

The retreat from Multiculturalism: the Australian experience

Farida Tilbury

Abstract:

This paper explores the retreat from multiculturalism in Australia, in policy, practice and rhetoric. The colonial settler society of Australia has, since the early 1970s, prided itself on building a multicultural nation of migrants from diverse racial, religious and cultural backgrounds. In the last few years, however, under the leadership of a conservative government and in light of international events, there has been a clear movement away from multiculturalism (even its weak or symbolic versions) towards monoculturalism by Australia's politicians. This has been mirrored by rising xenophobia among the population. The paper examines the manner in which cultural homogeneity and assimilation has returned to the policy agenda, particularly through discourses of national fragmentation, identity loss, values challenges, and risk. The retreat to a Eurocentric identity and explicitly 'Enlightenment' values, within the context of a 'Judeo-Christian heritage' is evidence of the growing confidence of the mainstream in asserting a traditional version of what it means to be Australian. The paper uses analysis of politicians' speeches and debate about the new citizenship test to demonstrate the process of realignment of the nation as an 'imagined community'.

Key words: multiculturalism, pluralism, Australia, citizenship,

Introduction

This paper explores the retreat from multiculturalism in Australia in the last year, in policy, practice and rhetoric. Australia has, since the early 1970s, prided itself on building a multicultural nation of migrants from diverse racial and cultural backgrounds. Multiculturalism has become part of the national identityⁱ. In the last few years, however, under the leadership of a conservative government and in light of international events, there has been a clear movement away from multiculturalism (even its weak or symbolic versions) towards monoculturalism by Australia's politicians. This has been mirrored by rising xenophobia (both fear of outsiders and fear of the 'stranger within') among the population – and a 'hysterical' rallying of forces pointing to serious divisions 'caused' by multiculturalism.ⁱⁱ Thus the commitment to pluralism which Australia had fostered for some time is now under threat. The paper examines the manner in which cultural homogeneity and assimilation has returned to the policy agenda, particularly through discourses of national fragmentation, identity loss, values challenges, and risk. Changes to citizenship rules will be a particular focus, particularly the ways in which citizenship is being used as a tool for exclusion rather than inclusion, however other evidence is also be discussed. A number of fundamental questions are addressed - how is current political discourse attempting to realign the nation as an 'imagined community'; what are the 'Australian values' being articulated by politicians and others; how are migrants and particular groups of migrants being positioned by these discourses; and how are dissenting voices challenging the dominant discourses.

Australia: some background

There is growing pessimism in Australia about the direction the country is taking in terms of its commitment to pluralism.ⁱⁱⁱ It is useful to provide a little background to the history of Australia, and Australian nationalism, to provide a context for this concern. The version of 'nation' on which Australia, a relatively young country with a history of only 50 years of citizenship, and 100 years of nationhood, was built is based on a model of the nation-state as it emerged in Western Europe and North America from the 18th Century. This concept implies close links between

ethnic and political identity. The nation was conceived as a collective that belongs together, on the basis of a shared language, cultural, traditions, history i.e. an ethnic community. The state is traditionally the political unit that tends to coincide with the ethnic one, with clear territorial boundaries.^{iv} Such a model represents a challenge for settler societies such as Australia, much more clearly an ‘imagined community’ of multiple groups and interests, that faces “the conflicting claims of groups of people who share identities and identity-conferring practices that differ from those of the majority...”^v

One way to deal with this challenge is to try to create a relatively homogenous nation. The first piece of legislation Australia passed as a new nation in 1901 was a law limiting entry. This arose from the tension between the need to populate the country for security and economic reasons, but simultaneously to ensure social cohesion. Concerns that settlers from Asia, some parts of Europe, and the Middle East in the 19th century would change the cultural character of the colonial outpost lead to the implementation of the *Commonwealth Immigration Act 1901* which restricted entry through a number of measures (primarily a selectively applied dictation test) to those of European stock.^{vi} Prior to 1948 Australians were British subjects, after which those of British and Irish stock automatically became Australian citizens. All others living in Australia were ‘aliens, with different criteria for eligibility for citizenship depending on their nation of origin. The *Migration Act 1958* deleted all reference to race or nationality as criteria for entry, and signaled the beginning of the dismantling of the ‘white Australia policy’. The result has been an increasingly heterogeneous nation. From the early 1970s a celebration of multiculturalism became a defining feature of Australia, and while it started as a political discourse it did find its way into the psyche of the people, although there has been ongoing tension about the extent to which ‘boutique’ versus ‘strong’ multiculturalism should be the goal^{vii}, and concern about the effect of ethnic pluralism on national cohesion^{viii}. There has also remained an undercurrent of Eurocentrism.^{ix} However, for the last three decades, citizenship was seen as a civic identity which did not necessarily erase aspects of cultural identity for

