

AN ADEQUATE KNOWLEDGE OF AUSTRALIA

CONSTITUTING THE KNOWING CITIZEN IN

CONTEMPORARY AUSTRALIA

Maria Chisari

Doctor of Philosophy, Communication

University of Technology, Sydney

2013

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of the requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Student:

Date:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank first and foremost my supervisor Associate Professor Katrina Schlunke for all her support. Her good humour coupled with her incredible body of knowledge on all things Foucauldian and beyond guided me to the finish line. I would also like to thank Virginia Watson, Elaine Kelly, Alastair Pennycook, Ros Appleby and Kitty te Riele for their assistance. I extend a special thanks to the librarian Patrick Tooth who helped me with all my queries with Endnote, to Juleigh Slater for her administrative know-how, and Chheng Vath who provided footstools, document stands and all other essential stationary goodies. I would also like to thank Lorraine Shannon for her generosity with her time and expertise that extended beyond her professional editorial work on my thesis.

I thank all the FASS students and staff with whom I debated over the pros and cons of cultural studies, sociology and sociolinguistics, pondered over research methodologies and participated in writing and reading groups. Too many too name, I single out here my 'lunchtime buddies', Kelly Chan, Mehal Krayem and Jesica Mwithia. We shared many laksas at 'the Malaysian place' or in *The Bagel* while we discussed the intricacies of our research, witnessed a collapsing crane from our Building 10 windows and solved the problems of the world on a daily basis. A big thank you also goes to all of the research participants who shared their stories and hopes of settling in Australia.

A special thanks goes to my dearest friend Fiona Pacey. From day one of commencing my thesis, Fiona's support has been unwavering. Fiona listened to my 'ups and downs' of doctoral study with exceptional calmness and patience, kept a constant lookout for me of news stories and journal articles about the Australian citizenship test, read some of my chapters and even helped me find academic employment. Fiona did all this while working full-time and commencing her own PhD. I wish her all the best in her doctoral studies.

The period of my candidature was sadly marked by the passing of too many loved ones, aunts, uncles, grandparents, cousins and friends. Here I want to mention two incredible women. Firstly I wish to acknowledge the support of Professor Alison Lee who was always so encouraging of women returning to higher education. During my first year of 'course work', Alison stressed the importance of writing everyday and she encouraged me to present conference papers and publish journal articles throughout my candidature. I mention also my dear old school friend Ruth Joshua-Graham. No matter how ill she was feeling, she would often ring to ask how my studies were going. Watching the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics in her Tassie home with her 'miracle baby' Caitlin is a bitter-sweet memory as we chuckled about national identity, teaching and being mums.

This thesis would never have been completed without the support of my family; to Philippe for all his hard work; to my loving parents who provided food, babysitting, picked up the girls from school travelling on public transport, did my grocery shopping (again on buses), gave me more food and are always there for me no matter what I throw at them. Grazie Mamma e Papá.

Finally, I want to thank my two wonderful daughters for being my personal cheer squad throughout my candidature. My little Isabella taught me how to make power point presentations and presented me with many beautiful pieces of artwork to decorate my workstation. My Nathalie helped me file and categorise research articles and textbooks, recorded student results on spreadsheets and gave me invaluable feedback on my introductory chapter. Both girls have put up with my grumpiness and even accompanied me to a conference presentation! I am so proud of my girls and cherish their love, interest and cuddles that have sustained me over these six long years of study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	3
ABSTRACT	8
PART ONE: INTRODUCING THE AUSTRALIAN CITIZENSHIP TEST	10
CHAPTER ONE: A TEST OF/FOR OUR TIMES.....	11
<i>A citizenship ceremony on Australia Day.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>A 'new' technology of government.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Structure of thesis.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Significance of study.....</i>	<i>24</i>
CHAPTER TWO: GENEALOGY AND GOVERNMENTALITY IN THE AUSTRALIAN CITIZENSHIP TEST	26
<i>Situating the Australian citizenship test in cultural studies.....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Genealogy as method.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Doing genealogy.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>An emphasis on populations.....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Problematisations and their technologies.....</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Government and freedom</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Citizenship theories.....</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Reassuring the population.....</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>Genealogy and governmentality as critique.....</i>	<i>48</i>
CHAPTER THREE: FROM BRITISH SUBJECT TO AUSTRALIAN CITIZEN: FROM ASSIMILATION TO INTEGRATION	50
<i>A history of citizenship in Australia.....</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Building a white nation.....</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>After the war: populate or perish</i>	<i>52</i>
<i>Assimilation and the Australian way of life</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>Civic resources: Educating the alien-citizen.....</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Know Australia – the booklet.....</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>The Discussion Paper</i>	<i>66</i>
<i>Public Responses.....</i>	<i>72</i>
<i>Becoming an Australian citizen – the booklet</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>Citizenship ceremonies – performing reassurance</i>	<i>77</i>
<i>Conclusion.....</i>	<i>82</i>
PART TWO: THE METAMORPHOSIS OF 'CORE' NATIONAL VALUES	84
CHAPTER FOUR: INTRODUCING AUSTRALIAN VALUES.....	85
<i>Core values.....</i>	<i>87</i>
<i>Defining Australian values.....</i>	<i>89</i>
<i>The values in Becoming an Australian Citizen</i>	<i>92</i>
<i>Universal values.....</i>	<i>96</i>
<i>Free, secular values.....</i>	<i>98</i>
<i>Respect for the individual – respect for the nation.....</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Mateship and a fair go</i>	<i>101</i>
<i>Tolerance and respect.....</i>	<i>103</i>
<i>Before becoming an Australian citizen: Let's Participate</i>	<i>105</i>
<i>Essential knowledge for the migrant-citizen in Let's Participate.....</i>	<i>107</i>

Unit 2: Australia and its people.....	108
Rights, responsibilities and privileges in Let's Participate.....	111
Conclusion	113
CHAPTER FIVE: A COMMITMENT TO MULTICULTURALISM, CITIZENSHIP AND AUSTRALIAN VALUES	115
Introducing multiculturalism to the Australian people	116
The FitzGerald Report in the year of the Bicentenary	121
The legacy of FitzGerald.....	131
Howard's One Australia policy	132
The national agenda for a multicultural Australia 1989.....	137
Politics and patriotism.....	138
1999 Multicultural agenda.....	140
Conclusion	143
CHAPTER SIX: PREPARING THE AUSTRALIAN COMPACT	145
Celebrating Federation: Australian citizenship for a new century	146
Celebrating the 50 th anniversary of the citizenship act.....	151
Australian citizenship for a new century	154
Comparisons between the Australian Compact and Australian values	157
The Council's promotion of multiculturalism	161
Australian citizenship ... a common bond.....	162
Australian citizenship: then and now	167
The National Framework of Values Education for Australian Schools.....	172
CHAPTER SEVEN: FORGETTING MULTICULTURALISM – SECURING OUR BRITISH HERITAGE ...	176
Forgetting the –isms: The final transformation of Australian values	178
Putting aside Amanda Vanstone for Peter Costello's values	181
The National Plan to Build on Social Cohesion, Harmony and Security	186
It's official: Australian values as government-sanctioned national identity.....	188
And then the M-word became the 'dirty' word (until it was no more)	191
The coming together of the Howard project.....	193
Discussing Australian values – some migrant perspectives	195
Migrant values	197
The value of multi-culture	199
Conclusion	202
PART THREE: HISTORY AS ESSENTIAL KNOWLEDGE	204
CHAPTER EIGHT: THE GREAT ACHIEVERS IN A STORY OF AUSTRALIA.....	205
A Story of Australia in Becoming an Australian Citizen.....	205
Howard's history	207
History and national identity.....	212
The historian as expert.....	215
In search of good history.....	217
The founding population of Australia in A Story of Australia.....	220
Diggers in a peaceful land.....	225
The non-chief human actors of history	229
CHAPTER NINE: ABSURD HISTORY.....	237
Migration's non-contributions to nation-building.....	237
A history of terra nullius.....	244
A need for intervention	250
The white man's burden.....	253
No Stolen Generations.....	257
The 'correct' Australian history.....	261

<i>Migrants reading Australian history.....</i>	<i>263</i>
PART FOUR: REFORMING THE AUSTRALIAN CITIZENSHIP TEST.....	268
CHAPTER TEN: HISTORY AS NON-ESSENTIAL ... YET NICE TO KNOW	269
<i>A newly elected government</i>	<i>271</i>
<i>A history not to be shared by all Australians.....</i>	<i>275</i>
<i>‘Nice to know’ history</i>	<i>278</i>
<i>Our Australian Story</i>	<i>280</i>
<i>Notable Australians</i>	<i>281</i>
<i>Indigenous Australians</i>	<i>285</i>
<i>Remembering the Stolen Generations.....</i>	<i>289</i>
<i>History as a curative science.....</i>	<i>295</i>
CHAPTER ELEVEN: FROM AUSTRALIANVALUES TO THECITIZENSHIP PLEDGE	298
<i>Reforming the Australian citizenship test.....</i>	<i>299</i>
<i>The expert committee members.....</i>	<i>301</i>
<i>The consultation process</i>	<i>305</i>
<i>Submissions to the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee</i>	<i>307</i>
<i>The Committee’s recommendations.....</i>	<i>309</i>
<i>The Pledge of Commitment</i>	<i>311</i>
<i>A speech made by the Minister for Social Inclusion, Tanya Plibersek</i>	<i>320</i>
<i>Migrant perspectives on the pledge and being Australian.....</i>	<i>324</i>
<i>Belonging in Australia – an unrequited love?.....</i>	<i>326</i>
<i>A final word from the knowing citizen.....</i>	<i>331</i>
CONCLUSION: BEING AUSTRALIAN TODAY	332
REFERENCE LIST	340

ABSTRACT

The Australian citizenship test was introduced by the Howard Government in October 2007 in order to assess whether migrants and refugees seeking the conferral of Australian citizenship had 'an adequate knowledge of Australia'. This new requirement was enacted in the *Australian Citizenship Amendment (Citizenship Testing) Act 2007* and it was made technical and calculable through a standardised computerised test administered to prospective citizens by the Department of Immigration and Citizenship. The requirement that test candidates have an adequate knowledge of Australia placed the onus on migrants to learn about Australian history and a set of 'core' values known as 'Australian values' that were believed to epitomise the 'Australian way of life'. In this way, the Howard Government viewed the conferral of Australian citizenship not as a status that bestowed civic rights and responsibilities on new citizens but instead conflated becoming a naturalised Australian citizen with the notion of 'being Australian', a form of subjectivity that the new citizen had to learn, embody and live by.

This new order of knowledge was a key governmental strategy that required migrants become knowledgeable citizens of Australian culture in order to integrate into the broader Australian community and secure social cohesion. New, too, under this testing regime was the requirement that candidates self-regulate their learning and preparation for the test. Civic education no longer remained part of settlement and language programs for newly arrived migrants as they now had to engage in private

study of the contents of the resource booklets, *Becoming an Australian Citizen* and *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond*. Since the electoral victory of the Rudd-Gillard Governments, the legislative requirement to have an adequate knowledge of Australia that is included in the revised Australian citizenship test has shifted from a mandatory knowledge of Australian values and Australian history to knowledge constituted as the responsibilities and privileges of Australian citizenship that are promoted as part of the taking of the Pledge of Commitment. Yet, while the orders of knowledge required to pass the test have changed, the desire that new citizens 'perform' Australianness still remains.

Informed by Foucault's writings on genealogy and governmentality and situated in the field of cultural studies, this thesis explores how the concept of becoming an Australian citizen is produced in and through the assemblage of texts, discourses and institutions engaged in the production of becoming an Australian. Using textual analyses of key government documents on Australian citizenship, political speeches, newspaper reports and migrant interviews, the analysis suggests that the main aim of the Australian citizenship test is to reassure the 'mainstream' community that the Australian way of life will prevail in modern Australia. By revealing the shifts, effects and inventiveness of these discourses about what constitutes the 'true' Australian identity and what represents the 'real' Australian, this study allows us to imagine other forms of subjectivity and alternative versions of national histories and civic values that come together to make up the everyday desires of belonging within the Australian community.

PART ONE: INTRODUCING THE AUSTRALIAN CITIZENSHIP TEST



CHAPTER ONE: A TEST OF/FOR OUR TIMES

A citizenship ceremony on Australia Day

On 26 January 2010, I attended a citizenship ceremony held in the heart of Sydney, Australia. I came to watch a group of 16 migrants make the Pledge of Commitment and become newly naturalised Australian citizens. The public citizenship ceremony was conducted as part of the Australia Day celebrations, Australia's official national day that commemorates the landing of the First Fleet at Botany Bay on 26 January 1788.

The Australia Day celebrations were held in Sydney's Hyde Park, a vast public parkland named after its British counterpart and famous for its tree-lined avenues, the Archibald Fountain, the statue of Captain Cook and the ANZAC War Memorial where the tomb of the Unknown Soldier rests. Framed by exotic palm trees, city skyscrapers and Sydney Tower, Hyde Park is a popular tourist destination as well as a place where the locals come to gather for their weekend strolls. During that particular day of celebration, food stalls lined the pathways and rock bands performed on open stages as children had their faces painted and danced along with their favourite TV characters, *Bananas in Pyjamas*. Around the main stage, camera people had begun to set up, waiting for the future citizens to arrive. Citizenship ceremonies held on Australia Day make for 'feel good' patriotic stories and provide great 'photo opportunities' for local politicians featured on the evening news.

There were miniature Australian flags everywhere on that hot summer's day, paper and nylon ones, flags on t-shirts, thongs and even ones tattooed on Australian faces, arms

and legs. Occasionally among the sea of blue, white and red you caught a glimpse of the once-preferred green and gold on a flying flag of the boxing kangaroo or a baggy green cap, a reminder of the nation's illustrious sporting culture. Then there were the ubiquitous tattoos of the Southern Cross on young bronzed bodies bringing to mind the shameful memory of similar tattooed bodies draped in the Australian flag on another fateful summer's day at Cronulla Beach some four years ago – and now all but forgotten.

As the crowds grew, the cheerful atmosphere intensified and fellow citizens smiled as they passed each other. A young couple walked past me and smiled too, the Aboriginal and the Australian flag poking out of their backpacks. The red, black and yellow stood out in a sea of blue, white and red. A few kilometres away in a park in Redfern, other Australian citizens were gathering together for Survival Day, commemorating 26 January 1788 when white people first colonised and dispossessed the original custodians of this great southern land.

The citizens-in-waiting arrived on stage dressed smartly in their 'Sunday best' and sat down in designated chairs. The ceremony was presided over by the Sydney Lord Mayor Clover Moore and the Federal Member for Sydney, Tanya Plibersek. It is obligatory for all future citizens to attend a citizenship ceremony and make the Pledge of Commitment. The ceremony is an official one, attended by a government representative such as the popular mayor of the city and the well-respected federal minister. Like Carols by Candlelight at Christmas time, the *Sounds of Silence* at Uluru or New Year's Eve fireworks around the nation, only in a place like Australia could the outdoors be used so spectacularly to produce such picturesque nation-scapes.

The opening protocol for these public ceremonies features an Indigenous elder performing a Welcome to Country. He played the didgeridoo in traditional Aboriginal dress and welcomed the people at the ceremony, reminding onlookers that ‘Australia Day for us Aboriginal people means something else’. He acknowledged that the land on which this ceremony was taking place belonged to the Cadigal people and named the various tribes and language groups.



Indigenous Elder, Australian citizenship Ceremony, Hyde Park, Sydney 2010

His performance was followed by the mayor and the Federal Minister making short speeches that espoused the virtues of Australian identity. Clover Moore acknowledged the soon-to-be citizens as part of the ‘souls who had enriched this country immeasurably by their customs, their cultures and contribution’ and who in return were asked to embrace ‘the freedom, the peace, the tolerance and the diversity’ and to pass on these values to their children. Tanya Plibersek spoke of her own parents’ migration journey to Australia in the ‘poorest and most desperate of circumstances’. She read a message from the Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, Senator Chris Evans reminding the future citizens to pay careful attention to the words of the pledge:

Making the pledge marks the symbolic and substantive commitment you must make to become an Australian citizen. It is a statement that outlines what the Australian community asks of all citizens and, in turn, the privileges that are bestowed upon citizens by the community.

The ceremony was formal yet friendly, staying true to the self-identified ideal of the easy-going and relaxed characteristics of what has come to be known as Australianness, that is, the Australian way of life. This was everyday democracy in action in which all can come to share in the celebrations of a new member being granted the privilege of joining the ‘national family’ and achieving national belonging.

After the speeches, the migrants were formally introduced. They were presented as 16 ‘new friends’ from Canada, China, India, Israel, Peru, Poland, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. Clover Moore conferred citizenship on them and told them that they now had acquired responsibilities and rights, ‘you are now officially Australian. Welcome to the Australian community’. The ceremony ended with the making of the citizenship pledge. All of the citizens stood and made the Pledge of Commitment reading from the sheet of paper in their hands. They were followed by Minister Plibersek and a few other Australians citizens standing among the crowd making the Affirmation of Commitment. After these pledges were performed, the newly naturalised migrants could stand with pride as fully pledged Australian citizens.

As is the closing protocol for these ceremonies, the national anthem was sung and the audience stood in accordance with custom. An opera singer dressed in a black formal suit performed the anthem, *Advance Australia Fair*. At the end of this performance, the

ceremony was declared officially over and the new citizens mingled with the gathered people and dispersed into everyday Australian life.



Mayor Moore confers Australian citizenship on migrants, Hyde Park, Sydney 2010

The Australian citizenship ceremony that I have just described is the final step in a set of procedures that migrants and refugees must complete before they can be conferred with the status of Australian citizenship. Before arriving at this important ceremony to make the Pledge of Commitment, migrants undergo a period of learning about living the Australian way of life and sit and pass the Australian citizenship test. This thesis is about the development, implementation and evaluation of the Australian citizenship test that has become part of everyday life in contemporary Australia.

A 'new' technology of government

This Australia Day celebration of citizenship embodies a profound truth and a simple irony. The truth is that people come to this country because they want to be Australians. The irony is that no institution or code lays down a test of Australianness. Such is the nature of our free society (Howard 2006).

In order to become a naturalised Australian citizen in contemporary Australia, the Australian Citizenship Amendment (Citizenship Testing) Act 2007 stipulates that eligible applicants must 'have an adequate knowledge of Australia'. This recently included clause of having to 'know Australia' was legislated into law by the former coalition Howard Government in September 2007 and incorporated within existing requirements of the Citizenship Act 2007 which required that new citizens understand the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship and possess an adequate knowledge of the English language.

What it means to 'have an adequate knowledge of Australia' is determined by the Department of Immigration and Citizenship and is modified according to what the incumbent government believes to be constitutive of Australian identity. Since its inclusion in the 2007 amendment, there have been two versions of what defines a significant knowledge of the Australian nation, realised through such concepts as Australian values, culture, history, the political system and Australian symbols. Having an adequate knowledge of Australia is promoted as a way of becoming a model Australian citizen and a way of being Australian, for to know Australia, according to government discourses, is to know how to live the Australian way of life.

Having an adequate knowledge of Australia like other essential criteria required for the conferral of citizenship is demonstrated through examination, that is, by prospective citizens visiting any office of the Department of Immigration and Citizenship around Australia and sitting and successfully passing the Australian citizenship test. It is a formal test that must be taken by any Australian permanent resident who wants to become an Australian citizen, who is between the ages of 18 and 60 and has resided in

Australia for a minimum period of four years. The test is completed on computer and consists of test candidates responding to 20 multiple-choice questions randomly selected from a larger pool of questions of which 15 or more questions must be answered correctly in order to be considered as having passed the test. Once successfully completed, applicants must lodge a completed citizenship application including forms relating to fees, proof of identity and references of good character. They must then wait for the Department's notification to attend a citizenship ceremony at their local council so that they can make the Australian Citizenship Pledge. When the above forms, tests, ceremonies and pledge have all been finalised, the Australian Government has deemed that migrants and refugees can call themselves Australian citizens and enjoy the privileges of Australian citizenship.

While previous colonial and federal governments have used tests in order to determine if potential migrants could enter Australia and settle here permanently, the concept of testing eligible permanent residents by formal examination of their suitability to become naturalised citizens is a fairly recent phenomenon. The United States of America, Canada, Britain, the Netherlands, Germany and many other nations have all introduced citizenship tests during the past three decades. Other nations such as France and New Zealand have considered introducing their own citizenship tests for new arrivals. The overriding principle behind many of these tests is that the performance of the candidate completing the test, that is, the test results, demonstrates their competency in the knowledge that is being tested and therefore knowledge of the adopted nation. In many of these citizenship tests, knowledge relates to civic responsibilities, a knowledge of the host nation's culture, values, geography and history and it can also include knowledge of the settlement services provided to new citizens. It is believed that mastery of this

essential order of knowledge produces the proper, model citizen, the migrant citizen who is referred to as the 'knowing citizen' throughout this study. This knowing subject is then regarded as having proven his/her loyalty and earned his/her place in the host nation as a newly naturalised citizen.

Whatever the form or topic that the required knowledge takes in the citizenship test, many nation-states administering these tests have justified their actions by claiming to be protecting local national identities and securing social cohesion. National identities need to be protected, it is claimed, from the burgeoning and negative processes of globalisation which are believed to be eroding national cultures and threatening the maintenance of cohesive national communities. In most instances then, the introduction of formal citizenship tests is framed as a defensive tool and a response to threats to the national security of state-bound populations.

In particular, the effects of mass movements of non-western migrants and refugees to liberal-democratic nations along with the processes of decolonisation, the perceived growing threats of Islamic terrorism and the spread of neoliberal practices have all come together to create the discourse of a crisis in citizenship. In turn, citizenship has been conflated with national identity and within this 'crisis context', is no longer framed in terms of acquiring civic rights but it is articulated instead as a way of living a particular way of life. That is, the implementation of citizenship tests in many liberal democratic nations has been influenced by the notion that differences emanating from certain migrants and refugees pose a threat to social unity in the presence of ever-increasing multicultural communities. In Australia, the government argued that administering a citizenship test would produce the 'right' kind of citizen who would display the

‘correct’ values and understand the ‘correct’ version of Australian history in order to ensure successful integration and belonging into the mainstream Australian community.

The use of ‘adequate’ to describe the essential knowledge required in legislation is interesting here. The adjective ‘adequate’ can describe something that fully and exactly represents its object or, alternatively, it can mean a form of knowledge that is ‘satisfactory’, that is, something that barely reaches an acceptable standard and is not worthy of any stronger praise. While this ambiguity in meaning may seem odd at first, a closer focus suggests that its use here in citizenship legislation fits well with the Australian ethos of knowledge that is ordinary and not zealously patriotic yet representative of a unique Australian identity.

This study explores how the implementation of a citizenship test for migrant communities is a form of governing that can be understood through Foucault’s writings on governmentality. That is, it is an art of governing prevalent in many liberal-democratic nations that has as its focus the nation’s population living in a bounded territory and the well-being, prosperity and security of these people. Governmentality in this study is understood as the organised practices, techniques and strategies through which individuals are governed and through which they come to govern themselves. This perspective explores how through calculated practices and knowledge migrants are constituted as suitable to receive the conferral of Australian citizenship and how they as individuals come to regulate their endeavours to become ‘knowing citizens’.

