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Abstract
The policy of multiculturalism was primarily a product of Labor Government under PM Gough Whitlam during the 1970s. The significant meaning of multiculturalism came to be accepted as providing all Australians – regardless of ethnic background, race and religion – equality and freedom. Australian multiculturalism has been closely related to the policy of immigration. The country had experienced the implementation of Immigration Restriction Act declared in 1901, which was popularly known as “a White Australia Policy”. The policy seemed to prefer immigrants derived from Anglo-Saxon origin and Western European countries than those from Asian origin. The outbreak of the Second World War resulted in the destruction of Europe and the fall of a great number of victims. The Australian involvement in the Pacific war contributed to the shortage of population due to the victims fell during the war. This, led to a crucial issue on population - - Who will defend Australia? After the war the White Australia Policy (W.A.P) seemed to be gradually weakened and finally ceased. Australia then commenced a nation building program through the changing of immigration policy - an open door policy of immigration was thus established. Historical documents have recorded the influx of immigrants derived from various parts of the world began to enter Australia since 1950s. The process of making a multicultural Australian society was then taking place, and finally led to the introduction of a multicultural policy in the 1970s. The implementation of a multicultural policy has created further crucial problems. One of the problems appeared was the issue of sustainability in various sectors for all Australians. The pro-contra responses towards the multicultural policy demonstrates the dynamics of a liberal democratic ethos operating in Australia. To some extends, such an ethos seems to have been poisoned by racism. The paper discusses a brief history of multiculturalism in Australia, and how the multicultural policy was implemented and responded.
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1. An Immigrants’ Country
Australia is a nation of immigrants. The indigenous Australians are Aborigines. Their ancestors were said to have settled in the continent 40 000 years ago. The European settlement was commenced 60 years following the establishment of a penal colony in the continent which took place in 1788. The penal colony feature of Australia seemed to have discouraged most Europeans to immigrate to Australia. The
transportation system which brought approximately 160,000 convicts to Australia was gradually terminated in the eastern colonies by 1853, while in Western Australia until 1867.

The discovery of gold in the eastern Australia in the 1850s led to the drastic increase of migrant population. The glitter of Australia’s gold had attracted migrants from various parts of the world. They mainly derived from the British Isles and New Zealand. Others came from Germany, Italy, Poland, China, America, Scandinavia and Hungary. In the decade 1851 to 1860 the population of Australian colonies grew from 405,400 to 1,145,000, and some 601,000 migrants arrived.\(^1\) Between 1851 and 1861 the number of Chinese increased from less than 2,000 to 40,000, making them the third largest national group in Australia after the British and the Germans.\(^2\) The large number of Chinese entering gold fields was said to have contributed to the cultural and social disruption of the Whites’ community. Differences in cultures of both races seemed to be the source of the Whites’ hatred falling towards the Chinese. The Whites’ refusal of Chinese migrants appeared in *the Goulburn Herald* dated 1 January 1853:

> … Our objection to Chinese emigration is not solely grounded on the manner in which it has been carried out. It must be remembered that the people we are thus introducing into our colonial society are as opposite in the habits, manner and customs, as two nations possibly can be; that they have scarcely a language in common.

In 1854 the Victorian Government passed the *Chinese Restriction Act*.\(^3\) The White’s fear of the Chinese existence in the continent was strongly expressed in a series of articles published regularly on the front page of *the Goulburn Herald* during the 1850s titled on “The Horrors of Chinese Emigration.” The accumulation of such a hatred feeling resulted in a social conflict as occurred in a gold field, Lambing flat, New South Wales, in 1861. Another evidence expressing a derogatory attitude was expressed in *the Bulletin* of 12 November 1887 which suggested that prior to entering Australia, the Chinese had to experience the Darwinian evolution:

> The Chinaman’s attempt to turn himself into a White Australia by a legal fiction is insult added to injury, and we trust a sense of the extent of the insult will accelerate his expulsion. Beside, the transition is too violent to be good for him. Let him go back to his Middle Kingdom and turn himself into a monkey, and work slowly up to the Darwinian scale as the white man himself has to do. Then let him come back to Australia a million years hence and try again.\(^4\)

Such White racial attitudes towards the Chinese resulted in a petition directed towards the Legislative Assembly of Victoria:

> To the Honorable of the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly,

> Sitting on Chinese Business, we are much obligated -We Chinese on the first coming to this Gold Field thought the English very kind, then the Chinese were glad to come digging gold and delighted the mercy manifested. Now we learn that the newspapers complain that we Chinaman bring no wife and children to this country; our reson is, that we wish to leave some of the family to look after our


\(^2\) Ibid.

