



[Current Issues Brief 20 1997-98](#)

An Anti-Racism Campaign: Who Needs It?

Adrienne Millbank
Social Policy Group
29 June 1998

Contents

[Major Issues Summary](#)

[Introduction](#)

[The anti-racism campaign](#)

[The problem with anti-racism campaigns](#)

[How 'racist' is Australia?](#)

[Australian Immigration: the Facts](#)

[Conclusion](#)

[Endnotes](#)

Major Issues Summary

- The Government's commitment to an anti-racism campaign predates the 1996 election. It owes its origins to the Coalition's opposition through the early 1990s to the then Labor Government's proposed racial hatred legislation, which aimed to make racial vilification unlawful, rather than to widespread concern that the level of racism in Australia was such as to warrant a national campaign of intervention. In the 1996-97 Budget \$5 million was allocated for the first of what was intended to be a two-year campaign. Market research has been undertaken, but the campaign has yet to be implemented.
- The Labor Opposition, representatives of ethnic groups, and supporters of multiculturalism have intensified their criticism of the non-appearance of the campaign, following the success of the One Nation party in the recent Queensland election. The campaign's non-appearance has been linked with the Government's dismantling of some of the national-level structures of multiculturalism, and its tougher stance on immigration and welfare for newly arrived migrants. The Government has been blamed for a 'collapse of consensus' regarding immigration and multiculturalism, and accused of fostering a climate of divisiveness and debate that has led to a 'resurgence of racism' in Australia.
- On the other hand, a number of commentators have argued that rather than a rising tide of racism unleashed by the Howard Government, the success of One Nation is the inevitable result of the suppression of debate that has been the defining

characteristic of Australia in the 1990s, and particularly under the Labor years.

- There is currently no generally accepted objective measure of levels of 'racism' in Australia. Much of the research which purports to show racism to be extensive and increasing in the 1990s is questionable, in terms of the definitions and methodologies used, and the agendas of the organisations and individuals who have published in the area. Examination of a broader range of material, including opinion polls, attitudinal surveys and market research, shows that there is a wide gap between 'expert' or 'elite' opinion on the issue, and the views of 'ordinary' Australians.
- The difficulties associated with packaging the 'message' of any anti-racism campaign are compounded by confusion in the current climate as to the extent to which the message is needed or wanted, and if unwanted, the extent to which it can be effective. Recent European experience shows that such campaigns can backfire. A survey conducted in European Union countries at the end of 1997, a year of anti-racism campaigns and activities, showed that rather than a reduction in racist attitudes, the year was marked by a growing willingness on the part of Europeans to openly declare themselves as 'racist'.
- Some of the material in the kit *Australian Immigration: the Facts*, released by the Immigration Minister in August 1997 to counter 'myths and misinformation' about immigration and multiculturalism, illustrates how difficult it is to summarise complex issues into short and simple responses without appearing to gloss over specific concerns, and without seeming evasive or condescending. It also shows how difficult it is to 'educate' people out of simplistic and misinformed views without sliding into what could be argued to be equally simplistic misinformation.
- Attempting to change a person's world-view or values is a complex challenge at the best of times. In the current politically charged environment, demands and expectations that an anti-racism campaign would resolve concerns and anxieties about immigration and multiculturalism and national identity, and would check apparently rising support for the One Nation party, appear unrealistic.

Introduction

The Government's commitment to an anti-racism campaign predates the 1996 election. It owes its origins to the Coalition's opposition through the early 1990s to the then Labor Government's proposed racial hatred legislation, which aimed to make racial vilification unlawful, rather than to widespread concern that the level of racism in Australia was such as to warrant a national campaign of intervention. The non-appearance of the campaign, promised as a 1996 election commitment, has been criticised by the Labor opposition, by ethnic group leaders and by supporters of multiculturalism. It has been linked with the Government's dismantling of some of the national-level structures of multiculturalism and its tougher stance on immigration, including the extension to two years of the waiting period for newly arrived migrants for access to welfare benefits. The Government has been blamed for a 'collapse of consensus' regarding immigration and multiculturalism.(1) It has also been accused of fostering a climate of divisiveness and debate that has led to a 'resurgence of racism' in Australia, and which has assisted the formation and development of a new political party, One Nation.(2)

The level of racism in Australia, the extent to which it is increasing, the extent to which an anti-racism campaign is needed and the extent to which such campaigns can be effective are all matters of debate. So is the extent to which One Nation supporters are 'racist'. The success of the One Nation party in the recent Queensland election, the possibility of a double-dissolution federal election, and the subsequent heightened climate of debate and expectation, however, mean that the context within which the campaign is to be delivered

could be particularly charged. The issue of racism in Australia, and how it is affecting our image abroad, appears to have become a political football. Michelle Grattan has pointed out(3) that if the anti-racism campaign itself were to become a political football, it could be worse than useless; it could be dangerous.