Aspiring citizens are encouraged to prepare diligently for the test by studying in private the contents of official government resources on which all the test contents relevant to

an adequate knowledge of Australia are based. These texts include the two official citizenship test resource booklets, *Becoming an Australian Citizen* and *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond*. An analysis of these texts forms part of the genealogy of the Australian citizenship explored in this study. Genealogy here is understood as the method that explores the multiple beginnings, continuities and discontinuities that have emerged around the notion of a unique Australian identity and the governmental attempts to constitute the model Australian citizen. In this study, a genealogical approach comprises textual analysis of political speeches, media reports and government resources that have prescribed the knowledge required in order to be deemed a suitable Australian citizen. It also incorporates ethnographic observations that explore the impact that these mechanisms have on aspiring citizens. A genealogical approach thus allows for transformation and works as a ‘counter-memory’ in order to produce alternative stories about Australian identity and multiple ways of being a proper Australian citizen.

Structure of thesis

To summarise, this thesis is about the development, implementation and reform of the Australian citizenship test in contemporary Australia. Its main objective is to explore how migrants and refugees who wish to become naturalised Australian citizens are constituted in and through the public, political and personal discourses surrounding the introduction of the Australian citizenship test. It concentrates exclusively on two forms of knowledge that were officially defined as demonstrating an adequate knowledge of Australia. These orders of knowledge focused on the subjects of Australian values and Australian history.

This opening chapter provides a brief introduction to the Australian citizenship test, a reinvented mechanism introduced by the Howard Government in order to manage the migrant population during a period dominated by a global crisis in citizenship. Through an engagement with literature on genealogy and governmentality chapter two analyses how these research tools and perspectives can be used to explore the process of seeking to belong in the Australian community and hence present a history of the present. Chapter three elaborates on the apparatus of assimilation that has framed discourses surrounding the status of Australian citizenship since its inception in 1948 and demonstrates continuity with contemporary discourses about migrant integration. It includes a brief textual analysis of how Australian identity was framed during the early days of Australia's post-war migration program. The chapter also includes a brief genealogical exploration of how the Pledge of Commitment conducted at citizenship ceremonies was invented as part of a technology of the self that interpellates the migrant into the ideal Australian citizen committed to Australia and its people.

The following four chapters trace the emergence of the discourse on Australian values over the last quarter century in both the public and political arena. Chapter four consists of a textual analysis of the content of Australian values as they are depicted in the citizenship resource booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen: Your Commitment to Australia*. It also includes a comparative analysis of Australian values with their depiction in the citizenship booklet's predecessor; a multimedia kit entitled *Let's Participate: A Course in Australian Citizenship*. The analyses highlight the transformation that these concepts underwent under the Howard Government. Chapter five outlines a genealogical exploration of the emergence of Australian values as part of the principles of multiculturalism in Australian political discourses of the time. It

focuses on key government texts including the 1988 *FitzGerald Report* and other documents relating to immigration, citizenship and multicultural policies during the period that saw the consolidation of neoliberalism in contemporary Australia.

Chapter six considers how citizenship discourses were framed around the time leading up to the Centenary of Federation. It consists of a textual analysis of the government report, *Australian Citizenship for a New Century*. This report has played an important role in shaping what has now come to be known as the *Australian Values Statement*. Chapter seven shifts the focus to a textual analysis of political speeches made by key members of the Howard Government relating to the notion of core civic values. Here Australian values were transformed from being considered as an economic imperative to one where they were concerned with a form of Australian identity that attempted to replace multiculturalism as social policy and also as a mechanism that would ensure national security. This chapter also demonstrates how the neoliberal notion of mutual obligation was put into practice through the apparatus of citizenship and includes an ethnographic study of migrant perspectives on Australian values and how these migrants accepted, contested and negotiated Australian values in their everyday lives.

The subsequent two chapters explore how the subject of Australian history was defined and used as ‘adequate knowledge’ in the original Australian citizenship test. Chapter eight investigates how the subject of history rose to importance under Howard’s Prime Ministership and this is contextualised through a brief discussion on the history wars. The chapter identifies a ‘shift’ in the role granted by government to the subject of history as a new mechanism of integration, whereby knowledge of history becomes disciplinary rather than an informative mode of knowledge. The chapter concludes with

a textual analysis of portrayals of non-Indigenous Australians in the section entitled *A Story of Australia* in the resource booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen*. Chapter nine is concerned with the portrayal of migrant and Indigenous histories included in *A Story of Australia*. As with the previous chapter, there is a comparative analysis of the text included in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* with its author's other writings in order to challenge the notion of history's objectivity. The analysis reveals that the official history of Australia in the original resource booklet excluded stories and denials of Indigenous dispossession and the Stolen Generations. In this way, the citizenship resource booklet worked as an instrument that promoted the government's preferred notion of Australian identity as benevolent and a march towards progress.

The final two chapters focus on the reforms introduced to the citizenship test after the recommendations made by the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee in 2008. Chapter ten investigates how the knowledge of history that had been a crucial component of the original test became non-testable but is still included in the new citizenship resource booklet, *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond* as 'nice to know' information. There is also a comparative analysis of some of the new booklet's contents on Australian history with its equivalent in the old booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen* in order to explore the continuities and discontinuities between the two tests. The chapter concludes with the suggestion that knowledge of history, following Foucault, should be viewed as a 'curative science'.

Chapter eleven details the outcomes of the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee and the government response to the committee's report. It explores how the concept of promoting Australian values as essential to the conferral of citizenship has

been replaced with an emphasis on migrants' understanding of the Australian Citizenship Pledge of Commitment. Comparing Australian values with the principles underpinning the citizenship pledge, the analysis demonstrates both the continuities and discontinuities between the tests produced under the Howard Government with that of the Rudd-Gillard Governments.

Significance of study

The introduction of the Australian citizenship test as official government policy was premised on the notion that in a constantly changing world affected by the interrelationship between neoliberalism and globalisation, the 'undeniable truths' produced through adequate knowledge of Australian values and Australian history would ensure security and social cohesion among the existing community and its newest citizens. These new citizens would, in turn, regulate their conduct accordingly in order to become 'proper', economically viable and knowing Australian citizens.

In exploring the question of how the knowing citizen is constituted through essential knowledge of Australian values and Australian history, the study reveals that stories of being Australian continue to privilege those individuals who are white, Anglo/European and Judeo-Christian. In this way, the introduction of the Australian citizenship test not only works to regulate the conduct of aspiring citizens so that they can be enticed to conform to a prescribed national identity but the test also targets the 'mainstream' community. This community is a body of people that needs to be reassured by government that the Australian way of life will survive beyond the twenty-first century. Reassurance here is used as a form of governmentality and a form of affective

citizenship that has as its main objective the eradication of 'white unease' and the procurement of security and well-being for the population. Governmental reassurance is about attending to the conduct of Australian citizens through the calculated technology of a citizenship test in order to work towards maintaining social cohesion in Australian society. This study is significant because it 'renders visible' the inventions of notions of national identities and national values as raced and classed and hence opens up other possibilities for multiple ways of thinking and being an Australian citizen.

CHAPTER TWO: GENEALOGY AND GOVERNMENTALITY IN THE AUSTRALIAN CITIZENSHIP TEST

The examination combines the techniques of an observing hierarchy and those of a normalizing judgement. It is a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to punish. It establishes over individuals a visibility through which one differentiates them and judges them. (Foucault, 1995, p. 184)

When migrants are conferred with the status of citizenship, they gain the right to remain indefinitely in Australia without fear of deportation, to hold an Australian passport and register any overseas born children as Australian citizens, to vote in government elections and stand for public office, to join the armed forces and apply for employment in the public service. As Australian citizens, they may be called to do jury duty or to defend Australia during times of war. This list of rights and responsibilities is all that distinguishes the Australian citizen from individuals who hold the status of permanent resident. In recent times, it has become more difficult for migrants and refugees to become naturalised and secure these rights and obligations. This is no accident. The Federal Government has legislated that in order to better appreciate what it terms the ‘privileges’ of Australian citizenship, interested migrants and refugees must undergo a formal examination in order to determine their suitability. This examination, as already mentioned, is known as the Australian citizenship test. In this chapter, I explain how this study of the Australian citizenship test is situated in the field of cultural studies. I

provide an outline of the genealogical approach that guides the study and explain how I use literature on governmentality as the study's main conceptual framework.

Situating the Australian citizenship test in cultural studies

This study is situated in the field of cultural studies and is guided by poststructuralist theory. This means that I conducted my research with 'a scepticism about universal truth, reality and objectivity' (Anderson, 2008, p. 48) and I reject the notion that there exists a typical Australian national character that aspiring citizens must emulate. This study on the Australian citizenship test is an empirical quest that explores notions of power and subjectivity through the study of a national culture that, following Miller (2000), is a study that touches on 'a mixture of economics, politics, textual analysis, gender theory, ethnography, history, postcolonial theory, material objects, and policy' (p. 7). It is, as Ang (2008) argues, 'a serious engagement with cultural complexity ... to advance more effective ways of seeing and intervening in the world' (pp. 227-28). Hence, in identifying with cultural studies, I present a study about becoming an Australian citizen as 'an irrevocably *engaged* mode of cultural analysis' that has the potential to merge the academic with the civic, the scholarly with the activist and the theoretical with the political (Ang, 2008, p. 228) in order to generate new insights into the constitution of the 'knowing' Australian citizen.

Situating my study of the introduction of the Australian citizenship test in a Foucauldian-inspired style of cultural studies differs from studies that investigate the test as a mechanism that will guarantee human rights and inclusion or cause exclusion and racism. Nor does it adopt a focus that views the test as a mechanism for spreading

the dominance of the English language. While such investigations contribute an informed critique of the test and its implications, my central focus instead is to problematise the ideas presented by various players and institutions about what constitutes a good, knowing, Australian citizen and what orders of knowledge are promoted as essential in the production of that knowing citizen. In order to do this I question the self-evidence and ‘naturalness’ of such categories as ‘nation’ and ‘race’ (Ang, 2008, p. 227) and following Frow and Morris, I argue that terms such as ‘nation’ and ‘community’ used in these discourses are merely inventions that deny and assimilate subjectivities (cited in Miller, 2001). As such I eschew essentialist definitions of national identity and instead move towards ‘plural accounts of person and polity’ (Miller, 2001, p. 6). In order to do this, I adopt Foucault’s work on genealogy as the main methodological approach of this study.

Genealogy as method

Genealogy retrieves an indispensable restraint: it must record the singularity of events outside of any monotonous finality; it must seek them in the most unpromising places, in what we tend to feel is without history – in sentiments, love, conscience, instincts. (Foucault, 1984, p. 76)

This study adopts genealogy as its main methodological approach. It involves a close reading of a small archive of documents that includes government reports, political speeches and migrant interviews which have articulated ideas about the conferral of citizenship, immigration and Australian identity for over 60 years. Through genealogy, this study explores the way in which power and knowledge emerge and operate in and

through the discourses surrounding the Australian citizenship test. In particular, I explore the ways in which members of the Australian population become enabled and constrained to think in particular ways about what it means to be an Australian citizen.

Following Foucault (1984), genealogy is defined as a form of ‘effective history’ that does not search for origins but focuses instead on singular, sporadic and spontaneous events that are characterised by disparities, continuities and discontinuities. These ‘vicissitudes of history’ challenge the pursuit of the origin popular in traditional histories which attempt to capture the essence of things and ‘their original identity’ (Scheurich & Bell McKenzie, 2005, p. 850). Put simply, genealogy analyses the ‘history of historical truths’ in order to ‘shatter’ these truths, defamiliarise their self-evidence while questioning ‘history’s’ attempt to record the past as a series of linear developments moving towards progress (Saukko, 2003, pp. 117-8).

In relation to this study, genealogy is not a search for the origins and causes of the Australian citizenship test but is rather about finding ‘numberless beginnings’ that have influenced its direction and operation (Foucault, 1984, p. 81). The purpose of this ‘multi-layered conceptual practice’ (Walters, 2012, p. 116) is to unravel the way in which this specific discourse weaves together a combination of social and political agendas around notions of Australian identity. Discourse here is understood as ‘a set of statements that determine actions and thoughts’ (Miller, 1993, p. xiv). It is a particular vocabulary and grammar that decides what can and cannot be said, and which fixes norms and elaborates criteria that makes it possible to treat a problem at a particular given period of time. It is this discourse then, that comprises the rules and ‘truths’ that determine what it means to be a model Australian citizen in the twenty-first century.

Walters (2012) writes that genealogy's purpose of denaturalising identities, objects and practices works to 'lessen the stranglehold they exert on our political imagination' (p. 118). In this way, a genealogical analysis can show us how things that appear natural in our everyday lives 'do not have to take their present form' and that 'other identities and existences are possible' (Walters, 2012, p. 118). Foucault (1984) advises us that this approach requires 'patience and a knowledge of details' and it also involves repetition (p. 76). In my genealogical analysis of naturalisation in Australia, I pay attention to the repeated statements, ideas and values being articulated about Australian citizenship by government institutions, media outlets and citizens in the street. These statements include debates around Australian identity and its relationship with the field of Australian history, portrayed in a range of areas including a national framework of values for primary schools and the high school history curriculum. It also includes discourses about border security, threats posed by terrorism and asylum seekers, and anxiety over the ill effects of neoliberalism and globalisation.

Saukko (2003) argues that these 'interdiscursive connections to different realms' enable us to connect them to wider social regimes and this in turn promotes their transformative effect (p. 130). In other words, a study on how the model, knowing citizen is constituted in various institutions and by various actors informs us about the prevalent discourses that constitute Australian identity in a range of social realms and it challenges the notion of viewing citizenship as being about active participation or as an institution that can secure human rights. In effect, a genealogy of the Australian citizenship test shows us how citizenship in contemporary Australia is not a stable and fixed entity. Instead it highlights how it is being promoted as a way of living and a form

of cultural practice that needs to be learnt, tested and embodied in order to be renegotiated and reinvented.

Genealogy's role, then, is to refuse the certainty of absolutes (Foucault, 1984, p. 87) and to promote a different kind of history, what Foucault (1984) calls an 'effective history' which:

deprives the self of the reassuring stability of life and nature, and it will not permit itself to be transported by a voiceless obstinacy toward a millennial ending. It will uproot its traditional foundations and relentlessly disrupt its pretended continuity. This is because knowledge is not made for understanding; it is made for cutting. (p. 88)

The objective of genealogy then is 'not to discover the roots of our identity but to commit itself to its dissipation ... it seeks to make visible all of those discontinuities that cross us' (Foucault, 1984, p. 95). If knowledge is about 'cutting' rather than 'knowing', that is power/knowledge, then history's role is to disrupt and thus expose these practices that promote ideas of progress, continuity, civilisation and reason. Yet Foucault goes further and suggests that history must not only 'cut' but it must also be curative. In order to be curative, we must discard the way of thinking about history as a march towards enlightenment and progress and acknowledge the failings, discontinuities and messiness of our past.

An analysis of the historicity of current discourses on how the proper and typical Australian citizen is constituted through specific knowledges, challenges the notion that these ideas of 'typical' are innate and natural and therefore opens up a space for

imagining and validating other visions of being Australian. It investigates the production of these particular practices in their 'historical specificity' and in doing so detects subtle shifts in new forms of knowledge required by the aspiring citizen' (Walters, 2012, p. 122). Citing Saar, Walters (2012) concludes that genealogy should be understood as a mode of writing history, as a mode of evaluation and critique and as textual practice (p. 115). He writes:

Genealogy uses historical knowledge to reveal that who and what we are is not fixed or eternal, not a matter of destiny or grand design, but a series of contingent becomings. (2012, p. 115)

Thus, genealogy has the 'capacity to imagine other forms of politics and subjectivity' (Walters, 2012, p. 115). For Rose, 'genealogy is a method that helps to dismantle authoritative forms of knowledge and thereby clear space for people to re-imagine themselves and their lives in new ways' (cited in Saukko, 2003, p. 116). For Bennett, 'genealogy points to the always compromised nature of academic knowledge, thereby, suggesting that, instead of pretending to be "free intellectuals", we should get openly engaged with the art of governing through state and other public and private agencies' (cited in Saukko, 2003, p. 116). In this study, genealogy illustrates the inventiveness and historicity of definitions of 'citizen' and 'Australian identity' and provides 'space' for re-imagining ourselves as Australian citizens with a range of values, alternative histories and multiple identities. Genealogy also provides the means whereby this study can inform government policy on the conferral of Australian citizenship status as well as provide a valuable critique of resources used to 'teach' the aspiring citizen how to become a knowing citizen. In this way, this study has implications for both policy and

pedagogy and as a practising TESOL teacher, it also has personal attachment and relevance to my field of work.

Finally, using a genealogical analysis to frame my research as ‘a practice of knowledge that is vital and dynamic’ (Walters, 2012, p. 116), and a form of ‘counter-memory’ allows me to repeat and arrange the discourses surrounding the Australian citizenship test in ‘a different manner’ (Walters, 2012, p. 124). What is important in opening up new perspectives about Australian identity is to recognise that national memory is always political because of ‘what is actively remembered by a society, and what is effaced and forgotten’ (Walters, 2012, p. 125).

Doing genealogy

In discipline theories of culture ... the state appears as a disciplinary apparatus engaged in the articulation of knowledge and power, capable of subjecting groups and individuals to processes of normalization, examination and surveillance. (Ang, 2008, p. 236)

The main focus of this genealogy is to examine the forms of knowledge presented in texts that inform, regulate and govern migrant subjects in the process of their becoming a member of the Australian citizenry. I explore how government documents constitute the ideal naturalised citizen. I examine political speeches made by leading political figures who were instrumental in developing the Australian citizenship test. I also report on interviews conducted with aspiring citizens in order to explore how migrants constitute themselves as ‘knowing citizens’.

However, this research project originally began as a study dedicated exclusively to an ethnography about migrants preparing to sit the Australian citizenship test. My aim was to explore how migrants and refugees wanting to become naturalised Australian citizens contested, accepted and negotiated the various discourses surrounding the introduction of the Australian citizenship test. In the process of undertaking that work I intended to address the gap in the research literature that (still) gives little attention to what migrants themselves think about becoming Australian. I also wished to deviate from popular discourses that frame the migrant other as either a victim or a villain. In focusing on the perspectives of migrants and refugees in relation to becoming an Australian citizen, I hoped to shift from the common practice of allowing only native-born Australian citizens to define what it means to become an Australian citizen and in this way, make possible a multiplicity of ways of being Australian from multiple perspectives.

While the objective to explore multiple ways of being an Australian citizen has remained, the prominent focus on the ethnographical aspects of the study has diminished significantly. Throughout the research process, my focus widened to include a range of texts and institutions that were involved with defining the conferral of citizenship and it became apparent that a comprehensive genealogical approach was needed in order to understand the complexity of the test as a technology of government. This resulted in a narrowing of the scope of the research project. The body of this research study now only includes a small amount of content relating to interviews with aspiring citizens. Short excerpts of interviews are dispersed throughout the study.

As a researcher, I feel some regret that I did not include many of the texts on migrant interviews, participants who had entrusted me with their stories of happiness, tragedies, struggles, family hopes and adversity. Nevertheless I believe that to incorporate some migrant texts in this study alongside government texts creates a more comprehensive critique of the Australian citizenship test. I hope that in the future I will be able to engage with the interview texts and extend my range of interviewees in a more comprehensive study. I briefly detail here some aspects of the ethnography in order to contextualise the interviews that I use in this study.

Approval to conduct an ethnography was granted by the University of Technology, Sydney's Research Ethics Committee. I conducted both small group and individual interviews with 30 recently arrived migrants and refugees who were from non-English speaking backgrounds and were contemplating taking out Australian citizenship in the near future. I deliberately chose participants who had arrived in Australia since the commencement of the 'war on terror' in 2001 as I believe that the introduction of the Australian citizenship test is one effect of this globally declared war of the West. In this way, I wanted to explore the values and attitudes of migrants who were familiar with the discourses of the 'crisis of Australian citizenship'. The participants were initially recruited with the assistance of five ex-students whom I had taught in TESOL classes at institutions of technical and further education and with whom I still keep in touch. Many of these students invited family members and friends to participate in small group interviews which were held in public spaces in cafes and in libraries. The interview questions were open-ended and encouraged an exploration of issues around citizenship testing and migrants' desires to belong.

The participants originated from many parts of the world and had come to Australia on a range of visas, including temporary protection and spouse visas. The refugee participants originated from Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran and Sudan. The permanent resident participants were from China, Korea, Ecuador, Greece, Indonesia, Japan, Lebanon, Macedonia, Russia, Taiwan, Turkey and Vietnam. The age range of the participants was from 18 to 55. My reason for interviewing only non-English speaking migrants was influenced by the view that policy around the Australian citizenship test was specifically targeting non-English speaking migrants who, the government claimed, did not understand or appreciate Australian values, and therefore required a test to instruct them on how to 'acquire' these values. I theorised these texts through the perspective of governmentality.

An emphasis on populations

Foucault described governmentality as:

The ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses, and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security. (1994a, pp. 219-220)

What is particular to studies on governmentality is their focus on 'the political problem of population' (Rose, O'Malley, & Valverde, 2006, pp. 84-85) rather than on the state as occupying the central role in political analysis. In this reasoning, individuals as members of a population are viewed as resources that need to be fostered, used and

optimised (Dean, 1999, p. 20). In the context of the Australian citizenship test, my emphasis is also on the living Australian population. While I focus specifically on migrants and refugees who are seeking the conferral of Australian citizenship, my analysis incorporates how members of the broader Australian community or what John Howard described as the 'mainstream' are governed with the objective of fostering reassurance among the Australian people. Mainstream Australians predominantly refer to Australians of Anglo-Celtic heritage because this group still makes up the majority of the Australian population.

Foucault attributed this emphasis on populations to the emergence of liberalism, a new political rationality of the nineteenth century that made distinctions between the state and civil society (Rose, 2006, p. 84). Foucault understood liberalism as a way of thinking that was concerned with the 'art of governing' (Gordon, 1991, p. 14). According to Dean (1999), this new modern art of government did not replace traditional notions of sovereignty and discipline. Rather a perspective of governmentality recasts sovereignty and discipline with a concern for the population and its optimisation in relation to its wealth, health, happiness, prosperity and efficiency, as well as focusing on the forms of knowledge and technical means that are appropriate to government (Dean, 1999, p. 20).

An emphasis on populations calls for an engagement with apparatuses of security, mechanisms, institutions and practices concerned with defending, maintaining and securing a national population (Dean, 1999, p. 20). Hindess (1996) elaborates that with the emergence of liberalism, Foucault identifies the 'mechanisms or modes of state intervention whose function is to assure the security of those natural phenomena,

economic processes and the intrinsic processes of population' (p. 125). Security here should be understood as 'a specific principle of political method and practice' that is distinct from other modes such as sovereignty or discipline (Gordon, 1991, p. 20). Gordon (1991) explains that whereas sovereignty has as its object the expansion of territory, and discipline focuses on the bodies of individuals, security addresses itself distinctively to 'the ensemble of a population' (p. 20). In modern day governing, security is not exclusive of but combines with sovereignty and discipline. This is particularly evident in the administering of the Australian citizenship test to aspiring citizens.

Problematisations and their technologies

To engage in the perspective of governmentality is to ask certain kinds of questions about power. This form of questioning is what Foucault refers to as problematisation. Dean (1999) defines problematisations as specific, recent situations in which the activity of governing has been called into question (p. 27). It is to study the 'discursive and non-discursive practices that make something enter into play of true and false and constitute it as an object of thought' (Rabinow & Rose, 1994, p. xix). Problematizing an issue, then, removes its certainty and refocuses it as a question that demands analysis and as such, 'frees up' the possibilities that can be offered as 'responses' to these questions (Rabinow & Rose, 1994, p. xviii). Hence, a problematisation concerning the conferral of citizenship for migrants and refugees calls for certain questions to be asked on how this is to be decided and what methods are the most appropriate for determining inclusion in the Australian citizenry. It incorporates questions of 'how to be ruled, how strictly, by whom, to what end, by what methods' (Foucault, 1991, p. 202).