\(^3\) Ibid., p.486.

\(^4\) *The Bulletin*, 12 November 1887, p. 5.
aged parents as the climate there is very rough; our women too are not like English women, when they go into ships they cannot walk or stand, and we can not afford the passage money …

(Here follow Signatures)5

In the meantime, social tension, racism and brutalism towards the Aborigines were also evident long before the arrival of Chinese migrants.6 The Whites’ derogatory attitudes can be found in the usage of language directed to the Aborigines. They includes, for instance, ‘a source of annoyance’, ‘hostile’, ‘cunning’, ‘treacherous’, ‘servile, despicable and humiliating position’, ‘savage’, ‘horrible cruelties’, ‘wild tribe’, inferior and degraded position’, and little better than ape.”7 A brutal massacre of Aborigines carried out by the White settlers, for instance, took place in June 1838 in Myall Creek, New South Wales which resulted in 25 Aborigines killed. The first court session regarding the conflict between White settlers and Aborigines was then held, which resulted in the hanging execution of seven White killers.8 The execution consequently seemed to have been worsening the relation between the White settlers and the Aborigines as reported by William Thomas in 1839 that ‘since the executions in Sydney, settlers were more intent than ever on destroying blacks’.9

The integrated, harmonious and coherent atmospheres performed by various ethnic and racial groups in Australia were thus scarcely found throughout the nineteenth century. The following section will examine whether racism is a dominant factor in Australia during the twentieth century and how the immigration policy led to the establishment of a multicultural Australia.

2. Immigration Policy

The Commonwealth of Australia came into existence when the Federal Constitution was proclaimed by the Governor General, Lord Hopetoun on 1 January 1901.10 The 1901 census showed that the population of Australia was 3 773 801. More than 77 percent had been born in Australia and 18 percent in the UK.11 The census did not include the Aboriginal population. It is estimated that their number had fallen from 300 000 in 1788 to 95 000 in 1901.12

The Immigration Restriction Act which was declared by the Federal Government of Australia on December 23, 1901 has been popularly called as ‘a White Australia Policy.’ According to the Act, ‘a Dictation Test’ had to be taken by peoples prior to migrate into Australia. In addition, there were also regulations concerning with a temporary residence and a deportation. The ‘Dictation Test’ seemed to be an effective strategy to carefully examine the language capability of the people intending to enter

9 Ibid.
11 Ibid., p. 3.
Australia, and at the same time to abandon unwilling immigrants as stated in the following lines:

Any person who when asked to do so by an officer fails to write out a dictation and sign in the presence of the officer a passage of fifty words in length in any European language by the officer (is a prohibited immigrant).13

Myra Willard, a historian, noted in her book History of the White Australia Policy that “the fundamental reason for the adoption of the White Australia Policy is the preservation of a British-Australian nationality”.14 Willard, thus noted:

...this primary reason for this policy found expression in the resolve to maintain British character and institutions in the Australian Colonies; towards the end of the century, however, it was expressed in terms of Australian nationalism. Australians feared that non-European immigration – the only unsought immigration, except from Britain, that flowed with any strength – might radically alter, perhaps destroy, the British character of the community. They knew that racial unity, though not necessarily racial homogeneity, was essential for national unity. The union of a people depends on the common loyalty to common ideals, and on common belief as the best course in general to pursue to attain these ideals.15

It is thus obvious from the above evidence, that ‘the unsought immigrants’ were Chinese, who performed their own cultural attitudes, mores, and values in the ways that were different from those of European settlers. In the meantime, Alfred Deakin, the Chief Justice in the first Commonwealth Government (1901), emphasized the importance of a racial unity in his speech concerning the subject of White Australia in the Parliamentary Debates:

A united race means not only that its members can intermix, intermarry and associate without degradation on other side, but implies one inspired by the same ideas, and an aspiration towards the same ideals, of a people possessing the general cast of character, tone of thought, the same constitutional training and tradition – a people qualified to live under this constitution, ...., and to develop themselves under it to the full height and extent of their capacity.16

