CHAPTER-II

MULTICULTURALISM AND IMMIGRATION POLICIES IN AUSTRALIA

Australia is widely known as a classical country of immigration. It has had a long history of migration and changing immigration policies before it became a multicultural nation. Since 1947, there has been a persistent policy of planned immigration intended to both build population and bring about economic growth. The Australian immigration programs can also be seen as the settlement policies initiated by successive governments of the country. Multiculturalism, both as a term and as a concept continues to fuel debate and engender strong views for and against it to appraise its relevance and vitality. Some tensions and dilemmas which have appeared recently in Australia pose questions about the meaning and desirability of multicultural Australia. Though the government rhetoric and policies espouse multiculturalism, structures have been established both to symbolize and to investigate multiculturalism in Australia. At the same time there has been growing body of theoretical criticism of the ambiguity and confusion surrounding the use of term “multiculturalism”. This chapter explores the evolution of policies of immigration in Australia, drawing on various works on multiculturalism and migration studies. It will briefly examine the historical context of Indian migration to Australia. Bringing these issues together, some of the common features and characteristics of multicultural contexts in Australia has been studied in the following sections.

Immigration has played a vital role in building of modern Australia and is very much the foundation of the nation. Indeed, apart from Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, the other Australians can trace their origins back to the immigrations which started with British colonization in 1788. Australia has witnessed migration from all parts of the globe, and over the years the cultural characteristics and the socio-economic composition of successive immigrant groups have changed. These changes have in turn transformed the composition of the Australian population resulting in modifications in country’s policy responses towards the migrant population. Australia, being a multicultural nation has managed its domestic pluralism, especially in relation to the settlement of ethnically diverse immigrant groups. The British and the Australians preferred to maintain the British character of the colonies by not encouraging too many foreigners to settle. They feared the loss of allegiance which had led to the defection of the United States from the British Empire. Thus, Australia has maintained an active immigration policy as immigration is not only important for
its contribution to the total size of the population but also because it has produced a society of increasingly diverse ethnic origins. There has been a planned program of mass migration in Australia since 1945. Due to the skills provided by the migration programs, Australian economy and regional development has seen a considerable growth. Cultural diversity is one of the greatest contributions of immigration to Australia. Its multi-racial and multi-lingual society has created a vital and thriving community and economy. However, the immigration has not always been steady or popular; indeed, Australia is sometimes called a boa-constrictor, taking huge gulps of immigrants when times are good and immigrants plentiful, and then quietening down for digestion during periods of war or recession (Price 1975: 304).

Australia was settled by white men subsequent to Captain Cook’s discovery in 1770. The early history of migration in Australia was ruled by insularity in contrast to the more active and outward-looking policies of recent years. Australia is a nation of migrants and their descendants, and the great majority has come from Europe, especially from Britain and Ireland. The white immigrant settlers in Australia from imperial Britain brought with them attitudes to colored peoples and their cultures which have only recently begun to change. Australian Aborigines, Chinese, Japanese, Indians, South Sea Islanders etc., all tended to be thought of as ‘lesser breeds without the Law’, people unfit for self-government at home or for assimilation into Caucasian community abroad, uneducated because they did not speak English, inferior because they were not white (Millar 1991: 378). It is true that the immigration exclusion policies of the six colonies and of the Australian Commonwealth were believed ‘justified on economic and social grounds as much as on straight color prejudice: cheap industrious labor could only depress standards of living, and the miscegenation of races lead to social problems’ (Millar 1991: 378). From the time Captain Cook landed in Australia until the Australian High Court judgment on indigenous land rights known as Mabo decision, followed by the enactment of Native Title Act by the commonwealth parliament, the Australian laws were based on the notion of terra nullis, i.e., the land belonging to no one.
The process of globalization has substantially altered the blueprint of population movement across the globe. Although, Australia has long been a country of immigration, the nature of international migration influencing the country has undergone profound change in the era of globalization. There are more than 200 different ethnic communities in Australia who speak diverse languages. There are more than 100 different religions registered with the authorities to perform a marriage ceremony. Twenty two percent of people in Australia are estimated to be born in other countries; about three quarters of Australians identify with an ancestry other than indigenous Australians who comprise two percent of the population. More than forty percent of Australians have at least one parent who has been born overseas. In all, Australians come from more than 200 birth places (Grassby 2000: 39).

The chapter provides a critical examination of antecedents of Australia as a migrant nation. It deals with the introduction and evolution of the concept of multiculturalism in Australia. The three significant measures undertaken by subsequent governments in promoting immigration were the abolition of the White Australia policy in 1972; the introduction of Multiculturalism policy in 1973 and the Racial Discrimination Act of 1975 (RDA) which enabled the government to ratify the international convention against all forms of racial discrimination. Thus, an examination of the White Australia policy and its gradual liberation to manage Australia's internal pluralism is pertinent for the present study. In the following section, a historical-analytical sketch of immigration policies right from its foundation days is made. It examines the host country’s responses to migrants crossing its territorial and cultural boundaries. Firstly, it focuses on relevant government policies relating to immigration, and secondly, it deals with debates and public opinion generated in reaction to the diversity which resulted from migration. The following sections will briefly sketch evolution of Australia’s multiculturalism from its antecedents as a predominantly Anglo-Celtic society. It will also briefly examine the contemporary immigration policies, before tracing the history of Asian-Indian immigrants to Australia in the following section. Figure 2.1 illustrates top ten ancestries as found in the 2006 Australian census.
Figure 2.1: Top Ten ancestries* in Australia 2006 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents (Per Cent)</th>
<th>Australian</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>Scottish</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Indian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ancestry in this case counts the first and second response and therefore may include double counting e.g. if a person reports Greek as their first response and Australian as their second, they will be counted once under each category.


IMMIGRATION POLICIES IN AUSTRALIA

WHITE AUSTRALIA POLICY

The immigration program in between 1788 and 1850 was dominated by the transportation of British convicts to Australian colonies followed by British free settlers. During the gold rush period, non-European immigrants started migrating to Australia in particular Chinese population. On 1 January 1901, the six British colonies, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania were proclaimed as the Commonwealth of Australia. The Immigration Restriction Act of 1901, also popularly known as “White Australia Policy” was passed by the new Federal Parliament which aimed at excluding non-Europeans. This formal implementation of the ‘White Australia Policy’ was welcomed by majority of the communities. Implementation of the policy included the ‘Dictation Test’, which was used to exclude certain applicants by requiring them to pass a written test in a European language, with which they were not necessarily familiar. This method of exclusion was borrowed from the South African Natal Act of 1897. This Immigration Act remained in force until 1958, when it was replaced by the Migration Act which
will be discussed in the following sections. While the White Australia Policy reduced the immigration of non-Europeans, the arrival of various European groups like British, German, Italian and Greeks increased.

Earlier, in 1841, a committee on immigration of New South Wales Legislative Council produced a report which emphasized the importance of racial homogeneity. It wanted British institutions to be reproduced in the colony. The attitudes led eventually to the White Australia policy and strong trade union movement. They were partly an expression of perceived racial superiority, partly a reaction against the whole concept of servility (Millar 1991: 11). Racism predominantly targeted non-European migrants, particularly the Chinese, who came in response to the Gold Rushes of the 1850s, and the South Pacific Islanders, who provided for cheap labor to the plantation owners in the late 19th century. The notion of “Yellow Peril” was a regular feature at that time. All immigration, settlement and citizenship policies until the 1970s were designed to maintain the British character as well as privileges. Non-British immigrants were expected to abandon their alien ways and become Australian. Official policy attempted to explain to the public that foreign migrants were an asset and to the migrants that they were lucky to be in Australia and should conform to its norms (Jupp 1991: 99).

The first phase that is assimilation phase can be considered as arising out of Australia’s quest of its national identity. The overriding assumption of this quest was that the society was one in which citizens were as much like other as possible (Jupp 1997 cited in Narang and Gopal 2002: 43). The doctrine of white Australia asserted the existence of a positive Australian identity, as explicitly conceived at the time of Federation, which comprised of three parts-‘Whiteness’, ‘Britishness’ and ‘Australianness’, and functioned at each level to guard security and assert dominion. The descriptive characteristics of the national identity defined by the White Australia policy included both racial and cultural elements at the same time due to numerous forms of exclusion and marginalization through institutional and informal racism, migrants resisted assimilation (Gopal and Narang 2002: 42-44).

Australia’s post-war immigration program maintained its allegiance to the idea of White Australia. The planners insisted on assimilation and the non-Europeans were considered not fit to truly assimilate due to their appearances. Assimilationism was
the official policy since 1880s implying abandoning of all characteristics that made individuals visible in a crowd. This included public use of languages other than English, the wearing of the unusual clothing, gestures not normally used, physical appearances and anything which prevented the individual from being invisible to the majority. These expectations were clearly spelled out in official welcoming material. The immigrants were expected to become real Australians by some, while the conservatives were happy to talk about them as becoming British (Jupp 1991: 97). All immigration policies prior to 1984, when the automatic right to vote was withdrawn from British citizens in Australia, aimed at maintaining the British character of Australia.