migrants, despite criticism from some commentators that it did not provide Australians with a clear sense of a national identity.^x

Australia is a nation of migrants. Apart from the indigenous people, who have lived on the continent for up to 60,000 years, since 'European' settlement began in 1788 Australia has been peopled by those who have been transported here, or who have chosen to migrate. Since 1945, 6.5 million people have migrated to Australia. Currently a quarter of Australia's 20 million people were born overseas, coming from over 200 countries, and speaking over 175 different languages, demonstrating a level of diversity uncommon in many nations. Migrants still come from traditional countries, with the greatest number of migrants arriving in Australia between July 2005 and June 2006 coming from the United Kingdom (17.7 per cent) and New Zealand (14.4 per cent), although the next highest groups are from Asia (China 8.0 per cent, India 8.6 per cent and the Philippines 3.9 per cent).^{xi} Currently the migrant intake depends on the demands of the labour market and is between 80,000-120,000 a year, with another 12-14,000 coming under humanitarian provisions. The largest proportion come under the 'Skilled entrants' category which uses a points system to determine access for those with skills in highest demand.

Migrants can remain in Australia indefinitely as permanent residents – there is no requirement that they become citizens. However, they are increasingly being encouraged to become citizens, as a means of demonstrating their commitment to the 'Australian way of life and values'. The federal government has been running a series of advertisements since 2003 with the tag line 'There has never been a better time to become an Australian citizen', although it is unclear why now is the best time, apart from the implication that pledging one's allegiance to the nation will signal complete membership, and therefore lack of suspicion, in a post 9/11 context. As will be seen shortly citizenship is increasingly being used as a way to manage and control diversity, and as the flagship for an ideological retreat from multiculturalism to monoculturalism.

However, it must be said that changes in Australia's approach to diversity is so far a 'downscaling' rather than a fullscale retreat as found in Europe^{xii}. Joppke argues this is because in Australia multiculturalism

has been entangled with national self definition since its inception, in the absence of other 'founding myths'. It is in many respects a household term, although I would not wish to overstate levels of support for it.^{xiii} As the Immigration Minister responsible for the move towards support for pluralism in Australia, Al Grasby, said "take away multicultural Australia and you have nothing left".^{xiv} Likewise 1990s Labor Prime Minister Paul Keating identified Australia as a "multicultural nation in Asia". It has been argued that multiculturalism was a top-down political strategy. This centrepiece of official government policy for the last few decades was part of the process of separation of the colony from mother England. In some ways multiculturalism was the national identity option taken up after racial identity (the White Australia policy) was dropped in favour of a cultural identity.

There is some debate about whether the retreat has been gradual or rapid. There is not space here to trace changes in the recent past, so I wish to focus on the period 2006-2007 to illustrate the nature of this change recently. I am particularly interested in how diversity is being written out of the national symbolism, and social cohesion written in, and the forms of exclusion which result.

Talking monoculturalism

The conservative federal government has picked up on levels of inherent xenophobia in Australians exacerbated by the climate of fear post September 11, to raise concerns over the effects of multiculturalism on social cohesion. In the following radio interview given by Prime Minister John Howard in 2006 his overt retreat from multiculturalism was justified as being necessary for Australia to develop a strong sense of nationhood.

