicultural Programs and Services*, Canberra: AGPS.

DIMA 1999 'A New Agenda for Multicultural Australia', Canberra: Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs.

Elkin, A. P. 1947 'Is White Australian Doomed?' in W. D. Borrie (ed) *A White Australia: Australia's Population Problem*, Sydney: Australasian Publishing Co., for Australian Institute of Political Science.

Evans, M., Jones, F. and Kelley, J. 1988 'Job discrimination against immigrants?' in J. Kelley and C. Bean (eds) *Australian Attitudes: Social and Political Analyses from the National Social Science Survey*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Evans, M. D. R. 1984 'Immigrant women in Australia: Resources, family and work', *International Migration Review* vol. 18(Winter): pp. 1063–90.

Evans, M. D. R. and Kelley, J. 1986 'Immigrants' Work: Equality and Discrimination in the Australian Labour Market', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* Vol 22(2): 186-207.

Fincher, R. 2001 'Immigration Research in the politics of an anxious nation', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 19(1): 25-42.

Fincher, R., Foster, L. and Wilmot, R. 1994 *Gender Equity and Australian Immigration Policy*, Sydney: AGPS.

Foucault, M. 1979 *Discipline and Punish*, Victoria: Peregrine Books (Penguin).

— 1982 'The Subject and Power', *Critical Inquiry* 8(Summer): 777-795.

Fraser, L. 1997 'The Impact of Contract Out on Female NESB Workers: case study of the NSW Government Cleaning Services', Canberra: AGPS.

Galbally, F. 1978 'The Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services for Migrants', Canberra: Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs.

Gilroy, P. 1987 *There Ain't no Black in the Union Jack*, London: Hutchinson.

Gramsci, A. 1971 *Prison Notebooks*, New York: International Publishers.

Greenwood, G. 1947 'The Australian Political Scene', *Pacific Affairs* Vol 20(No 3): 276--89.

Hage, G. 1998 *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*, Sydney and New York: Pluto Press and Routledge.

— 2002 *Against Parnoid Nationalism: searching for hope in a shrinking society*, Sydney: Pluto press.

Harris, H. L. 1947 'Australia from Overseas', in W. D. Borrie (ed) *A White Australia: Australia's Population Problem*, Sydney: Australasian Publishing Co. for Australian Institute of Political Science.

Hawthorne, L. 2001 'The globalisation of the nursing workforce: barriers to overseas qualified nurses in Australia', *Nursing Inquiry* 8(4).

Healy, E. 1996 'Welfare Benefits and Residential Concentrations Amongst Recently-Arrived Migrant Communities', *People and Place* vol. 4(no. 2): pp. 20–31.

Henderson, R. F., Harcourt, A. and Harper, R. J. A. 1970 *People in Poverty: A Melbourne Survey*, Melbourne: Cheshire.

Holt, H. E. 1956 'What Immigration Means to Australia' *Ministerial Statement to House of Representatives, Reprint 8th August*, Canberra: AGPS.

Horne, D. 1994 *How to be Australian*, Melbourne: National Centre for Australian Studies, Monash University.

Hugo, G. 1995 'Atlas of the Australian People: 1991 National Overview' *Third National Immigration and Population Outlook Conference*, Adelaide.

Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission (HREOC) 1991 *Racist Violence: Report of the National Inquiry into Racist Violence in Australia*, Canberra: AGPS.

— 1993 *State of the Nation 1993: A report on people of non-English speaking backgrounds*, Canberra: AGPS.

— 1994 *State of the Nation 1994: A Report on People of Non-English Speaking Backgrounds*, Federal Race Commissioner, Canberra: AGPS.

— 1995 *State of the Nation: A Report on People of Non-English Speaking Backgrounds*, Canberra: AGPS.

Inglis, C. 1996 'Multiculturalism: new policy responses to diversity', Paris: Unesco.

Ip, D. 2003 'Research paper on Three Chinese Groups in Australia' *Metropolis Conference*, Vienna, September 2003.

Iredale, R. 1997 *Skills Transfer: International Migration and Accreditation Issues*, Wollongong: Wollongong University Press.

Iredale, R., Bilik, N. and Guo, F. 2003a *China's Minorities on the Move: Selected Case Studies*, New York: M. E. Sharpe.

Iredale, R., Hawksley, C. and Castles, S. (eds) 2003b *Migration in the Asia Pacific: Population, Settlement and Citizenship Issues*, Cheltenham and Northampton MA: Edward Elgar.

Jakubowicz, A. 1981 'State and Ethnicity: Multiculturalism as Ideology', *Australian - New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 17(3): 4-13.

— 1984 'State and Ethnicity: Multiculturalism as ideology', in J. Jupp (ed) *Ethnic Politics in Australia*, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

— 1986 'Social Science, Ethnicity and Immigration: An Overview of Research in Academic Institutions in Australia' *Ethnicity and Multiculturalism 1986 National Research Conference*, Melbourne.