ASSIMILATION

Assimilation promotes incorporation of the migrants completely into the host society. Immigrants are expected to forego their linguistic, cultural or social distinctiveness and become part of the majority population. It is based on narrow concept of adaptation. Assimilation was the official policy towards the indigenous people and immigrants until the 1960s, when Australia signed the International Convention to Eradicate All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The policy of assimilation was disapproved of for denying people their own ethnic and cultural inheritance. Nevertheless, the policy makers were not much perturbed by these criticisms. In policy as well as in public attitudes, immigrants from non-English speaking backgrounds were expected to forget their past, to give up their language and culture, and to assimilate, but only as second grade citizens. Assimilationist approaches are found in nations which base their sense of belonging both on membership of political community and on sharing a common culture (Castles 2000: 137). To begin with from 1947 to 1964, Australia adopted the policy of assimilation.

According to the strictly hard-line assimilationist policy, i.e. one of total assimilation or 'straight line assimilation', migrants were expected to shed their social characteristics and cultural identity at the earliest possible opportunity (operationally defined at one time as to take place within six months of entry); merge fully into the mores of Australian society and conform to the social institutions and cultural practices of the new society (Jayasuriya 1990: 1-2). The newcomers, who were selected as 'good types (Kunz cited in JamRozik et al. 1995: 94) were termed 'New
Australians' and were expected to assimilate in due course. Andrew Jakubowicz (2002), an eminent Australian sociologist opines assimilation as being used to describe the process for making minorities the same as majorities-for indigenous people, the “full bloods” would die out and the “mixed bloods would become like whites”. Furthermore, he argues that assimilation is a sharp point between two cultures-one side means the victory of majority, and the other the cultural survival of the minority.

The policy of assimilation has been replaced by pluralist policies in some countries in response to the migrant’s attitude towards the policy. The migrants were unwilling to assimilate and started concentrating in certain occupations and residential areas. This led to the emergence of the ethnic communities who were interested in maintaining their linguistic, cultural and social characteristics. Official policy relating to migrant settlement was modified so that assimilation was viewed as a two-stage process. In the first stage, there was to be a modest relaxation of attitudes towards members from other cultures’, races and ethnic groups in the hope that at a later point of time they or their offspring would be ‘assimilated’. In this two-stage view of assimilation the expectation was that eventually, within the same generation or at least by the next generation, these newcomers would become ‘integrated’ or ‘assimilated’ into the institutions and practices of a new society through some ‘melting pot’ process. In this process, the concepts of ‘ethnicity’ became a part of the language of political discourse and governments were more prepared to incorporate the aspects of cultural and ethnic differences in policy development (Jayasuriya 1990: 2).

The changed circumstances in Australia led to an environment which triggered policy reforms. These included general societal changes, rise of professional middle class generation in postwar period, foreign relations pressures and the impact of reform movements. Also, realizations on the part of policy makers that immigrants were not fully assimilating as expected and were being concentrated into particular occupation and residential areas led to attitudinal changes. Finally, in 1973, the government declared Australia as a multicultural society. Along with the acceptance of multicultural nature of society, the government also conceded the irrelevance of White Australia policy in order to meet the exigencies of the time and the changing
circumstances. First, there was a change from Assimilation model to Integration which was viewed as the gradual process of adaptation.

INTEGRATION

The term ‘integration’ did not mean that ethnic and cultural diversity was accepted as a permanent feature of Australian society. Rather, it meant that some aspects of diversity which did not disturb or threaten the dominant culture and social order, such as displays of folklore or ethnic food festivals, would be accepted as colorfully ‘exotic’ entertainment for the Anglo-Australians, at the same time keeping the immigrants ‘happy’. However, this was also a period during which it became evident, through research and everyday observation that immigrant organizations, far from being a barrier to social cohesion, often acted as bridge between an immigrant group and the host society. Similarly, the significance of the family in the settlement process became gradually recognized and this recognition led to changes in immigration policy, with more attention being given to the balance of the sexes and family reunion (Jamrozik et al. 1995: 95).

The model of ‘integration’ was in use in official proclamations to illustrate the different approach from strict Anglo-conformity and the espousal of a milder adaptation of assimilation. During Whitlam Labor Government of 1972, immigrant policy reforms were accorded high priority. One of the primary initiatives undertaken was to annul the ‘White Australia’ policy and initiate a policy of unbiased migrant recruitment. In the post-Second World War period, with the immigration reforms and historical events, the non-European immigrants started arriving in Australia. The need to accommodate such plurality of ethnic cultures was soon realized. The years from 1964 to 1973 were the period of policy of integrationism. In 1964, the Assimilation branch of Department of Immigration was renamed the Integration branch in response to the annual Citizenship Conventions. Andrew Jakubowicz (2002), points that integration suggests a division between those parts of cultural life that are personal and group-based and those that require individuals to engage with wider social structures. It assumed that the first generation would find it difficult to change, but their children would be indistinguishable from the children of people in Australia for generations. Some of the majority communities view it as a way of paying lip-service to diversity while continuing a path towards assimilation.
The three Prime ministers, Gough Whitlam, Malcolm Fraser and Bob Hawke, had reasserted their support for the concept of multiculturalism and for institutions to give it effect. Between 1973 and 1978, policy was mainly concerned with repudiating assimilationism and with preventing racial or ethnic discrimination. Both Fraser and Whitlam agreed that assimilationism and discriminatory history needed to be rejected in the interest of national harmony. One of the 'founding fathers' of multiculturalism, Al Grassby, spoke of multi-cultures in Australia as 'the family of the nation'. Let us now examine the concept and policy of multiculturalism as it evolved and has been practiced in Australia.

AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURALISM

Australia required immigration for its economic development and national security, towards the second half of twentieth century. It's 'All white policy' had failed to augment her demographic density. So, the new Australian slogan was, 'populate or perish'. Australian immigration policy was liberalized allowing entry of different European nationalists. Some concessions were also made to encourage non-European settlers.

The models which steered the government policies towards immigrants from the late 1940s were those of assimilation and integration. Australia's changed socio-cultural and demographic reality forced the policy makers to ponder over the relevance of assimilation in a new culturally diverse Australia. The usage of non-English languages, creation of ethnic media and initiatives like strategic forms of ethnic community solidarity facilitated the process of settlement and integration. It is the size and political power of the migrant population which has been the central variable which brought about change in Australia's settlement policy in the transition from assimilation to multiculturalism.

Multiculturalism as a concept is extensively contested at various levels, in theoretical explorations, in empirical studies, in debates on government policy, and in public views on Australian society. The period of multiculturalism was steered in with the election of the Whitlam Labor government in December 1972 and the appointment of Al Grassby as Minister for Immigration. The concept of multiculturalism was borrowed from Canada where it started as an ideology...
endeavoring to unify three ethnic and cultural communities in the 1960s: English, French and others, including the indigenous population. It was officially embraced as a policy in Canada in 1971. In Australia, explicit policies were first introduced in 1973 by the Australian Labour Party (ALP) government led by Gough Whitlam.

Australian multiculturalism largely describes its cultural and ethnic diversity. Over a half of Australians were born overseas or have at least one parent born overseas. Australian multiculturalism as a public policy articulated by governments endeavors to administer the consequences of that diversity. It acknowledges the right of all Australians to:

- **cultural identity**: the right of all Australians, within carefully defined limits to express and share their individual cultural heritage, including their language and religion;
- **social justice**: the right of all Australians to equality of treatment and opportunity, and the removal of barriers of race, ethnicity, culture, religion, language, gender or place of birth; and
- **economic efficiency**: the need to maintain, develop and utilize effectively the skills and talents of all Australians, regardless of background.

These dimensions of multiculturalism are expressed in the eight goals articulated in the National Agenda. The eight goals identified by the National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia are as follows:

1. All Australians should have a commitment to Australia and share responsibility for furthering our national interests.
2. All Australians should be able to enjoy the basic right of freedom from discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion or culture.
3. All Australians should enjoy equal life chances and have equitable access to and an equitable share of the resources which governments manage on behalf of the community.
4. All Australians should have the opportunity to fully participate in society and in the decisions which directly affect them.
5. All Australians should be able to develop and make use of their potential for Australia's economic and social development.
6. All Australians should have the opportunity to acquire and develop proficiency in English and languages other than English, and to develop cross-cultural understanding.

7. All Australians should be able to develop and share their cultural heritage.

8. Australian institutions should acknowledge, reflect and respond to the cultural diversity of the Australian community (DIAC 1989). There are also limits to Australian multiculturalism. These may be summarized as follows:

- multicultural policies are based upon the premises that all Australians should have an overriding and unifying commitment to Australia, to its interests and future first and foremost;

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

- multicultural policies impose obligations as well as conferring rights: the right to express one's own culture and beliefs involves a reciprocal responsibility to accept the right of others to express their views and values (http://www.immi.gov.au/).

The emergence of multiculturalism policy under Gough Whitlam period (1972-75) can be identified with the government's effort at addressing the migrant's problems rather than ignoring them. The passage of RDA 1975 and Grassby's introduction of new points system, reduction of period for naturalization from five to three years etc can be seen as the beginning of multiculturalism. The labor government aimed at curtailing discrimination and favouring non-European migration. Fraser government from 1975-83 promoted the policy more vigorously. Galbally Report (1978) became the first major multicultural policy initiative directed explicitly for the whole country expressing its commitment to address migrant's disadvantages. Ethnic became an important legitimizing term attached by the government to organizations, individuals and funding diverse programs and services. The most serious drawbacks of the Fraser approach were its propagation of such a limited conception of multiculturalism, its concentration on 'status' organizations and
its determination to calm ethnic demands through its co-optive policies (Foster and Stockley 1988: 3-4).