The involvement of Australia in the First and Second World Wars resulted in the fall of a large number of Australian soldiers. This led to the decrease of Australian population, while there was a possibility of foreign invasion during the Second World War. Such a situation created a belief that Australia needed a significant increase in its population. The need was also demanded to develop and reconstruct Australia’s industries as rapid as possible. Thus, in July 1945 the first Minister for Immigration, Arthur Calwell, initiated a large skill immigration program aimed at realizing population increases of two percent per annum. He expected to have 10 migrants from the UK for every non-British migrant, but the number of Britons was just not available. Finally, the reliance was placed upon Europeans displaced during the war, especially those with industrial and trade skills. In 1948 a displaced persons scheme was

15 Ibid., p.189.
16 Ibid.
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established which introduced an estimated 170,000 settlers to Australia over the three years of its operation. Australia then signed the assisted passage agreements with European countries to ensure the continued availability of migrants to meet Australia’s need. The agreements include with the UK (1947), Malta (1948), the Netherlands (1951), Italy (1951) and The Federal Republic of Germany (1952). In 1951 Australia became a foundation member of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM), which was established to provide migrants from Europe transport arrangement, financial assistance towards passage costs and related services. The former Prime Minister E.G. Whitlam noted in his book, that through ICEM, Australia was able to make informal tripartite migration arrangements with Austria (1952), Greece (1952), Spain (1958), Belgium (1961) and other European countries. It is obvious that Calwell was in favor of European migrants. Calwell’s racial attitude towards ‘coloured migrants’ was recorded by Whitlam:

If Australians are ever foolish enough to open their gates in a significant way to people other than Europeans, they will soon find themselves fighting desperately to stop the nation from being flooded by hordes of non-integratables… I maintain that a big influx of coloured people would be a menace to social standards and to the trade union movement. The coloured people would tend to congregate in ghettos. They would form the nucleus of ‘black power’ in Australia.

Criticism towards the implementation of White Australia Policy led to the changing of immigration policy. The Immigration Reform Group reported that:

Through the United Nations and the involvement of Great Powers, the problems of multi-racial societies have become world problems. When these problems discussed at the U.N., Australia has failed almost invariably, to play a responsible part. Through the U.N. and the involvement of Great Powers, the problems of multi-racial societies have become world problems. Our government’s vacillating attitude on South Africa is well known. It is impossible not to conclude that we are acutely embarrassed by ‘White Australia’ and therefore feel unable to take an effective stand on racial issues. How can we hope to serve as a ‘bridge between East and West when our Achilles’ heel is known to the whole world? Yet can we afford to sit by, year after year, in embarrassed silence?

Under the Whitlam Labor Government, a new package of laws concerning the Australian immigration policy was introduced in 1973. During his duty as an Australian Prime Minister, Whitlam stated that he had made the following policies by:

making available, for the first time, assisted passage to non-Europeans. The number of non-Europeans settling in Australia increased to an average 20,000 per annum during our term in office;

introducing in 1973, as easy-system whereby tourists and other short term visitors from non-European countries could, like most Europeans, obtain visa without the careful checks used previously, simply by producing a pre-paid return ticket, a valid Passport, a declaration that they have enough funds to support their stay and a written promise not to occupy employment while in Australia;

---

18 Ibid.
19 Ibid., p. 490.
terminating the special privileges and conditions enjoyed by British citizens in Australia by way of easier attainment of citizenship, visa, re-entry permits and voting qualifications;

repealing the sections of the Migration Act which retained the old discrimination against Aboriginal Australians and to seek special permission to leave the country;

revising the travel arrangements between Australia and New Zealand to abolish discrimination against non-Anglo-New Zealanders, such as Maoris;

agreeing to reciprocal visa facilities for visiting Australian and Japanese businessmen permitting an initial stay of up to 180 days, double the period previously available;

giving greater emphasis in immigration to family-reunions – the people most likely to settle happily and permanently in Australia are those who have friends or relatives waiting for them on arrival;

permitting overseas students to remain on the successful completion of their studies when their services were sought by an Australian employer;

providing assisted passages for Vietnamese orphans and later for adopted Vietnamese children and orphans from any country;

instigating the first amnesty in Australia for illegal migrants;

amending the Crimes Act to eliminate the discrimination which permitted the deportation of Australians who had been naturalized. The old legal doctrine ‘once an immigrant always an immigrants’ was replaced by a new doctrine of ‘once an Australian always an Australian’;