A key characteristic of governmentality is to identify technologies of government, that is, the ‘means that have been invented to govern the human being; to shape or fashion conduct in desired directions’ (Rose, 1996, p 131). Hence, to conduct an analytics of government, calculated thought becomes realised by its attachment to a technology (Rose, 1999, p. 51). That is, thought becomes governmental by becoming technical, meaning that it incorporates ‘an assembly of forms of knowledge with a variety of mechanical devices and an assortment of little techniques oriented to produce certain practical outcomes’ (Rose, 1999, p. 52). Put simply, technologies refer to the tools for intervening in the conduct of conduct.

The new ‘art of governing’, then, was a search for technologies of government that could address the recurrent concern that authorities were governing too much (Rose, 2006, p. 84) or in Hindess’ (1996) words, it is about limiting government in order to guard the freedom of the individual. Hence it promotes what has come to be known as ‘small government’. In this way, the introduction of the Australian citizenship test can be viewed as a new technology of government that allowed the Federal Government to intervene and ‘govern from a distance’ in relation to who was to be included as a new citizen of Australia. Under a neoliberal government, aspiring citizens must take on ‘individual responsibility’ in order to gain the required knowledge for becoming a suitable Australian citizen. Therefore, my main focus in this study is on investigating how human conduct as a collective production (of populations) implies deliberate calculation and thought and how this thought ‘operates within our organized ways of doing things, our regimes of practices, and with its ambitions and effects’ (Dean, 1999, p. 18).

Studies of government ‘presume a set of standards and norms of conduct by which actual behaviour can be judged, and which act as a kind of ideal towards which individuals and groups should strive’ (Dean, 1999, p. 10). In this way, the Australian citizenship test works towards producing a set of standards, social norms and ideals in relation to what is considered to be a model Australian citizen and which prospective citizens must be aware of and abide by. It is these norms and standards in discourses surrounding citizenship that are a central focus of this study. In particular, what is of interest to me is how these normative practices came to be considered as essential knowledge for the conferral of citizenship as well as how prospective citizens engage with these practices, knowledges and popular discourses in pursuit of their goals and desires. A perspective of governmentality thus explores ‘the relation between the government of ourselves, the government of others, and the government of the state’ (Isin & Wood, 1999, p. 8).

Government and freedom

Government as the ‘conduct of conduct’ is dependent on the idea that the individual being governed is ‘an actor and therefore a locus of freedom’ (Dean, 1999, p. 13). That is, the act of government presupposes the existence of individuals who are free in the sense that they are living and thinking beings (Dean, 1999, p. 13). So when migrants are required to learn a particular order of knowledge in order to sit and pass the Australian citizenship test, the assumption is that they must be free to act, that is, prepare for the test in this way.

So by preparing for the test, individuals act upon themselves and govern themselves by drawing on their capacity for free choice. Lowenheim and Gazit (2009) associate this practice with the ‘act of responsabilization’ whereby governmental responsibility is transferred to private individuals (p. 159). These private individuals then become responsible for their success or failure in integrating into the Australian citizenry. In this way, becoming a knowing citizen through private study can also be theorised as a technology of the self.

Dean (1999) thus affirms that the notion of government ‘presupposes the primary freedom of those who are governed entailed in the capacities of acting and thinking’ (p. 15). This attempt to act upon oneself, or, ‘practices on the self’ through technologies can also be viewed as a means of resistance to other forms of government (Dean, 1999, p. 13). Hindess (1996), too, argues that Foucault’s articulation of governmentality recognises resistance and evasion, like other forms of power as ‘a ubiquitous feature of human interaction’ (p. 100). Therefore by successfully passing the test, migrants and refugees resist media stereotypes that portray them as failures or as migrants who have a values deficit and who are always portrayed in a state of marginalisation.

Citizenship theories

If we understand governmentality as ‘the management and regulation of citizens both through the formal organs of the state, and the informal interpersonal interactions’, (Miller, Lawrence, McKay, & Rowe, 2001, p. 131) then it follows that citizenship should be seen as a crucial site of governmentality (Miller et al., 2001, p. 97). Yet citizenship has traditionally been associated with the entity of the nation-state.

Castles and Davidson (2000) write that the institution of citizenship is at the very essence of the nation-state and define citizenship as ‘the integration of all the inhabitants of a territory into the political community’ with the emphasis being placed on political equality among those citizens (p. 2). Citizenship here is not only seen as a key institution promoting national identity but it is also at the core of democracy, implying inclusion and exclusion at the same time. Writing from a sociological perspective, the two authors summarise citizenship as being about the empowerment of citizens in a changing world context (2000, p. 28).

Foucault’s perspective on governmentality offers an alternative reading to classical theories of citizenship. According to the perspective of governmentality, modern populations are not bound together through a social contract or violence against outsiders but they live together as a population where the objective is the governing of self and others in the hope of achieving a happy, wealthy and secure society. It follows then that studies in governmentality and citizenship cover similar fields. The concept of citizenship encompasses various translations that draw on notions of civic membership, belonging, recognition, allegiance, commitment, rights, responsibilities, privileges, obligations, inclusion, exclusion, democracy, freedom, group rights and human rights. These concepts are commonly set in a national context so that citizenship is thought of in relation to the nation-state.

Citizenship, too, has many categories: social, civic, civil, political, cultural, feminist, queer, Indigenous and so on. In contemporary political theories, the concept is often presented as a dichotomy between the liberal-democratic and the communitarian models of citizenship. Broadly speaking, these theories define citizenship as having two

categories; citizenship as active participation or citizenship as the acquisition of rights. As this study reveals, notions of participation and rights are reflected in how the Australian Government and migrants approach the conferral of Australian citizenship.

Hindess (2004) explores how ‘the valorization of citizenship has come to be associated with progressive politics’ (p. 306). He reminds us that this view of the progressive and superior ‘nature’ of European forms of citizenship is reminiscent of Aristotelian thought which attributed to the polis a development that was seen as ‘natural’ and ‘the product of a particular and distinctive history’ (2004, p. 312). Hindess (2004) turns to the writings of Kant who claimed that human beings’ capacity for ‘rationality and moral autonomy’ could only be developed in a world where all people were citizens (p. 313). These citizens then form themselves into societies, that is, into discrete and relatively self-contained collectivities, each endowed with its own particular customs and way of life’ (Hindess, 2004, p. 312). This sets up a distinction between citizens and non-citizens, leading to an ‘elitist view of humanity’ which Hindess (2004) concludes remains influential in modern times (p. 313). From this ranking it follows that citizens of Western democratic states are often thought to be more ‘civilised’ than those individuals from states in which citizenship is less fully developed (Hindess, 2004).

This view is useful in understanding how Australian values were discussed in relation to migrants and particularly Muslim migrants discussed later in this the study. This notion of citizenship as a civilising force is related to the notion of citizenship as privilege.

Used as a substitute for culture, ‘citizenship’ becomes that which connects individuals in a multicultural world. But citizenship is not a given, not a

naturalized status – it is something to be learned ... or to be earned. (Fortier, 2010, p. 24-5)

In the Australian context, citizenship has always been offered to the aspiring citizen as a privilege that is granted by government. In other words, citizenship has to be earned. Here citizenship is not based on the notion of gaining rights because one is living and working in a state bound territory. It is based on liberal rationalities that require free individuals to be self-sufficient and fulfil obligations. The idea of privilege also invokes the notion of granting someone something as well as the opportunity to revoke or take away that privilege. It also puts the state and its 'mainstream' in a dominant position. As with the concept of tolerance, it is shrouded in power relations whereby migrants must control their behaviour by 'earning' the status of citizenship or 'earning' the tolerance of the mainstream community. In this way, it encourages the prospective citizen to regulate his/her behaviour according to specified norms.

Reassuring the population

Nyers (2004) argues that under neoliberal globalisation, citizenship policies have been linked to the 'political governance of security and insecurity' (p. 204). The introduction of the Australian citizenship test and the *Australian Values Statement* are also indicative of these practices of securitisation that instruct prospective candidates on how they should regulate their conduct in order to become model Australian citizens who do not threaten the Australian way of life. This appeal to national security thus becomes a 'call for reassurance' (Nyers, 2004, p. 205) manifested in contemporary Australia as the desire to maintain social cohesion among the culturally diverse population during

uncertain times. Defined as the way to restore or give confidence, peace and a sense of security to a population, the term reassurance extends on theories of securitisation and offers an affective and productive way of theorising the emergence of Australian values in contemporary Australian politics.

The argument of reassurance is premised on the realisation that failure to pass the Australian citizenship test does not endanger the migrant from remaining in Australia as a permanent resident. Furthermore, many of the rights and responsibilities of Australian citizens are also held by Australian permanent residents leading many migrants to declare that 'PR', or that the status of permanent resident is just as good as being a citizen. Failing to become an Australian citizen is a symbolic form of exclusion from the Australian citizenry. For this reason, I argue that the Australian citizenship test and its mandatory Australian values worked as a mode of governmentality that not only targeted the aspiring citizen to adopt the Australian way of life, but that it just as significantly targeted the 'mainstream' community (Hage, 2003a) to reassure it that this 'unique' Australian way of life with its Australian values was secure. Yet, this form of reassurance differs from Hage's (2003b) psychoanalytical position in that I theorise it as a form of pastoral power. In many media reports and government documents detailing immigration and the conferral of Australian citizenship, reference was frequently made to what the 'Australian people', the 'general public' and 'old Australia' wanted (Howard, 2006; ACTRC, 2008; DIMIA, 2006). As an act of security, the test becomes a 'performative' process (Nyers, 2004, p. 205) that influences the social and political life of the aspiring citizen.

In a similar vein, Bigo (2002) argues that the securitisation of migration is ‘a transversal political technology, used as a mode of governmentality by diverse institutions to play with unease’ and affirm the government’s role as ‘providers of protection and security’ (p. 65). The Howard Government also used the discourse of Australian values in this way by constantly reminding the ‘mainstream’ that they needed reassurance and in the process created the population’s anxious need for reassurance. This ‘governmentality of unease’ draws on ‘a reassuring and protective pastoral power’ in which ‘the technologies of surveillance sort out who needs to be under surveillance and who is free of surveillance’ (Bigo, 2002, p. 82). Securitisation ‘works through everyday technologies, through the effects of power that are continuous rather than exceptional’ (Bigo, 2002, p. 73).

Studies in securitisation are increasingly focusing on governing through affect. For instance, Isin (2004) proposes the subject of the ‘neurotic citizen’ who governs him/herself through ‘responses to anxieties and uncertainties’ (p. 223). This neurotic citizen stands in a ‘tension-filled relationship’ with the contemporary neoliberal citizen who has become ‘overcharged and overburdened’ as a rational and calculating subject and who does not ‘adequately account for the relationship between technologies of the self and technologies of power’ that are appropriate to contemporary citizenship issues (Isin, 2004, p. 223). Rather, it is the neurotic citizen ‘who is governed through its affects’ (Isin, 2004, p. 222) that prevails in modern day life.

Johnson (2010, p. 496), too, takes up the notion of citizens who self-regulate their conduct through ‘affective citizenship’ and explores how politicians’ comments about feeling comfortable with immigrants’ differences serve ‘as a form of normalizing

discourse that encourages both forms of self-government by some citizens and forms of casual surveillance by those who feel they belong' (2010, p. 501). Australian values can then be theorised as part of the apparatus of affective citizenship. They are affective because, as migrants adopt Australian values in their everyday lives, they become familiar and reassuring to the mainstream through the elimination of differences.

The process of learning about Australian values and passing the Australian citizenship test can be viewed as a process of subjectivation (Fortier 2010), that is, a technology of the self that encourages aspiring citizens to take responsibility for becoming ideal Australian citizens. In other words, the Federal Government's discourse on Australian values was made technical through the implementation of the citizenship test which draws on neoliberal forms of governing that place the impetus on the individual to acquire these values rather than focusing on citizenship as a status that can deal with inequalities and other social problems faced by migrants in their everyday lives.

Therefore the mandatory requirement for migrants to know Australian values addresses the 'affective subject whose conduct arises from desires, fears, anxieties, insecurities, affection, care, dis/trust, un/ease' (Fortier, 2010, p. 19). Thus, Fortier (2008) concludes that concepts such as values, integration and tolerance 'work to conjure up classificatory schemes of inclusion and exclusion on the basis of values rather than on displays of cultural competence and capital' (p. 5).

Yet while the concept of citizenship has recently become securitised and transformed, the concepts that make up discourses on Australian values have always worked as a form of affective governing on the aspiring citizen. Transformation here also refers to how the discourses around Australian values have impacted on the broader Australian

population. Drawing on Dillon, Nyers (2004, p. 205) argues that when something is being secured, it is acted upon, changed and transformed through the very act of securing it. Similarly I argue that the notion of reassurance forms part of securitisation and affective citizenship also transforms and plays a crucial part in the process by which Australian subjectivities are formed. In hoping to preserve the Australian way of life through such mechanisms as the Australian citizenship test and Australian values, the Australian way of life is redefined, re-conceptualised and transformed into a multiplicity of ways of being an Australian citizen with multiple values.

Genealogy and governmentality as critique

As previously mentioned, the Australian citizenship test came into existence after the Howard Government amended the citizenship act so that prospective citizens had to demonstrate that they possessed an adequate knowledge of Australia through examination. Lowenheim and Gazit (2009) provide a detailed analysis of citizenship tests through the lens of Foucault's writings on governmentality. They view citizenship tests as 'disciplinary technologies' that work on notions of standardisation and transparency in order to convey the idea that the tests are objective and 'scientific factual' (2009, p. 149-51). It is a form of surveillance whereby candidates are subjected to a set of ritualised rules; what to bring to the examination, how not to discuss the test with others, how to use the computer mouse, that is, a ritualised 'ceremony of power' through which test candidates are 'physically subjected to the classifying and normalizing gaze of the state' (Lowenheim & Gazit, 2009, p. 152).

Although the original Australian citizenship test encompassed a range of topics concerned with civic education, the public rhetoric of politicians focused more on knowledge relating to Australian values and Australian history. These orders of knowledge were assessed through a test that featured multiple choice and true/false questions. This kind of test format is problematic as it does not allow test candidates to elaborate their own views and forms of knowledge and has the effect of shutting down any opportunity for critique of the values and national identity propagated by the Australian Government. In effect, the format of the test objectifies these official histories and national values as it codifies them as the ‘correct answer’ suggesting to candidates that the nation’s ‘own identity is known and that its history is objective and obvious’ (Lowenheim & Gazit, 2009, p. 154). Having one correct answer to questions on issues of national histories suggests that debates relating to this history have already been settled (Lowenheim & Gazit, 2009, p. 154). Lowenheim and Gazit (2009) also argue that citizenship tests reward conformism and do not encourage reflection. They conclude that a citizenship test ‘indicates a governmentality that views the ideal (new) citizen as an apolitical and simple-minded person’ (2009, p. 155).

And yet there is always resistance. Migrants who pass the test resist the stereotypes imposed on them that they do not understand Australian values or that they are incapable of appreciating the history in which these values were forged. Hindess (1996, 2004), too, reminds us that free individuals have the capacity for resistance. It is hoped that the genealogy that follows makes possible the conditions for seeing resistance, negotiation, contestation and acceptance in the activities pertaining to the migrant becoming the knowing citizen.

CHAPTER THREE: FROM BRITISH SUBJECT TO AUSTRALIAN CITIZEN: FROM ASSIMILATION TO INTEGRATION

Leaving aside for a moment the separate issue of the White Australia policy, Australia's post World War II immigration policy had been built on the principle of assimilation. We would draw people from many countries, but when they came here they would become Australians. They would be assimilated into the host culture; they were then called New Australians. (Howard, 2010, p. 174)

A history of citizenship in Australia

The legal status of Australian citizen was created in 1948 with the enactment of the *Nationality and Citizenship Act*. The act introduced the status of citizenship for Australians and it stipulated the conditions by which citizenship could be acquired or lost. These conditions included acquiring citizenship by birth or descent, registration and naturalisation. Before this act was introduced, the only formal civic status that existed for people born on Australian territory was that of British subjects. All other individuals residing but not born in Australia and who were not already British subjects were known as aliens. Indigenous peoples were also classified as British subjects although this did not translate into the status of Australian citizen when the *Nationality and Citizenship Act 1948* took effect on 26 January 1949.

In this chapter I conduct a brief background analysis of the introduction of the status of Australian citizenship in 1949. The implementation of this legislation was guided by the belief that through the process of becoming naturalised, migrants would demonstrate

their allegiance to their newly adopted nation and assimilate into the Australian way of life. I conduct a textual analysis of some key government texts used to inform the new migrant of the knowledge required in order to become assimilated into the Australian community. I also introduce the Australian Citizenship Pledge of Commitment performed at citizenship ceremonies in order to suggest that mechanisms such as civic resource booklets and the taking of the pledge work as technologies of the self that encourage migrants to take responsibility for their own sense of belonging and inclusion. These techniques require that migrants self-discipline their conduct by studying the booklets and performing publicly a pledge to the nation and at the same time these activities work to reassure the existing Australian community that their existing Australian way of life will prevail.

Building a white nation

The idea of defining the status of an Australian citizen first arose during the Australasian Federation Convention of 1897-1898 when some of the delegates charged with drafting the Australian Constitution proposed the inclusion of a separate status of citizen for the soon-to-be federated nation (Dutton, 2002). The proposal was defeated because those opposed were reticent about using the term citizen in the Australian Constitution fearing that it would depart from the 'British forms' (Dutton, 2002, p. 10) that the new nation of Australia wanted to maintain. The result was that no definition of Australian citizen was included in the Australian Constitution. Instead, reference was made to 'the people of the Australian Commonwealth' (Dutton, 2002, p. 10). In effect, Australian citizenship as a legal category was created by the Australian Parliament rather than the Australian Constitution (Stephen, 2000, p. 4).

One of the federated nation's first legislative acts was the enactment of the *Immigration Restriction Act 1901*. This act prohibited the entry of non-whites and non-Europeans into Australia. The main purpose of the 1901 act was to secure the homogeneity of the Australian people as British and by definition, this meant excluding all non-white migrants, particularly Chinese and other Asian migrants from entering the country. It succeeded in excluding non-white immigrants by administering a dictation test to undesirable applicants. The test was almost guaranteed to ensure failure as those applicants who could not write in English were immediately rejected while other 'undesirables' were tested in another European language that they were not familiar with (Elder, 2005, p. 99). Failing the test led to migrants being denied entry to Australia or being deported if they were already residing in Australia.

The *Immigration Restriction Act 1901*, or White Australia policy as it is more commonly known, was effective in securing a white population for the large part of the twentieth century. In this way, Davidson (1997) and Dutton (2002) conclude that although nationality had followed the British model of being premised on birthplace, *jus soli*, in practice Australian nationality operated more in line with *jus sanguinis*, law of the blood because the White Australia policy treated 'the nation as bound by blood' and permitted entry only to British migrants with whom the Australian people believed they had an affinity (Dutton, 2002, p. 11)

After the war: populate or perish

The move towards individual citizenship laws for British Commonwealth nations was officially put forward at a 1947 London conference on nationality attended by members

of the British Commonwealth who proposed that member countries determine through legislation their population's own citizenship status following the precedent initiated by Canada in September 1945 (Jordens, 1993; Klapdor, Coombs, & Bohm, 2009). In Australia, the portfolio of citizenship was added to the recently established Department of Immigration. This department had been established in 1945 and was headed by the first Minister for Immigration, Arthur Calwell. Its role was to manage the large-scale immigration program on which the nation was about to embark and which would bring the arrival of thousands of British and European migrants to Australia's shores over the next 30 years. It was responsible for administering migrant eligibility for citizenship as well as providing services for their successful incorporation into the Australian population.

The immigration program was to be part of a larger nation-building venture and the solution to securing national productivity. The war experience had shaken Australian confidence, revealing 'Australia's military vulnerability' and its deficit in human labour which had failed to keep up with a growing economy coupled with a declining birthrate (Klapdor et al., 2009, p. 5). The popular cry of 'populate or perish' was uttered by Calwell and government determined that Australia's massive nation-building venture would be supplemented by a large intake of migrants totalling one per cent of the total population.

Calwell had stressed from the beginning of the program that the department's goal was to attract British migrants foremost, stating that 'for every foreign migrant there will be ten from the United Kingdom' (Klapdor et al., 2009, p. 5). Yet despite this preferential treatment, the number of British migrants remained low as the increasing prosperity of

other settler nations and Europe generated competition for the Australian program (Jordens, 1993). Calwell's Department was therefore forced to take on a larger number of Displaced Persons and War Refugees from Northern Europe and eventually, permission to migrate to Australia was extended to Southern Europeans who had originally been considered to be inferior workers and unable to fit into Australian society. The restriction on non-white and predominantly Asian immigrants remained.

At the same time there were also concerns that the inclusion of non-British migrants would lead to problems within the Australian community. The Returned Soldiers', Sailors' and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia who mainly made up the employees of the Department of Immigration, took a keen interest in assuring that the differences of the non-British migrants arriving would not affect the British-Australian way of life (Jordens 1993). During his parliamentary speech introducing the *Nationality and Citizenship Bill 1948*, Calwell stated that:

The bill is not designed to make an Australian any less a British subject, but to help him express his pride in citizenship of this great country. ... To say that one is an Australian is, of course, to indicate beyond all doubt that one is British; but to claim to be of British race does not make it clear that one is an Australian. The time has come for Australia and the other dominions to recognise officially and legally their maturity as members of the British Commonwealth by the passage of separate citizenship laws. Therefore, it gives me great pleasure to introduce this bill that will enable Australia to proclaim its own national citizenship and establish the duties and responsibilities as well as the rights and privileges that are inherent in it. (Palmer, Bell, Martyn, O'Neill, & Prince, 2005, pp. 2-3)

Calwell's speech reveals how pervasive British influence was, as, the alien– that is the foreigner– was to be defined against 'British subject status and not against Australian citizenship' (Dutton, 2002, p. 16). Dutton (2002) believes that a principal impetus for the introduction of the status of Australian citizen was related to managing movement across international borders' (p. 15). For Calwell in particular, the establishment of an 'Australian nationality' would facilitate immigration and deportation policies, the issuing of passports and the representation of Australians abroad (Dutton, 2002).

Successful incorporation into the broader Australian community, it was claimed would be demonstrated through the migrant's take up of Australian citizenship. The director of the Immigration Department, T. H. Heyes had also made this connection, stating in 1952 that 'a high rate of naturalisation would be evidence of the success of our immigration policies' (Klapdor et al., 2009, p. 6). Hence, the Department of Immigration conducted its policies in a way that established an important relationship between Australian citizenship and immigration programs which continues to this day. Changes made today to immigration policies reflect and also require intervention in citizenship laws. As a result, the success of Australia's immigration program has consistently been measured by the migrants' take up of citizenship (Klapdor et al., 2009).

Assimilation and the Australian way of life

While the government opened its doors to migrants who were not British, the distinction and preferential treatment of the British migrant was legally defined in the new *Nationality and Citizenship Act 1948*. In this act, all migrants who were not British,

Irish or protected persons were classified as aliens. In order to become a naturalised Australian citizen in 1949, the alien had to comply with specific conditions relating to age, character, residency, registration, English language and civic skills.

One of the largest impediments to the take up of citizenship was the inability of applicants to obtain three character references from Australian citizens (Davidson, 1997, p. 93). Furthermore the Nationality and Citizenship Act stipulated that aliens had to place a notice in the local newspaper at least two years before their intention to become naturalised. The reason for this was so that any member of the community could lodge an appeal. This practice reveals how there has always been a requirement that migrants self-discipline their conduct as well as the need to reassure the community of their good intentions. In this way, naturalisation worked as a programmable, disciplinary mechanism on aliens wanting to become Australian citizens.