The Labour Government under Hawke from 1883 continued the policies of multiculturalism, but with lesser fanfare. It was motivated by a political strategy based on the slogan of ‘community sacrifice with equity’. The government remained firm in defence of multiculturalism and non-discriminatory immigration policies during the 'Blainey debate' on Asian immigration in 1984. Ethnic and multicultural policies were modest during this period, but were not openly battered. The debate on the purported requisite and desirability had facilitated a waning of the government's commitment to multiculturalism. The Hawke government decisions on multiculturalism had ‘less to do with ethnicity per se and more to do with moving towards capturing a perceived public disaffection by winding back the welfare state or, at least, privatizing it and changing its nature’. However, in the later years, the government proposed many policy changes towards multiculturalism (Foster and Stockley 1988: 8).

Multiculturalism as a public policy maneuvered a number of important programs: in media (the creation of Special Broadcasting Service), in service delivery (access and equity), in employment (equal opportunity) and in wider social development (productive diversity). The position of Commissioner for Community Relations was established in 1974, followed by the passing of the RDA1975. The Australian Ethnic Affairs Council (AEAC) was established in 1977, and after a series of conferences and consultations it produced the document entitled Australia as a Multicultural Society. Another committee, Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services for Migrants, was constituted by the government to examine the provision of services for immigrants. That committee’s report, Migrant Services and Programs (1978), known as the Galbally Report (after the chairman of the committee), recommended a number of measures.

The National Agenda was to serve as a policy framework within which a wide range of programs and activities would be carried out. Fraser government’s most important initiative was to implement the Galbally recommendations of 1978. These called for greater recognition in government services that many clients could not speak English; for immigrant welfare to be delivered through subsidized ethnic organizations; for official support for community languages and media; and for
setting up of a research institute which would refine the concept of multiculturalism and develop knowledge about Australian cultural variety (Jupp 1991: 103-4).

Multiculturalism developed in Australia as a progression of tentative ideas and gradual reforms sponsored by consecutive Labor and Liberal Coalition Federal Governments. Although it focused on migrant absorption, its realm has been broadened to include 'all Australians' and its provisions have been elaborated and polished. These have enjoyed wide bipartisan support and now inform a multitude of institutions and processes at the federal, State or Territory, and local levels of government, as well as many private sector organizations. The terms of Australian multiculturalism are contained in two overarching policy statements presented in Parliament, *the National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia* (1989) ('National Agenda') launched by the Hawke Labor Government, and *A New Agenda for Multicultural Australia* (1999) ('A New Agenda'), launched by Howard's conservative Coalition government.

The Galbally committee formulated four guiding principles on which services and programs of particular interest to ethnic communities were to be based in future. The principles were:

- All members of our society must have equal opportunity to realize their full potential and must have equal access to programs and services;
- Every person should be able to maintain his or her culture without prejudice or disadvantage and should be encouraged to understand and embrace other cultures;
- Needs of migrants should, in general, be met by programs and services available to the whole community but special services and programs are necessary at present.
- Services and programs should be designed and operated in full consultation with clients, and self-help should be encouraged as much as possible with a view to helping migrants to become self-reliant quickly (Jupp 2001: 783).

The four main beliefs affirmed the rights of immigrants to equal access to society's resources but also recognized that en route to settlement immigrants might need special services and provisions.
There has been no legislative basis to multiculturalism. The first stage in establishing the multicultural Australia was intricate. The creation of diverse ethnic organizations, enthusiastic to the maintenance of foreign languages and culture, was not welcomed by public opinion or by officials. The government commissioned a committee to conduct *Review of Migrant and Multicultural Programs and Services* (ROMAMPAS) in 1985. Following its report, the government closed the Institute of Multicultural Affairs established in 1983 and instituted in its place Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA) located in the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Another Committee to advise on Australia's Immigration Policies (CAAIP) produced its report, *Immigration: a Commitment to Australia*, in May 1988. One noteworthy effect of that report was the establishment of a new ‘independent’ body, the Bureau of Immigration Research (BIR), attached to the Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs. BIR is one of the chief research organization on immigration matters directly funded by the government, and in its research outlines and dissemination of data and views through its reports and national conferences it has become a forum for debate on immigration and multiculturalism.

Community attitudes and government policies in response to the increasing ethnic and cultural diversity have moved over the years, from assimilation to integration, then to cultural pluralism, to be replaced later by the concept of multiculturalism. Each shift in policy has been an acknowledgement of the ineffectiveness of the policy of the time and each has meant a further acceptance of cultural diversity in Australian society. A more critical view, however, would be that these shifts did not represent any radical policy change but were aimed at only a slowing down of the assimilation processes, not their abandonment. As a result, changes in expressed policies have shown themselves to be rather superficial in practice and effect (JamRozik et al. 1995: 92).

**THE MEANINGS OF MULTICULTURALISM IN AUSTRALIAN CONTEXT**

Zubryzcki's (1982: 1-2) doctrine of “multiculturalism for all Australians” has been a characteristic feature of Australian multiculturalism during the Fraser era which continued into the Hawke era. According to the document, colloquial usage often restricts the term 'ethnic' to people of other than Anglo-Celtic origin, and particularly to migrants from non-English speaking countries. This usage ignores the fact that the
term is derived from the Greek word ethnos meaning 'nation' or 'people'. Accordingly, all persons living in Australia are 'ethnic', whether they are Aboriginals, or trace their roots to the British Isles, continental Europe, Asia, Africa, the Pacific nations or the Americas, or regard themselves simply as Australians. The Paper argued that the phrase 'ethnic affairs' applies, strictly speaking, to the full range of inter-group relations and should not be limited to issues affecting minority groups alone. AEAC in 1977 formulated the principles of multiculturalism as social cohesion, equality and cultural identity. It aimed at assuring the rights of the minorities in a democracy.

There has been suspicion in public about the meaning of multiculturalism for Australian society. The term 'multiculturalism' is viewed as the relationships and institutional arrangements between diverse cultural groups that affect access to resources, privileges and participation in decision making.

There are two distinct approaches, each underlining a different theoretical concept supporting the concept of multiculturalism: cultural pluralism and structural pluralism. The proponents of cultural pluralism argued that the three principles of multiculturalism – social cohesion, equality, and cultural identity – enabled ethnic and cultural diversity to grow while at the same time developing a common bond of citizenship. 'The normative view of multiculturalism, as a form of cultural pluralism, becomes closely linked with the key notion of 'ethnic groups' and ethnicity' because multiculturalism promoted the right of individuals to assert their cultural difference and develop their sense of self-esteem and self-respect. In short, multiculturalism serves to enable the culturally different to maintain their distinct sense of cultural or ethnic identity. As a result, ethnicity became an 'organizational strategy' and its usage in policy tended to gravitate between two major objectives. One relates to its expressive dimension and highlights the need, actual or symbolic, for group continuity and belonging on the part of its members; and the other, the instrumental dimension, is oriented more towards the satisfaction of the material aspects of living, such as the need for economic and social security and political and social power on the part of ethnic groups, individually or collectively' (Jayasuriya 1990: 3). The Lippman Committee of 1976 drew attention to this dilemma by pointing out that "a fine line divides cultural from structural pluralism". Two distinct but closely related facets of cultural pluralism – the expressive/instrumental dimension of ethnicity and the cultural vs. structural distinction – contains the seeds of the contradictions and
dilemma that lay inherent in the doctrine of cultural pluralism (Jayasuriya 1990: 3). Multiculturalism is viewed as unproblematic harmony, achieved via the balancing of individual choices. The basis for this is that to be an equal member of any society, not only must one have equal rights, but also equal identities. And as ethnic background forms these identities, cultural heritage cannot be ignored or scorned without damaging our sense of personal dignity (Gopal and Narang 2002: 40).

Australian Multiculturalism has a ‘culturalist’ view of multiculturalism which emphasizes the ‘expressive’ dimensions of ethnicity aimed primarily at providing emotional security for the culturally different by accepting, and even promoting ethnic groups to cultivate their sense of identity and difference within a framework of understanding and tolerance of each other’s differences. In short, this was an ‘ethnic identity’ model of multiculturalism highlighting the need for cultural maintenance enhancement and ‘equality of respect’ based partly on liberal notion of equality of opportunity (Jayasuriya 1990: 4-5). The foundations of this ‘culturalist’ perspective were laid by the influential Galbally Report of 1978 during the Fraser era of conservative/liberal politics; and this policy document became the key instrument of public policy which provided the infrastructure and organizational supports through such mechanisms as the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs (AIMA). Policies concerned with ethno-cultural diversity have essentially been top-down social policies. It is argued that multiculturalism has developed in an adhoc way as a strategy for integrating immigrant communities into basically unchanged society (Castles 2000: 154).