amending the Aliens Act to eliminate the annual notification of address, occupation and marital status by aliens;

amending the aliens registration policy to remove restrictions on the change of names by aliens;

excluding racially selected sporting teams from Australia.21

Australian migrants seemed to have enjoyed the principles of equality as expressed in the above regulations. In April 1973 the Whitlam Government introduced the Australian Citizenship Bill to establish uniform laws of citizenship.22 This means that all citizens deriving from various ethnics and races, that have possessed various cultural values, including Aborigines – the indigenous Australians,23 have been integrated under the Australian constitution. Furthermore, the Racial Discrimination Act was proclaimed on 31 October 1975, which embracing not only the Aborigines, but also migrants as stated by Whitlam in the launching speech of this Act:

The new Act writes it firmly into our laws that Australia is in reality a multicultural nation, in which the linguistic and cultural heritage of the Aboriginal people and of peoples from all parts of the world can find an honoured place. Programs of

---

community education and development flowing from that Act will ensure this reality is translated into practical measures affecting all areas of our national life.  

The date, 31 October 1975, had thus become a historical turning point in the history of Australia. For the first time, according to Whitlam ‘the nation solemnly affirmed its opposition to all forms of racial discrimination and established machinery to deal with it’. Whitlam’s policy was popularly called the policy of integration.

Prior to this integration policy, the policy of assimilation had been applied to Aborigines, and later to all migrants. The assimilation’s policy seemed to have been difficult to be applied due to differences in cultural values, attitudes and traditions that strongly embedded within ethnic and racial communities living in Australia, whilst assimilation would lead to a cultural amalgamation. Assimilationism thus meant the abandoning of all characteristics that made individuals visible in a crowd. This included the public use of languages other than English, the wearing of unusual clothing, gestures not normally used, physical appearance and anything which prevented the individual from becoming invisible to the majority. The policy of assimilation was thus replaced by the policy of multiculturalism.

3. A Multicultural Australia

The first official recognition that rapid assimilation was impracticable came as early as 1964 when the Assimilation branch of the Department of Immigration was renamed the Integration Branch. This was partly in response to criticism at the Annual Citizenship Conventions which had been held since 1950. The most open repudiation of assimilationism, such as the ending of racial discrimination in selection, followed the election of the Whitlam government in 1972. Shortly after the election of the Whitlam Labor government, the Social Issues Committee of the Immigration Advisory Council, chaired by Professor Jerzy Zubrzycky, strongly recommended to Immigration Minister Al Grassby the adoption of a policy of multiculturalism. This, seemed to have been accorded with advice from immigrant community organizations directed to the government. Thus, Grassby delivered his famous paper, *A Multicultural Society for the Future*, in 1973. Grassby argued:

‘We should seek to share our heritages’ as ‘a nation drawing upon the rich diversity of its people’. The commitment to social equality was not only complementary to this cultural pluralism, it was foundational’: ‘my concept of a society able to sustain growth and change without disintegration is a society based on equal opportunity for all’.

Grassby’s concept of equality then came into existence through Whitlam’s Labor Government Immigration Reform as mentioned above. There were two elements

24 Whitlam, Ibid., p.505-506.
25 Ibid.
27 Ibid.
29 Ibid.
in Australian multiculturalism according to the balance of political forces. The first was a social justice imperative, aimed at erasing or at least ameliorating those social inequalities, and the second was a matter of equal rights to pursue and to maintain a plurality of cultures within Australian society, with parity of recognition, respect and value by the society.\footnote{Ibid.} The second entailed to call on the state to resource the maintenance of minority cultures, instead of supporting only the practice of the dominant or perhaps elite ones.

By the early 1970s, partly because of return migration and the ‘economic miracle’ in Italy, had decreased the main sources of immigrants (though there were many source nations), Australia was consequently looking beyond Europe for its labor migration, for instance, to Turkey, Latin America, and then Lebanon.\footnote{Ibid.} This means, a large number of Moslem immigrants of any non-Christian religion during the period arrived in Australia. Following the Whitlam Labor government, the Fraser Liberal government accepted significant numbers of Indo-Chinese refugees fleeing the war and its aftermath. There were a number of moral panic about Vietnamese ‘boat people’, but there was no political controversy over that.