Everyone knows that I don't use the word multiculturalism very much and the reason I don't use it very much is that it has been used in a very zealous...mushy fashion by some over the years. To many people multiculturalism simply means that we are tolerant to people of different cultural backgrounds, now if that's all it means, then it's a fine concept. We are tolerant to people of different backgrounds but over the years at its zenith, the more zealous multiculturalism basically said that this country should be a federation of cultures. You can't have a

nation with a federation of cultures. You can have a nation where a whole variety of cultures constantly influence and mould and change and blend in with the mainstream culture, but a nation that doesn't have a core culture... and the core culture of this nation is very clear; we are an outshoot of western civilisation. Because we speak the English language our cultural identity is very heavily Anglo-Saxon. It doesn't mean that it isn't distinctively Australian, but you have to recognise that there is a core set of values in this country.^{xv}

Discourses of fragmentation are apparent in the notion that “You can't have a nation with a federation of cultures”, which links to concerns about identity loss, specifically the loss of a sense of being part of ‘Western civilisation’ which shares an ‘Anglo-Saxon’ identity, an identity multiculturalism has threatened. As Ghassan Hage has shown Australia maintains a self identity which foregrounds mainstream (white, European) culture, and diversity is accommodated only insofar as it is acceptable to this mainstream.^{xvi} While this has been implicit in discourses over the last few decades, it is now increasingly explicit, as in this speech. Howard’s suggestion that other cultures should ‘blend in with the mainstream’ clearly signals that those who retain aspects of cultural practices that do not ‘blend in’ are threatening the nation’s cohesion. Howard asserts that there is a core set of values in the country, which are being put at risk, although the precise nature of the threat is unclear. An indistinct sense of this threat is apparent in the incomplete sentence “...but a nation that doesn't have a core culture...”. Multiculturalism is trivialized through the words ‘zealous’ for its supporters, and ‘mushy’, signifying ‘do gooder liberals’ with little understanding of the reality of nation-building. Howard’s speech has definite echoes of Arthur Schlesinger, who challenged the value of diversity in his *The Disuniting of America* – the notion of multicultural zealots appears to have been adopted wholesale from him: “...in an excess of zeal, well-intentioned people seek to transform our system of education from a means of creating ‘one people’ into a means of promoting, celebrating and perpetuating separate ethnic origins and identities. The balance is shifting from *unum* to *pluribus*”.^{xvii} Schlesinger also uses the term “multicultural zealots”.

A final quote from the Prime Minister illustrates this move away from multiculturalism, within a discourse of the need for social cohesion, obviously at threat from the centrifugal forces of multiculturalism. In an address to the National Press Club Howard made the following statement:

In the 21st century, maintaining our social cohesion will remain the highest test of the Australian achievement. It demands the best Australian ideals of tolerance and decency, as well as the best Australian traditions of realism and of balance. ...Our celebration of diversity must not be at the expense of the common values that bind us together as one people - respect for the freedom and dignity of the individual, a commitment to the rule of law, the equality of men and women and a spirit of egalitarianism that embraces tolerance, fair play and compassion for those in need. Nor should it be at the expense of ongoing pride in what are commonly regarded as the values, traditions and accomplishments of the old Australia. A sense of shared values is our social cement. Without it we risk becoming a society governed by coercion rather than consent. That is not an Australia any of us would want to live in....Most nations experience some level of cultural diversity while also having a dominant cultural pattern running through them. In Australia's case, that dominant pattern comprises Judeo-Christian ethics, the progressive spirit of the Enlightenment and the institutions and values of British political culture. Its democratic and egalitarian temper also bears the imprint of distinct Irish and non-conformist traditions.^{xviii}

Diversity is framed as a threat to social cohesion, based on common values, which, to borrow a phrase from Durkheim, acts as 'social cement'. Once again the sense of threat is evident, this time articulated as the risk of 'becoming a society governed by coercion rather than consent'. This is somewhat ironic given the recent imposition of stringent testing of citizens, easily seen as a coercive move. Howard frames his argument as one that all Australians share. The final phrase of this speech is taken verbatim from what was to become a section of the information booklet for the citizenship test, which is discussed shortly. It demonstrates the climate of neo-liberal, monocultural, conservative assertiveness identified by Joppke – particularly when read with the phrase encouraging pride in

the achievements of the ‘old Australia’, by which we are to hear not the 60,000 years of achievements of ‘Indigenous Australia’, nor the success of the three decades of ‘cohesive diversity’, but the success of ‘white settler society Australia’. Incidentally, the federal government is pushing for a ‘black letter’ version of Australian history to be taught at schools, to cement in the national psyche this particular version of national identity.