During the period immediately after the commencement of the post-war migration program, the government introduced assimilation as the policy that was to manage the burgeoning cultural differences in Australian society. Assimilation refers to the processes used to encourage aliens to become 'the same' as British-Australians through adopting Australian practices and the English language so that the migrant alien would become indistinguishable from the native born Australian and incorporated into the Australian community as a 'new Australian'. The desire for assimilation was premised on the notion that racial differences among the population were not compatible and even dangerous to the existing Australian way of life. Assimilation, however, could not occur overnight and required government intervention. The Chifley-Calwell Government set

out on a wide-scale assimilation program, similar to the program that it was using to assimilate 'half caste' Indigenous peoples.

Reminiscing on the use of the term 'assimilation', John Howard defended the policy in his recent autobiography:

That was the term with which I had grown up, and which I had always imagined accurately described the process. They were to become Australians and were new to our country; hence the term seemed to me to make good sense. I never believed that people who used the term did so in a patronising or offensive fashion. (Howard, 2010, p. 174)

There were many like Howard who claimed that assimilation was not paternalistic but a welcoming policy (Hirst, 2006). That is, implementing the policy of assimilation was presented in positive terms about adopting the Australian way of life. According to White (1981), the term 'the Australian way of life' emerged in the 1940s as a way to combat communism and as a way of dealing with the large-scale post-war immigration program. White (1981) believes that the concept of the Australian way of life denied that there were different ways of life among Anglo-Australians as well as different cultural traditions among migrant groups. For those who espoused the virtues of the Australian way of life, the cultural differences emanating from migrants were an affront to a nation that demanded social uniformity (White, 1981).

In more recent times, the Australian way of life has morphed into declarations about 'being Australian' or 'being un-Australian'. Stratton and Ang state that the emergence of this notion of 'the Australian way of life' was itself influenced by the large-scale

immigration program. That is, the invention of the Australian way of life became necessary during this time, because, in having no choice but to accept non-British immigrants, Calwell's Government subsequently introduced a hierarchy of different subcategories of 'white' Europeans (the Scandinavians, Dutch and German were better than the Italians, Greeks, Croatians and Macedonians) and these alien migrants were to disrupt forever the almost homogeneous British Australian society (Stratton & Ang, 1998, p. 151). Hence this categorisation introduced an element of diversity in being white which could no longer be attributed to and related 'directly to the (British-derived) racial purity of the "Australian type"' (Stratton & Ang, 1998, p. 151). Hence Stratton and Ang (1998) conclude that after the commencement of post-war immigration, racial and cultural homogeneity became separated and this resulted in an emphasis on 'the concept of "the Australian way of life" as the basis of government policy to assimilate migrants and Aborigines alike' (p. 151).

By the 1960s, the policy of assimilation was discredited as having failed to improve the plight of non-British migrants who remained among the most socially and economically marginalised in Australian society (Elder, 2005; Koleh, 2010). A new policy of integration was introduced. Although similar to assimilation, the policy of integration was tolerant of migrant differences and demanded conformity from the next generation who would be expected to adopt the Australian way of life. This policy was followed by the introduction of multiculturalism in the 1970s as the apparatus that would manage difference in Australian society. Multiculturalism is discussed in chapter five. What remained constant throughout these changes to social policies concerned with population management was the need to articulate and remind new and old citizens of the Australian way of life.

Civic resources: Educating the alien-citizen

In order for migrants to successfully assimilate into the Australian way of life, Calwell and his government introduced a range of mechanisms that included booklets, pamphlets, letters and media advertisements to inform the alien on the proper conduct that this way of life entailed (Jordens, 1994). This way of life was translated in official resource documents produced by a range of government departments including the Department of Education and the Department of Immigration.

Benedict Anderson (1991) argues that the dissemination of the printed word following the invention of print capitalism helped create nationalism in nineteenth century nation-states. In the context of the naturalisation of foreign citizens, consecutive Australian Governments have used printed books as pedagogical resources to inform and instruct future citizens on what it means to be an Australian citizen. In the early 1900s, Walter Murdoch, Emeritus Professor of English wrote a series of textbooks for school children that he described as an ‘elementary account of civic rights and duties’ (Murdoch University, 2011). The titles included *The Australian Citizen*, *The Struggle for Freedom* and *The Making of Australia*. Murdoch’s writings were about loyalty to the nation and he defined good citizenship as ‘devotion to the good of others’ (Dutton, 2002, p. 90)

By the time the large-scale immigration program was in full swing, booklets were also being used to entice the British migrant to Australia’s shores. These booklets were concerned with promoting a unique Australian way of life to future British migrants and as such, their focus was on immigration and the benefits it could bring. Eventually these booklets dealt with the subject of citizenship.

A booklet to promote Australian citizenship was first proposed in 1946, two years before the enactment of the Citizenship and Nationality Act, by the immigration minister himself (Jordens, 1994). In suggesting the production of an Australian citizenship booklet, Calwell believed that such a publication would

Give the alien an outline of our historical and cultural background, our social structure and mode of government, an appreciation of our way of life, and what Australia stands for as a nation. It will bring home to him the privileges and benefits which derive from Australian citizenship, and will better fit him to take his place as a partner in our great Commonwealth. (Calwell, cited in Jordens, 1994, p. 3)

Throughout those early years of the Department, several other suggestions were made in order to promote Australian citizenship to future newcomers. In early 1953, the Director of the Department of Immigration, Heyes suggested that at the next citizenship convention, the Department should work towards adopting a Charter of Australian citizenship because he believed that the increase in immigration made it necessary for Australians to become ‘more deeply conscious of our standards of citizenship’, and that ‘the privileges and obligations of citizenship’ also needed to be made clearer (Jordens, 1993, p. 5). The Immigration Advisory Council was charged with its execution the following year and at the 1955 Citizenship Convention, the issue of a charter of citizenship was put on the agenda (Jordens, 1993, p. 6). The Department suggested that the future document describe ‘in an inspirational way the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship’, and that it ‘set out the characteristics of the basic freedoms of Australians’, and ‘define what it means by the Australian tradition or way of life’ (Jordens, 1993, p. 6).

The charter, however, did not eventuate and it would take another 50 years before it was put on the agenda again by the Howard Government in the form of the *Australian Values Statement*. Calwell's intended citizenship booklet did not eventuate either. Instead, officials within the department decided to use the booklets already being distributed to promote migration to prospective British migrants to Australia. They provided content that the government believed to be essential knowledge for the migrant in his/her journey towards becoming an Australian citizen and becoming incorporated into Australian society. Over the years, a number of these pocket booklets were adapted to include promoting immigration and citizenship to non-British European migrants as well as British migrants. The following section details two of these resources produced in the first decade of the citizenship act.

Know Australia – the booklet

The first booklet distributed to both British and non-British migrants was entitled *Know Australia*. It was a pocket-sized booklet with a red, black and white cover depicting a dot painting in the style of Aboriginal artwork. It was written in a question and answer format. The second edition was published during the final year of World War II and its contents were divided into the following sections:

- Australia and Australians
- Australia – A Place To Live In
- Good Living Standards
- Nature and the Earth are Bountiful
- Plenty of Sport for Leisure Hours
- Some History – Past and Present
- When did it happen?

The main theme of its 52 pages dealt with promoting Australia as a great destination where employment could be readily found and the new migrant was provided with great facilities and benefits. As with most booklets of its kind produced in the late 1940s and early 1950s, it highlighted Australia's abundant sunshine with claims of 'at least 6 hours of sunlight per day'! It also stressed the importance of sports, the beach and surfing to the Australian daily life. This booklet did not go into any detail about what it means to be Australian, nor did it stress the nation's British heritage.

The purpose of these booklets was to promote Australia as a great destination for newcomers. They focused on describing the immense space that is the Australian continent. Not much was written about the 'national character' of the population presumably because Australian people were considered to be Britons who were living in the most southern of continents and therefore no different from its intended audience and therefore requiring no further explanation. Rather, emphasis was placed on the youthfulness of the working population and there were detailed summaries of marriages, figures about people between the ages of 20 and 45, and deaths. It should be noted that this was during the peak period of 'populate or perish' where emphasis lay in building the labour population and the nation's industries and infrastructure.

Despite not focusing on the Australian people as a unique category, there was a dedicated question on Indigenous peoples. The booklet *Know Australia* (1945) acknowledged some of the hardships faced by Indigenous peoples after colonisation as well as acknowledging Indigenous peoples' participation in the war. In the first section of the pocket booklet entitled, 'Australia and Australians', question ten asks, *Are Aborigines dying out?* The section reads,

As in all newly settled countries, the natives suffered at first from their contact with the white race. It has been estimated that at the time of the first settlement in 1788 there were about 300,000 blackfellows in Australia. Many were badly treated in the early years, but it is believed that there are still 52,000 full-blooded aborigines in the country, mostly in reservations which white men are not permitted to enter and where the blacks, living in their natural state, are increasing in numbers. In other parts of the Commonwealth they are strictly protected. They cannot be given liquor and are encouraged to live an active communal life. Many of the young men have enlisted in the armed forces.

What is interesting about this extract written during the period of administering the Aboriginal Protection Act is that ‘white settlement’ or ‘first contact’ was acknowledged as having led to suffering and ill treatment of Aboriginal people. The policy of protectionism was suggested as a remedy for these past injustices with the text emphasising that no white person was allowed to disrupt the ‘natural state and communal life’ of Indigenous peoples. The extract reads as if a particular kind of species was being protected from the white man’s civilising yet destructive lifestyle. The extract ended on a ‘positive’ note, describing the ‘many’ young Indigenous men who had enlisted in the armed forces during the war.

In subsequent additions, the booklet was amended to reflect the different type of immigrant that was being targeted. The 1950 edition of *Know Australia* adopted a more officious tone. The cover of the booklet no longer had the Aboriginal artwork. In its place was the depiction of the Australian coat of arms. Gone too was the question about the survival of Aboriginal people. Eventually, that booklet was superseded by another

booklet entitled *Australia and Your Future* (1952). This booklet was produced during the period that coincided with low immigration when numbers dropped from 89,000 in the 1950-1951 period to 38,500 migrants arriving in the next three years (Klapdor et al., 2009, p. 7). There was also a dramatic decline in the number of refugees being accepted (Klapdor et al., 2009, p. 7). This period also experienced a low uptake of citizenship. Before 1952, the number of migrants who had declared an intention to naturalise was less than half of those eligible, and of this group, only 25 per cent had actually done so (Klapdor et al., 2009, p. 6). This decline in migrant numbers was reflected in the content of the resource booklets that were being distributed.

In *Australia and Your Future*, the image of Australia that was being promoted was one where there were plentiful jobs and social security benefits (including child endowment), schools and lots of leisure activities under the sun. The first section began with an invitation.

Australia wants you – and especially if you are confident in your own mind that this, the last continent to be discovered and settled, will give you the kind of life and future you are looking for.

The section entitled *This Place Australia* and stretching over four pages, covered Australian history, beginning with the statement that ‘In 1788 the British established the first white settlement’ (p. 3). It adheres to notions of discovery and progress, alluding to the adventurous and pioneering spirit of Australians. In this booklet, we also begin to see an emphasis being placed on the English, the Irish and the Scots who came (p. 5). On page 6, this section concluded that

The first Australians brought to the country Anglo-Saxon traditions, ways of life and culture. These their descendants have moulded to their environment and needs.

So now that non-British migrants were being let into the country, the Anglo-centricity of the people needed to be articulated. Here, ‘first Australians’ referred to the first white settlers and convicts, not the Indigenous peoples. What is interesting about this publication of 1952 when Harold Holt was Immigration Minister is that the Indigenous peoples who had figured in the 1945 booklet as a dying race and who had enlisted in the armed forces were not mentioned. No references were made to Indigenous peoples at all. Perhaps one way of reading this is to understand that assimilation had worked and there was no need to single out Indigenous peoples for a new Indigeneity had emerged in the form of Anglo-Saxon traditions and people. We also begin to see an articulation of the Australian identity based on a British heritage. We must remember that this booklet was not only intended for British migrants as is evidenced on its back page which lists contact details for migration schemes with Malta, The Netherlands, Italy and other foreign offices. This, too, coincided with the need to articulate the Britishness of Australians.

Throughout those early years of the post-war immigration program, other booklets were published. At the same time, the role of promoting the take up of Australian citizenship by aliens became fully absorbed by the Good Neighbour Council. This was a movement established in 1950 which consisted of local groups around Australia who enlisted the active support of community agencies and volunteers ‘to assist in migrant integration

and as a consequence to promote their desire to become Australian citizens’

(Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, n.d.).

The Good Neighbour Councils produced a variety of resources to promote the take up of Australian citizenship and even had their own newspaper. These texts are not discussed in this study as they were not produced by government departments and did not pertain to official immigration policy. The next publication produced by the Federal Government did not occur until 1997 when the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs produced the booklet, *What it means to be an Australian Citizen* in preparation for the 50th anniversary of the Citizenship Act. This booklet is discussed in chapter six.

It was not until the enactment of the Australian citizenship test in 2007 that a new citizenship resource booklet was required. Before this booklet and its accompanying citizenship test could be prepared, there was a consultation process to be gone through. I return now to the period that brought in the implementation of the Australian citizenship test.

The Discussion Paper

Australian citizenship is more than just a ceremony – citizenship lies at the heart of our national identity and gives us a strong sense of who we are and our place in the world. Australian citizenship is a privilege not a right. (DIMA, 2006, p. 5)

On 17 September 2006, Andrew Robb, the Parliamentary Secretary for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, released for public consideration the discussion paper, *Australian*

Citizenship: Much More than a Ceremony. The paper explored the merits of introducing a formal citizenship test for migrants and refugees who were Australian permanent residents and who were seeking to become naturalised Australian citizens. Interested parties had only two months, that is, until 17 November and just before the summer holiday break to make a submission either online or by post. The results were released in December 2006 on the first anniversary of the Cronulla Beach Riots. Within three months, the entire consultation process was complete and the Department of Immigration was well on its way to drafting the bill that would bring into effect a formal citizenship test. The speedy introduction of the test was aided by bipartisan political support that the Government received from the Opposition Labor Party (Bennett & Tait, 2008).

In his autobiography, Robb (2011) claimed that the implementation of a citizenship test to determine suitability for the conferral of Australian citizenship was his idea. It was his personal view that a test would force migrants and especially migrant women to learn the English language so that they would not remain isolated at home (Robb, 2011). In expressing this view, Robb shared his political party's belief that migrants should be required to learn about the Australian people and their culture, history and values so that they could successfully integrate into the mainstream community and that this demonstrated act of integration would secure social cohesion. Robb, too, was a critic of multiculturalism and during his time in parliament, he had been instrumental in making multiculturalism 'a dirty word' (Hart, 2006). Indeed, the Discussion Paper is one of the first among many government documents related to the introduction of an Australian citizenship test that avoids the use of the term multiculturalism under Robb's administration. By January 2007, the department's name had changed from the

Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs to the Department of Immigration and Citizenship.

In promoting integration and Australian values, the Discussion Paper did not provide an explicit problematic as to why the test was needed. No crisis in citizenship was named as the impetus for such a policy change. No threat to social cohesion was defined. Yet there were some subtle insinuations in the Discussion Paper that the granting of Australian citizenship to migrants was about to be overhauled. For instance, the Discussion Paper stated that a test would be ‘an important part of the process of assisting people to fully participate in the Australian community’ because ‘it would provide a real incentive to learn English and to understand the Australian way of life’ (DIMA, 2006, p. 11). Three ‘critical aspects’ were identified for testing and these were ‘knowledge of Australia, commitment to Australian values and knowledge of English’ (DIMA, 2006, p. 11). These aspects were to come together with the final objective of the integration of new Australian citizens into ‘one family’ (DIMA, 2006, p. 5). Integration here could be read as the alternative to the previous social policy of multiculturalism.

In the Discussion Paper’s ‘Forward’, Robb qualifies his evaluation of Australia’s cultural diversity:

Australia has been hugely successful at integrating millions of people with diverse backgrounds from 200 countries, because, *in the main*, we have embraced and drawn from the wealth of that diversity, and we are all the richer for it. (my italics) (DIMA, 2006, p. 5)

So here it is the ‘we’ in Australia who have embraced and integrated the millions of migrants, not the migrants themselves who have initiated this integration process. And it is the benefits that ‘we’ have gained from this diversity which is selective and only includes the ‘wealth’ that we desire and ignores all other aspects of diversity. Indeed, the Discussion Paper states clearly that one of the main purposes of the test is to ‘provide assurances that the applicants for the test understand some common values’ (DIMA, 2006, p. 11). It is not stated who must be assured by the applicants, or whose common values must be understood but it can be surmised that this assurance is required for those whom the Howard Government commonly referred to as the ‘mainstream’.

There are many examples throughout the Discussion Paper that suggest that a citizenship test for migrants is being considered so that this invented mainstream Australian can feel assured. For instance page 11 states that migrant participation in ‘Australian life’ and their interest in learning English and understanding the ‘Australian way of life’ through the implementation of a citizenship test are ‘critical (imperatives) from a broader community perspective’. On the same page but under the section on the economic impetus for introducing a test, the text states that the test will provide ‘the mechanism through which we can be assured that new citizens have sufficient English and knowledge of Australia to maximise the employment and other economic opportunities which benefit the individual and Australia’ (DIMA, 2006, p. 11). Again in the same section, the following extract is telling of government attitudes towards migration:

Encouraging migrants to become Australian citizens enables Australia to reap the full benefit of our migration programme and to take advantage of their skills

and contribution across our full economic infrastructure. Individuals are then in a position to fully participate in our society and achieve their full economic potential as citizens. (DIMA, 2006, p. 11)

In this extract, the migration program and the benefits it brings are premised on predominantly economic terms. The only potential that migrants must achieve is an economic one so that the nation can benefit from the migration program. On page 16, the Discussion Paper provides another example of how the test can reassure the Australian community. The extract's cautionary tone warns that:

Australian citizenship is highly valued – and is much sought after by many. Once obtained, it allows full participation in the Australian community. As such, it is of paramount importance to *ensure* that *we know* with absolute confidence *the identity of the person* who obtains citizenship. (DIMA, 2006, p. 16)

In this extract, it is the applicant that is suspect and who is presumed to be dangerous and who needs to prove otherwise to the Australian community. For this reason, the paper proposes that testing must be aligned to 'the whole-of-government National Identity Security Strategy (NISS)' in order to check for 'identity fraud' (DIMA, 2006, p. 16). In this form of governmentality, regulating the conduct of future citizens requires the involvement of multiple government organisations. The following page also emphasises a binary between us and them with the statement, 'the focus of any prospective citizenship test would be on helping people learn about *our country* and preparing *them* for their life as Australian citizens' (my italics) (DIMA, 2006, p. 17). This again highlights the policy of integration on which the test was premised and how it works as an 'individualising' and 'totalising' aspect of government.

During the media release announcing the coming of the test, Robb stressed the importance of assuring the mainstream community, stating that ‘it is important that the Australian community is comfortable that members of the community who are not Australian citizens, but are here for an extended period of time, understand and respect our way of life’ (Howard & Robb, 2006). Although Robb was referring specifically to permanent residents who are ‘members of the community’, there still needs to be that reassurance for the ‘Australian community’ of their intentions in respecting ‘our way of life’.

It is interesting to note that the Discussion Paper uses the term ‘merits’ to introduce the possibility of a citizenship test. The word ‘merit’ connotes something that has value and is advantageous. This use of the word merit captures the tone of the paper which reads as a *fait accompli*. The Discussion Paper does not deal with the non-merits or raise questions such as *what does the public think of this idea of a citizenship test? What are the pros and the cons for introducing a test? What are the costs involved to government and to the individual applicant in introducing formal testing? Are there alternative paths that can be pursued?* As Miller and Rose (2008) argue, devices such as discussion papers are used by governments to encourage community participation in decisions relating to governing the population. They become ‘programmes for reforming reality’ (Miller and Rose, 2008, p. 29) and are promoted as creating consensus among the Australian community by making these programmatics normative so that the mainstream can feel reassured that the make up of the citizenry is ‘in their hands’, that is, ‘programmable’.

Public Responses

A total of 1,644 written submissions were received from the Australian community in response to the Discussion Paper. Considering its timing which was strategically timetabled at the end of the year when there was a greater likelihood that responses would be minimal (Batainah & Walsh, 2008), the number of responses seems to demonstrate that there was widespread interest among the Australian community in relation to how new Australian citizens were to be governed. Most of the responses came from ethnic community groups, human rights organisations and English language providers. The government published the results in the *Summary Report on the Outcomes of the Public Consultation on the Merits of Introducing a Formal Citizenship Test* (DIMA, 2007). The report stated that 60 per cent of respondents were in favour of introducing a formal citizenship test.

In relation to the question of whether knowledge of Australia demonstrated effective participation as an Australian citizen, only one third of all submissions responded to this question with 92 per cent of these agreeing that knowledge of Australia was important. Similarly, only 30 per cent of submissions addressed the question of whether a demonstrated commitment to Australian values was important and of these, 93 per cent were affirmative. Through these results, the government could claim to have 60 per cent support from respondents but this figure fails to deal with the fact that a greater number of respondents chose to ignore the questions relating to testing, knowledge and values and chose instead to focus on other aspects in the Discussion Paper such as the need for continued English language tuition and settlement programs for recently-arrived migrants.

In addition to the online and written submissions, Andrew Robb and his department organised a series of face-to-face consultations with 129 representatives from a range of government, business and community groups in the cities of Perth, Melbourne, Brisbane, Sydney, Hobart, Darwin and Adelaide (DIMA, 2007). In these discussions, the key themes that arose centred on identifying citizenship education as an ‘important initiative to promote effective and equitable participation in Australian society’ (DIMA, 2007, p. 11). The discussions also promoted a strong commitment to English language training for prospective citizens and there were suggestions for alternative test formats. Participants also raised concerns about adequate safeguards to provide for exceptions and exemptions to citizenship to avoid barriers for disadvantaged applicants such as survivors of torture and trauma (DIMA, 2007, p. 11).

Despite the government’s victory claims and bipartisan support from the major political parties, the pending introduction of the Australian citizenship test was highly controversial among a range of community groups (Allison, 2007; Bennett and Tait, 2008). Critics such as Liberal Minister Petro Georgiou (2008) stated that ‘the new test is punitive; it turns its back on our tradition of inclusive citizenship; and will prevent many meritorious aspiring citizens from full membership of the Australian community’.

There were many other submissions that were critical of formal testing. Of particular interest is the submission made by the Director of the Centre for International and Public Law at the Australian National University, Kim Rubenstein. Rubenstein did not believe that there should be a formal test for migrants. Her main objection to many of the proposals in the Discussion Paper focused on the distinction made between citizens who gained citizenship automatically by birth and those who were granted citizenship.

According to Rubenstein (2006), not addressing 'native born' citizens results in the discrimination of citizens who have been naturalised. She also believed that it was contestable to claim that the conferral of Australian citizenship is a privilege and not a right for the naturalised citizen. She elaborates:

This is not necessarily so. Australian citizenship is a statutory concept ... and there are certain people, whom the Australian Citizenship Act 1948 currently bestows citizenship upon, as a legal right.

While it is possible for the government to amend the Act ... it is not clear what the outer limits are for depriving people of their citizenship, or denying recognition of citizenship. The Constitution places limits on the extent to which the Government can define alienage ... and deprive a person of his/her citizenship, or membership of the Australian 'people'. (Rubenstein, 2006)

Rubenstein similarly adds that some 'legal responsibilities' such as obeying the law do not only apply to naturalised citizens but are also the responsibility of those with automatic citizenship status and in most cases, they are the responsibility of non-citizens as well. In relation to the promotion of Australian values, Rubenstein (2006) commented that:

A commitment to the basic values underpinning a liberal western democracy such as Australia is important in creating a functioning and essentially cohesive community. However, it would be too difficult and arguably divisive to define a singular view of what Australia's way of life and values are. Engendering a commitment to Australia can be encouraged in ways other than formal citizenship testing. Formal testing would not assist in ensuring a commitment to Australia's way of life and values.