The early 1980s saw a critical rise in youth unemployment, and there was a virulent racist campaign about ‘Asian’ (meaning South-East Asian) migrants ‘taking our jobs’. The party political bipartisanship over both non-discriminatory immigration and multiculturalism policies held firm throughout this period, as it did in 1984 when a prominent professor, historian Geoffrey Blainey, conducting a widely reported and influential tour addressing conservative audience and giving a warning that too many immigrants from different cultures congregating too densely made ordinary Australians fearful and uncomfortable and could lead to violence.\footnote{Ibid., see also Geoffrey Blainey, \textit{All for Australia}, Methuen Haynes, 1984. Blainey’s argument was based on the questionnaires circulated to a number of ‘ordinary’ Australians.} The politics of multiculturalism, which remained in place throughout this period, led not only to the degree of state control over the cultural affairs of ethnic minority communities, but also to the state responsibility its social funding.

4. Multiculturalism of Australia: A Retreat?

In 1996 the politics of multiculturalism was further shaken with the appearance of Pauline Hanson, leader of ‘One Nation’ Party, with her speech indicating her anti-Asian attitudes:

...for too long ordinary Australians have been kept out of any debate (on immigration and multiculturalism) by the major parties. I and most Australians want our immigration policy reviewed and that of multiculturalism abolished. I believe that we are in danger of being swamped by Asians. Between 1984 and 1995 40% of all migrants coming into this country were of Asian origin. They have their own culture and religion, form ghettos and do not assimilate. Of course I will be called racist but if I can invite who I want into my home, then I should have the right to have a say in who comes into my country. A truly multicultural country can never be strong or united.\footnote{Scott Poynting and Victoria Mason, \textit{Op.Cit.}, see also John Burge, “The Silent Destruction of Australia: Is Pauline Hanson A Racist?, (http://www.despatch.eth.com.au).}
In the 1998 election campaign, the Liberal government tacitly adopted a number of One Nation’s stances, and the Labor Opposition did little to oppose them. The Howard government’s Border Protection Bill (1999) and new ‘temporary safe heaven’s visa regulations introduced the same year without opposition from Labor were said to be actually borrowed from Pauline Hanson’s policies.34 In the 2001 election campaign, Hanson’s words ‘I can invite who I want into my own home’ and ‘We will decide who comes to this country and the circumstances in which they come’ thus became Howard’s election slogans. Such xenophobia slogans were said to be targeted towards ‘Middle Eastern’ asylum seekers and tended to criminalize the Moslem Other as a consequence of the 9/11 airliner attacks in the US.35 Even prior to the attacks, Hanson had merged her xenophobia with the prevailing currents of Islamophobia. A series of moral panics about ‘Middle Eastern boat people’, largely asylum seekers from Iraq and Afghanistan, and their supposed security risks and criminality had melded in the common sense of racism with those over two series of group sexual assaults perpetrated in 2000 and 2001 by groups of immigrant young men of Lebanese and Pakistani background respectively. In the 2001 federal election’s campaign, Hanson further emphasized:

You can’t have gangs going around and committing these offences. And especially what’s happening of raping women; ‘white women on the streets because, in their opinion, white women are worth absolutely nothing to them, to their race, their cultural background’.36

In August 2005, Poynting and Mason reported that the Prime Minister met with Islamic Leaders and instructed that the 30 Muslim schools in Australia must teach ‘Australian values’.37 They also reported that the government was ready to ‘get inside’ Muslim schools and mosques to make sure they were not promoting terrorism.38 In a conference of Australian imams convened in Sydney in mid-September 2006, the participants endorsed the federal government’s proposed tests for citizenship and permanent residency. They also made a recommendation that had been concertedly issued from conservative circles for a year, that ‘Muslim clerics preach in English and they be accredited by a national board of Islamic leaders’.39 The interventions by the Howard Government were clearly directed at Muslim communities on the basis of their religion, and more alarmingly, the Howard government were said to have refused to reaffirm its commitment to multiculturalism while imposing of its ‘New Integrationism’,40 a different conceptual approach of ‘Whittam’s integration policy’ that had been implemented earlier.