Jayasuriya, L. and Kee-Pookong 1999 *The Asianization of Australia? Some Facts about the Myths*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Jones, A. 2001 'The Business Council of Australia's Case for Population Growth: An Ecological Critique', *People and Place* 9(2): 49-57.

Jones, F. 1996 'National Identity and Social Values', *People and Place* vol. 4(no. 4): pp. 17–26.

Jordens, A.-M. 1995 *Redefining Australians: Immigration, Citizenship and National Identity*, Sydney: Hale and Iremonger Pty Limited.

Jupp, J. 1966 *Arrivals and Departures*, Melbourne: Cheshire-Lansdowne.

— 1984 *Ethnic Politics in Australia*, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

— 1993 'The Ethnic Lobby and Immigration Policy', in J. Jupp and M. Kabala (eds) *The Politics of Australian Immigration*, Canberra: AGPS.

— 1996 '1996 Federal election: the ethnic dimension', *FECCA 1996 Federal Election Kit*.

— (ed) 2001 *The Australian People: an Encyclopedia of the Nation, Its People and Their Origins*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 2002a *From White Australia to Woomera*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 2002b 'Undoing the Damage and Restoring Multiculturalism' *Beyond Tolerance: National Conference on Racism*, Sydney: Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC).

Jupp, J. and Kabala, M. 1993 *The Politics of Australian Immigration*, Canberra: AGPS.

Jupp, J., York, B. and McRobbie, A. 1989 *The Political Participation of Ethnic Minorities in Australia*, Canberra: AGPS.

Kalantzis, M. and Cope, B. 1984 'Multiculturalism and education policy', in G. Bottomley and M. de Lepervanche (eds) *Ethnicity, Class and Gender in Australia*, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

Kelly, J. and McAllister, I. 1984 'Immigrants, Socio-Economic Attainment, and Politics in Australia', *British Journal of Sociology* Vol. 25(September).

Kukathas, C. 1993 'Multiculturalism and the Idea of an Australian Identity', in C. Kukathas (ed) *Multicultural Citizens: The Philosophy and Politics of Identity*, St Leonards: The Centre for Independent Studies.

Lever-Tracy, C. 1981 'Post War Immigrants in Australia and Western Europe: in reserve or centre forward?' *Ethnicity and Class Conference*, University of Wollongong, NSW.

Lever-Tracy, C., Ip, D. and Tracy, N. 1996 *The Chinese Diaspora and Mainland ~China: An Emerging Economic Synergy*, Basingstoke: MacMillan.

Lever-Tracy, C. and Quinlan, M. 1988 *A Divided Working Class*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

MacQueen, H. 1970 *A New Britannia*, Victoria: Penguin.

Martin, J. 1978 *The Migrant Presence*, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

— 1984 'Non English-speaking women: production and social reproduction', in G. Bottomley and M. d. Lepervanche (eds) *Ethnicity, Class and Gender in Australia*, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

— 1986 'Non-English speaking migrant women in Australia', in N. N. Grieve and A. Burns (eds) *Australian Women: New Feminist Perspectives*, Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

— 1988 'Marxism and the Migration Debate in Australia' *School of Behavioural Sciences*, Sydney: Macquarie University.

— 1991 'Multiculturalism and feminism', in G. Bottomley, M. de Lepervanche and J. Martin (eds) *Intersexions*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

McAllister, I. 1988 'Ethnic issues and voting in the 1987 Federal election', *Politics* vol. 23(no. 2): pp. 219-47.

McCall and et.al. 1985 'Introduction', in I. Burnley and et.al. (eds) *Immigration and Ethnicity in the 1980's*, Sydney: Longman Cheshire.

McKay, B. (ed) 1999 *Unmasking whiteness: race relations and reconciliation*, Nathan: Queesnland Studies Centre Griffith University.

Morrissey, M., Dibden, M. and Mitchell, C. 1992 *Immigration and Industry Restructuring in the Illawarra*, Canberra: AGPS.

Morrissey, M. J. and Trompf, P. 1986 *Industrial Democracy in a Multiethnic Workforce*, Canberra: AGPS.

Nicolaou, L. 1991 *Australian unions and immigrant workers*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

NMAC, N. M. A. C. 1995 *Multicultural Australia, The Next Steps: Towards and Beyond 2000*, (Two Volumes) Canberra: AGPS.

O'Loughlin, T. and Watson, I. 1997 *Loyalty is a One Way Street*, Sydney: ACIRRT.

OMA 1989 *National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia*, Canberra: AGPS.

Parella, L. 1993 'Participation in Government Structures: Progress or Co-Option?' *Australian Feminist Review*(18): 67-79.