The Howard Government, however, was not to be deterred. At the media release announcing the Australian citizenship test, Robb reiterated the government's line that 'Australian citizenship is a privilege and not a right' adding that the test was 'an important extension of the Government's broader philosophy of mutual obligation' and that it was 'something worth striving for' (Howard & Robb, 2006) highlighting his neoliberal agenda for the migrant community.

Becoming an Australian citizen – the booklet

Preparation for developing test resources began immediately and in February 2007, a Senate Estimates Committee quizzed immigration officials on whether experts external to the Department of Immigration were involved in developing these resources. In his response, Mr. Vardos, the immigration official, confirmed that the department had engaged 'the AMEP Research Centre, which is a consortium of Macquarie and La Trobe universities' and reminded the committee that it was the AMEP that had developed the *Let's Participate* course used to teach civics education to newly settled migrants (SSCLCA, 2007). This course is discussed in the following chapter.

The Minister for Immigration also suggested that test resources would be based on the 'existing Australian Migrant English Program syllabus' (Hart, 2007). Hart (2007) reported that 'Mr. Andrews said Macquarie University in Sydney was preparing the resources on values, which included material on "the rule of law, the fact that we live in what I'd call a secular legal regime, the place of courts and respect for courts [and that] men and women are equal"'.

Hart's (2007) article also reported the following revelation:

Mr Andrews said he was involved in compiling material about the history of Australia.

"There's a short potted history of Australia I suppose which I'm taking hands-on interest in and doing some work myself – history was one of the subjects I did my arts degree major in, so I have an ongoing interest in history," he said.

Preparations for the accompanying resources were rushed, produced in an ad hoc manner and shrouded in secrecy (Batainah & Walsh, 2008). The booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen: Your Commitment to Australia* was released in September 2007, just one month before the introduction of the Australian citizenship test. Its acknowledgements page did not confirm if the Adult Migrant Education Program (AMEP) or even the former Federal Minister for Immigration and Citizenship contributed to its content. Indeed, not even the Department of Immigration and Citizenship was cited in its acknowledgments and readers were only informed that it was a publication by the Commonwealth of Australia, legitimated with the depiction of the national coat of arms. The AMEP Research Centre, however, should have been the obvious choice as contributor. It was a government-funded English language and early settlement program administered by various educational providers offering recently arrived migrants English language tuition.

When government changed in late 2007, the new Rudd Government reiterated its support for a formal citizenship test and convened a review committee in order to review the mechanics of the Australian citizenship test. The result was that the old citizenship test and its accompanying resources were heavily criticised. This review

process is discussed in chapter eleven of this study. Despite many changes, the practice of administering a test was maintained and informing the test candidate on what knowledge was required in order to become a model citizen was continued through the production of a citizenship resource booklet. What was also stressed by the review committee was the Pledge of Commitment made by new citizens at citizenship ceremonies around the nation. During these ceremonies, the most important act is making the pledge as an act of joining the Australian community and making a promise to uphold the Australian way of life. A short history of the Australian Pledge of Commitment follows.

Citizenship ceremonies – performing reassurance

An important and consistent feature of the naturalisation process has been the requirement that newly naturalised citizens attend citizenship ceremonies. These were originally held in local courts. Today they are organised and take place in local councils. In the early days, Calwell stressed that he wanted to emulate the American model of naturalisation which was successful in impressing on new citizens ‘the gravity of citizenship’ as well as their civic rights and duties and the nation’s history (Dutton, 2002, p. 16). The Citizenship and Nationality Act required that all new citizens attend citizenship ceremonies so that they would feel as though they had done something special for themselves and for the nation and, just as importantly, to ‘inform the community that the person was no longer an alien’ (Dutton, 2002, p. 17). Dutton (2002) writes that

Citizenship ceremonies were postulated as the key moment in the process of assimilation: the ceremony signified the alien's crossing of the boundaries of citizenship. (p. 17)

In order to stress the significance of the event, Calwell arranged for all ceremonies to display the Australian flag (Dutton, 2002, p. 17). When Harold Holt replaced Calwell as Immigration Minister, he instructed that the flag of the Union Jack also be displayed at the citizenship ceremony (Dutton, 2002, p. 17). In 1954, the Australian Citizenship Convention agreed that a portrait of the queen should also be displayed, highlighting the Liberal Government's commitment to promoting citizenship as a form of symbolic allegiance to 'the Crown and British nationality' (Dutton, 2002, p. 17). What has been a consistent and key feature of the citizenship ceremony was the taking of the oath of allegiance, now known as the Pledge of Commitment.

The pledge first came into effect with the enactment of the Nationality and Citizenship Act of 1948 when all aliens, that is, migrants and refugees who were not British subjects and who desired Australian citizenship were required to make the following oath:

I, (first name, last name) swear by Almighty God that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty King George the Sixth, his heirs and successors according to the law, and that I will faithfully observe the laws of Australia and fulfil my duties as an Australian citizen. (Department of the Parliamentary Library, 2002, p. 1)

In those early days, allegiance was sworn to the monarch in the name of God rather than swearing allegiance to Australia and its people, illustrating older influences of juridical

and pastoral relations of power. From its inception then, the oath or affirmation of allegiance was promoted as an essential part of the citizenship process (Department of the Parliamentary Library, 2002, p. 1). Seventeen years later in 1966 the Minister for Immigration, Hubert Opperman amended the oath to include words of renunciation to all other allegiances in order to ‘control’ the loyalty that new citizens expressed to Australia. Declaring that the change would ‘simplify and shorten the naturalisation ceremony and enhance its dignity’, he also stated, somewhat paradoxically, that a new citizen ‘renouncing all other allegiance’ while declaring eternal allegiance to Australia would ‘eliminate the emotional disturbance felt by candidates due to their national and rightful love of their homelands’ (Department of the Parliamentary Library, 2002, p. 1). Perhaps Opperman was referring to the notion of divided loyalties, suggesting that you can only love one nation at a time. The new oath of allegiance was as follows:

I, (first name, last name), renouncing all other allegiance, swear by Almighty God that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty, Queen Elisabeth the Second, Her Heirs and Successors according to law. (Department of the Parliamentary Library, 2002, p. 2)

Yet the order of renunciation performed here may be different to what Opperman imagined. I asked my father about how he felt renouncing his beloved Italy when he became an Australian citizen in 1980. ‘I didn’t renounce my country’, he told me in Italian. ‘How could I do that? I can’t speak English. I only moved my lips and pretended to say the words. I tricked them with my own ignorance!’ he said proudly laughing at himself.

It is in Foucault's (1988) lectures on technologies of the self that the notion of renunciation is raised as part of ancient Christian practice and as part of caring for the self and knowing the self. This is significant as it must be remembered that the word pledge includes the meaning of 'to care for' so that new citizens were caring for themselves in an ethical manner by performing allegiance to the monarch. Foucault (1988) wrote that 'to be concerned with oneself was, for the Greeks, one of the main principles of cities, one of the main rules for social and personal conduct and for the art of life' (p. 19). He elaborates that for Socrates, 'teaching people to occupy themselves with themselves, he teaches them to occupy themselves with the city' (1988, p. 20). For the Epicurians, too, 'teachings about everyday life were organized around taking care of oneself in order to help every member of the group with the mutual work of salvation' (Foucault, 1988, p. 21). So when migrants like my father were asked to renounce their homeland, they did not give up a care of the self but that care of the self in which they participated looked different.

Whereas in the Greco-Roman culture knowledge of oneself appeared as the consequence of taking care of yourself, Foucault (1988) concludes that in the modern world, 'knowledge of oneself constitutes the fundamental principle' (p. 22). To renounce one's previous nation during the saying of the citizenship pledge hence serves to transform the migrant 'from one reality to another' resulting in the transformation of the self (Foucault, 1988, p. 40). In this way, the saying of the pledge is similar to Christian practices in antiquity, that is, a confessional religion that imposed on its followers the duty of truth obligations:

The duty to accept a set of obligations, to hold certain books as permanent truth, to accept authoritarian decision in matters of truth, not only to believe certain

things but to show that one believes, and to accept institutional authority are all characteristics of Christianity. (Foucault, 1988, p. 40)

These truths and beliefs were articulated as Australian values in the first test and as principles of the pledge in the second test. These practices still resonate in modern times and were reflected in the ritual of pledging allegiance to Australia while renouncing one's former nationality. Yet 20 years later, the relevance of this practice would again be brought into question when the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Chris Hurford described renunciation as 'ambiguous and unnecessary' (Department of the Parliamentary Library, 2002, p. 2). This followed on from recommendations made by the Human Rights Commission in 1986 that the oath or affirmation of allegiance should not include a renunciation to a candidate's other allegiances (Department of the Parliamentary Library, 2002).

By 1993, another amendment was introduced, this time replacing the whole oath or affirmation of allegiance with a Pledge of Commitment as well as removing reference to the Crown. Swearing allegiance to an offshore monarchy was becoming difficult to sustain at a time when calls for a republic were gaining momentum. Removing the Crown from the oath was completed under Immigration Minister, Senator Nick Bolkus. Bolkus explained that new citizens needed a new oath of allegiance which reflected 'the core values of Australia and which is a bonding instrument, and we can do this without any disrespect to our sovereign' (cited in Department of the Parliamentary Library, 2002, p. 2). Hence we see one of the first articulations of the pledge embodying Australian values. The result was that the Pledge of Commitment was introduced, one

version referencing God, the other omitting God, with each candidate given the choice to decide which version they would make.

That pledge is still in existence today and it is the same pledge made by the new citizens described in the introduction of this study. I return to the pledge in the final chapter in order to highlight its continuing significance in the process of becoming an Australian citizen.

Conclusion

Since the inception of the Citizenship Act, the granting of Australian citizenship as a privilege was to be reciprocated through allegiance. For this reason, Dutton (2002) argues that the 1948 legislation was primarily a symbolic act ‘which meant no more than the *de facto* administrative concept that preceded it’ (pp. 15-16) and suggests that government discourses about Australian citizenship after 1949 were concerned with ‘the problems of incorporating migrants’ rather than ‘questions of civil and political rights, democracy and popular sovereignty’ (p. 18). He concludes that ‘Australian citizenship lacks substance and its primary uses remain controlling the movement of people across borders and incorporating migrants’ (2002, p. 18). Dutton is writing from the perspective of citizenship that seeks to secure rights for citizens. Klapdor, Coombs and Bohm (2009), on the other hand, state that citizenship has great symbolic value because ‘it formally establishes membership in the national community’ (p. 2).

Perhaps it is this kind of view about citizenship that John Howard was referring to when he described in his autobiography the use of the term ‘new Australians’, new citizens

becoming part of the national community. Throughout his years as Prime Minister, he would come to contrast these ‘new Australians’ with the model of ‘old Australia’. We can recall that in the opening extract of this chapter, Howard mentioned ‘leaving aside’ the White Australia policy for the moment. Yet in his autobiography, he never returned to discuss the policy. It remained ‘aside’ as it has done so in many current discourses about Australia’s immigration past. The principles of the White Australia policy framed thinking about Australian identity for over 70 years and it can be argued that it still lurks within notions of the ‘typical Australian’ and the ‘Australian way of life’.

PART TWO: THE METAMORPHOSIS OF 'CORE'
NATIONAL VALUES

CHAPTER FOUR: INTRODUCING AUSTRALIAN VALUES

Value is seen as a human production that is both the goal and motor of human progress. Plato's conception in the Republic of the dialectic, Aristotle's notion of the unfolding of faculties, Rousseau's idea of the perfectibility of man, Nietzsche's ... prophecy of the transvaluation of values, and Agamben's ... image of the 'coming community' are all variations on a historical concept of value as the object of a quest undertaken by the human species as a whole.

(Mitchell, 2005, p. 367)

The central principle behind such a (citizenship) test and (values) statement is to ensure that those people who wish to become Australian citizens do so by way of demonstrating a level of understanding and commitment to Australia and our way of life. This way of life is influenced by a history that includes the Judeo Christian beliefs and traditions brought by the British settlers. Also present were the values and institutions that form the basis of a free and open democratic society, particularly our British political heritage, and the spirit of the European Enlightenment. (Andrews, 2007a, p. 154)

The Australian citizenship test was introduced with the primary objective of having migrants embrace Australian values. At the second reading of the *Australian Citizenship Amendment (Citizenship Testing) Bill 2007*, Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, Kevin Andrews stated:

While people are not expected to leave their own traditions behind, we do expect them to embrace our values and integrate into the Australian society. In

becoming a citizen, they pledge their loyalty to Australia. (Commonwealth of Australia, 2007b, p. 4)

Howard, too, had made similar comments during the lead up to the launch of the Australian citizenship test. In December 2006 at a joint press conference with Andrew Robb, the Prime Minister summed up his rationale for introducing a citizenship test:

This is a test that affirms the desirability of more fully integrating newcomers into the mainstream of Australian society. This is about cohesion and integration, it's not about discrimination and exclusion ... So it's not about keeping people out, it's about bringing people together after they've come here and that's what the country wants. The country wants a unifying commitment to the values and the future of this society. (Howard & Robb, 2006, p. 3)

For the Prime Minister, a test that promoted Australian values would have the effect of reassuring 'the country' that migrants could integrate and that this would in turn ensure social cohesion. Howard suggested that 'the country' wants this, where the country could be understood to be the 'native-born' Australians. That is, a values test could demonstrate to the country that migrants want to make a significant contribution to the nation's present and future wellbeing. Integration, it should be noted, has the meaning of making something whole, as one, and complete.

In this chapter, I explore the concept of Australian values through a textual analysis of their depiction in the citizenship resource booklet *Becoming an Australian Citizen: Your Commitment to Australia*. I compare this booklet to its predecessor, a multimedia kit entitled *Let's Participate: A Course in Australian Citizenship*. The analysis reveals that

the concept of core civic values underwent significant transformation during Howard's time as Prime Minister, and that this transformation was reflected in how citizenship has come to be defined as a normative form of active participation and acceptance of the Australian way of life.

Core values

At the same time that the Australian citizenship test was introduced in October 2007, the Howard Government also put into place the *Australian Values Statement*. This statement, known as *Form 1281*, outlines the ten principles of Australian values and is included as part of the administrative process for foreigners applying for Australian provisional or permanent residency visas. Under the title of *Living in Australia – Australian Values*, the Department of Immigration and Citizenship's website informs potential visa applicants that:

The Australian government believes that new residents should be encouraged to learn as much as they can about their new country, its heritage, language, customs, values and way of life and to apply for Australian citizenship when they become eligible. (Department of Immigration and Citizenship)

The *Australian Values Statement* thus works in a similar way to the Australian citizenship test, demanding of its applicants that they gain knowledge of Australia's history, language, customs and values in order to be deemed ready to accept the grant of permanent residency and eventually for the conferral of Australian citizenship.

In the original test, three mandatory questions on Australian values were included which all had to be answered correctly in order to successfully pass the test. This requirement created an anomaly as there was a possibility that a test candidate could score over the prescribed 12 out of 20 questions correctly and still be deemed to have failed the test if all three specific questions on Australian values had not been answered correctly. The Department of Immigration and Citizenship's website used to list five practice questions; the one on Australian values read as follows:

Which one of these values is important in modern Australia?

- Everyone has the same religion
- Everyone has equality of opportunity
- Everyone belongs to the same political party

The correct response is the second choice, 'everyone has equality of opportunity'. As will become apparent throughout the next four chapters on Australian values, the very idea of imposing core civic values onto the migrant population was premised on the notion that national modern communities possess an innate core value system that defines the cultural characteristics of the 'mainstream' population's particular way of life. It is, as the opening cited extracts state, part of the discourse about a quest for human progress. In this way, the production of core civic values can be framed as a form of governmentality, that is, as an attempt to regulate and instil in the population a system of 'ethical behaviour' that is predicated on living by a set of core values that will secure the happiness and moral wellbeing of the whole of the Australian population.

Defining Australian values

Taking care of oneself requires knowing oneself. Care of the self is, of course, knowledge of the self – this is the Socratic-Platonic aspect – but also knowledge of a number of rules of acceptable conduct or of principles that are both truths and prescriptions. To take care of the self is to equip oneself with these truths: this is where ethics is linked to the game of truth. (Foucault, 1997, p. 285)

In late 2007, I was teaching an English language course to recently arrived migrants and refugees at a government funded institution in a south-western suburb of Sydney. It was during a lesson on Australian current affairs on a sweltering summer's day under a hot tin roof that a student from China posed the question, *Teacher, what are Australian values?* At first, I did not know how to reply to her question. Obviously the expectation was that I would know what Australian values are not only because of my position of 'teacher as expert' but also because, in the student's mind, I was an ordinary Australian *and all ordinary Australians know what Australian values are*. At the time, there had been a lot of talk in the media and by politicians of un-Australian behaviour and the suggestion was made that migrants had to live by *our* values or 'clear off'. The assumption was that 'native-born' or 'real' Australians would 'innately' know about Australian values while for aspiring or 'newer' Australians, Australian values would have to be classified in official texts and they would then have to learn about them.

After class, I pondered over the student's question, googled 'Australian values' and prepared a lesson on the topic for the class to study the next day. I am indebted to the student who asked that evocative question that set me on my path to conducting this

research. Her question and the realisation that I did not know the answer was the impetus for my focus on Australian values in these next four chapters.

Let me begin with the official definition of Australian values. According to the citizenship test resource booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen (2007a)*¹, Australian values are defined as follows:

- 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

(p. 5).

In general terms, a value can be defined as something of worth or quality and the principles or moral standards held by a person or social group. The term values is also part of everyday language as people often use it to describe their own personal attributes, speaking of the values that they hold and equating them with a sense of morality and ethics. *The Oxford English Dictionary* reminds us that value is also defined as ‘the generally accepted or personally held judgement of what is valuable and

¹ To assist with readability, in-text references relating to the booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, 2007 are referenced with the reference page number at the end of the cited extract.

important in life'. In *New Keywords: A Revised Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, Mitchell (2005) writes that the word has an ancient etymology, as 'Plato and Aristotle discussed it under the headings of the classical triad of truth, beauty and goodness, and connected it with questions of justice, morality, virtue, pleasure, utility and happiness' (p. 365). The entry elaborates that translations of value are varied but revolve around concerns for 'the ultimate value of human life, the purpose of human existence, or the nature of goodness itself' (Mitchell, 2005, p. 365).

How then are we to proceed with an analysis of the recent discourses on Australian values? How do we begin to translate the multiplicity that is Australian values? Are they the principles, concepts, notions and ideals that speak of truth and ethics? Or are they the 'core' morals and beliefs held collectively by a group of people living within the same state-bound territory? Do they extol the values of the Enlightenment that are presumed to reflect the 'virtues' and civic participation that ancient Athens demanded of its citizens?

What we can feel certain about when contemplating Australian values is their intensity. They are contested yet symbolic and intangible notions that nevertheless produce real material effects. What I want to suggest is that the officially defined concept of Australian values is best understood as a 'new' game of truth informed by a particular order of knowledge and invented by governments in order to regulate the conduct of the nation's citizenry. They are put into practice through citizenship resource booklets and citizenship tests. Elaborating on Foucault's work on technologies of the self, I am interested in exploring how migrant subjects constitute themselves as 'good' naturalised

Australian citizens through certain practices such as preparing and studying the content on Australian values in the citizenship resource booklet.

The purpose of the Australian citizenship test then is not to discriminate or exclude as so many have claimed but to influence and shape migrants' conduct in accordance with a set of normative values and these values work to constitute migrant subjectivities. So values, too, work as a normalising discourse about what is constitutive of a 'good' Australian citizen as well as what is constitutive of Australian identity. Migrants respond to these mandatory forms of knowledge by conforming, contesting and negotiating this official identity that is predicated on this concept of Australian values. This set of values also invents a 'mainstream' who 'naturally hold them'. 'Mainstream' Australians, as a result, are reassured that their way of life as imagined by Howard will survive into the future. The tool used to foster an appreciation of Australian values in future citizens was the citizenship resource booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen: Your Commitment to Australia*.

The values in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*²

As the previous chapter suggested, printed books have often been used as important teaching artefacts in civics education. *Becoming an Australian Citizen* was no exception as it was the only government-sanctioned booklet produced by the Department of Immigration that provided information relating to the questions in the Australian

² This textual analysis is based on the first print edition of *Becoming an Australian Citizen* issued in September 2007. In November 2007, the Department of Immigration and Citizenship reprinted the booklet with minor corrections.

citizenship test.³ Three whole pages were dedicated to detailing Australian values from pages five to seven under Part 1 titled, *What does being an Australian mean?* This constituted less than seven per cent of the booklet's total content yet the comprehensive elaboration of each value point was considerable and highlighted the importance of gaining knowledge of Australian values for successful completion of the Australian citizenship test. The section on Australian values was preceded by the sub-section *Responsibilities and privileges of Australian citizenship* (pp. 3-4) and followed by *Part 2 – Our land, our nation*.

There are five images scattered over the three pages on Australian values, all of which portray people. Four of the images portray men and only one in the final section on Australian values on page seven portrays women. The first image appears to be of two men, perhaps volunteers, in a bushfire situation. The second image positioned to the side of the text about *Freedom of Speech* portrays a man dressed in smart casual attire speaking with microphones around him at what appears to be a public lectern. None of these photographs are referenced in the *Acknowledgements* page of the booklet. They are part of a pool of photographs that appear throughout many of the Department of Immigration's publications on immigration issues and life in Australia. On the left hand corner of page six near the text on *Freedom of religion and secular government* there is a photograph portraying two men in distinguishable religious attire, one dressed as a Christian priest and the other as a Buddhist monk. The final page dedicated to Australian values has two images, the first one portraying three women in a hospital

³ The booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen* is no longer available for download to the public. It has been archived in the Department of Immigration and Citizenship's website.

setting (two dressed in nurses' uniforms) and the final image shows two men at work in what is perhaps a car factory, a young white man and an older Asian man.

These are the images that are used to embody Australian values, Australian citizens and the Australian nation. They are foremost images of Australian workers, who are mostly men, and they are images that reflect many of the national myths about Australians; SES volunteers in the bush, the Aussie battler, doctors and nurses, free public speakers and people of diverse religious orders coming together to live and work in social harmony.

The first mention of Australian values appears on page one of the booklet in the following extract:

Australia is a liberal democracy in the Western political tradition. The civic values of Australia include respect for the equal worth, dignity and freedom of every individual, religious tolerance and the equality of men and women.