This Current Issues Brief looks at the problems associated with anti-racism campaigns, at the problems associated with the sort of material released by the Immigration Minister Mr Ruddock in 1997 to counter 'myths and misinformation' about immigration, and at what can be learned from recent European experience. It looks at the politically charged climate of debate about 'racism' in Australia in which the anti-racism campaign is to be delivered. And it looks at the gap between 'expert' or 'elite' opinion about what racism is and how serious a problem it is in Australia, and the views of 'ordinary' Australians.

The anti-racism campaign

The then Labor Government first introduced its racial hatred legislation in 1992 (the Racial Discrimination Legislation Amendment Bill 1992), and later reintroduced it in an amended form (the Racial Hatred Bill 1994). The Coalition maintained its opposition to the legislation on free speech grounds. It reiterated throughout the period of debate its abhorrence of expressions of racism, and its belief that education was more effective than legislation in changing people's attitudes and behaviour. The Commonwealth *Racial Hatred Act 1995*, which amends the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975*, was passed in August 1995. In its 1996 election platform the Coalition committed \$10 million to an anti-racism campaign, seemingly as a way of delivering on its stated principles and convictions. In its 1996-97 Budget, the Government committed \$5 million for the first of what was described as a two-year campaign, stating that the other \$5 million would be dependent on an assessment of the campaign's effectiveness. \$4.6 million of the 1997-8 allocation has been carried over to the 1998-99 Budget.

The campaign's development is being coordinated by a special unit within the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMA). According to background information provided by the unit last year, the campaign's intended target audience is to be the whole Australian community, with particular targets the 'conscious and unconscious perpetrators of racism'. The campaign is intended to have two strands, public awareness and community education. So far, about \$360 000 has been spent, on market research and consultation and expert advisory groups.(4)

Criticism of the non-appearance of the campaign has intensified over the last couple of weeks. Senator Nick Bolkus, Immigration Minister under the former Labor Government, on 11 June released a media release titled *Howard allows racist fire to burn*, claiming that in the face of 'clear evidence that racism is on the rise' an anti-racism campaign was now needed as a matter of urgency(5). Ethnic group representatives have also renewed their calls for the campaign. Randolph Alwis, Chair of the Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils of Australia (FECCA), has said he believes that, following the level of support shown for One Nation in the Queensland election, the urgency of need is so compelling he cannot wait for the Government's campaign. He has indicated that FECCA, with its supporters, would try to come up with a campaign of its own in the next few weeks (for which it would be seeking funding).(6)

Labor and ethnic community representatives have been joined by high-profile 'multiculturalists' Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis(7), in blaming the Howard Government for a 'collapse of consensus' regarding immigration and multiculturalism. They claim that by fostering notions of a 'mainstream' Australia, and of 'freer debate', the Government has sown only divisiveness and intolerance. Dr Andrew Theophanous, Secretary to the Shadow Ministry and former Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister Paul Keating dealing with multicultural issues, has repeatedly argued that multiculturalism is the foundation of

harmonious community relations, that it relies on the funding of programs to support cultural maintenance and access and equity, and that it is under threat.(8)

The response by Immigration Minister Mr Ruddock to intensified criticism of the non-appearance of the campaign has been that, whether or not it is delivered before the next election, the Government's commitment to an anti-racism campaign is unambiguous. His concern is for its effectiveness, rather than its timing. He has also maintained that it is important, especially given the current climate and sensitivity of issues being dealt with, to test material and approaches to ensure that the campaign relieves, rather than exacerbates, community tensions.