Multiculturalism recognizes the right of individuals and groups to self-identification and promotion of their own culture, regardless of cultural differences. It is also set of government policies and accompanying programs in that context. In the last three decades or so of 20th century, various nation-states have initiated transforming the ideology of multiculturalism into tangible economic, political and social interventions. The policy of multiculturalism has received both appreciations as mechanism to respect pluralism, as well as severe criticism for perpetuating stereotypes of ethnic groups, undermining social cohesion, threatening national identity, etc. Australia is one such country which has adopted the policy of multiculturalism from mid 1970s and at present is faced with a mix of its approval
and rejection as well as new challenges. The following section will deal with the government's extended support for the policy initiative in addressing its' diversity.

MULTICULTURALISM AS A GOVERNMENT POLICY

The concept of Australia as a multicultural society first appeared in government policy documents in 1972 and has been a focus of public debate and of varied interpretations as already pointed in above discussion. In the National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia, the term 'multicultural' was defined as 'simply a term which described the cultural and ethnic diversity of contemporary Australia.' (www.immi.gov.au). The policy of multiculturalism meant 'government measures designed to respond to that diversity'. The policy was not concerned with the selection of immigrants but with 'managing the consequences of cultural diversity in the interests of the individual and society as a whole' (JamRozik et al. 1995: 99). In its early phase, it focused on refutation of assimilationism and policies for improving welfare and educational provisions for mainly working class migrants of European origin. The Liberal and Country Party coalition (1975-1982) continued with multiculturalism policy but modified it to include cultural pluralism, the role of ethnic organizations in the provision of welfare services and the value of multiculturalism for achieving social cohesion in an ethnically diverse society.

The ALP government from 1983-1996, made implicit statements about multicultural citizenship. The government focused on redefining multiculturalism besides addressing key policy goals like economic deregulation, social safety net, focus on Asia Pacific region etc. This focus on Asia Pacific region arose due to the shift from Europe to Asia as the main source of immigration. This was also due to the increased emphasis on high skilled levels as an entry-criterion and the labour-market entry of second-generation immigrants with much better educational levels than their parents etc. The government moved from 'ethnic group approach' and developed what may be called 'a citizenship model of multiculturalism'. The new model was laid down in the National Agenda for a multicultural Australia in 1989.

While the government was engaged in actively promoting the policy of multiculturalism through its National Agenda as discussed elsewhere in the chapter, the Leader of the Opposition, John Howard, spoke about 'One Australia' and the need
to consider 'at what rate immigration from Asia should continue’. His successor, John Hewson, expressed his views on multiculturalism more directly and emphasised that there was ‘a feeling that multiculturalism may be promoting a sense of division within Australian society’. He also expressed that multiculturalism ‘has got out of hand’, and it should be discouraged and assimilation encouraged instead, so as ‘to make Australia a united country again’. Within the Labor Party itself there were opinions that would at best be described as ‘lukewarm’ towards the notion of multiculturalism, and some were openly antagonistic to it (JamRozik et al. 1995: 102).

Howard government after 1996, tracked back from multiculturalism believing that it diluted the Australian values. In 1999, after a number of years of debate, a new statement of Australian multiculturalism was adopted with social justice removed, and which called for lower level of commitment from government. Many conservatives felt that multiculturalism policy should be deserted and all programs that sustain it should be closed. On the other hand, most of people accepted the reality of Australia as a multicultural society and were proud of the diversity of cultures and the great success of ethnic communities getting on together with little conflict and a great deal of mutual benefit. The following principles were adopted in the ‘New Agenda for a Multicultural Australia’ in the paper titled Australian Multiculturalism for a New Century: Towards Inclusiveness:

- **Civic duty**: all Australians are obliged to support the basic structures and principles of Australian society – our Constitution, democratic institutions and values – which guarantee us our freedom and equality and enable diversity in our society to flourish;

- **Cultural respect**: subject to the law, the right to express one’s own culture and beliefs involves a reciprocal obligation to accept the right of others to do the same;

- **Social equity**: all Australians are entitled to equality of treatment and opportunity enabling them to contribute to the social, political and economic life of Australia, free from discrimination on the grounds of race, culture, religion, language, location, gender or place of birth;
- **Productive diversity**: the significant cultural, social and economic dividends which arise from the diversity of our population should be maximised for the benefit of all Australians (www.immi.gov.au).

The government's multicultural policy statement, Multicultural Australia: United in Diversity issued on 13 May 2003 reaffirms the fundamental principles of the New Agenda for Multicultural Australia and has outlined four principles that underpin multicultural policy:

- **Responsibilities of all**: all Australians have a civic duty to support those basic structures and principles of Australian society which guarantee us our freedom and equality and enable diversity in our society to flourish
- **Respect for each person**: subject to the law, all Australians have the right to express their own culture and beliefs and have a reciprocal obligation to respect the right of others to do the same
- **Fairness for each person**: all Australians are entitled to equality of treatment and opportunity. Social equity allows us all to contribute to the social, political and economic life of Australia
- **Benefits for all**: all Australians benefit from the significant cultural, social and economic dividends arising from the diversity of our population. Diversity works for all Australians (Fact Sheet no 6/ www.immi.gov.au.)

As the official policy of state, multiculturalism centers around state's public acknowledgement of the cultural and ethnic diversity and recognition that all Australians have the right to hold, express and share their cultural heritage. It exhibits heterogeneity and hybridity in Australian society, moving away from policy of assimilation. There was a clear acknowledgement in the *National Agenda* document that Australian social institutions had not provided equitable access to resources for all Australians, and many immigrants of non English-speaking background and Australian Aborigines experienced problems and injustices. (JamRozik *et al.*1995: 101). However, as opined by Raja (2001: 147), multiculturalism as a model of nation building serves as a useful function as long as it asserts that cultural pluralism and diversity is not a hindrance to the country. It stresses on delivering access and equity to apparent disadvantaged, yet it seems to privilege ethnic minority groups at the cost
of Anglo-Celtic majority people. Thus, it leads to divisiveness, exclusiveness and reverse racism (Raja 2001: 148).

In policy rhetoric and in much of the writings on the subject, Australia is presented as a multicultural society. The public attitudes and policy elucidation and implementation reflected multiculturalism as dissection between the ‘multiculturals’ or ethnics’ on one side and the ‘true Australians’ on the other, with the Aborigines again distinctly somewhere else. ‘Australians’ are those with the Anglo-Celtic identity and the others are ‘hyphenated Australians’- Greek-Australians, Polish-Australians, Chinese-Australians, and so on (Foster and Stockley 1988: 6). One section of people assumed each new wave of immigrants as threat to national cohesion, to the celebrated Australian way of life, to the standard of living. The government on the other hand asserted its efforts towards promoting diversity through multiculturalism policy. Multiculturalism delivers opportunity to the state to accept a more pluralist vision of society in its policies. The overall objective has been the goal of a construction of a socially cohesive multicultural Australian society based on an overarching set of values, which would be strengthened by cultured diversity (Vasta cited in Gopal and Narang 2002: 48). By abandoning the doctrine of ‘White Australia’, Australians have moved on from just an attitudinal change of a perceived national political identity which had grown obsolete in an increasingly heterogeneous society and a world of altered values. The policy of multiculturalism reflected those changes, and seemed to assure all Australia’s ethnic groups of their rightful place in the national fold (Gopal and Narang 2002: 50).

The other significant change in the social and economic context facing migrant ethnic groups arises from the impact of profound changes in the social demography of the country. Australia’s post-war immigration has been uneven and the multicultural variety is most visible in cities like Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, Perth, Wollongong, Geelong, Canberra and Darwin. Australian multiculturalism is an urban phenomenon, compared with nineteenth century ethnic variety both in Australia, United States and Canada (Jupp 1991: 96). Each group in Australia has its own special culture, language, religion and identity. One can witness diversity in the kinds of music, literature, art, food and also in the patterns of inter-racial marriages and inter-generational differences in adaptation in the host society. This multiplicity
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is a reservoir to promote people in adapting itself to the changing situations. However, the concept and policy of multiculturalism has yet not been completely accepted by all. There are both criticisms and limitations of this policy as also challenges.

CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF MULTICULTURALISM

"I do believe that if Asian immigration is in the eyes of some in the community, it’s too great it would be in our immediate term interest supportive of social cohesion if it were slowed down a little" John Howard, Opposition leader, 1988.

"I believe we are in danger of being swamped by Asians. They have their own culture and religion, form Ghettos and do not assimilate" Pauline Hanson, Member of Oxley, Sep. 1996 (Megalogenis 27 July 2004, The Australian)

The debates and assertions about the nature and reality of multiculturalism seem to surround Australian society and polity all the time. Multiculturalism, both as a term and as a concept continues to fuel debate and engender strong views for and against it. It is criticized as a policy introduced with haste to appease the ethnic communities and undercut the opposition’s political base among these communities. In spite of a few reservations by some politicians, in general at the official and political level it is agreed that Australia is significantly multicultural. It promotes a society with ample diversity of languages, religious and birthplace groups, chiefly resulting from immigration after 1947. However at the public level, extent of support for multiculturalism is yet not very clear.

There are two broad debates in Australia over multiculturalism. One is the immigration debate about the social and cultural composition of the society. This debate raises the concerns about 'race' as well as concerns about unemployment, environmental sustainability, ethnic enclaves, and the loss of the traditional Australian ways of life. The other debate is over how best to respond to or manage cultural diversity, where the disquiet is over governmental efforts to accommodate and support cultural minorities. Both debates obviously touch deeply on questions of national identity (Levey 2001: 870).