Australian citizenship is about living out these values in everyday life and in local communities. (p. 1)

From its introductory page, the citizenship booklet informed its reader that Australian citizenship was about 'living out these values in everyday life' (p. 1). Modern citizenship too, was promoted as resting on 'sentiments of nationhood and enduring attachment to what Australians hold in common' (p. 1). It was through this conflation of Australian values, national identity and commonality that the continuing prosperity, democracy and freedom of the Australian population would be ensured:

These values and principles are central to Australia remaining a stable, prosperous and peaceful community. They provide the common reference points for our free and democratic society. (p. 5)

In the paragraph that followed on page five, it was recognised that these values were shared by ‘all liberal democracies’ but it was also claimed that these principles ‘have been adapted to Australia’s unique setting, moulded and modernised through waves of settlement by people from all over the world’. Although the passage stated that people from all over the world have influenced the development of Australian values, the ensuing paragraph left the reader in no doubt as to who these people were who had ‘moulded’ and ‘modernised’ Australia:

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 European Enlightenment. Distinct Irish and non-conformist attitudes and sentiments have also been important. (p. 5)

John Howard had expressed similar sentiments and similar wording during his 2006 Australia Day Address to the National Press Club. A year earlier, he had described Australian values as follows:

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. (Howard 2006)

What is most notable in these two similar passages is who was not included. Non-British migrants and their differences were omitted, implying that their cultural heritage did not contribute to the Australian identity. Nor do Indigenous cultures contribute to Australia's identity. Howard's categorisation immediately invokes the image of a predominantly white population whose key characteristics include Judeo-Christian, British and Irish heritage, and European Enlightenment. It reflects the characteristics of what Howard had always claimed to be the 'mainstream' or 'old Australia' (Ang, 2001). In this way, making this essential knowledge for the test candidate to master had the effect of making this discourse seem truthful and undisputable so that all new citizens would understand that the dominant ethnic group had British, Irish, European Judeo-Christian backgrounds and that those others who were not British, Irish, European or Judeo-Christian (and who were predominantly non-white) must regulate their conduct to try to participate in this ordinary, 'dominant cultural pattern' through the adoption of Australian values. Anglo-Australians were once again placed at the centre of the nation.

Universal values

These values that were labelled in the resource booklet as Anglo-Celtic are values that many liberal-democratic societies have claimed as pertaining to their own national identity. Their genesis is found in the French Revolution and the Enlightenment as the Prime Minister had claimed. Today they are promoted as neutral and universal as many of the individual principles are found in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* which came into effect in 1948 as a direct response to the atrocities of World War II. At the time of drafting the Declaration, Hernán Santa Cruz of Chile, a member of the drafting sub-Committee, described it as

A truly significant historic event in which a consensus had been reached as to the supreme value of the human person, a value that did not originate in the decision of a worldly power, but rather in the fact of existing—which gave rise to the inalienable right to live free from want and oppression and to fully develop one’s personality. (United Nations)

So here too we can see how these principles that the Howard Government labelled as Australian values were also thought of by certain members of the United Nations in terms of ‘values’ that could improve all human life. Yet even at the time of drafting the declaration, others noted that these ‘values’ were not universal. For instance, the Human Rights Commission’s Vice-Chairman, Dr Chang from China commented that ‘there is more than one kind of ultimate reality. The Declaration, ... should reflect more than simply Western ideas’ and suggested studying non-Western ideas such as Confucianism (United Nations).

Chang’s comments thus reveal the Eurocentric focus of the notion of the ‘universal values’ that are purported to guide the conduct of populations in many liberal democracies. Fortier (2008) argues that the language of values as ‘universal, timeless and unquestionable’ conceals the fact that they are historical constructs (p. 5). In this way, they are used by governments to mark ‘absolute differences’ between ‘our values’ and the cultural practices, customs and lifestyles of migrant groups (Fortier, 2008, p. 6). Therefore the concept of national values in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, by their very definition of ‘national’, cannot claim to be universal or neutral. Australian values are Eurocentric concepts that were forged through British colonialism, and they remain

committed to maintaining Anglo-Celtic domination by regulating migrants' understanding of Australia's national identity.

Free, secular values

In *Becoming an Australian Citizen* under the value of *Freedom of religion and of secular government*, the claim that 'Australia has secular government and no official or state religion' (p. 6) uncovers further contradictions when we consider this statement in relation to the extract cited below that occurs a few pages later under the title of

Religions:

Australia has a Judeo-Christian heritage ... Religious laws are not recognised and have no legal status in Australia. Australia uses a Christian calendar. This means that days like Good Friday, Easter Sunday and Christmas Day are public holidays. (p. 13)

Stratton (2011) argues that institutions such as public holidays based on Christian calendars serve to reveal how 'the secularity of Australia has always been closely linked with the dominance of Christianity' (p. 8). Throughout colonial history, there has been a popular assumption that Christianity has 'a common repertoire of moral and ethical assumptions which inform a shared social order' and it is this repertoire that forms the foundations to the Australian social order (Stratton, 2011, p. 8). This notion was made possible because of the enforcement of the White Australia Policy which ensured that the 'white' ethnic groups from Irish, British and European backgrounds and who were members of the Catholic, Anglican and Uniting churches made up the majority of the Australian population (Stratton, 2011). This assumption leads to a connection being

made between whiteness, Christian and Australian society and this idea infiltrates a range of political institutions and policies in Australia (Stratton, 2011).

The pages on Australian values dedicate considerable time to asserting the nation's secular status. This is not surprising for, as Asad (2003) reminds us, 'the emergence of secularism is closely connected to the rise of the modern-nation state' (p. 2). Yet as Johnson (2007) and Stratton (2011) argue, Howard's frequent articulation of the nation's values juxtaposed with an articulation of a secular nation-state calls into question these declarations when they are considered in tandem with some of his political practices. For instance, Johnson argues that since the 9/11 attacks, Howard's religious references have become more frequent. His promotion of conservative Christianity is used to argue that 'Anglo and Western values are under threat' and he has even described Jesus Christ as 'a man whose life and example has given us a value system which remains the greatest force for good ... in our community' (cited in Johnson, 2007, p. 199). The result of this conflation is that Christianity and Australian values become established as the true way of being Australian.

The principle of *Freedom of religion and secular government* is summarised with the bold statement that 'religious intolerance is unacceptable in Australian society' (p. 6). Yet a careful reading of the examples offered as illustrating the separation between the state and religion in Australian society suggest that religious intolerance does exist in Australian law. For instance, the examples cited of laws relating to the custody of children in divorce and the practice of bigamy bring to mind Sharia law which both Howard and Costello had denounced in 2005 as incompatible with 'Western' notions of freedom and which are discussed in chapter seven. This declared freedom then, does not

suggest a mutual relationship between the migrant citizen and the mainstream but is a one-sided affair that favours the ‘real’ Australian.

Respect for the individual – respect for the nation

In relation to the principle of *Respect for the equal worth, dignity and freedom of the individual* on page five of *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, the text elaborates that:

Individual Australians are free and equal and should be treated with dignity and respect ... Australians reject the use of violence, intimidation and humiliation as ways to settle conflict in our society. (p. 5)

The focus on the individual is particularly interesting as it demonstrates how the discourse of Australian values is part of a neoliberal agenda in that it advocates a focus on the individual who is free. The message of Australia here is that of a peace-loving population that shares a cultural heritage where conflicts are not settled through violence. As Elder (2007) argues, these declarations reflect many of the national myths about Australian identity and in particular about Australia’s peaceful past which denies tragic episodes in Australian history such as Indigenous dispossession and the implementation of the White Australia Policy that excluded non-white immigrants from entering Australia for nearly 70 years.

Similarly the principle of *Peacefulness* which has been directly placed after the section *Equality of opportunity* reads as follows:

We are proud of our peaceful society. We believe that change should occur by discussion, peaceful persuasion and democratic process. We reject violence as a means of changing a person's mind or the law. (p. 7)

This shift into the personal with the use of the pronoun 'we' has the effect of creating a binary between 'we', those who love peace and democracy and those who are not part of the collective 'we' and hence reinforces the idea that there are fundamental differences between the 'mainstream' and migrant communities.

Mateship and a fair go

The values described on page seven of the booklet draw on popular narratives about the Australian character and its support for a 'fair go' and 'mateship'. According to the booklet, a fair go ensures that there are 'no formal or entrenched class distinctions in Australian society' (p. 7). Many scholarly texts have shown how Australians have taken ownership of this notion by claiming that equality of opportunity prevails in every aspect of Australian daily life (Elder, 2007; Stratton, 1998; White, 1981). This equal opportunity is manifested in a range of practices including the selection of employment and entry into the defence forces. Elder (2007) argues that notions such as 'a fair go' and 'mateship' have a long history as they derive from the 'familial rivalry' between colonial Australia and its 'working man' notion of egalitarianism, with Britain and its class obsessed society (p. 53). The principle of the equality of men and women is separated from this general list of *Equality of opportunity* and placed under its own subheading in the section immediately following the section entitled *Equality under the law* (p. 7). It reads

Men and women have equal rights in Australia. Jobs and professions are equally open to both women and men. Both men and women can serve in the military. Both women and men can hold positions in government. (p. 7)

If we compare this with the preceding principle of *Equality under the law*, we can note a great deal of repetition within the two consecutive principles:

All Australians are equal under the law ... This means that nobody should be treated differently from anybody else because of their race, ethnicity or country of origin, because of their age, gender, marital status or disability ... Being treated the same means that getting a job or being promoted is based on a person's skills, ability and experience, and not on their cultural background or political beliefs. (p. 6)

This repetitive framework around equality outlined in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* reflects the repeated claims made by the Prime Minister that some migrant communities such as Muslims displayed unequal treatment of women. For instance, after the 2005 Cronulla Beach riots, Howard stated 'that "newcomers to this country must embrace our values" and that greater emphasis should be placed on "integration" into values such as legal and gender equality and religious tolerance' (cited in Johnson, 2007, p. 201). Furthermore, in a book commemorating his ten years in office, Howard is quoted as saying that Muslim women were treated badly within their community and later defended his claim by stating 'There is within some sections of the Islamic community an attitude towards women which is out of line with mainstream Australian society' ('PM's Muslim comments "offensive"').

This singling out of gender equality as a national value was telling of the Howard Government's desire to 'govern from a distance' the presumed exploitation and marginalisation of women in Muslim communities. As Lake (2007) argues, in declaring equality between men and women as an exclusively Australian value, the Howard Government was performing 'a political project that invokes the principle of sexual equality not as a value in itself but as a means for denouncing other cultures' presumed denigration of women'. It must also be remembered that it was under the Howard Government that many of the advances made in women's equality were 'wound back', including 'drastically reducing funding available for child care' (Stratton, 2011, p. 4), an issue often associated exclusively as the concern of women. Besides, 'equality of opportunity' here is limited to gender. There is no mention of equality of opportunity based on other categories such as sexuality or disability.

Tolerance and respect

The final Australian value described in the booklet was that of *Tolerance, mutual respect and compassion for those in need*. Here the text drew on the discourse of mateship, another of the national myths featured in many stories of Australianness (Elder, 2007). The concept of mateship has parallels in many other nations including the notion of fraternité in France and the solidarity movement in 1980's Poland. The section began with the bold statement, 'On the whole, Australians support the principle of 'live and let live' (p. 7). Written as an idiomatic expression, this statement could have caused some difficulties for prospective citizens who do not have English as a first language. It may also be difficult to accept that 'real Australians' support the notion that naturalised citizens can live their lives in the way that they wanted to, given that the

very notion of introducing Australian values and an Australian citizenship test was based on the desire that migrants learn specifically to live ‘the Australian way of life’.

The text went on to elaborate upon the Australian people’s ‘strong tradition of “mateship”’ (p. 7) whereby friends, partners, family members and even complete strangers helped each other in times of need. Another example of Australian mateship provided is that of ‘government support in the form of a social safety net for those who struggle through life through no fault of their own’ (p. 7). In these classic neoliberal terms, support was qualified for those who were not at fault, that is, the entrepreneurial citizen (Johnson, 2007) or the innocent victim where support should lead to self-sufficiency that is either regained or learnt.

In *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, Australian values are described as ‘the everyday guideposts for living in Australia’ (p. 4). The section on Australian values concluded with the declaration that Australian values ‘have helped Australia to successfully welcome and integrate millions of people from many ethnic groups and cultural traditions’ (p. 7). Through this statement, Australian values were explicitly promoted as a tool for integration. As part of this process of integration, the section concluded with the following appeal to the migrant-cum-citizen:

What is asked is that Australian citizens make an overriding commitment to Australia – its laws, its values and its people. (p. 7)

Focusing on a commitment to the people of Australia revealed how the test and its values were introduced not as a device that would promote a philosophy of ‘live and let live’ but primarily as a mechanism that would reassure the Australian mainstream, that

is, the ‘dominant pattern’ in Australia’s population of its continued prominence in stories of Australia.

Before becoming an Australian citizen: *Let’s Participate*

Throughout the 46 pages of *Becoming an Australian Citizen* there is not one mention of the term multiculturalism or its derivatives. Nor is there an elaboration of reconciliation. This is in stark contrast to its predecessor booklet, *Let’s Participate*. This textbook was part of the multimedia kit, *Let’s Participate: A Course in Australian Citizenship* (2002). The kit included workbooks, video and audio cassettes, fact sheets in 22 different languages, CD ROMS, a professional development website and other teaching materials at three levels of English proficiency. The kit was used in institutions implementing the Adult Migrant Education Program (AMEP). It commenced as a twenty-hour elective course for AMEP students and was later incorporated into the English language teaching syllabus.

The educational kit was released in June 2001 after the Minister for Multicultural Affairs Phillip Ruddock proposed its development in the 2000 report *Australian Citizenship for a New Century*. This report was prepared by the Australian Citizenship Council and was instrumental in directing civics education for migrant Australians in the new millennium and is discussed in greater detail in chapter six. In this chapter, I focus on the kit, *Let’s Participate* which was jointly developed by the department’s Australian Citizenship Program and the Adult Migrant Education Program Research Centre (Australian Citizenship Council, 2000, p. 22).

Let's Participate put into practice the Australian Citizenship Council's recommendations of promoting a particular model of citizenship that emphasised active participation in a constantly changing society. Its function was not only to educate the would-be citizen, but completion of this course was deemed to be demonstrated evidence that students had an adequate understanding of English and an adequate understanding of the responsibilities and the grant of Australian citizenship (Murray, 2003, p. 4). Thus, migrants who had completed the course did not need to attend an interview with their application for citizenship for they had a certificate which 'proved' their competency.

At the time when the idea of a citizenship test was first proposed, *Let's Participate* was widely in use throughout many English language classrooms in Australia and extended beyond those institutions of the AMEP. As the evaluation report, *Integrating Citizenship Content in Teaching Adult Immigrants English* (Murray, 2003) revealed, the curriculum course had been deemed a success by students and teachers alike. The majority of interviewed students reported that they found the workbook to be very useful (Murray, 2003, p. 85). For example, one participant commented that

the book was very good because it covered each part, like the first section we learned more about the flag and other things. We could not get this information from outside. (Murray, 2003, p. 85)

Other students commented on the course in general:

if my friends they want to be a citizen I think it is the best way because if you don't take this class, then you don't understand anything about Australia and what you are doing and who do you belong to.

... many people are pressing to know how to live here in this country and how to be a citizen ... (Murray, 2003, pp. 128-9)

Yet soon after the implementation of the Australian citizenship test, educational institutions were directed by the Department of Education to suspend use of *Let's Participate* for civic education and no alternative text was recommended. As a practising teacher at the time, no explanation was given at my workplace as to why the kit was to be abandoned. As the previous chapter revealed, it had been proposed by the Department of Immigration and Citizenship that the new resource being developed for the citizenship test would be modelled on *Let's Participate* (SSCLCA 2007). The textual analysis that follows relating to the contents of the workbook can shed some light as to why the kit no longer contained appropriate content and was no longer deemed suitable for teaching civic education to migrant Australians.

Essential knowledge for the migrant-citizen in *Let's Participate*

Let's Participate was written before the Citizenship Act, 2007 was amended to include the requirement of 'having an adequate knowledge of Australia'. The multimedia course contextualised its citizenship education objective with information about government, laws, rights and privileges of Australian citizenship as well as including content relating to Australia and the population. The table of contents of *Let's Participate: Workbook 2* (2002) read as follows:

Unit 1: An introduction to Australian citizenship

Unit 2: Australia and its people

Unit 3: Democratic government in Australia

Unit 4: Rights, responsibilities and privileges

Unit 5: Law and democracy in Australia

Unit 6: Becoming an Australian Citizen

An analysis of some of the texts included in the workbook is useful here in order to examine how during its fourth and final term in office, the Howard Government shifted its view of civic education for migrant citizens. This shift was from one in which the policy of multiculturalism was acknowledged as essential knowledge for managing migrant communities and for articulating Australian identity to one where a monoculture was promoted as the ‘true’ Australian way of life in the booklet *Becoming an Australian Citizen*. The textual analysis that follows focuses exclusively on units two and four of the book, *Let’s Participate*. Content of unit two bears the closest relation to the citizenship test’s emphasis on knowledge of Australia and Unit four incorporated content that bears the closest relation to the notion of Australian values in the Howard-inspired test.

Unit 2: Australia and its people

The introductory pages of *Let’s Participate* informed learners that they would learn about Australia’s multicultural society, reconciliation, some Australian symbols and some Australian landmarks (AMEP Research Centre, 2002, p. 9). The first questions posed to the reader in this unit were:

Why do you think multiculturalism is good for Australia?

How can we all contribute to Reconciliation?

If we take the first question, we can see that embedded in it was the notion that multiculturalism was a good thing for everyone. That is, the directness of these questions left no room for the reader to disagree with the concepts of multiculturalism or reconciliation. The closed nature of the first question did not encourage a critical evaluation of multiculturalism. Nor was there any explicit definition or treatment of multiculturalism in the workbook. The word appeared as part of the everyday. For example, in a transcript that was part of a listening exercise within this unit of work, the ‘speaker’ comments on how ‘multicultural’ it was for his Australian-Chinese mother to have met his Malaysian-Chinese father in an Italian restaurant! (AMEP Research Centre, 2002, p. 63). This emphasises a popular portrayal of multiculturalism as related to spectacle, folklore and food.

If we contrast the knowledge of Australia that was promoted in *Let’s Participate* with that of the knowledge required in order to pass the Australian citizenship test acquired by reading *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, it becomes apparent that support for the policy of multiculturalism was one of the main differences between the two texts. With *Let’s Participate*, although subdued, this government-produced publication espoused the virtues of Australia being a multicultural nation. *Becoming an Australian Citizen* on the other hand, fell silent in regard to acknowledging the effects of 30 years of multiculturalism as official social policy, preferring instead to articulate a unitary British heritage with Judeo-Christian values.

In *Let’s Participate*, reconciliation, too, was presented as an accepted reality desired by many in Australia. The topic of reconciliation was elaborated on pages 11 and 12 through three reading texts. The first was a dictionary entry on the meaning of

reconciliation and the last was an entry from a government report entitled *The Goals of Reconciliation*. It read,

A united Australia which respects this land of ours, values the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander heritage and provides justice and equity for all. (2002, p. 12)

The future citizen, then, could understand that reconciliation was a national truth that was accepted by the Australian people. The learner was also informed that reconciliation was necessary because of the hardships and dispossession faced by Indigenous peoples after British colonisation. The second text on reconciliation read as follows:

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have lived on this continent for more than 60,000 years. After British settlement their traditional ways of life were disrupted, and they suffered injustice, loss and disadvantage.

Over the past few years, many Australians have come to support a movement towards Reconciliation between Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous Australians. (2002, p. 11)

The text continued by giving examples as to how the community could support reconciliation with activities proposed such as including Indigenous perspectives in school curricula and flying official Indigenous flags on official occasions (AMEP Research Centre, 2002, p. 12).

When the Howard Government commissioned the production of the citizenship test resource booklet, this booklet also included content on Indigenous flags and Indigenous

history. Yet as discussed further in Part Three, *History as Essential Knowledge*, unlike its predecessor booklet there was no acknowledgement of the hardships faced by Indigenous peoples since British colonisation, nor for that matter was the word ‘reconciliation’ used in the text as it was in the Workbook, *Let’s Participate*. This was a form of knowledge that disappeared from texts and resources relating to civics education for prospective citizens by the final year of Howard’s Prime Ministership.

Rights, responsibilities and privileges in *Let’s Participate*

The section in the booklet *Let’s Participate* that also lends itself well to comparison with its successor booklet relates to the rights and privileges of Australian citizenship presented on pages 31 to 33. Rights, responsibilities and privileges were distinguished as follows:

The basic rights of all Australians:

- Freedom of speech
- Freedom of religion
- Equality of opportunity regardless of gender, race or origin (p. 32)

The responsibilities of Australian citizenship:

- Obeying Australian laws
- Voting in federal, state and council elections⁴
- Serving on a jury if called
- To defend Australia if necessary (p. 33).

The privileges for Australian citizens:

- Voting in Australian elections

⁴ This is incorrect as Australian citizens are only obliged to enrol on the Electoral Roll, not to vote at elections. Once enrolled, they must vote at elections or pay a fine.

- Standing for government elections
- Applying for an Australian passport
- Seeking diplomatic help from Australian embassies stationed overseas
- Applying for employment in the Australian Public Service and the Australian Defence Forces
- Registering a child as an Australian citizen

Hence concepts that many Australians describe as their rights were here classified as privileges for new citizens such as registering to vote in government elections and applying for an Australian passport. Similar categories are used in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*. One particular way of understanding how these notions were classified as privileges is by noting that they all required the migrant to make an application that must be accepted or rejected by a government authority. In this way, these notions were not rights but indeed privileges. The concepts that had been deemed as rights for all Australian citizens, on the other hand, suggest that they were not negotiable, not discretionary or reliant on application. Yet they were abstract concepts and this opened up the possibility of their having multiple uses. For instance, if we return to our analysis of the citizenship test resource booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, we can observe that these three concepts of freedom of speech, religion and opportunity were not presented as rights but they were included instead in the classification of Australian values. Thus the rights and responsibilities articulated in *Let's Participate* and taught to prospective citizens in the early years of the new millennium were, in Howard's final year as Prime Minister reconceptualised, redefined and recorded in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* as Australian values.

Conclusion

This shift from a discourse of rights to a discourse of values paralleled a shift in the way citizenship was imagined by the Howard Government. Citizenship, traditionally desired by many migrants for the legal rights and status it provided had in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, become enmeshed in notions of national cultural identity and the need to live the Australian way of life. It was promoted as a privilege that had to be earned. It indicated who was a ‘real citizen’ and who must wait for recognition to become one. The shift from rights to values and the continual articulation of the conferral of citizenship as a privilege reflected Howard’s belief that ‘we’—those who hold Australian citizenship as a birthright—decide who can join the Australian community. So, rather than encouraging the integration that Howard claimed would be so beneficial to social cohesion, the shift from rights to values emphasised the differences between migrants and mainstream Australians, reinforcing migrants as ‘other’ to the mainstream.

The movement from rights and responsibilities to one of values is also about a shift in focus from the collective to the individual, that is, it is the individual aspiring citizen who must discipline her/himself through the adoption of Australian values in order to earn the conferral of Australian citizenship. For this reason, the Howard Government had to commission the production of a new citizenship resource booklet that reflected this shift and that did not bother itself with ‘outdated’ and divisive policies of multiculturalism and reconciliation. In the next chapter, I present a brief historical account of the complex and at times ambivalent relationship between multiculturalism

and Australian values. In this way, I hope to highlight the continuing significance of multiculturalism and its tenuous relationship with Australian values.

CHAPTER FIVE: A COMMITMENT TO MULTICULTURALISM, CITIZENSHIP AND AUSTRALIAN VALUES

Immigration to Australia is about becoming Australian. It is not driven by multiculturalism... Multiculturalism provides important support for immigrants, but as a concept it is not something with which many can identify. Just as Australia is a democracy but has its own identity, so also is it multicultural, but nonetheless identifiably Australian. It is the Australian identity that matters most in Australia. And if the Government will affirm that strongly, multiculturalism might seem less divisive or threatening. (CAaip, 1988, pp. 10-11)

The introduction of the Australian citizenship test heralded a renewed call for migrants to demonstrate their commitment to Australia. The citizenship resource booklet's title reflected this objective as it was aptly titled, *Becoming an Australian Citizen: Your Commitment to Australia*. Twenty years earlier, the government report, *Immigration: A Commitment to Australia* had also advocated that new immigrants should demonstrate a commitment to Australia, yet at the time, commitment was promoted as an integral part of the immigration process rather than as part of the naturalisation process.