Reactions to questions posed in a telephone survey in May by the campaign's market research company Eureka, apparently designed to test the extent to which negative stereotypes are held within the community, would certainly appear to confirm the sensitive and potentially provocative nature of the issues being dealt with. Householders expressed outrage at being asked to agree or disagree with statements such as 'Aborigines are dirty and lazy', 'Vietnamese are responsible for crime', and 'Muslims have strange ways and will never be part of Australian society'.(9) It should perhaps be noted that the Minister has explained that there were only a few negative statements out of a lengthy mixture of positive and negative statements, derived from focus groups, that survey participants were asked to respond to.

Labor has undertaken to deliver, in office, a 'more intelligent' 'grassroots' campaign, which, according to the Leader of the Opposition Mr Beazley, would be run along the lines of the 'Australia Remembers' campaign. 'Australia Remembers' involved the disbursement of funds to each federal electorate, for local level activities to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the end of World War Two. Mr Beazley has also reaffirmed, in an address to a FECCA conference in March, Labor's 'belief in multiculturalism not just as a word, not just as a policy, but as a national reality and a vital part of our national identity'.(10) He has also promised that Labor would restore an office of multicultural affairs, to be renamed Multicultural Affairs and Citizenship, in the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet.

The problem with anti-racism campaigns

The problem with anti-racism campaigns is that there is no clearly understood or agreed method of changing people's prejudices, values, attitudes or behaviour. What is known is that direct confrontation is likely to be counter-productive. Experience with anti-racism campaigns recently or currently being run by organisations such as the Australian Football League, or by State Governments, for example Western Australia's 'Living in Harmony' campaign, demonstrate that, at the community level, people appreciate the opportunity to express their disgust at racist behaviour, and to demonstrate solidarity with their team, school or work-mates.(11) Television advertisements comprising appealing images of smiling people to such lyrics as Bruce Woodley's *We are Australian* make people feel good about themselves. What is less clear is the extent to which such activities reach and change the behaviour of those most likely to offend.

Joe Wakim, Secretary of the Australian Arabic Council, has urged the Government to 'quit stalling' on the anti-racism campaign, on the grounds that there was no evidence that campaigns against drink driving, gambling and smoking have backfired.(12) However, there is arguably greater community consensus regarding the need for, and any cost benefit analysis of, the latter sort of campaign. In the current climate of cynicism and disillusion, people could find inherently offensive the notion that a government and bureaucratic elite has determined that the level of racism among Australian voters is such that millions of taxpayer dollars must be spent on their re-education and attitude improvement.

Recent European experience suggests that the possibility of backlash should not be taken lightly. In 1997 the Council of Europe coordinated a year of anti-racism campaigns and activities throughout Europe. A survey at the end of the year, conducted in European Union countries by the polling organisation Eurobarometer, found that rather than a decline in racism, it had been marked by a growing willingness on the part of Europeans to openly declare themselves as racist. Twenty-two per cent of those surveyed in December 1997 in Belgium, 16 per cent in France, and 8 per cent in Britain declared themselves to be 'very racist'. Thirty-four per cent of those surveyed in Germany, 30 per cent in Italy, and 24 per cent in Britain admitted they were 'quite racist'.⁽¹³⁾As the primary goal of the Year's activities was, presumably, to reduce racist attitudes, rather than to encourage honesty and self disclosure, the campaigns run in European countries in 1997 would appear to have failed, if not backfired.

The lessons from Europe are perhaps salutary. According to the polling organisation, dissatisfaction with their life circumstances, fear of unemployment, insecurity about the future and low confidence in the way public authorities and the political establishment worked in their countries were the main characteristics of those who put themselves at the top of the 'racist' scale. There is also in Western European countries, which are officially not immigrant receiving, particular anger at the seeming impotence of governments, despite tougher laws and rhetoric, to stem the annual inflow of millions of immigrants (family, asylum-seeker and illegal) from poorer countries.

How 'racist' is Australia?

There is little research that would be widely accepted as objective on levels of racism in Australia. Views vary widely, depending on whether one adopts the narrow 'biological difference' dictionary definition, or the broader 'cultural discrimination' view of academics of the left. The Macquarie dictionary defines racism as 'the belief that human races have distinctive characteristics which determine their respective cultures', or 'offensive or aggressive behaviour to members of another race stemming from such a belief'. The broader view of racism includes systemic, indirect and often unconscious discrimination against people because of cultural and language differences. In the narrower view, levels of racism are shown by incidents of verbal abuse or violence. In the broader, they shown by such things as levels of unemployment amongst Aboriginal people and non-English speaking migrant groups, or the under-representation of these groups at the highest levels of government and administrative power.