Multiculturalism has been effective at local government levels which have a fairly large number of councilors from various ethnic backgrounds all over Australia. But there is very less representation in the state and federal decision making bodies.
Moreover, no persistent strategy has been devised to draw on the ethnic and cultural diversity in forging links with source countries of these immigrant communities (Randazzo 2002). The arguments, however, in favor of Australian multiculturalism is that it gives official blessing to harmonious community relations, in the same way as public exhortations in the 1950s gave a similar blessing to assimilation. A second argument is that as assimilation failed for many immigrants, nothing is to be gained from its continued espousal; especially as such immigrants become citizens and participants in the democratic process. Demands that immigrants become ‘real Australians’ were seen by the late 1960s as a reason for increasing return rates to Europe, although economic improvement at home was probably more important (Jupp 1991: 105).

A Saulwick poll in 1994 found that 72 per cent of Australians believed that Australia was a better place to live in “now that people from so many countries live here”. A 1997 ANOP poll indicated that 78 per cent of Australians felt that multiculturalism had been good for Australia. However, an AGB/McNair poll in 1996 showed that 70 per cent opposed the abolition of multicultural policies, but the same percentage supported at least a short-term freeze on immigration and a reduction of Asian migration. A closer examination of opposition to migration showed that new arrivals tend to oppose it more strongly than the older ones. In the recent years, unemployment, growing social inequality, low wages and part-time casual employment associated with major economic and social changes have heightened concern about change in general. Professor Murray Goot of Macquarie University based on opinion polls has highlighted that suggest increase in support for immigration with decline in unemployment. (Menadue 2003: 83-5).

With regard to public support, Murray Goot points out the three attempts made by different people to interpret the same data generated by the OMA 1988-89 survey of Australian attitudes. According to Ian McAllister, the results of the survey show that multiculturalism enjoys a high level of support. Katherine Betts concedes that the OMA survey showed widespread support for access and equity programs but there was little support for continuing cultural pluralism. According to Foster and Seitz, while the OMA survey shows general support for the positive statements relating to the meanings of multiculturalism and overall support for all the stated official aims of
multiculturalism, it surely signals some caution to any government which thinks it can substantially change structures and ideas which are embedded in Australia's cultural inheritance. Rejecting these three conclusions, Murray Goot on the basis of a reanalysis of the data suggested that firstly, while pro-multiculturalism easily outnumbers anti-multiculturalists, many Australians are neither pro-multiculturalists nor anti-multiculturalists. Secondly, attitudes to multiculturalism are good predictors of the positions adopted on a range of other issues. Thirdly, that as the proportion of Australians who were born in Britain declines, and the proportion born in Asia increases, support for multiculturalism is likely to increase. In general, according to observers and critics, multiculturalism runs the risk of ignoring institutional racism, and gender and class discrimination and such other problems (Gopal and Narang 2002: 52-53).

JamRozik et al. (1995: 114-115), points to a number of factors associated with the future of multiculturalism policy largely based on government policy and the attitudes found in the core institutions. First, multiculturalism does not reflect power relations in Australia with accuracy, as there are still clear links between ethnicity and socio-economic life chances. Second, it presents an equal chance to be unequal; it does not come to grips with inequalities of ethnicity, class, and gender. Third, acceptance of cultural pluralism also runs the danger of creating separate and inferior educational and social systems for different groups. Fourth, irrespective of its manifest acceptance in principle, multiculturalism does not hold much attraction for the Anglo-Australian majority. Complete multiculturalism would mean the abandonment of the myth of a 'typical Australian' and also a significant 'dilution' of the Anglo core of the society, so deeply embedded in the core institutions: education system, professional bodies, politics and government. The concept of multiculturalism is criticized for maintaining capitalist ideology and maximizing support for the party which espoused this ideology. In sum, support of cultural pluralism was used to distract attention from the inferior class position of many immigrants, to keep them happy in their ethnicity, and to secure their vote (JamRozik et al. 1995: 106). Notwithstanding the number of committees, reports and definitions, multiculturalism has remained a contested area in policy and the concept itself has continued to be interpreted in a variety of ways.
Some Critics of multiculturalism believe that it produces tribalism and divided loyalties. The tragedy of September 11 has heightened suspicion of Islamic immigrants and probably prompted some criticism of multiculturalism. Australian national university professor emeritus Helen Hughes favors multiculturalism but she believes migrants have to integrate into society as integration is vital for the future health of Australian society (Powell 2002). Theophanous (1995: 289) argues that multiculturalism is a scapegoat for many who feel their identity is threatened from a number of sources. The present crisis of Australian multiculturalism arises basically from two main sources – the exposure of the tensions and contradictions inherent in multiculturalism as a form of cultural pluralism; and its inability to cope with the demands of the current and emerging social reality (Jayasuriya 1990: 13).

Whereas the public rhetoric of multiculturalism celebrates diversity and toleration, this only serves to disguise the fact that most migrants remain a lower paid under-class, performing menial labor at lower rates of pay than the rest of Australian society. Multiculturalism is the ideal form of ideology of global capitalism. In other words, multiculturalism is a disavowed, inverted, self-referential form of racism, racism with a distance. It respects the others’ identity, conceiving the other as a self-enclosed ‘authentic community towards which he, the multiculturalists, maintains a distance rendered possible by his privileged universal position (Gopal and Narang 2002: 51). Gopal (2004: 319) further argues, that amongst other problems that state sponsored policy of multiculturalism faces is that it tends to freeze the fluidity of ethnic identity by synthesis of cultural identities and differences into a harmonious ‘unity in diversity’ mould. Foster and Stockley (1984:133,136,140) posit that multicultural concept and policy is an historical product, the results of human intervention. They further argue that the concept of “ethnicity” has been used quite overtly for political ends. Also, it conflict between Black and White Australians can blow wide open the current conception of multiculturalism in Australia which will force people to ‘move beyond multiculturalism’.

Some critics of multiculturalism claim that it creates cleavages within each ethnic community between elites and other members of the community. By placing emphasis on ethnicity it has tended to obscure the class differences not only within each ethnic community but also between the stronger and the weaker ethnic groups
But it is not multiculturalism that is causing the ethnic and social problems. Extremists and racists have been assailing the core values that are integral to the Australian concept of multiculturalism, compounded over the years by failures to always apply the policy consistently and effectively. But such problems are challenges to multiculturalism. They are not its products (Colin November 23, 2006 www.smh.com.au/news). In the United States there is a wide variety of programs designed to assist disadvantaged ethnic groups, especially Afro-American and Hispanics. These programs are under fire from conservatives. The Americans debate has influenced Australia. It is concerned with a quite different concept of multiculturalism based on minority rights and affirmative action, neither of which have been enshrined in Australian policy or practice except for Aborigines (Healey Kaye 1997:35). Thus, regardless of the evident differences, “these settler states have managed to make use of the image of themselves as nations of immigrants to create the prospect of a more open, fluid and dynamic sense of national identity—one that accords with the dictates of multiculturalism” (Kivisto 2002:189-190). On the whole Australian model appears to be fairly successful by managing migration, providing rapid access to citizenship and other formal rights and in dealing with these changes with little social tension. The Australian quest for a multicultural nation has dealt with dilemmas of reconciling immigrants’ attachment with their culture and homeland on one hand, and their desire to adapt to the over-arching Australian framework, on the other. Having discussed the multiculturalism policy, the chapter in the following section looks at various relevant immigration policies adopted in Australia either to increase or curtail the population movement.

CITIZENSHIP

Until the *Nationality and Citizenship Act (NCA) 1948*, Australians were solely British subjects with 'duties and privileges' as subjects of the Queen. For most of the twentieth century the prevailing conception of citizenship was a culturally normative one – it was conceptualized in relation to British culture and ethnicity, not in terms of the rights and responsibilities of the citizens of an autonomous state. The department saw the attainment of Australian citizenship as the final step in the process of assimilation of alien migrants, and closely monitored citizenship statistics as the only measurable indicators of the success of their settlement programs (Jordens 2002). It is
opined that Citizenship tests hold out the superficial promise of acting as some kind of population filter to ensure that migrants measure up to certain predetermined Australian qualities and values. But the test will have no impact on the composition of the migration program or make-up of Australian society, since all potential candidates for the test are, by definition, already living there as permanent residents (Costar and Citizenship in Australia, within the confines of the twentieth century, has been an admixture of ideals and practice—a device of inclusion and exclusion. Citizenship has never simply connoted the right to vote, but entailed the requisite characteristics that enabled a person to ‘claim’ citizenship (Dyrenfurth 2005: 88).

RECENT IMMIGRATION POLICIES

In all major migrant countries, increase in rate of immigration or proportion of foreign born population raises concerns about the economic socio-cultural adjustment and impact of foreign born population. The following section presents attitudes towards immigration and immigrants in Australia. Australian immigration policy has experienced major shifts in its migration programs which are being enlisted below:

• **1947-1971**: Due to the major labor shortages in the post-war period, Australia opened its doors to migrants from European countries other than the traditional sources of Ireland and United Kingdom. It focused on migrant settlement programs especially of semi-skilled, unskilled and refugees.