This chapter investigates the emergence of 'core national values' in political discourse, originally articulated as 'principles and institutions' from the early 1980s and metamorphosing into the concept of Australian values under the Howard Government and used by consecutive governments as a way of defining an official Australian identity. Taking a genealogical approach, I explore how these Australian values are tied

to the idea that migrants must demonstrate a commitment to Australia. I examine in chronological order the government documents; *Immigration: A Commitment to Australia* (CAAIP) (1988), *Liberal/Nationals Immigration and Ethnic Affairs Policy* (1988), the *National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia 1989*, the *New Agenda for Multicultural Australia, 1999* and Howard's fourth headland speech, *Politics and Patriotism* (1995). Through these texts, I explore how the government's articulation of core civic values for migrant consumption became an essential 'guide' for practising the Australian way of life.

Before examining the key documents listed above and exploring how they dealt with the concept of core civic values, it is important to contextualise this discourse through a brief introduction to the policies of multiculturalism in order to demonstrate how these apparatuses of government put into practice various notions of difference and sameness. Many of the discourses around migrants becoming Australian citizens are framed around the relevance of multiculturalism as both a way of life and government policy. In more recent times, incorporating Australian values into a citizenship test has had the effect of replacing multicultural policy as the apparatus that should manage the population's cultural diversity. Yet somewhat paradoxically, it was the policy of multiculturalism that had originally brought to the fore the notion of Australian values as they have come to be understood in contemporary Australia.

Introducing multiculturalism to the Australian people

The concept of multiculturalism was first introduced in the 1970s by the Whitlam Labor Government. Mentioned for the first time by the Minister for Immigration, Al Grassby

at a speech in August 1973, Grassby (1973) made the analogy of the ‘family of the nation’ in order to describe the impact that the large scale post-war immigration program had had on Australian society. He stated:

In a family the overall attachment to the common good need not impose a sameness on the outlook or activity of each member, nor do these members deny their individuality and distinctiveness in order to seek a superficial and unnatural conformity. The important thing is that all are committed to the good of all.

(Grassby, 1973)

Grassby’s request that ‘all are committed to the good of all’ illustrates his vision of what multiculturalism was to stand for. Grassby envisioned an Australian population where commitment was demanded from both ‘old’ and ‘new’ Australians in order to achieve ‘the common good’. It was understood as a form of pastoral power. Grassby concluded his speech with the following plea:

Our prime task at this point in our history must be to encourage practical forms of social interaction in our community. This implies the creation of a truly just society in which all components can enjoy freedom to make their own distinctive contribution to the family of the nation... we need to appreciate, embrace and preserve all those diverse elements which find a place in the nation today. This involves the most fundamental issues of human rights such as those enshrined in the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which ...guarantees freedom of social and cultural expression for all residents of countries ratifying it. (Grassby, 1973, p. 9)

So here we can see how the early articulations of multiculturalism embraced similar themes as those surrounding the discourse on Australian values during the Howard years. Grassby associated ‘all those diverse elements’ with notions of human rights found in the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Yet in these early days of multiculturalism, Grassby’s emphasis was on community social interaction rather than social cohesion, once again stressing that sameness and conformity were not the objective.

At the time of its inauguration into official Australian Governmental policy, multiculturalism was heralded as a replacement for the official policy of integration and the implementation of its programs also came to symbolise the last step in the dismantling of the White Australia Policy. Immigrants could no longer be selected or excluded on ‘racial’ criteria and the Australian population was categorised as one which was comprised of ‘cultural pluralism’ (Koleth, 2010). A great number of language and settlement services were specifically introduced as part of the multicultural package in order to foster social harmony among the increasing cultural diversity of the population (Grassby, 1973).

When the Australian Government changed from the Whitlam Labor Government to the Fraser Liberal Government, bipartisan political support for multiculturalism followed. In 1981, at the *Inaugural Address on Multiculturalism to the Institute of Multicultural Affairs*, Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser framed multiculturalism in terms of human rights, stating:

Multiculturalism is concerned with far more than the passive toleration of diversity. It sees diversity as a quality to be actively embraced, a source of social

wealth and dynamism. It encourages groups to be open and to interact, so that all Australians may learn and benefit from each other's heritages. Multiculturalism is about diversity, not division – it is about interaction not isolation. It is about cultural and ethnic differences set within a framework of shared fundamental values which enables them to co-exist on a complementary rather than competitive basis. It involves respect for the law and for our democratic institutions and processes. Insisting upon a core area of common values is no threat to multiculturalism but its guarantee, for it provides the minimal conditions on which the well-being of all is secured. (Fraser, 1981)

In this speech, the concept of 'a core area of common values' is presented as part of the apparatus of multiculturalism and interaction once again is one of the key objectives desired by government. What is also particularly interesting about Fraser's speech is the use of similar concepts to define both multiculturalism and the current articulation of Australian values, for example, principles of respect before the law and democratic institutions. Interesting, too, is his declaration that core values are the 'minimum condition' for multiculturalism and the secure well-being of the population. Fraser goes on to make the connection between Australia's commitment to multiculturalism and the growing ties and expansion of Australian foreign policy relations with many new nations. He elaborates:

If empathy and respect for each other's basic values and concerns are at the heart of multiculturalism, their growing prominence has had a deep impact on our affairs abroad. (Fraser, 1981)

Thus, in Fraser's speech, basic values are mutually shared by the Australian community and immigrant groups. There is no suggestion that values are the exclusive realm of Australian-born people. Rather Fraser acknowledged that respect for these shared values ensured a peaceful relationship between nation-states. And so by the mid-1980s, multiculturalism had become part of a nation-building process and a way of defining a new and progressive national identity (Ang, 2001). For Kolehmainen (2010), the goals of multiculturalism included 'the pursuit of social justice, the recognition of identities and appreciation of diversity, the integration of migrants, nation-building, and attempts to achieve and maintain social cohesion', notions that today pertain to the discourse of Australian values rather than multiculturalism (p. 2).

Multiculturalism continued to flourish during the Labor Governments of Hawke and Keating. During the years from 1986 to 1996, there was an expansion of multicultural programs and 'strong efforts to place multiculturalism within a nationalist narrative where cultural diversity and tolerance were part of Australian national identity' (Kolehmainen, 2010, p. 11). Yet multiculturalism continued to have its critics who argued it was a 'divisive policy' that pampered minority groups rather than emphasising what members of the Australian community shared in common (Jupp, 2002, p. 117). It was claimed that multiculturalism was divisive as it encouraged tribalism and ethnic enclaves through its support for migrant differences. One of the most hostile criticisms of multiculturalism came in the form of the FitzGerald Report and it is to this report that the next section is dedicated.

The FitzGerald Report in the year of the Bicentenary

Chaired by academic and businessman Stephen FitzGerald, the inquiry, *Immigration: A Commitment to Australia* (CAAIP, 1988), or the FitzGerald Report as it became more commonly known as, was convened to consult the broader Australian community on the nation's immigration policy and its objective of instilling a commitment from migrants to the Australian nation at the point of arrival in Australia. The report also focused on citizenship issues affecting migrants and refugees and it is in this report that we find one of the first public articulations of Australian identity and the citizenship process being defined by a set of core national values.

The FitzGerald Report's terms of reference were wide-ranging, requiring an investigation into the relationship between Australia's immigration program and the economy, the nation's social and cultural development and key population issues (CAAIP, 1988, p. ix). The report aimed to address broader questions relating to the governing of 'others', including 'why Australia should accept immigrants, how many and who they should be' (CAAIP, 1988, p. ix). Although its focus was directly related to immigration policy, it also dealt with citizenship matters.

Unlike the recent discourse around citizenship testing, the problematic in the FitzGerald Report was identified as immigration where, it was claimed, there was 'widespread mistrust' and 'failing consensus' among the Australian community in relation to immigration policies. The FitzGerald Report made direct reference to the Asian immigration debate that had exploded in media reports (CAAIP, 1988, p. 7) and the inquiry itself had been commissioned in order to address what the Minister for

Immigration described as ‘concerns and misunderstandings about immigration which have grown in recent years’ (Ray, 1988, p. 1).

The ‘Asian immigration’ debate was sparked by eminent historian, Geoffrey Blainey who had argued that the intake of Asian immigration should be reduced because too many Asian immigrants could endanger Australia’s social, political and economic structures (Ang, 2001 p. 108). John Howard too, as Leader of the Opposition at the time had spoken out against Asian immigration stating that it was in the best interest of the Australian community and social cohesion to ‘slow down’ Asian immigration ‘so that the capacity of the community to absorb was greater’ (Ang, 2001, p. 108). Asian differences were viewed as threatening the Australian way of life. These views were predicated on notions of maintaining social harmony meaning that differences were seen as threatening and sameness was desired instead. Many years later, Howard (2010) recently defended his comments ‘not as a racial outburst, but a *commonsense* remark about the rapidity of change’ (p. 175).

Sameness here can be understood as a form of assimilation that is underpinned by the idea that all citizens should share the same values and cultural practices and ‘live by the laws of the country and in return receive the benefits of life in Australia’ (Elder, 2007, p. 130) in order to maintain social unity and cohesion. According to Howard and the FitzGerald Report, what seemed to be just as threatening to national social cohesion was the policy of multiculturalism that had informed Federal Governments on immigration and social issues over the past 15 years.

The committee of authors of the FitzGerald Report dedicated considerable space and time to debating the relevance of multiculturalism in Australian society. It stated:

There is disquiet about the way immigration is thought to be changing Australia. Immigration policy is held by many to be a grab bag of favours. Many Australian-born see government as protecting all interests but theirs. Multiculturalism, which is associated in the public mind with immigration, is seen by many as social engineering which actually invites injustice, inequality and divisiveness. (CAAIP, 1988, p. 3)

Throughout the pages of the FitzGerald Report, there was a scathing attack on multiculturalism and FitzGerald himself would not have disputed that the report was a direct attack on multiculturalism as he made the following revelation some years later:

The idea that multiculturalism might have run its course was deeply offensive to vested interests of the kind which represent in my view the ‘ism’, the dogma – their vested interest in the sense that it was developing as an industry, it provided their employment, their rationale, their ‘raison d’être’. (FitzGerald, 1996)

FitzGerald (1988) went on to suggest that multiculturalism had run its course and was only ‘a phase in the evolution of Australian society’ which ‘would be replaced by something “bigger, broader, all encompassing” highlighting FitzGerald’s strongly held view that multiculturalism was not for *all* Australians.

Although immigration and not citizenship was prescribed as the official focus of the Committee, a key underlining theme emerged from the report of a desire to assure

mainstream Australia that the Australian way of life was secure and would prevail into the future. The report states:

Many Australians are not convinced that immigrants are making a commitment to their new country. Inevitable changes to their society, brought by immigration, trouble them. Poor rates for the take up of citizenship disturb them. The status of citizenship is seriously undervalued. One million immigrants have declined to take it. Citizenship should reflect a commitment to Australia and its institutions and principles.

Immigration must be a two-way commitment between the immigrant and Australian society. Key Australian principles and institutions must have the support of the immigrant, and citizenship must be a watershed in the immigrant experience. (CAAIP, 1988, p. xi)

What becomes apparent in the unfolding of this excerpt is that although its main theme relates to immigration, immigrants are not identified as the main stakeholders. Instead, it is the viewpoint of the 'many Australians' framed in relation to how they feel about immigrants that is offered as the overriding objective of the report. The extract also highlights the continuities of the concerns that had dominated the period of migrant assimilation in the 1950s and 1960s with fears that the privilege of Australian citizenship was not being fully appreciated by migrants (Jordens, 1993). In those early days of the large scale, nation-building immigration program, the focus was on instilling loyalty for Australia into the migrant other. During the preparation of the FitzGerald Report, this demand for loyalty had intensified and become reconceptualised and re-phrased as a 'commitment to Australia'. As Lowenheim and Gazit (2009) argue, governments stressing the need for migrants to demonstrate their commitment to their

adopted nation is about proving themselves worthy of being conferred with the status of Australian citizen (p. 158).

The cited extract also reveals how the FitzGerald Report was instrumental in bringing to the fore not only a crisis in immigration but also the notion of a ‘crisis in citizenship’.

Now that the White Australia Policy had been dismantled, new mechanisms were needed to preserve the prominent place of the mainstream. And despite the claim of a ‘two-way commitment’, the final paragraph cited above more specifically identifies the one-way responsibility of the immigrant to support ‘key Australian principles and institutions’ and take up citizenship as the ultimate goal of the ‘immigrant experience’.

The FitzGerald Report introduced the institutions and principles of the Australian way of life as follows:

In inviting people to immigrate to Australia, we need to make it very clear that the unacceptable and repugnant are not to be transplanted, that the commitment we require to our society includes, fundamentally, a commitment to accept and respect basic institutions and principles.

These include parliamentary democracy, the rule of law and equality before the law, freedom of the individual, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, equality of women, universal education. (CAAIP, 1988, p. 4)

It must be noted that, with the exceptions of ‘freedom of the press’ and ‘universal education’, these principles and institutions as they were defined by the FitzGerald Report in 1988 have become transformed into the *Australian Values Statement* defined

by the Howard Government in 2007. The use of terms such as principles and institutions rather than values is an interesting one. Principles and institutions do not conjure up the same affective response as values. Instead, they connote an idea of general rules to be used as guides to individual and group action. They appear to be official and technical whereas the term ‘values’ belongs more to the realm of the worth of the individual and the personal. It is interesting to note that in the above cited extract, the migrant is framed outside of ‘our society’.

Despite these different nuances between the principles and institutions proposed in the FitzGerald Report and the Australian values defined under the Howard Government, the underlying message of the two texts remains the same. That message is that Australia has an established culture framed by core values and that these need to be protected from the ‘repugnant’ and ‘unacceptable’ values of others or rather, their lack of values and hence migrant-cum-citizens need to adopt our Australian values, principles and institutions in order to remedy their deficiency and safeguard the well-being of the Australian population.

The FitzGerald Report continued in its cautionary tone, warning that:

Intending immigrants must be made aware that these (institutions and principles) are fundamental, and before departure be given the text of a declaration they will be asked to make at the time of taking citizenship, in which they will have to make a commitment to accept and respect these institutions and principles. And it should make clear that what is required is no more than that, as direct beneficiaries of a non-discriminatory policy, they are asked to commit

themselves to uphold the social system that makes this non-discriminatory policy possible. (CAAIP, 1988, p. 5)

So here we see the genesis of the *Australian Values Statement* that is currently a mandatory requirement for entry to Australia for visitors holding temporary and provisional residency visa status. In the FitzGerald Report, this recommendation had been made because the committee believed that citizenship was undervalued by the migrant. The committee hence proposed that citizenship be made more ‘meaningful’ firstly by restricting what it termed ‘non-survival benefits’ to those eligible migrants who had not applied for Australian citizenship (CAAIP, 1988, p. 121). This would have functioned as a form of punishment for those migrants who were considered to have been insufficiently appreciative of Australia’s ‘non-discriminatory policy’. It emphasised the responsibility that individuals had to accept in order to ensure their sense of belonging in the Australian community. Secondly, it proposed that citizenship would become more meaningful if prospective migrants and prospective citizens were obliged to make ‘a declaration to respect fundamental institutions and principles in Australian society’ (CAIIP, 1988, p. 121).

The FitzGerald-led committee even provided a model of the ‘possible citizenship declaration’ that would be made by new citizens at the citizenship ceremony. It warrants stating in full below:

- I undertake to respect the laws of Australia and fulfil my duties as an Australian citizen.
- I will endeavour to inform myself about the principles upon which these laws, and related institutions, are based.

- I undertake to accept and respect institutions and principles of Australian society, including parliamentary democracy, the rule of law and equality before the law, freedom of the individual, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, equality of women, universal education.
- I undertake to accept and respect the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of race, colour, descent and national or ethnic origin which informs the laws and institutions of Australian society and the immigration policy of Australia and under which I have taken up residence in Australia and thereby become entitled to. (CAAIP, 1988, pp. 121-122)

It is useful to present in full here also, the wording of the current *Australian Values Statement (Form 1281)* in order to make a comparative analysis between the two texts:

This statement must be signed by the main applicant and each person aged 18 years or over who is included in the visa application, unless they have already signed it on the visa application form. I confirm that I have read, or had explained to me, information provided by the Australian Government on Australian society and values.

I understand:

- Australian society values respect for the freedom and dignity of the individual, freedom of religion, commitment to the rule of law, Parliamentary democracy, equality of men and women and a spirit of egalitarianism that embraces mutual respect, tolerance, fair play and compassion for those in need and pursuit of the public good;
- Australian society values equality of opportunity for individuals, regardless of their race, religion or ethnic background;

- the English language, as the national language, is an important unifying element of Australian society.

I undertake to respect these values of Australian society during my stay in Australia and to obey the laws of Australia.

I understand that, if I should seek to become an Australian citizen:

- Australian citizenship is a shared identity, a common bond which unites all Australians while respecting their diversity;
- Australian citizenship involves reciprocal rights and responsibilities.

The responsibilities of Australian citizenship include obeying Australian laws, including those relating to voting at elections and serving on a jury.

If I meet the legal qualifications for becoming an Australian citizen and my application is approved I understand that I would have to pledge my loyalty to Australia and its people.

The two texts, although produced some 20 years apart, are very similar in detail. They should be read as values that encourage the regulation of the conduct of knowing citizens at their entry point. The website and *Form 1281* also include information for the visa applicant on how to understand the *Australian Values Statement*. The applicant is informed that:

As part of your visa application process you are required to read the *Life in Australia* booklet and sign the statement on this form. If you have difficulty or are unable to read the booklet, you may have the content of it explained to you, for example, by a friend or relative. The statement, that you must sign, confirms you understand and will respect the values of Australian society (as explained in

the booklet) and will obey the laws of Australia. This includes acknowledging what would be required if you later applied for Australian citizenship.

Clearly, then, the *Australian Values Statement* that is in place today and which many critics claim emerged as a direct response to the current spread of Islamophobia and other global Western anxieties is not the original invention of the Howard Government. It was first conceived by the FitzGerald Committee that preceded it by two decades. And as previously discussed, the principles and institutions identified by the FitzGerald committee are almost all the same as the values categorised in the *Australian Values Statement*. Both texts focus on the self-disciplining aspect of the knowing citizen who must accept responsibility for adhering to these normative principles. The FitzGerald proposal required that immigrants ‘endeavour to inform themselves’ about the principles and related institutions on which Australian laws are based. The *Australian Values Statement* ‘encourages people to gain an understanding of Australia, its people and their way of life, before applying for a visa to live in Australia’. The government requires that immigrants do this by reading the *Life in Australia* booklet and signing the *Values Statement*. It further suggests that if migrants have difficulty or are unable to read the booklet, that they should seek assistance from a friend or relative who can explain the content of *Life in Australia* to them. They are to care for themselves and know themselves as future Australian citizens by acting on their own, that is, exercising their freedoms to become informed migrants who care for the national body.

The requirement that new immigrants and prospective citizens must sign a values declaration highlights the institutionalising of neoliberal thought in Australian politics during the 1980s and continuing into the present day. In this sense, migrants become

reconceptualised as individuals who have to demonstrate commitment to Australia in exchange for the privilege of being granted migrant/worker status. There is no government assistance with which to master these values for the onus is placed on individuals to know themselves, highlighting the link between technologies of domination and technologies of the self (Procacci, 2001). That is, it highlights how aspiring citizens fit into certain games of truth about Australian identity and in the process, these aspiring citizens participate in practices of self-formation and practices of freedom in the hope of developing and transforming themselves to attain a certain mode of being (Foucault, 1997, p. 282), in this case, in order to become model and knowledgeable Australian citizens.

At the time, the Committee did not consider that a values pledge should be used as a way of defining a set of core national values. The report continues:

The Committee is not suggesting a prescription of core values. The core is too disputed and the values are too much in flux. (CAAIP, 1988, p. 5)

Hence, despite the intervening 20 years, there are similarities between the values, institutions and principles that the migrant needed to know but there is also the recognition during that ‘celebratory year’ in 1988 under a Hawke Labor Government that values were contested and prone to changes.

The legacy of FitzGerald

The FitzGerald Report proved to be highly controversial. Many of its recommendations were ignored by the Hawke Labor Government and multiculturalism survived as a bipartisan government policy for the time being. Yet while the report may have

understood that the concept of core national values was a ‘disputed’ one which was ‘too much in flux’, this view was not shared by the then leader of the opposition John Howard. Launching his party’s immigration policy just days before the recommendations of the FitzGerald Report were released in May 1988, Howard’s *Immigration and Ethnic Affairs Policy* commenced with the following promise:

The next Liberal/National Party Government will foster the ideal of One Australia where loyalty to Australia, our institutions and our values transcend loyalty to any other sets of values anywhere in the world. (Liberal Party of Australia, 1988)

Howard’s One Australia policy

Howard’s controversial One Australia policy, like the FitzGerald Report, is remembered more for its focus on criticising multiculturalism. It was a policy that identified Australia’s immigration policy objective as one that would ensure that all decisions relating to the immigration program reflected ‘the national interest’. This national interest included selecting future immigrants based on the economic benefits they would bring and approving migrants who were ‘younger’, ‘skilled, knowledgeable, educated and employable’. The policy did not elaborate on what would constitute a ‘knowledgeable migrant’. Defining and testing what constituted the knowing citizen would have to wait another 20 years. The policy did however define Australian values by calling for migrants ‘to respect the institutions and principles which are basic to Australian society’ (Liberal Party of Australia, 1988).

Interestingly, in a press release dated 16 May 1988, John Howard's office commented on the coming FitzGerald Report, stating that:

It is extremely regrettable that the Prime Minister (Hawke) has already intervened to try and force a rewriting of some of the FitzGerald Report. Such prejudiced behaviour is the antithesis of the open debate which is needed. The last thing we want is Prime Ministerial sensitivity at any criticism of current policy. (Liberal Party of Australia, 1988)

As his 11 years of Prime Ministership would come to attest, Howard himself became a Prime Minister who would intervene in policy areas as wide ranging as citizenship and reconciliation in his quest to promote an Australian identity very much to his liking (Johnson, 2000).

Values were not the only concerns that Howard's policy and the FitzGerald Report had in common. On page two, the Opposition Coalition's policy stated:

The Liberal and National Parties assert, without qualification, that it must be the role of the elected government, acting on behalf of and with the support of the whole community, to make the final and absolute decisions on who will or will not be granted entry to Australia on a temporary or permanent basis. (Liberal Party of Australia, 1988, p. 2)

This declaration of the prerogative of government to make these decisions seems at first to go against the practices of neoliberal governmentality whereby governing too much was discouraged. Yet as Johnson (2007) has argued, liberal government like that of

Howard's was not really about less government. Two paragraphs later, the policy continues:

The capacity of the Australian people to accept and absorb change must always be a major factor in immigration policy. The size and composition of our immigration policy should not jeopardize social cohesiveness and harmony within the Australian community. (Liberal Party of Australia, 1988, p. 3)

Even before it had been elected to government, it appears that the Liberal Party had wanted to reassure the community that if elected to office, the power to decide on the composition of the population would be in their hands. The Policy Report continued:

We have, and will continue to insist that migrants accepted for permanent settlement in our country share our basic values and commitments and are able to make a positive contribution to our national well-being and advancement. (Liberal Party of Australia, 1988, p. 2)

Evidently, Australian values were part of the discourse of the time and the actual term was used, especially by Howard, but just as in the FitzGerald Report, the Liberal Party's policy categorised these values as mainly 'institutions and principles' stating that:

Migrants will be expected to respect the institutions and principles which are basic to Australian society, including parliamentary democracy, the rule of law and equality before the law, freedom of the individual, freedom of speech, freedom of association, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, equality for women, universal education. Reciprocally, Australia will be committed to facilitating equal opportunity for participation of migrants in society. (Liberal Party of Australia, 1988, p. 3)

This last statement emphasises the reciprocity that informed the Liberal Party's view on extending citizenship rights to migrants. Only if migrants respected Australia's unique 'institutions and principles' would a Coalition-led Howard Government extend equal opportunity and allow participation in the broader Australian community. In this way, the conferral of Australian citizenship was to be conditional rather than a democratic process. It reveals Howard's longstanding view that the outcome of citizenship should be connected with the process of migrant integration as the Liberal policy emphasised that 'enclave settlement (would) not be encouraged' (Liberal Party of Australia, 1988, p. 3). Although the policy document stated that it would continue 'to encourage respect for Australia's cultural diversity' it also made the following declaration:

We understand the continuing personal bonds that many of our citizens feel for their country of origin. The principle we endorse is that whilst any person should value his or her own cultural traditions there is a higher and stronger purpose in which allegiance to one's chosen country is paramount. Such an allegiance acknowledges both the benefits and the responsibilities of Australian citizenship, to which we believe all new residents should aspire. (Liberal Party of Australia, 1988, p. 8)

Similar sentiments had been expressed in the FitzGerald Report:

But if there is no priority of commitment to Australia and its future, if the attachment of Australia is not greater than the attachment to the countries of origin, these voices deserve little weight or validity in the determination of immigration policy.