The Prime Minister, Mr Howard, the Immigration Minister Mr Ruddock, and the Leader of the Opposition Mr Beazley, are among political leaders who have recently reflected the commonly held perception that, a few isolated individuals or fringe groups aside, Australian is a basically tolerant, egalitarian and decent society, as its capacity to peacefully absorb successive waves of immigrants has demonstrated.

On the other hand, Professor Stephen Castles, consultant to the former Labor Government on multiculturalism⁽¹⁴⁾, and the academic who has perhaps most widely researched issues of multiculturalism and racism in Australia, finds 'Anglo' Australia to be racist to its very core. 'Two centuries in which racism was an almost universal tenet have left their mark on institutions, social practices, intellectual discourse, popular ideas and national culture'.⁽¹⁵⁾ He argues that nothing short of fundamental change of our institutions, attitudes and practices is needed if Australia is to realise its potential and emerge as a complete and stable multicultural society, as distinct from the thoroughly racist state it now is.⁽¹⁶⁾ Along with fellow 'multiculturalists' Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis, he has theorised that 'Anglo' Australian national identity is both weak (not being forged in the flame of battle for country), unattractive (based on genocide, racism, sexism and war mythology), and backward looking (to a bygone era of monoculturalism and colonial supremacy)⁽¹⁷⁾.

Professor Castles is disappointed that commitment to the fundamental changes that he regards as so obviously required in Australia 'appears to be lacking in so many areas of Australian life'(18). Among those in whom he is doubtless disappointed is Paul Sheehan, author of the recently published best-selling book *Among the Barbarians: the Dividing of Australia*(19). Sheehan argues that rather than a rising tide of racism unleashed by the Howard Government's divisive fostering of the mainstream and retreat from multiculturalism, the success of One Nation is the inevitable result of the suppression of debate that has been the defining characteristic of Australia in the 1990s. He is angered by what he sees as the imposition of the politically motivated ideology of multiculturalism by the likes of Castles, Cope and Kalantzis, whom he views as 'outmoded Marxists'. He states that he is a supporter of 'Asian' immigration which he sees as providing Australia with a 'jolt of energy and talent', and of Aboriginal culture. However he is angered at what he sees as the ideology driven and self-evident silliness of denying that there is a strong and overriding 'mainstream' Australian cultural identity. He is particularly angered by what he sees as 'politically-motivated accusations of racism, made hollow by overuse'.

For many people the biggest issue is social cohesion. Australians care about the dividing of Australia for political purposes.

They care about the manipulation of immigration against the clear wishes of the electorate, the race politics now systemic in the Labor Party, the censorious and often hysterical treatment of Aboriginal issues, the endemic accusations of 'racism' and 'discrimination' at the first sign of dissent, the news media's intoxication with discord, and the entrenchment of a multicultural industry that has reached its use-by date.(20)

The closer examination of One Nation voters and potential voters that has been undertaken by a number of journalists following the Queensland election would appear to give some support to Paul Sheehan's views, at least insofar as they seem to reflect how people see themselves. Typical of those recently interviewed is Mr Peter Plush, resident of Victoria's Wimmera region for over 40 years. He describes himself as feeling let down by national governments over the last 20 years, and betrayed by his National Party. He supports One Nation's stand on immigration and programs for Aborigines, but will reserve his vote until he has examined the calibre of the candidate. 'If you think that bloke's a friggin' racist, you're not voting for him'. (21)

'Expert' opinion

In its 1996 booklet in the Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research's 'Understanding...' series, *Understanding Racism in Australia*(22), the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC), which administers the complaints-based *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* and *Racial Hatred Act 1995*, explains that despite the view of 'Anglo-Australia' that Australia is not a particularly racist country, there is 'ample evidence' of racism. It reports a 'disturbing' level of incidents directed against Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and people of non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB), especially the more 'visible' Asian and Muslim minorities. In its 1996 *State of the Nation* report on people of non-English speaking backgrounds, it cites high levels of unemployment and underemployment among some NESB groups as evidence of serious levels of systemic discrimination. It submits as evidence of rising levels of racism in Australia the 'significant increase' in complaints it received in 1996.