• **1971-1996**: The structural changes in economy followed by ageing of the baby boom cohorts in the workforce, labor shortage no longer remained the *raison d’être* of immigration. An immigration program based mainly on skill recruitment, family reunion and refugee/humanitarian component was developed. The White Australia policy was dismantled which led to ushering in an era of migrants from Asia.

• **1996- Until recently**: Australia entered a phase of promoting more temporary immigration visas targeting particular occupations. Its permanent migration policy based on skilled migrations was further strengthened.

The Australian government has had a planned migration program, aiming at delivering the best long-term outcome in terms of the living standards and well-being.
of all Australians. Five core values underpinning Australia’s current immigration policies are:

1. Immigration policy must be non-discriminatory in terms of race, religion, color and ethnicity.
2. It must demonstrably be in national economic and social interest.
3. Close family reunion to the extent that it is reasonable and sensible
4. Contribution to the resettlement of those most in humanitarian need
5. Retain the capacity to manage the movement of people across the borders in an orderly and efficient manner (Ruddock 2003: 72).

The right to permit entry or expel aliens from Australia is derived from the principle of sovereignty which is enshrined in the Australian Constitution. The Constitution gives the Commonwealth Parliament the power to enact laws with respect to “naturalization and aliens” (the Constitution s 51(xix)) and “immigration and emigration” (the Constitution s 51(xxvii)). Commonwealth Parliament has enacted the Migration Act 1958 (MA), described as “an Act relating to the entry into, and presence in, Australia of aliens, and the departure or deportation from Australia of aliens and certain other persons”. Delegated legislation, the Migration Regulations 1994 (MR), is made under the power conferred by the MA to determine the parameters of entry and related matters. This scheme provides the legal framework for the implementation of the Australian Government’s policy regarding entry to Australia of aliens (Goddard and Papadopoulos 2009: 1).

Although Australia’s immigration system is complex and subject to frequent change, there are a number of principles on which the system is based. Some of them are listed below:

- **Citizen/non-citizen dichotomy**
  The powers contained in the MA extend to all non-citizens within Australia, regardless of the period of time that they have spent in Australia and whether that period of stay has been lawful or unlawful. A person ceases to become subject to the MA when Australian citizenship is granted.

- **Universal visa system**
All non-citizens are required to hold a visa. A non-citizen in Australia who does not have this permission is an "unlawful non-citizen" and subject to automatic detention and removal.

• Codified scheme

The MA and MR provide the sole legal authority for the grant of a visa to a non-citizen. It is therefore, impossible for a visa to be legally granted under another Act of Parliament, either of the Commonwealth or a state or territory.

• Decision-making and delegation

The power to make decisions or determinations under the MA is expressed to be a power of the minister. A delegate of the minister exercises the power of the minister on his behalf. Some of the powers in the MA are expressed to be a power which is personal to the minister (Goddard and Papadopoulos 2009: 2).

The Migration Act 1958

Since its enactment in 1958, MA has undergone considerable changes, most recently in 1989 and 1994 when substantial amendments were made. The MA continues to be amended on a regular basis. The MA provides the framework for the operation of the immigration system through the enactment of provisions relating to various issues like the status of non-citizens in Australia, mechanisms to control the number of visas granted, refugee applicants and other provisions about protection of visas. It also deals with sponsorships, the procedure for entering Australia, powers with respect to unlawful non-citizens etc. Save for some specific provisions, the MA says little about particular visa categories available to non-citizens (for example, tourist, student or migrant). This level of detail is contained in the MR. It is, therefore, not possible to advise a potential visa applicant using only the Act as a reference, nor is it possible in many cases to advise a person properly using only the MR, without being familiar with the provisions of the MA (Goddard and Papadopoulos 2009: 2).

There are several other Acts of Parliament which are relevant to immigration law. These Acts include, but are not limited to the:
Australian Citizenship Act 1948, which determines the circumstances in which a non-citizen is eligible for Australian citizenship and related matters.

Passports Act 1938, which relates to the issue of passports.

Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act 1946, which defines the status of certain non-citizen children in Australia, various acts relating to overseas students in Australia.

Legislative Instruments Act 2003.

Acts Interpretation Act 1901.

The Migration Regulations ACT 1994

The current MR was made in 1994. Since that time they have been amended on many occasions. The Government's immigration policy is that migration should be beneficial to Australia's interests. It therefore, emphasizes the importance of attracting young, skilled or entrepreneurial migrants who will be of benefit to the country and who will be able to settle without difficulty. It continues to maintain a commitment to family reunion and humanitarian resettlement provided this does not place a high burden on Australia's public health and welfare systems (Goddard and Papadopoulos 2009: 6). Each year the minister announces the annual intake of migrants (those people who are granted permanent visas). There are four streams or components to the program: family, skilled, special eligibility and humanitarian. Migrants are selected under the Migration Program in three streams — Skill, Family and Special Eligibility; while the Humanitarian Program offers resettlement to refugees and to displaced persons who have suffered discrimination amounting to gross violations of their human rights. The rules for each, in general terms:

- **Skill:** Most migrants must satisfy a point test, have particular work skills, and be nominated by particular employers, have other links to Australia or have successful business skills and/or significant capital to bring to Australia to establish a business of benefit to this country.

- **Family:** Selected on the basis of the family relationship to a sponsor in Australia—essentially spouses, fiancés, dependent children and parents who meet the 'balance of family' test (a test designed to give an indication of how
strong the parents’ family links are with Australia compared with other countries.

- **Special Eligibility**: Covers former residents who had not acquired Australian citizenship and are seeking to return to Australia as permanent residents.

- **Humanitarian**: Refugees and other Humanitarian Program arrivals must satisfy the criteria concerning refugees or humanitarian cases (DIAC 2008). The following table illustrates movement of immigrant population by selection criterias:

### Table 2.1: Settler arrivals by eligibility category, 1996-97 to 2006-07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility Category</th>
<th>1996-97</th>
<th>1999-00</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>36490</td>
<td>19896</td>
<td>28066</td>
<td>34771</td>
<td>37138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>19697</td>
<td>32350</td>
<td>38504</td>
<td>59507</td>
<td>60755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Eligibility</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>9886</td>
<td>7267</td>
<td>9569</td>
<td>12113</td>
<td>12247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Programme Migration</td>
<td>19286</td>
<td>32628</td>
<td>17597</td>
<td>25098</td>
<td>29899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85752</td>
<td>92272</td>
<td>93914</td>
<td>131593</td>
<td>140148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Migration eligibility categories have changed during the period. The allocation of settlers to categories is based on assumptions, to align as closely as possible past policies with current policy. Comparisons between years are therefore indicative only.


The MR 1958 allows the Minister to ‘cap’ or limit the number of visas which can be granted each year in a particular visa subclass (DIAC 2009). The globalization of the labor market and the increasing movement of people for temporary business, work and personal purposes, has been the stock of the temporary entrants in Australia, particularly skilled temporary residents increased significantly in recent years.

**REVIEW OF THE IMMIGRATION POLICIES**

Australia experienced substantial immigration over the last few years after the renunciation of “traditional source country” preference, which has led to ethnic
diversification of the population. In Australia, two significant policy changes have been brought out in the last half century. The first is the abolition of ethnic background considerations; and the second is the shift from an "occupational needs principle" towards "general skills principle", reflecting a change in the perception of the economic benefits of the types of skills that are involved (Winkelmann 2001:5). The move away from support of permanent settlement to temporary-worker migration besides increased focus on skill in selection of migrants has helped Australia build its population as well as skills.

The colonial past has indeed shaped the immigration policies of Australia. An important characteristic of the policy remains the ethnic consideration of the immigrants. However, in 1966 Immigration Minister Opperman, after reviewing non-European policies announced that the applications for migration would be accepted from well-qualified persons on the basis of their suitability as settlers, their ability to integrate easily and their possession of qualifications deemed useful to Australia. The subsequent policy changes triggered the influx of the non-European migrants, first as "temporary residents" and later as residents of Australia. Australian immigration policies clearly outline their requirement of intake based on "broad-based skills with the capacity to contribute to Australia’s economy" (DIMA 2000).

All applications for migration to Australia are assessed against requirements set out in the Migration Act and Regulations. The Government determines the criteria and sets the number of people who can enter under the program on an annual basis. The criteria for the Migration Program are selective, choosing those applicants who meet Australia's requirements and have good prospects for successful settlement. Migrants can be selected on the basis of such factors as relationship to an Australian permanent resident or citizen, skills, age, qualifications, capital and business acumen. All applicants must also meet the health and character requirements specified by migration legislation (DIAC 2008).

Australia's permanent immigration program has two components: a) Migration, for Skilled, Family and Special Eligibility Stream migrants and, b) Humanitarian, for refugees and others in humanitarian need. The social stream of migrants constitutes family reunification and humanitarian influx. Family reunification occupies the status of being a major factor in Australian immigration,
though various steps are increasingly being taken over the years to limit the size of such flows. Migration program is more focused towards the skill stream in order to deliver migrants with much needed skills and expertise. Skilled migrants have helped in generating jobs, paying taxes, adding to the cultural diversity of Australia (Ruddock 2003: 72, 75).