In the meantime, there was a need for all government policy to conduct systematic and ongoing cost/benefit analysis to allow for informed public debate about the economic and social impact of government policy.41 Such an analysis would help

---
34 Ibid.
35 Ibid.
36 Ibid.
37 Ibid.
38 Ibid.
39 Ibid.
40 Ibid.
governments and the public recognize and monitor the potential strengths and weaknesses of government policy, allowing the government to minimize the costs and maximize the benefit. According to Poynting and Mason, a full disclosure by governments of the costs and benefits of the policy of multiculturalism, however, has not been available in Australia.\(^\text{42}\) The lack of English language skills in the workplace resulted in substantial economic costs in the form of lost productivity and reduced international competitiveness. The estimation of the costs concerning the English training program are nevertheless available. In 1989, for instance, The Office of Multicultural Affairs, for instance, estimated the poor English language skills cost Australia A$3.2 billion each year in additional communication time needed in the workplace. This estimate was to justify more government spending on English language training. In addition, it was claimed in a report published by the federal government-funded Bureau of Immigration Research that lost output owing to unemployment caused by lack of English language skills could be as high as A$1.6 billion per year. The lack of English language also increases workplace accidents. In addition, increased welfare spending for immigrants, who could not speak English and were unemployed in 1991-1992 was estimated to be A$300 million directly for English language training. In all, the lack of English skills in the workplace could cost Australia over A$5.4 billion per year – equal to 1.5 per cent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP).\(^\text{43}\) This estimate of the economic cost of lack of English language skills does not include spending either by State and Local governments for language training of employees who have difficulty communicating in English nor by commerce and industries. There are indirect costs such as Australia’s immigration program’s being effectively controlled by the multicultural lobby. This led to a ‘blowout’ in the current account deficit of A$6 – 8 billion per year during the late 1980s, which in turn led to a rapid increase in Australia’s foreign debt.\(^\text{44}\)

5. Conclusion

By 1973 the Whitlam Labor government through Grassby declared the commencement of multiculturalism in Australia. Under the multicultural policy, citizenship status had become more easier to achieve, and this resulted in the enfranchisement of hundreds of thousands of non-British immigrants. A series of programmes were drafted, and some tentative steps taken to respond to the rising call for ethnic rights. These included the expansion of central government grants to ethnic groups to employ welfare workers, the beginning of state-funded radio broadcasting in ethnic languages, a multicultural education program, and a concerted effort to expose the problems that thirty years of migration had exacerbated.\(^\text{45}\) The victory of the conservative Liberal/Country (National) Party coalition in 1975 changed the tension but not the directions involved in the multicultural program. This, means that the White Australia Policy had been removed.


\(^{44}\) *Ibid.*

A range of evidence, however, suggests that racial attitudes towards non-European migrants have been a dominant feature since the declaration of Immigration Restriction Act (1901), which was popularly known as the White Australia Policy (W.A.P.). Such racial attitudes were further evident even after the Second World War. The fall of a large number of Australian soldiers in the Great Wars resulted in the lack of human resources. A significant issue then appeared - Who will defend Australia? A Nation Building program was thus commenced by increasing immigrants preferably from the British Isles and Europe, and later from non-European countries due to return migrants to Italy caused by the economic progress taking place there.

The appearance of Pauline Hanson’s One Nation Party with her racial attitudes expressed in her influencing campaigning speeches seemed to have weakened the multicultural policy as shown by Howard government’s refusal of multiculturalism, and at the same time introducing a ‘New Integrationism’. The 9/11 airline attacks to the US also strongly contributed to the decline of multicultural policy and its atmosphere in Australia, particularly a tight monitoring exercised by the government towards Australian Moslems and their leaders. In addition, the highly spending costs caused by the lack of English language skills performed by migrants in the workplace aroused some public concerns. In the meantime, a growing body of evidence which suggests that the policy of multiculturalism is a major cause of Australia’s relative economic decline and reduced international competitiveness. To such extends, it seems that a retreat of multicultural policy in Australia has been taking place.

The retreat from multiculturalism and the introduction of the assimilationist discourse of the ‘New Integrationism’ present ‘dangerous implications’ for both domestic protection of religious freedom and Australia’s wider adherence to international human rights obligations. Is it the ‘New Integrationism’ or renovation and reassertion of multiculturalism? It needs further examination.

The World has seen, however, that ethnic and racial conflict, rather than ideology has become an explosive issue in the 1990s. Some governments tend to abandon multicultural policies and begin to endorse a highly importance of common and popular core values which are considered to be able of creating the unification of people of different ethnic backgrounds.
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