Critics of HREOC accuse the Commission of overblowing the issue of racism to keep the bandwagon rolling on. They have argued that the number of complaints in 1996 rose from a small base, and that the only logical conclusion to be drawn about the number of complaints received under the Commonwealth's anti-racism legislation overall is that race

discrimination is a very minor worry in Australia.(23) In the twenty years to December 1996, complaints averaged 10 per week, of which 60 per cent were withdrawn, or came to nothing. In the twelve months following the proclamation of the *Racial Hatred Act 1995*, 112 complaints were lodged, 27 of which were found to be inadmissible. HREOC's data management systems have apparently been such that they have not enabled the extent to which complaints are inter-ethnic, i.e. between migrant groups, to be monitored. In addition, the overrepresentation of some non-English speaking background groups in tertiary institutions questions claims of systemic discrimination. (24)

'Mainstream'Australia

As Professor Murray Goot(25) has demonstrated, responses to opinion polls and surveys vary depending on the contexts within which questions are framed, and often reveal more about the agendas and views of the survey sponsors than those surveyed. HREOC, following community consultations throughout 1996, found members of the more recently arrived migrant groups, from Asian countries in particular, were experiencing racism on a daily basis.(26) A survey conducted by the Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research in 1995 of the same groups found that 96 per cent of those surveyed were happy about their decision to migrate, citing friendly people and lifestyle as the things they most liked about Australia. (The next best things were freedom, political stability and a clean environment).(27) A survey commissioned by the Victorian Multicultural Commission in 1997 found that less than one per cent of school students held racist views, a finding which was interpreted as showing that young Australians did not see any need to debate multiculturalism.(28) A survey of schools in Brisbane in 1996 conducted by Des Cahill, Professor of Intercultural Studies at RMIT, found racism was a serious problem, with racist attitudes widespread among students.(29)

Whatever particular surveys and 'consultations' purport to reveal, there are several clear trends.(30) For the last twenty years, a significant majority (over 60 per cent) of Australian residents have favoured 'lower' immigration levels, and opposition to 'high' levels of immigration has intensified with economic restructuring and the entrenchment of unemployment. People have remained confused and uneasy about the policy of multiculturalism, despite-or perhaps because of-the attempts of successive governments to explain and sell the policy. There is considerable unease and anxiety about the issue of Australia's national identity and future. And the vast majority of Australian residents do not see themselves as racist, particularly when compared with other countries. If anything they see themselves as tolerant to a fault.

Australian Immigration: the Facts.

On 29 August 1997, the Immigration Minister released *Australian Immigration: the Facts*, a kit of materials designed to respond to intensified levels of public questioning, following the 1996 election, about immigration and its effects on the population and economy. The kit was designed particularly to counter the sort of 'misinformation' that has been circulating, for example about migrant entitlements. It comprises a selection of DIMA's fact sheets, the parliamentary statement on racial tolerance moved by the Prime Minister on 30 October 1996, a speech by Mr Ruddock which describes measures the Government has taken to tighten criteria for migrant entry and to sharpen the program's economic focus, and a question and answer booklet called *Dispelling the Myths about Immigration*. Following the Queensland election, and in the absence of an anti-racism campaign, the Immigration Minister has undertaken to update the information kit. Mr Ruddock is expected to launch the revised kit early in July.

Demand for the kit has outstripped supply, and its usefulness in countering the sort of misinformation abroad on talkback radio, or brought as queries to Members of Parliament by their constituents, has been demonstrated. However, the *Dispelling the Myths* booklet

illustrates some of the difficulties associated with anti-racism campaigns. In the need to provide brief and succinct responses to what are complex issues, specific and real concerns, such as to do with migrant settlement patterns, or high levels of unemployment and crime amongst some groups, are glossed over. The need to 'keep it short and simple' creates an unfortunate impression that the target audience is seen as just plain ignorant, and hence, presumably, as incipient racists. If as Paul Sheehan argues, a significant proportion of 'mainstream' Australia is just plain angry, sick of being kept in the dark and fed patronising gloss by the 'multicultural thought police', then the booklet runs the risk of being counterproductive.