Park, R. E. 1950 *Race and Culture*, Glencoe: The Free Press.

Parkin, F. 1982 *Max Weber*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Perera, S. and Pugliese, J. 1997 ''Racial suicide': the re-licensing of racism in Australia: political developments and changes in attitudes toward race in Australia', *Race and Class* 01.

Phizacklea, A. and Miles, R. 1980 *Labour and Racism*, London: Routledge.

Price, C. A. 1956 'Assimilation' *Citizenship Digest*, Canberra: AGPS.

Ram, K. 1996 'Liberal multiculturalism's 'NESB Women': A South Asian post-colonial feminist perspective on the liberal impoverishment of 'difference'', in E. Vasta and S. Castles (eds) *The teeth are smiling: The persistence of racism in Multicultural Australia*, Sydney: Allen Unwin.

Reynolds, H. 1987 *Frontier*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Rivett, K. (ed) 1962 *Immigration: Control or Colour Bar*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Rizvi, F. 1996 'Racism, reorientation and the cultural politics of Asia-Australia relations', in E. Vasta and S. Castles (eds) *The teeth are smiling: The persistence of racism in Multicultural Australia*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Rubinstein, K. 1995 'Citizenship in Australia: unscrambling its meaning', *Melbourne University Law Review* 20(2).

Siew-Ean, K. and Price, C. A. 1996 *Understanding Australia's Ethnic Composition*, Canberra: AGPS.

Smith, T. F. 2002 'Engineering brain-gain revisited', *People and Place* 5(4).

Smolicz, J. 1981 'Core values and cultural identity', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4(1): 75-90.

Smolicz, J. J. 1997 'Australia: From Migrant Country to Multicultural Nation', *International Migration Review* vol. 31(no. 1): pp. 171–86.

Stevens, F. S. 1971 *Racism: the Australian Experience - Prejudice and Xenophobia*, Vol. 1, Sydney: Australia and New Zealand Book Company.

— 1972a *Racism: The Australia Experience - Colonialism*, Sydney: Australia and New Zealand Book Company.

— 1972b *Racism: the Australian Experience - Black versus White*, Vol. 2, Sydney: Australia and New Zealand Book Company.

Thomas, M. 1999 *Dreams in the Shadows*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Vasta, E. 1991 'Gender, Class and Ethnic Relations: The Domestic and Work Experiences of Italian Migrant Women in Australia', in G. Bottomley, M. de Lepervanche and J. Martin (eds) *Intersexions*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

— 1992 'The second generation Italo-Australians', in S. Castles, C. Alcorso, G. Rando and E. Vasta (eds) *Australia's Italians*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

— 1993a 'Immigrant women and the politics of resistance', *Australian Feminist Studies*(18): 5-23.

— 1993b 'Immigrant women and the politics of resistance', *Australian Feminist Studies* vol. 18: 5-23.

— 1993c 'Introduction', *Australian Feminist Studies*(18): 1-4.

— 1993d 'Multiculturalism and ethnic identity: The relationship between racism and resistance', *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 29(2): 209-25.

— 1996 'Dialectics of domination: racism and multiculturalism', in E. Vasta and S. Castles (eds) *The teeth are smiling: The persistence of racism in multicultural Australia*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

— 1999 'Multicultural Politics and Resistance: Migrants Unite?' in G. Hage and R. Couch (eds) *The Future of Australian Multiculturalism*, Sydney: RIHSS Sydney University.

— (ed) 2000 *Citizenship, Community and Democracy*, London; New York: Macmillan, St. Martins Press.

Vasta, E. and Castles, S. (eds) 1996 *The Teeth are Smiling: The Persistence of Racism in Multicultural Australia*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Vernon, R. 1965 'Report of the Committee of Economic Inquiry', Canberra: AGPS.

Viviani, N. 1996 *The Indochinese in Australia 1975-1995: from Burnt Boats to Barbeques*, Melbourne: Oxford.

Warhurst, J. 1993 'The growth lobby and its opponents: business, unions, environmentalists and other interest groups', in J. Jupp and M. Kabala (eds) *The Politics of Australian Immigration*, Canberra: AGPS.

White, R. 1981 *Inventing Australia*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Wilton, J. and Bosworth, R. 1984 *Old Worlds and New Australia*, Victoria: Penguin.

Wooden, M., Holton, R., Hugo, G. and Sloan, J. 1994 *Australian Immigration: A Survey of the Issues*, Canberra: AGPS.

Zappalà, G. 1997 'The Parliamentary Responsiveness of Australian Federal MPs to their Ethnic Constituents', *Department of the Parliamentary Library Research Paper* No.8.

Zubrzycki, J. 1964 *Settlers of the La Trobe Valley*, Canberra: ANU Press.

— 1968 'The Questing Years' *The Questing Years*, Canberra: AGPS.