The economic category leads to selection of migrants on the basis of personal characteristics and hence, keeps a check on the “quality” aspects of migration. Economic criteria are employed as point system. The General Skilled Migration (GSM) visa categories target skilled migrants who are young, have good English language skills and can quickly enter the Australian labour market. Points can also be awarded for specific work experience, Australian work experience, nominating an occupation in demand/job offer, partner skills, Australian qualifications, regional Australian study, and nomination by a state or territory government, eligible relative sponsorship and community language (DIAC 2009).

Successive governments in Australia from 1960s onwards treated economic migration as a labour market strategy to alleviate skill shortages in particular sectors. They employed “Occupational Priority List” by stating that employers desiring to recruit persons not on the list had to demonstrate that no suitable local resident was available or readily trained. However, since the 1990s, Australia loosened its criteria and preference was given to migrants in occupations that formed part of “Migration Occupations in Demand List”. Moreover, the economic criterion continues to employ an Employer Nomination Scheme for skilled persons nominated by an Australian employer who has not found a suitable contender from the local labour market or by training (Winkelmann 2001: 6).

Australian immigration over the post-war period has been drawn from a large number of countries with 58 countries of birth having more than 10,000 persons and with 112 more than 1,000 persons. Moreover, there have been fluctuations in the mix of birthplace groups entering Australia. The current Australian program is highly planned with government setting a target for each year, and planning level for each component of the migration program are fixed (Khoo et al. 2008: 197). Under Liberal /National Country Party (Lib/NCP) since 1975, migration policies underwent a change from manpower orientation to family reunion. Family reunion was not
intended by the government but rather it was the result of domestic political change and the resultant new influences over the migration policy. An unintended component of family reunion program was the increase in Asian migration to Australia. By 1983, Australia’s immigration policy was as much like USA or Canada in terms of its focus on family reunion program and Asian (non-European) migrants. Labour Party since 1983 also focused on the implications of migration on the labour market besides focusing on family reunion program (Birrell 1984: 66). Throughout the post-World War II period, successive Lib/N.C.P governments had always preferred “high settlement” types, i.e., relatively skilled and of British or Anglo origin. Such migrants were believed to be most resourceful, job ‘creative’ and most likely to assimilate without creating social problems (Birrell 1984: 70).

Fraser era entered Numerical Assessment System (N.U.M.A.S.) in 1979 which liberalized entry for independent applicants on the basis of skill attainment, competence in English, and other qualities likely to favour the prospective migrant in his search for job, and in assimilating readily within the Australian society. This selection did not give any concession in the direction of entry for low-skilled non English-speaking applicant, such as might appeal to ethnic communities or employers wanting such workers (Birrell 1984: 71). In 1980-81, migration intake was considerably increased by introducing general eligibility criteria (also called labour shortage) based on manpower orientation of the government policy towards migrants. The A.L.P. government opposed labour shortage program. Lack of employment opportunities for the domestic aspirants in wake of migration of overseas skilled migrants leads to opposition to such migrations in the host society even if they are available cheaply and conveniently. The party competition for migrant vote became a dominant factor in deciding the migration policies in Australia.

Australia’s immigration program has always emphasized the immigration of permanent migrants over the temporary ones, but since 1996 owing to new global economy and business groups wanting more flexible arrangements for bringing in skilled workers from overseas, the Australian government introduced new temporary business entry visa that allowed employers to sponsors skilled workers from overseas to stay for over a period of up to four years. The 457 subclass temporary business entry visa is similar to US H-1B visa that it is employer sponsored but it differs from
H-1B in that it include people on intra company transfer, it is open to people with trade skills, and it is not subject to annual quotas. There is a minimum salary level and employers have to pay migrants on the same basis as the Australian workers. The visa is renewable and visa holders can apply for permanent residency (Khoo et al. 2008: 198). While the permanent settlement program is highly planned and controlled by the Australian federal government, the business visitor program is largely market driven.

Since the introduction of the visa, there has been an increase in temporary entry of skilled workers. There is also a substantial increase in the other categories of temporary migrants to Australia such as overseas students and working holiday makers. In 2001, Australia changed its policies on foreign students to allow them apply for permanent residence skilled migrants on completion of their studies without leaving the country. Australia has become one of the world's five pre-eminent destinations of foreign students, along with U.S.A., UK, Germany and France. Of the largest six countries of origin, five are Asian: China (15 per cent), Korea and India (9 per cent each), Japan (8 per cent) and Malaysia (5 per cent) (Hugo 2006: 111).

There are minimum skill and salary levels for 457s and they are restricted to the top four Australian Standard Classification of Occupation (ASCO) levels: managers, professionals, associate professionals and skilled trades. This category of visa allows employers to recruit skilled migrants much more quickly than through the settlement program and represents an adjustment to the globalization of many skilled labour markets. There has been some concern in Australia that employers may misuse the program to replace Australian workers with lower-paid, non-unionized workers with poorer conditions than their Australian counterparts. Moreover, others are concerned that it is used as a substitute for training Australian workers. Nevertheless, it has been very successful in meeting skill shortages in a number of areas (Hugo 2006: 113). Hence, in response to globalization and the increased significance of the knowledge economy, there has been a massive change in the selection of immigrants wishing to come to Australia with a much greater focus placed on skill than ever before.

Earlier most of the immigrant countries focused on the incorporation of low-skilled migrant workers in the lower levels of affluent country’s workforce particularly in 1950s and 1960s. However, the changing circumstances and global
developments in terms of unemployment, recession besides long term social integration of migrant minorities, have forced policy makers to devise newer ways to deal with migration programs. R. Birrell (1984: 68) points that till the time Australia’s presumed need to “fill up open spaces”, to defend the country and provide more people to help Australia develop its resources remained shared assumptions. The immigration programs were rarely subjected to public scrutiny or contentious debates. There is opposition by some interest group to the promotion of high migration intake by Australia’s business and political elites.

Until recently, engagement with the Asian region has been minimal despite the fact that Asian and Pacific countries have become important origins of migration to Australia and destinations for emigrants in the last quarter century. The 9/11 attacks caused a rethinking of security considerations in Australia as was the case elsewhere in the world. This involved a re-evaluation of the nation’s relationship with neighbouring countries and the realization that improving the security, stability and well-being of those nations is fundamental to Australia’s future security. This has resulted in increased investment, capacity building and strategic interest in those countries by the Australian government. (Hugo, 2006: 126).

These policy initiatives have indeed led to a diverse composition of the Australian population. The end of ‘exclusionary’ immigration policy and the induction of multiculturalism have led the nation to move on from just being a migrant nation into a heterogeneous and diverse society. There has been planning and strict control of entries by the government. Though the entry policy is marked by non-discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity and national origin but selection of migrants has been on the basis of economic and social criteria. There has been acceptance of cultural pluralism and also various social policies and special agencies deal with educational, social and economic needs of immigrants. Even before official adoption of multiculturalism policy, there were clear evidences of dilution of its White Australia in the form of MA 1958 and other legal relaxations granted from time to time for entry of non-European migrants. The end of the Vietnam War and other economic and political changes triggered large-scale Asian immigration into Australia.
Thus, to conclude, Australia has clearly demonstrated a shift in its immigration program from being dominated by permanent settlement to granting of visas to live and work on a temporary basis. Skill education, Australian qualification, ability to speak English and work experience became the dominant criteria in selecting both settlers and temporary migrants (Hugo and Dasvarma 2008: 20). This has led to an increase in the migration of people from Indian subcontinent, making India second largest origin country of immigrants where English is not the main language spoken. The Asians are the fastest growing overseas-born ethnic group in Australia. In 1990s, eight out of ten top countries of Australia’s migrants were Asian countries. Let us now briefly look at the history of Indian migrations to Australia.

INDIAN MIGRATION TO AUSTRALIA:

Though Asians were the first to touch the shores of Australia, yet their immigration has always remained a thorny issue in Australian society and politics. As evident, the White Australia policy was enacted to prevent Chinese and other Asian immigrants from entering Australia. The end of Vietnam War opened floodgates for immigration of these people. There is a strong and steady rise in numbers of Asians in Australia following multiculturalism policy and subsequent relaxations of immigration policies. This rise has indeed occupied centrality in issues of public debate. In 1991, the figure of 6,87,850 Asians excluding West Asia amounted to 4.3 % of its total population. Out of this 0.7 percent was of South Asian people migrating under family reunion program. Hong Kong was Asia’s largest sorce of immigrants in 1992-92 followed by Vietnam, Philippines, India, China, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Taiwan and Indonesia (Yallop 1985: 30). In the 21st Century the “Invasion Complex” of Asians has still not completely disappeared though it has been critiqued, and it has now most commonly represented as marking a less acceptable racist movement that was discarded with the white Australia policy, it still informs some of the ways in which international affairs and immigration are understood. In her 1996 maiden speech in federal parliament, One Nation Party leader, Pauline Hanson suggested that the large population of Asian nation compared to the small population of Australia has a threat (Elder 2007: 124-125).

The leaders of Australian colonial governments and successive federal governments were conscious of India as a part of the Empire, a populous Asian
dependency of Britain ruled by British administrators, in the interests of imperial community. There were only a few Indian migrants in Australia. The British government viewed Australian restrictive immigration policies before and after federation with some concern, because of a desire neither to offend Indians as well as Japanese nor to create a second-class citizenship within the Empire. Yet the Australians saw Indians as second-class citizens, as constitutionally inferior. As J.C. Watson, the Labor Party leader, said: Australians are ‘citizen-subjects’ of the Empire whereas Indians were ‘subject-citizens’. Australia wanted to keep all Asians out for a number of reasons, including a basic assumption that white men were racially superior. During that phase though India was not happy with Australian immigration policy, yet it did not register a formal complaint with Australia (Millar 1991: 254).