As examples

- The 'answer' to the question *Why do we have to have an immigration program?* is 'We have a migration program which is carefully managed in the national interest...' The question is a good one, and arguably deserves a less condescending response. A more honest and less evasive answer would be that we have an immigration program because we had one. It has built our population and shaped our society. It cannot just be turned off without considerable economic and social cost, and without putting in place measures too harsh to be acceptable to most people. In any event, all developed countries have immigrant inflows: Australia's migration program allows ours to be controlled and managed in the national interest.
- The assertion in the booklet that 'Australians have considerable say in the composition of the program' could be argued to be less than honest. Bilateral agreement on immigration and multiculturalism between the major political parties has meant the average Australian has had very little say in these policy areas. Only those who are representatives of established interest or lobby groups have been involved in the traditional annual migration level consultations.
- In response to concerns regarding migrant ghettos the booklet explains, simplistically, that only an ignorant person who has never gone anywhere would see the concentration of disadvantage at Cabramatta to warrant more concern than the concentration of Australians at Earls Court in London.

Unfortunately, the booklet ends on a note of what could be described as evasive bureaucratic double-speak worthy of *Yes Minister*, and hardly likely to inspire confidence in people who are already angry with government and confused about multiculturalism.

To ensure that Australia's cultural diversity remains a unifying force, the Government has announced a new National Multicultural Advisory Council which will develop a report making recommendations for the Government's multicultural policies for the next decade.

The revised booklet will, hopefully, address issues of real and obvious concern about immigration and multiculturalism more openly.

Conclusion

Dispelling the Myths shows how difficult it is to summarise complex issues into short and simple statements without appearing to gloss over specific concerns and without appearing evasive or condescending. It also shows how difficult it is to 'educate' people out of simplistic and misinformed views without sliding into what could be argued to be equally simplistic misinformation.

Much of the research on racism in Australia in the 1990s, which shows it to be of concerning levels and increasing, is questionable in terms of the definitions and methodologies used, and the agendas of the organisations and individuals who have

published in the area. There is currently no widely accepted objective measure of racism in Australia. What research across a broader range of material, including opinion polls, market research and investigative journalism does make clear, is that there is a wide gap between 'expert' or 'elite' opinion on the issue, and the views of 'ordinary' Australians.

Attempting to change a person's world-view or values is a complex challenge at the best of times. The difficulty of packaging the message of an anti-racist campaign is compounded by confusion as to the extent to which the message is needed or wanted, and if unwanted, the extent to which it can be effective.

In the current politically charged environment, demands and expectations that an anti-racism campaign would resolve concerns and anxieties about immigration and multiculturalism and national identity, and would check apparently rising support for the One Nation party, may be unrealistic.

Endnotes

1. Leader of the Opposition, Mr Beazley, Speech to the Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils of Australia (FECCA), 28 March 1998.
2. See for example essays in G. Gray & C. Winter (eds), *The Resurgence of Racism: Howard, Hanson and the Race Debate*, Melbourne, Monash Publications in History, 1997; and in Phillip Adams (ed), *The Retreat from Tolerance: A Snapshot of Australian Society*, Sydney, ABC Books, 1997.
3. In 'Politics as a race apart', *The Financial Review*, 13 June 1998.
4. Advice provided in June 1998 by Mr Phong Bui, Manager, Anti-racism Campaign Unit, Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs.
5. Senator the Hon. Nick Bolkus, Media Release no. 22/98.
6. Interviewed by Alexandra Kirk, *PM*, 19 June 1998.
7. Bill Cope was (briefly) Director of the Office of Multicultural Affairs, and of the Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research. Mary Kalantzis was a former Senior Research Fellow at the Centre for Multicultural Studies, University of Wollongong, Member of the Advisory Board, BIMPR, and Member of the Community Cultural Development Board of the Australia Council. They have published many articles in the mainstream press on multiculturalism.
8. See for example the Hon. Dr Andrew Theophanous MHR, Press Release 27 May 1998, *Attacks on Multiculturalism have Created a Crisis*; and Andrew Theophanous 'Needs and Means of Combating Racism' in P. Jones and S. Howard (Project Managers) *Bringing Australia Together: The Structure and Experience of Racism in Australia*, Woolloongabba, Qld, FAIRA, 1998.
9. Frank Cassidy, '\$50 000 racism poll leaves participant 'appalled, stunned'', *Canberra Times*, 15 May 1998.
10. Leader of the Opposition, Mr Beazley, op. cit.
11. The 'Living in Harmony' Campaign was launched in October 1997, and comprises a range of strategies aimed at different sectors of the community-school, business, sports, local government and the public sector. Information provided by the Office of Multicultural Interests in the Premier's Department, Western Australia.
12. Joe Wakim, 'A climate for replacing prejudice and stereotypes', *The Australian Financial Review*, 19 June 1998.
13. Reported in 'We're racist, Europeans admit', *The West Australian*, 22 December 1997; and in Geoff Kitney 'EU shock as study shows more people admitting racism', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 23 December 1997.
14. Professor Castles was Director of the Centre for Multicultural Studies at Wollongong, Chair of the Advisory Board, BIMPR, and Member of the National Multicultural Advisory Council. He is currently Professor of Sociology at Wollongong.
15. S. Castles and E. Vasta, in S. Castles and E. Vasta (eds), *The teeth are smiling: the*