There are many similar examples from the Treasurer Peter Costello, who will succeed John Howard if the Liberal Party wins the November election. His statements often revolve around the need for Muslims to integrate (Howard is rather more circumspect, with his target generally remaining unnamed). Several speeches focus on signaling that those who wish to live by Shari’a law should choose to leave the country, rather than try to practice it here. For example, in a 2006 address to the Sydney Institute (a conservative think tank) he said:

...A person who does not acknowledge the supremacy of civil law laid down by democratic processes cannot truthfully take the pledge of allegiance. As such they do not meet the pre-condition for citizenship.^{xix}

This notion that one cannot honestly take the pledge of allegiance, which constitutes part of becoming a citizen, if one believes that laws should be determined by God, is one that should seriously concern members of most religions.

Testing Citizens

This year the Australian government introduced a comprehensive test for those wishing to become Australian citizens. Rules for becoming a citizen had gradually relaxed until 2002 - for example in 1984 the waiting period was reduced to 2 years and only basic English required, and people over 50 were exempt from the language test.^{xx} However, since 2003 there has been an ongoing campaign to strengthen the ‘meaning’ of Australian citizenship, a campaign which increasingly appears to be about exclusion rather than inclusion. In addition to the advertising campaign introduced in 2003, a longer waiting period of 4 years, a stricter English language test, and the new ‘Australian Citizenship Test’ (values test) have been introduced. The decision to introduce a Citizenship Test appears to

have been prompted when Peter Costello observed a speech at a citizenship ceremony which encouraged people to retain other affiliations and cultural practices; together with his reaction to the notion that Muslims in Australia would like to adhere to Shari'a law.^{xxi} The test, and the information booklet on which it is based, focuses on homogeneity, invisibilising internal differences, particularly differences of values. The booklet identifies the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, and provides information about the nation and its symbols, its history, and government. It identifies the following as 'Australian' values:

Respect for the equal worth, dignity and freedom of the individual; Freedom of speech; Freedom of religion and secular government; Freedom of association; Support for parliamentary democracy and the rule of law; Equality under the law; Equality of men and women; Equality of opportunity; Peacefulness; Tolerance, mutual respect and compassion for those in need. ...These values and principles are central to Australia remaining a stable, prosperous and peaceful community.

It goes on to repeat the phrase used by Howard in his earlier speech:

These values and principles reflect strong influences on Australia's history and culture. These include Judeo-Christian ethics, a British political heritage and the spirit of the European Enlightenment. Distinct Irish and non-conformist attitudes and sentiments have also been important.

While the booklet says the test is not about a 'quest for conformity' or a 'common set of beliefs', the universalizing tendency is clear in the focus on 'Judeo-Christian ethics, a British political heritage and the spirit of the European Enlightenment' and statement that 'Migrants have chosen to come to Australia and to share a common set of values' – the assumption is that the choice to come to Australia means choice to give up one's culture of origin. This ignores the question of whether values can be given up easily, and the fact that migration is not a clear choice for many, particularly refugees. In the booklet there is a strong focus on the need for citizens to have an 'overriding commitment to Australia', despite Australia allowing dual citizenship.

The test consists of 20 questions, and while one only needs to achieve a result of 60% to pass it, applicants must get all 3 questions on Australian values correct. The first person to fail the test, a 'Philipino bride', failed it on one of the values questions^{xxii}. In an article analyzing the public responses to the discussion paper about the proposed citizenship test, Betts and Birrell note that key concerns were that the test supports social exclusion and invites discrimination; that the values are not uniquely Australian (and many Australian-born do not share uphold them); that it sends a negative message which could be useful for racists; and that it seems directly targeted at Muslims in a 'knee-jerk' reaction to the political climate in the 'war on terror'.^{xxiii} Certainly a reasonable question to ask is why this intervention has been introduced at this point in time.