Prominent historian Geoffrey Blainey opposed the influx of Asians on the pretext of interest and wishes of Australian people and that they would destroy Australian way of life.

Australia is not a homogenous Anglo-Celtic country. Studies have revealed that, the first fleet that arrived at Sydney Cove on 26 January 1788 had a dozen ethnic groups of sailors, soldiers and convicts who established the first colony in Australia. Subsequent migration composed of life convicts by British colonial Government from Mauritius, Reunion, Mozambique and Madagascar. Asiatic-Indians and Chinese migrated to Australia via Mauritius. The first Indians to settle in Australia were Muslims. The convict system was abolished in the mid- nineteenth century and discovery of traces of gold in New South Wales took place in 1820s. A million people from Europe and America entered Australia in between 1852 to 1861. Large scale Asian migration took place, during this ‘Gold rush era’ as Chinese miners, largely concentrated in Victoria, reached nearly 50,000 by 1850. Indentured labour arrived from India, Japan and Sri Lanka (Gopal 2004: 316).

The HLC on the Indian diaspora (2000: 277-278) indicated that Indians in Australia comprised of 30,000 NRI, 1, 60,000 PIOs which is nearly 1.02 per cent of the total Australian population. During British Colonial rule, camels and their handlers or ‘drivers’ from North-West India were sent to Australia in 1850. The three ‘Ghans’ along with a first consignment of 124 camels arrived in Melbourne in June, 1860. These immigrants were employed on contract basis for three years and they
were repatriated back to India on the expiry of their contract. Those left behind were employed as labourers. The Australian Government named the major Australian train route as ‘Ghan Express’ in act of appreciation of the hard and dedicated work displayed by the Indians.

Sikhs and Punjabi Muslims migrated to Australia mainly as agricultural labourers, hawkers and traders. The North coast of New South Wales has the greatest concentration of immigrants. The number of Indian emigrants sharply declined to about 7000 as a result of enactment of Immigration Restriction Act, 1901. The next wave of immigration was in 1930 when a group of labourers from Jalandhar district of Punjab went to Australia to work in sugar plantation in Woolgoolga (New South Wales). About 400 Sikh families settled there and were engaged in Banana cultivation. In spite of continuation of “White Australian Policy,” the railway and dock workers decided to migrate in 1947 and this flow of Anglo-Indians continued till 1960s. This migration was accepted in spite of prevalence of the Restrictive Policy. The Restrictive immigration policy was relaxed in 1966. A quantum jump in immigration took place after 1966. The Indian population in Australia rose from 7,500 in 1947 to 14,107 in 1961 and to 29,212 in 1971. The nature of Indian immigrants changed from rail and dock workers to qualified professionals (HLC 2002: 278).

Migration from Fiji and Other Countries, such as Malaysia, Mauritius, and Singapore also took place after 1966. This migration is termed as ‘twice migrant’ and has added to the complexities of Indian diaspora in Australia. The migration from Fiji took place due to the political instability caused by two military coups in 1987 and motivated by opposition to Indians. A third quasi coup in 2000 again accentuated migration of Indian diaspora from Fiji to Australia (Connell 2004: 195)

Table 2.2: Indian Born Population in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>7,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>6,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>6,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>6,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>8,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>14,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>29,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>37,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>41,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>47,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>60,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>77,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>95,449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A glance at the above table reveals that there is insignificant increase in migration from 1901 to 1947 due to the existence of the restrictive immigration policy but after independence, there is some spurt in numbers because of migration of Anglo-Indians from India to Australia. The above table also reveals a sharp rise in migration after 1986 when a number of professionals like computer and software experts, engineers, doctors, accountants opted to settle in Australia. Indians have also migrated from East and South Africa though it is difficult to estimate the numbers. Rough estimates suggest that there may be two lakh of people of Indian ancestry comprising of first and twice migrants and their children by the end of twentieth century.

It is pertinent to point out that Australia is not the first Choice of Indian migrants. Emigrants chose to migrate to America and other advanced Western countries and on failing to enter these countries, they turn towards Australia. Students prefer America because of availability of scholarships and employment. However, it may be mentioned here that Australia is also becoming a favourite destinations for Indians because of its liberal immigration policies and growing opportunities. Australia is presently accepting skilled personnel and professionally qualified people such as doctors, engineers, IT professionals and skilled workers like electricians, plumbers etc. The number of Indian migrants entering Australian borders has doubled during the last few years.

A brief reference to the migratory patterns of Indian diaspora to Australia is made here. A detailed study of the ethno-cultural identity of the Indians in Australia
vis-à-vis United States of America is taken up in the following chapters. As argued in the preceding discussion, Australian immigration program remains closely linked with a vision of a multicultural Australian society. Indian migration to Australia is a recent phenomenon as compared to Indian migrations to other countries like U.S.A., United Kingdom etc. It is said that the first Indian came as part of Captain Cook's ship. The following section categorizes Indian migrations to Australia into these broad patterns:

- **Early Migrants:** The Sikhs migrated to Woolgoolga to work in Banana plantations where they now comprise a rich community. A large number of British and Anglo-Indians migrated after India attained its independence.

- **All White Australia:** The Immigration Restriction Act considerably reduced the Asian migrations until 1966 when they were relaxed for entry of educated migrants.

- **Migrations after enactment of Multiculturalism Policy:** There was influx of Indian migrants not only from India but also from places like Fiji, Singapore, Mauritius etc. Both primary and secondary migration of people of Indian origin continues to take place with increasing numbers year after years. Fiji had military coups as a result of which the migration of Indo-Fijian diaspora to Australia accelerated dramatically.

- **Recent Migrations to Australia:** It consists of highly qualified professionals like engineers, doctors besides the business and entrepreneurial community. A new wave of immigration of Indian students has added to the migrant population of Australia. The Indian community has achieved significant positions in so far its level of education is considered. Thus, Indian migration has indeed increased many folds following the proclamation of multiculturalism policy. Available figures show that there were 43,700 Indians in 1981, 66,200 in 1991 and 1, 90,000 in 2001 (Gopal 2004: 322). Thus, the Indian diaspora has many facets which can be classified as old immigrants, the new immigrants, the geographically indirect, immigrants, the second generation and Australian-Indian.
As discussed above, the old migrants comprised of unskilled agricultural labours, whereas the new immigrants are well-educated and technically skilled. They are holding white collared jobs and belong to middle and upper socio-economic strata of Australian society. The common factor amongst all these migrants is their desire to migrate to Australia in order to enhance their socio-economic status. The old immigrants and the geographically indirect immigrants show greater concern in protecting their ethniC identify as compared to new immigrants and the second generation of Indians of Australia. This is evident in their residences, patterns of living, relations with the wider Australian society, concept of identity, social net works and political affiliation. The patterns of their adaptation in the host society and greater issues of ethno-cultural identity are dealt in chapter four using a comparative framework.

CONCLUSION

The essentially Anglo-dominated mono-cultural society in 1945 has given way to a situation in today's globalized world in which English-speaking majority cannot avoid interaction with substantial ethnic minorities of European, Asian, South American, African and Oceania region. The heterogeneous economic, cultural, social and racial features of Australian society have led to the recognition of plural or multicultural Australia. Multiculturalism in Australia has intended to advance social justice for ethnic minorities, yet a lot needs to be done. It is definitely more egalitarian than those countries which sticks to exclusionary or assimilationist policy. Progress to address problems of immigrants has been slow in many key areas. Indigenous and NSEB people are still far from equal with regard to participation in political and economic power.

Australia is a multicultural nation state which has adopted a 'top-down' political strategy. In Australia, multiculturalism is a center piece of official government policy which ensures inclusion of ethnic minorities within its evolving national main strength culture. Notwithstanding, the claims of engagement with Asia and Asian identity, Australia nonetheless remains essentially Anglo-Celtic. However, constructive engagement with Asia, geographical location of Australia and the technological ascendance of many Asian nations will certainly determine the future course of population movement to Australia. The above discussion clearly indicates
that Australia is an immigrant multicultural nation with increasing proportion of Asians in Australian population.

In the last few years, there has been a transformation of the scale, characteristics and significance of international population movements. This demands a constant re-evaluation of Australia's immigration policy and programs. Indeed, of immigration policy of Australia has been debated and polled that no other federal policy has, yet it has not failed to evolve from its colonial legacy. The incident of September 11 had raised concerns with security and integrity of national borders. The response of both government and Australian population has been of restraint and caution. Having a long experience as of immigration, Australia has developed policy and programs which maximizes the benefit of such developments. All immigration policy formulation in Australia should be undertaken in full recognition of the fact that the world immigration situation of the twenty-first century is different. It is part of a set of powerful international processes which are creating new political, economic, financial, cultural and information links between countries. It is important to realize that increase in international population movement is going to create more cultural diversity which will bring major changes in society. The challenge will increase in the wake of globalization and increased porous boundaries of nations. The representative and bureaucratic structures need to be refashioned so as to address individual and group rights more democratically.