- persistence of racism in multicultural Australia*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1996, p. 4.
16. Ibid., p. 5.
 17. S. Castles, B. Cope and M. Kalantzis, *Mistaken Identity: multiculturalism and the demise of nationalism in Australia*, Sydney: Pluto Press, 1990, pp. 9-12.
 18. S. Castles in S. Castles & E. Vasta (eds). op cit., p. 5.
 19. P. Sheehan, *Among the Barbarians: the Dividing of Australia*, Sydney, Random House, 1998.
 20. P. Sheehan. 'How a gag on plain speech created Hanson', *The Age*, (Melbourne), 3 June 1998.
 21. As quoted in Gary Tippett, 'Hand of Hanson is felt across the land'. *The Sunday Age*, 21 June 1998.
 22. S. Zelinka, *Understanding Racism in Australia*, Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, Canberra, AGPS, 1996.
 23. Ross Macgregor, reported in Geoff Maslen 'Race is not the issue', *The Bulletin*, 20 May 1997.
 24. A number of articles on this issue have appeared in the quarterly *People and Place*, published by Monash University's Forum for Population Studies.
 25. Murray Goot is Professor of Politics at Macquarie University. He has specialised in polling on immigration issues, and has published widely, including in the mainstream press. See especially 'Poll vaults from flawed position', *The Australian Financial Review*, 15 October 1996; and 'Public opinion as Paradox: Australian attitudes to the rate of immigration and the rate of Asian Immigration 1984-1990', *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, vol.3, no 3, 1991.
 26. Race Discrimination Commissioner Zita Antonios, *State of the Nation: A Report on People of Non-English Speaking Backgrounds*, HREOC, Sydney, AGPS, 1996.
 27. Described in BIMPR News Release 185/95, *Survey Shows Immigrants Like Australia*, 23 February 1995; and in Michael Magazanik, 'We made the right move, say migrants' *The Age* (Melbourne), 23 February 1995.
 28. Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis authored the survey report *Young People Speak About Identity and the Making of a New Australia*, released 7 April 1998 by Victorian Premier Mr Kennett. Survey findings summarised in Fiona Carruthers, 'Youth won't tolerate racism', *The Australian*, 16 March 1998.
 29. Described in Caroline Milburn, 'Teachers believe racist attitudes widespread', *The Age* (Melbourne), 23 February 1995.
 30. Trends in attitudes to immigration, immigrants and multiculturalism are tracked and summarised in Hugh Mackay's *Mackay Reports*, Lindfield, NSW, Mackay Research. See especially *Being Australian*, 1988; *Multiculturalism*, 1995; *Society Now*, 1995; and *Mind and Mood*, 1996, 1997, 1998. See also Carol Bailey, 'Food's Great But...: Evolving Attitudes to Multicultural Australia 1985-1995', *Without Prejudice*, 1996.

[Top](#)

Comments to: web.library@aph.gov.au

Last reviewed 27 September 2001 by the Parliamentary Library Web Manager

© Commonwealth of Australia

[Parliament of Australia Web Site Privacy Statement](#)

Images courtesy of AUSPIC