In one sense these changes appear symbolic – there has been no change to entitlements of Permanent Residents (although in October those entering Australia, other than tourists, must sign a form saying they respect Australian values). The citizenship and language test could be seen as simply as extensions of the previous requirements. However, the changes are clearly ideological in nature, and have provided the opportunity for increasingly overt statements of patriotism, often targeted at Muslims who are seen to have values diametrically opposite those of 'Australia'. It is the latest example of the 'closed borders' approach which has won the conservative government the last two federal elections, a form of chest-beating nationalism, vague but strong, which rallies the mainstream population to assert its right to be here and impose its values on others. It is this approach which produced the Cronulla riots in 2006.^{xxiv} What is ironic is that the same government is committed to economic globalisation and the opening of borders for economic gain.

Such interventions are not unique to Australia, by any means. Joppke notes that the United Kingdom has brought in measures such as an American style oath of allegiance, a toughening of language requirements, and mandatory citizenship and democracy classes at schools. The UK Cattle report identified a remarkably similar set of values associated with British citizenship, including respect for human rights and freedoms, upholding democratic values, observing laws, supporting anti-discrimination measures, support for women's rights, acceptance of

English language, and respect for religious and secular views. As Joppke points out however, “Instead of being ‘British’, this was the universal, nationally anonymous creed of the liberal state”^{xxv}.

The voice of the people

The question of the extent to which the Australian population supports the recent moves is difficult to answer. The Cronulla riots in late 2006, where thousands of young men (and some women) draped in Australian flags chanted racist slogans as they ‘reclaimed the beach’, indicated a depth of antagonism of mainstream Australians to internal diversity (in this instance in the form of young people of Lebanese background) which was shocking to many. Betts and Birrell note that those who opposed the introduction of the citizenship test were not the common people, but academics, advocates and ethnic associations, and argue that it is in line with the sentiments of most Australians. Jupp has tracked the way the conservative government has tapped into Australians’ xenophobia to win electoral support. I wish to illustrate that there is a level of ambivalence in Australians’ attitudes towards multiculturalism through two sets of survey data.

Goot and Watson use data from several surveys to track Australians’ attitudes to immigration and diversity^{xxvi}. The results indicate a certain ambivalence, with people keen on the general notion of ‘multiculturalism’, but not on specific policies which support it. Their findings also indicate the majority hold a very traditional understanding of what it means to be Australian. They report that surveys conducted in 1988 and 1997 showed two thirds were positive about Australia as a multicultural society. However, support for the maintenance of ethnic distinctiveness is low – those agreeing that ‘it is impossible for people who do not share Australian customs and traditions to be fully Australian’ was 41% in 1995, and 42% in 2003. Those agreeing with multicultural policies, such as that ethnic minorities should be given government assistance to preserve their customs and traditions remained at a very low 16% in both years. In answer to the question ‘it is better for society if groups maintain distinct traditions and customs’, 12% and 16% agreed respectively; whereas those who felt groups should ‘adapt and blend into

the larger society' were at 73% and 71%. While 86% in 1995 and 74% in 2003 agreed 'immigrants make Australia open to new ideas and cultures' many had quite restricted views about what being 'truly Australian' means. In 2003 92% agreed that speaking English was necessary; 89% that having Australian citizenship was necessary; 89% that respect for Australia's political institutions and law was necessary; 68% that a person should have lived most of their life in Australia to be truly Australian; 58% that one must be born in Australia; 37% that one must have Australian ancestry; and a full 36% that one must be Christian to be truly Australian. Goot and Watson conclude that 'nativism' is, for many, a core part of Australian national identity. Certainly such sentiments seem to indicate there would be widespread support for stricter conditions on citizenship.

One might also conclude from these results that the term multiculturalism is understood and accepted by the Australian people as a descriptive term, but is not accepted as a prescription for policy, and that support for real diversity is low.

Recent xenophobia has been focused on Muslims, who have also been targeted by politicians for threatening social cohesion through maintaining cultural practices supposedly at odds with 'Australian' values. In a 2007 study a third of the representative sample of 1400 Australians reported that they thought that Muslims make Australia a worse place to live.^{xxvii} 35% believed Muslims threaten to change the Australian way of life, culture and values. Qualitative responses supported this view: "They're trying to change us rather than adapt to us," "They will try to change the Australian culture, like take Christmas away, things like that". 48% believed Muslims have a negative impact on Australia's social harmony and national security (47%). 59% felt that migrants should assimilate and 'learn to live like the majority of Australians'. In a clear message to Muslims, one in four (26%) believed migrants should dress like other Australians.^{xxviii} Once again it appears a strong desire for monoculturalism is being expressed. However, those agreeing with most of the above statements were not a majority – for example 51% did **not** believe that Muslims threaten to change the Australian way of life, culture and values. Additionally, the same study found negative attitudes were quite

malleable, undergoing dramatic change as a result of education and contact with Muslims.

So it is difficult to gauge levels of public support for multiculturalism, and for the recent initiatives seeking to roll it back, partly because it is difficult to know what Australians mean by it.

Discussion and Conclusion

This paper provides evidence that the conservative government in Australia, and a good proportion of the Australian people, have come to the conclusion that national cohesion depends on the assertion of a singular set of values, allegiance and identity.^{xxix} Only 13 years ago Stratton and Ang declared that Australian nationalism involved an imagined community premised on multiculturalism: “This ‘modern’ Australian nationalism... is not only un-ideological (i.e. it isn’t predicated on lofty universal ideals and principles as is American nationalism), but in its desire to decolonise itself...it also lacked the cultural resources to imagine itself as ‘looming out of an immemorial past’, to use Benedict Anderson’s description of the nation...”^{xxx} Recent history has proved this assessment inaccurate. As we have seen Australia is being re-imagined ideologically, as based on Enlightenment liberal democratic values, and is explicitly linking itself to its colonial past, identifying with its Judeo Christian, Anglo Saxon/Celtic heritage. As such it is a settler society straddled by the Indian and Pacific Oceans, apparently returning to mother England. In doing so, it is explicitly using citizenship to exclude those who do not fit this rather anachronistic image of itself.

It must be noted that Australia is not alone in this retreat from multiculturalism. While it seems to illustrate, at a national level, the ‘hunkering down’ that Putnam describes occurring at the individual and community levels when confronted with diversity, clear similarities can be traced across a number of Western nations. In the values articulated by Australia, the Netherlands, the UK, Canada etc, we see the ‘liberal creed of liberty and equality’ reinforced. If we take Samuel Huntington’s suggestion that the world is moving toward a clash of civilizations based on fundamentally different civilizational blocs, it seems that a form of alignment, rather than ‘hunkering down’ is going on here. While the

movement I have traced is articulated in terms of the need for a stronger national identity, the effect, when numbers of nations make the same move, is to make clear the connection between other 'like minded' states, producing an increasingly clearly defined 'civilizational identity' of nations linked by Enlightenment values and European connections. While such a position seems patently absurd for a country with a diverse population situated in the middle of Asia and the Pacific which had been among the most successful multicultural nations in the world, for the majority of its inhabitants it seems to provide a sense of security and value in an insecure world.

Notes

ⁱ Joppke, C. (2004). The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the liberal state: theory and policy. *The British Journal of Sociology*. 55 (2), 237-257.

ⁱⁱ Jupp, J (2007a) "The Quest for Harmony", in *Social Cohesion in Australia*, J Jupp and J Nieuwenhuysen, Cambridge University Press, Port Melbourne, p 9-20.

ⁱⁱⁱ Jupp, J and Nieuwenhuysen, J (2007) *Social Cohesion in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Port Melbourne

^{iv} Gellner, Ernest. 1996. "The Coming of Nationalism and Its Interpretation: The Myths of Nation and Class." *Mapping the Nation*. New York: New Left Books.

^v Kelly, P (ed) (2002) *Multiculturalism Reconsidered: Culture and Equality and its Critics*. Cambridge, Polity Press, p 1.

^{vi} Jupp, J (2007b) *From White Australia to Woomera: The story of Australian Immigration*. (2nd ed) Cambridge, Port Melbourne.

^{vii} Fish, S. (1997). 'Boutique Multiculturalism, or Why Liberals Are Incapable of Thinking about Hate Speech'. *Critical Inquiry*. Vol.23, No.2, pp.378-395.

^{viii} Castles, S, Kalantzis, M, Cope, B and Morrissey, M (1992) *Mistaken Identity: Multiculturalism and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia*. 3rd ed. Pluto Press, Sydney.

^{ix} Castles S and Davidson A (2000) *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*. Macmillan Press: Houndsmills, UK; Jupp and Nieuwenhuysen, op cit; Goot, M and Watson, I (2005) 'Immigration, Multiculturalism and National identity', in Wilson, S, Meagher, G, Gibson, R, Denmark, D and Western M (eds), *Australian Social Attitudes*, NSW Press, Sydney.

-
- ^x Galligan, B (2001) *Australians and Globalisation: The experience of two centuries*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; Galligan, B and Roberts, W (2004) *Australian citizenship* Carlton, Vic: Melbourne University Press, 2004; Betts, K (1999) *The great divide: immigration politics in Australia*, Sydney, N.S.W.: Duffy and Snellgrove; Betts, K and Birrell, B (2007) 'Making Australian Citizenship mean more', *People and Place*, Vol 15, no 1, pp45-61.
- ^{xi} DIAC 2007 Facts Sheet 2 Key Facts in Immigration. Available at <http://www.immi.gov.au/media/fact-sheets/02key.htm>
- ^{xii} Joppke, op cit.
- ^{xiii} Stratton, J and Ang, I (1994) 'Multicultural imagined communities: cultural difference and national identity in Australia and the USA', *Continuum: The Australia Journal of Media and Culture*, Vol 8, no 2.
- ^{xiv} Quoted in Betts, K op cit p322.
- ^{xv} Howard, John, 24 Feb 2006, Interview with Neil Mitchell Radio 3AW, Melbourne, available at <http://www.pm.gov.au/media/interview/2006/Interview1788.cfm>
- ^{xvi} Hage, G. (1998). *White Nation: Fantasies of White supremacy in a multicultural society*. Annandale, NSW: Pluto Press.
- ^{xvii} Schlesinger, A (1998) *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*, W. W. Norton & Company; Revised edition. New York.
- ^{xviii} Howard, John, 26 Jan 2006, Address to the National Press Club Great Hall, Parliament House, available at <http://www.pm.gov.au/media/speech/2006/speech1754.cfm>
- ^{xix} Costello, Peter, 23 Feb, 2006, Address to the Sydney Institute, 'Worth Promoting, Worth Defending – Australian Citizenship, what it means and how to nurture it', available at <http://www.treasurer.gov.au/tsr/content/speeches/2006/004.asp>
- ^{xx} Betts and Birrell, op cit.
- ^{xxi} Costello, Peter, Friday, 24 February 2006, Interview with Paul Murray 6PR, available at <http://www.treasurer.gov.au/tsr/content/transcripts/2006/017.asp>; Speech to the Sydney Institute, Feb 23, 2006, op cit.
- ^{xxii} Lunn, S and Meade, K (2nd Oct 2007) 'Citizenship test marks first day', *The Australian*.
- ^{xxiii} Betts and Birrell, op cit.
- ^{xxiv} Collins, J (2007) 'The Landmark of Cronulla', in Jupp and Nieuwenhuysen, op cit.
- ^{xxv} Joppke op cit, p 253.

^{xxvi} Goot and Watson, op cit. The following surveys were used: International Social Survey Program 1995; Australian Election Study 1996, 1998, 2001; and The Australian Survey of Social Attitudes 2003.

^{xxvii} Australia Deliberates, 2007, *Muslims and non-Muslims in Australia: Final Report*, available at <http://ida.org.au/content.php?p=dpprelease>

^{xxviii} Australia Deliberates, op cit.

^{xxix} A position argued by a number of theorists, notably Barry, B (2001) *Culture and Equality*. Cambridge, Polity; and recently Robert Putnam (2007) *E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century*, The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture, *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30 (2), 137–174.

^{xxx} Stratton and Ang, op cit. p 14.

Author affiliation: Senior Lecturer, Sociology and Community Development, Murdoch University, South St, Murdoch, 6150, Australia
E-mail: f.tilbury@murdoch.edu.au