And if immigration policies are not unashamedly Australian, then how can we possibly assess who we want to come here as immigrants, who to select and how best to facilitate their settlement? (CAAIP, 1988, p. 10)

These two extracts recall Hindess' (2004) argument that citizenship here is viewed as 'a progressive and desirable human condition that is associated with 'civilisation and improvement' for those defined as 'other' (p. 309). In the extract cited above, it is unclear as to what 'unashamedly Australian' means although when followed by 'we', those who get to decide who will be allowed in would suggest a binary between being Australian and the non-Australian, 'them'. This is immediately followed by the statement that 'immigration to Australia is about becoming Australian. It is not driven by multiculturalism' (CAAIP, 1988, p. 10).

Hence the Liberal Party's immigration policy, the FitzGerald Report and now the current citizenship test policy have all stressed that the conferral of citizenship for migrants should be viewed as 'the ultimate expression of an individual's commitment to Australia and its future (that) requires respect for Australia's institutions and values' (Liberal Party of Australia, 1988, p. 3). In other words, becoming a citizen is conflated with becoming Australian. Citizenship here is a one-way process enacted by the migrant-citizen. And it is a process that is put into place so that mainstream Australians can feel comfortable about who is allowed to be included into their community. For instance, the policy continues that the conferral of citizenship for migrants also signifies 'a mark of their acceptance by their fellow Australians and a declaration which recognizes their responsibility to contribute to the common good' (Liberal Party of Australia, 1988, p. 12).

The policy statement *Immigration and Ethnic Affairs Policy* concludes that because Australia's naturalisation requirements are not 'rigorous', an elected Liberal/National Party Coalition Government would change the law so that eligibility for citizenship would be extended to four years residency and adds the following revelation:

We will also ensure that the processes of acquisition and awarding of citizenship are strengthened to ensure the intending citizens understand more fully the meaning of their commitment to Australia. (Liberal Party of Australia, 1988, p. 12)

With hindsight, we can see that this was a long-term project of the Howard Government that took nearly 20 years to bring to fruition. And Howard did achieve his objective – as the Australian citizenship test, the mechanism that was to ensure that aspiring citizens would commit to Australia– has now become a permanent and everyday fixture in the lives of aspiring citizens. Furthermore, since the implementation of the Australian citizenship test, the prerequisite requirement for permanent residency when applying for Australian citizenship has been extended from a period of two to four years. The government claimed that this longer period would allow greater time for migrants to learn about the Australian way of life and Australian values.

The National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia 1989

Despite the attack meted out by the FitzGerald Report, a year later the Hawke Government released the policy statement, the *National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia* which reiterated the government's commitment to multiculturalism and promoted the everyday practices of multiculturalism as a way of defining Australia's

national identity. However, some of the recommendations from the FitzGerald Report did find their way into this document, particularly the emphasis on the relationship between immigration and economic efficiency (Koleth, 2010, p. 10). The National Agenda also focused on the need for ‘an overriding and unifying commitment to Australia’, and framed multiculturalism as applying to all Australians (Koleth, 2010, p. 10).

In this document we also find the definition of ‘the fundamental principles of multiculturalism’ based on the following rights and obligations; the right to express ones’ cultural identity and heritage, equality of treatment and opportunity and for individuals ‘to accept the basic structures and principles of Australia’ (Koleth, 2010, p. 10). Some of these listed obligations reflect the Australian values that are current today. Hence, we see not only the articulation of multiculturalism and Australian identity being conflated but also the emergence of the notion of mutual obligation between the individual and the state. The focus on mutual obligation, multiculturalism and the national agenda was also taken up by the then Opposition Leader John Howard. By the time of the 1996 election that would bring him to power for the next decade, neoliberalism was well on the way to becoming a permanent fixture in Australian political debates.

Politics and Patriotism

During one of his ‘headland’ speeches made in 1995 where Howard set out his future vision for Australia if elected Prime Minister and aptly titled, *Politics and Patriotism: A Reflection on the National Identity Debate*, Howard became more explicit in his

promotion of national values as a way of articulating Australia's national identity.

While claiming that 'no one owns the national identity' he identified national identity as 'the glue that binds us together and stated:

Our identity is so distinct and our shared values so robust that we cheerfully take them for granted unless something threatens them or someone challenges them.

(Howard, 1995, p. 1)

Howard (1995) was making a plea to depoliticise national identity because 'constant debate about identity implies either that we don't already have one or, worse, that it is somehow inadequate' (p. 3). This debate initiated some of the key themes of the history wars. During this speech, Howard (1995) spoke of Australian identity in terms of 'abiding values' and 'our distinguishing virtues' which included 'the spirit of tolerance, independence and inclusion'. It was a national character which he believed had been shaped by 'generations of unique individuals' as well as 'successive waves of immigration'. Yet he still emphasised that the strength of a 'culturally diverse community' could only be secured by 'an overriding and unifying commitment to Australia' (Howard, 1995, p. 3). Here we see a solidification of the notion of migrants committing to Australia, a notion that had emerged in the FitzGerald Report. This speech also witnessed the rebirth of the notion of Australian identity and values as being under threat.

Howard's 1995 speech was insightful in that he gave a clear articulation of how, over the next decade as Prime Minister, he would promote what he saw as the important interrelationship between Australian history, Australian identity and Australian values. From his opening line, he made a connection between 'our national identity and the

shared values and history that have shaped it' (1995, p. 1). He continued that these 'lively traditions and values ... bind us together as a people'. The direct link between values and national identity was also evident in the following extract:

Our national character springs not from particular ideologies but from mainstream, egalitarian values, a robust democratic tradition, our history, our geography, many Liberal or Conservative-minded Governments; and Labor ones as well, successive waves of immigration which have beneficially shaped our identity and, most of all, generations of unique individuals who have all played their part in moulding our national character. (Howard, 1995, p. 4)

The 1995 headland speech was a significant moment in Howard's political career as it outlined the vision of Australian identity that Howard would attempt to impose throughout his Prime Ministership, a vision that was framed by a belief in a population possessing core values inherited from a uniquely British past.

1999 Multicultural agenda

Although Howard acknowledged and played tribute to the population's cultural diversity in his 1995 speech, he did not articulate this in terms of a relationship with the policy of multiculturalism. His only reference to multiculturalism in the speech was the following statement:

This is an opportune moment to recall with pride our party's record on *multicultural issues*. (Howard, 1995, p. 7)

Howard was referring to the nation's 'overall triumph' in emphasising 'inclusion, diversity and participation' by the large numbers of immigrants who had arrived after World War II. He expressed a congratulatory tone for the success of 'multicultural issues'. Yet by the time he was elected Prime Minister the following year, he could no longer relegate Australia's increasing cultural pluralism to mere 'multicultural issues'. Multiculturalism as a way of expressing Australian identity had been growing, particularly under the leadership of Hawke and Keating. The continued support from government was reflected in the *New Agenda for Multicultural Australia, 1999* prepared under Howard's leadership. This statement was to replace the 1989 statement that was about to expire. There were many continuities in how multiculturalism was to be practised yet under the Howard government, there were also many changes introduced. Under this revised statement, multiculturalism was to be defined as being for *all* Australians and the concept of values continued to play a key role in defining this identity. That is, multiculturalism and values were constitutive of each other.

The *New Agenda for Multicultural Australia, 1999* was innovative as it introduced into government policy for the first time a connection between the concept of values and multiculturalism along with citizenship. The agenda stated:

The values of Australian multiculturalism form one dimension of the values which make up Australian citizenship which is built on a set of common civic values, rights and obligations that can unify Australians. These include: respect for institutional structures, participation in support of democracy and its institutions, respect for the law, respect for and tolerance of others' beliefs and practices, individual freedom of association and prime loyalty to Australia's interests. (Commonwealth of Australia, 1999, pp. 6-7)

So here the values that are identified as pertaining to multiculturalism are also associated with the values that make up Australian citizenship. Interestingly, once again, many of the values identified in this agenda are also similar to the 2007 values. The National Multicultural Advisory Council, in preparing the 1999 Agenda had written that

In fact, the reason Australian multiculturalism is able to make our diversity a great resource for all Australians is precisely because, at its core, are the same values that are embedded in the notion of ‘citizenship’, including respect for difference, tolerance and a commitment to freedom and equal opportunity.

(NMAC, 1999, p. 41)

Nevertheless, the Council stressed that ‘an overriding commitment to Australia’s national interests’ (NMAC, 1999, p. 41) was an essential requirement for migrants living in Australia. What this new agenda highlighted was that, although always controversial, the policy of multiculturalism had become for many, ‘a form of symbolic politics aimed at redefining national identity’ (Ang, 2001, p. 95). Ang (2001) states that at the height of its popularity in the early 1990s, multiculturalism became a form of ideology that was inscribed ‘in the very core of “new Australia”’ (p. 95). This new Australia differed significantly from Howard’s preferred old Australia. A significant recommendation made by the Council was recommendation seven which stated:

The Council believes that there is a close and positive relationship between multiculturalism and the legal status of Australian Citizenship as well as the wider concept of ‘citizenship’ which refers to membership of the Australian community ... Australian citizenship has played an important unifying role in the development of Australia’s nationhood and the modern multicultural society

which has evolved with it. The Council ... recommends the active promotion of the benefits of Australian Citizenship to encourage its take up. (NMAC, 1999, p. 12)

These recommendations and their eventual outcome are discussed in the following chapter. To conclude here, despite explicit governmental intervention to diminish the popularity of multiculturalism and to dictate to migrants how they were to live as naturalised Australian citizens, support for multiculturalism did not disappear from the public sphere.

Conclusion

In the early days of neoliberal politics, core values and multiculturalism were not on opposite sides of the political spectrum. Indeed, the two concepts were constitutive of each other. For the Howard Government, the policy of multiculturalism was blamed for migrants apparent failure to have an overarching commitment to Australia. This view was also strongly articulated in the FitzGerald Report of 1988. The report was significant as it brought to the fore the novel idea of the state consciously managing the national culture and not just the population (Stratton, 1998 p. 112). And this management was premised on the problematic that multiculturalism was detrimental to social cohesion in Australia and that an affirmation of a homogenous and unique Australian identity was needed to counter the ill feelings towards this policy.

Under FitzGerald's proposals, immigration was to be viewed primarily as an economic resource where individuals held obligations to the Australian state for the privilege of

having been allowed (that is, ‘invited’) to migrate and work in Australia. In order to stress the need for migrant obligation, the report promoted the notion of ‘commitment’ from immigrants to the Australian nation and articulated in official documents the principles and institutions that were to be respected by the ‘migrant other’ as part of a government sanctioned national identity. These documents included the 1989 and 1999 national multicultural agendas. Commitment here draws on the definition of the active citizenship that is derived from the Athenian model of citizenship (Irving, 2000). Irving (2000) concludes that tying the legal status of citizenship to notions of commitment was not the best way to express or measure commitment (p. 20). The next chapter continues by illustrating how the notion of commitment was promoted during the Centenary of Federation celebrations.

CHAPTER SIX: PREPARING THE AUSTRALIAN COMPACT

The Council recommends that the National Council for the Centenary of Federation ... ensure that the transformation of Australia from a somewhat insular and largely Anglo-Celtic white society to one of the most culturally diverse countries in the world is given the prominence it deserves. The experience and contribution of Australians from all over the world in the course of this transformation should be appropriately celebrated and commemorated in the events and lasting memorials that mark the Centenary. (Commonwealth of Australia, 1999, p. 14)

The above cited recommendation made in *A New Agenda for Multicultural Australia*, 1999 was taken up by the Howard Government and transformed into the report, *Australian Citizenship for a New Century* prepared by the Australian Citizenship Council. An independent body, the Australian Citizenship Council had been established in 1998 as part of the Centenary of Federation celebrations. Its main objective was to advise the Minister for Immigration on developing a contemporary policy on citizenship as well as promoting 'increased community awareness of the significance of Australian citizenship for all Australians, including its role as a unifying symbol' (Australian Citizenship Council, 2000, p. 3). The Council had also been commissioned to advise on ways to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Australian citizenship that was to take place in 1999 (Holland, 2005, p. 152). The Australian Citizenship Council was also part of the committee that had been commissioned to produce the educational kit, *Let's Participate*, discussed in chapter four. The report, *Australian Citizenship for a New*

Century was released in February 2000 and the government response was released over a year later in May 2001.

In this chapter, I focus on how citizenship discourses were framed by the Howard Government during a period of heightened nationalistic feeling that commenced with the Centenary of Federation celebrations. I focus specifically on the report, *Australian Citizenship for a New Century* (Australian Citizenship Council, 2000) because it is in this report that we see the first official articulation of Australian values. I also explore the newly introduced notion of ‘Australian multiculturalism’ and explore how this concept became conflated with the apparatus of citizenship and developed in other government institutions along with the *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* (Department of Education, 2005). In this way, I reveal how this new form of ‘Australian multiculturalism’ was reconceptualised from a demand for commitment from migrants to a declaration of ‘a common bond’ among the diverse Australian population and how this shift to a desire for commonality rather than commitment highlights how political power ‘at work within a legal framework of unity’ connects with old notions of ‘pastoral’ power that focuses on the individual in order to ‘constantly ensure, sustain, and improve the lives of each and every one’ (Foucault, 1994b, p. 307).

Celebrating Federation: Australian citizenship for a new century

In his opening letter to the minister, the Council Chair to the Australian Citizenship Council, Sir Ninian Stephen, a former judge of the High Court of Australia who also held the position of Governor-General of Australia from 1982 to 1989, articulated the

Council's belief that Australian citizenship was a 'major success story' and a 'unifying concept' that needed to focus on continuity rather than change (Australian Citizenship Council, 2000 pp. 1-2). One of the most important recommendations made in the report was the promotion of the 'Australian Compact', a declaration detailing core civic values. Stephen informed Minister Ruddock that

With that Centenary (of Federation) in view we believe that the primary focus should be on Australian citizenship as involving certain widely held but often unexpressed civic values rather than simply on the legal status of Citizenship. These civic values, having evolved over time, already form the foundation of Australia's democratic society. We believe that they can be stated as a set of seven shared values in the nature of an Australian Compact. So stated the Council believes that if appropriately promoted throughout the community they will give added meaning to Australian citizenship. (Australian Citizenship Council, 2000, p. 1)

So here, for the first time, we witness the appearance and definition of core civic values in an official capacity. Sir Ninian Stephen's words are significant as he made claims of the 'widely held but often unexpressed civic values' that reflected community attitudes towards citizenship in Australia, reflecting the Council's belief that these articulated civic values underpinned Australian citizenship. While stressing that these values were the 'foundation of Australia's democratic society' he also acknowledged that they have 'evolved over time', suggesting a notion of progress and improvement in this 'success story'. In this way, the Council recognised that citizenship affected all Australians and it was not solely the prerogative of those desiring naturalisation.

In preparing the report, the Australian Citizenship Council (2000) sought community feedback via the issues paper *Contemporary Australian Citizenship* released in February 1999. Two hundred responses were received for this issues paper (Commonwealth of Australia, 2001, p. 4). It also sought 'direct input' from a number of government bodies among them the Civics Education Group, the Multicultural Advisory Council, the Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commissioner (Australian Citizenship Council, 2000, p. 5). This highlights how the apparatus of citizenship worked in conjunction with several technologies of government and institutions in order to direct the management of new citizens through various forms and institutions of expertise.

The Council was made up of 14 members. The members were Sallyanne Atkinson OA, Robert Ellicott QC and Archbishop Barry Hickey OAM, Donald Horne and Mark Ella. Sallyanne Atkinson was the first elected Liberal Mayor of Brisbane and an officer of the Order of Australia who had been on the Australian Olympic Committee for the Brisbane 1992 and Sydney 2000 Olympic bids and became Deputy Mayor of Sydney's Olympic Village in 2000. Robert Ellicott has been a lawyer, Liberal politician and judge. The now retired Roman Catholic Archbishop of Perth, Barry Hickey was also known for his conservative stand against secularisation. Donald Horne was an academic and journalist who had edited the magazines, the, *Bulletin*, the *Observer* and *Quadrant* and is best remembered as the author of the iconic, *The Lucky Country* (1964). Mark Ella, considered one of the great players of rugby union and the first Indigenous player to captain the national Wallabies team was also a member of the Council.

The Council acknowledged that their report had been informed by two earlier government reports; *Australians All: Enhancing Australian Citizenship*, the 1994 report of the Joint Standing Committee on Migration and *Whereas the People ... Civics and Citizenship Education*, the 1994 report prepared by the Civics Expert Group (Australian Citizenship Council, 2000, p. 5). The latter report had been chaired by historian, Stuart Macintyre, highlighting the significant role bestowed on historians in citizenship studies. Most significant for this current study was John Hirst's involvement with the Civics Education Group. As an historian who specialised in Australian colonial history, he was extensively consulted by the Council. The Council also praised the school educational program led by Hirst and titled, *Discovering Democracy*, a program which flowed from the 1994 *Whereas the People ...* Report. The role of John Hirst as the expert historian is discussed in Part three.

The Australian Citizenship Council's (2000) report, *Australian Citizenship for a New Century* commences by identifying its problematic: 'there is public uncertainty about what it is that Australians hold in common' (p. 6). One of the initial foci therefore was to explore what public beliefs Australians held in common. This desire for the common was premised on the notion that it was a unifying factor in Australian everyday life. In addition, Council members were concerned that most Australians did not understand 'a great deal about the history and operation of Australia's system of government and law' and therefore recommended that civics and citizenship education become government priority (Australian Citizenship Council, 2000, p. 20). It was believed that civics education would 'significantly enhance Australians' ability to participate in and contribute to community life as informed and responsible citizens' (Australian Citizenship Council, 2000, p. 20).

In order to understand how the Australian Citizenship Council's brief came about, it is important to look back a few years to when the two Labor Governments of Hawke and Keating made civics and citizenship education a government priority. Macintyre and Simpson (2009) advise us that the promotion of civics education came about as a way to remedy some of the ill effects of neoliberal policies that had been adopted by nations like Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (p. 123). These neoliberal policies emphasised individual choice and were therefore judged by many to be eroding 'traditional community values and cohesion' (Macintyre & Simpson, 2009, p. 123). There was also the belief that under a neoliberal regime, 'pressure for academic success and vocational achievement came at the expense of citizenship commitment and skills' and led to an apparent tension between 'education for individual success and economic efficiency on the one hand, and personal and community wellbeing on the other' (Macintyre & Simpson, 2009, p. 123).

At the same time, many critics were concerned that the policy of multiculturalism was not holding Australian society together because multiculturalism was not predicated on a set of common values. Macintyre and Simpson (2009) thus conclude that the re-emergent interest in civics and citizenship education in Australia was seen as one possible solution to this dilemma (p. 123). It was around this time that the Department of Immigration was preparing to celebrate 50 years since the inauguration of the Australian Citizenship Act. It produced a booklet entitled, *What it means to be an Australian Citizen* to be distributed as part of a kit for schools as well as for distribution to aspiring citizens and it is to this booklet that I turn to now.

Celebrating the 50th anniversary of the citizenship act

What it means to be an Australian citizen (1997) was purported to ‘help our future citizens to better understand their new country’ by providing ‘a brief summary of our history, heritage, symbols, institutions and laws’ (p. 1). This was a 29-page A4 size, colour booklet with an introductory message from the then Immigration Minister, Philip Ruddock. In his opening message, Ruddock declared that:

Members of one of the world’s most culturally diverse societies, Australians values many basic rights including equality of treatment, equality under the law, democracy, and equal opportunity for all.

Our strength as a new nation is a direct result of these shared values – and the centrepiece of our unity is Australian citizenship. (p. 1)

This message came under the title of *Shared Values for a Shared Future* and illustrates one of the first texts designed for migrant consumption that focused on the notion of civic values which are conflated with ‘basic rights’. The booklet also reflected many of the themes that the Australian Citizenship Council would take up a few years later. In this book, we begin to see the development of a more comprehensive history being promoted as an essential form of knowledge required of future citizens. The history section begins on page 16 with the title, *The First Australians*:

Contact with Europeans was not generally a happy experience for Australia’s Indigenous peoples. Many were dispossessed of their lands, they fell victim to diseases brought by the colonists and their family systems were disrupted and in many cases destroyed. (p. 16)

In *What it Means to be an Australian Citizen* there is also the inclusion of details about *Mabo: 1992* and an elaboration of the *Parliamentary Joint Statement: 1996*. Mabo is described as ‘a landmark decision in the High Court’ which provided Indigenous Australians ‘with an opportunity to claim ownership of particular parcels of land, under certain circumstances’ (p. 17).

What is also particularly interesting about these two pages on *The First Australians* is that an explanation of the Parliamentary Joint Statement on racial tolerance is included here while the full text of the statement is included a few pages earlier (p. 10) on a single page under the title of *A Parliamentary Reaffirmation*. The Racial Tolerance statement was a joint parliamentary resolution against racism and it had been contentious for Howard, who in his role as Prime Minister had insisted that the word multiculturalism be deleted from the text (Ang, 2001, p. 97). Neither text has the words ‘racial tolerance’ included in its title. The statement’s objective was to address both immigration and reconciliation issues and in the booklet, *What it means to be an Australian Citizen*, it is presented under these two themes suggesting a substitute for the policy of multiculturalism.

The booklet, *What it means to be an Australian Citizen* acknowledged that nation-building was the result of ‘the combined contributions of our Indigenous people and those who came here later from all over the world’ (p. 8). It declared:

We expect and respect the cultures and traditions of newcomers and, in return, expect that they also respect and accept the cultural differences they find here. While we embrace and celebrate the diversity of the Australian people, we also aim to build a cohesive, tolerant and unified nation of people. (p. 8)

Firstly, it is important to point out the distinction between the use of diversity and difference. The Howard Government never denied the importance of diversity. Yet as Fortier (2008) argues, diversity is preferred as a form of ‘diluted differences for those worthy of it’ (p. 17). That is, ‘differences are obliterated under a veneer of universal diversity’ that suggests that we are all different, we are all ethnic, we are all migrants and therefore we are all the same (Fortier, 2008, p. 17). Furthermore, diversity has become an ambivalent reality ‘recognised as inevitable, desirable and valuable, while it is also seen as a disturbing sign of change and a potential threat to stability, peaceful cohabitation, cohesion or safe living’ (Fortier, 2010, p. 24).

The above cited extract from *What it Means to be an Australian Citizen* also reiterates the notion of mutual obligation a few pages later with the title, *Our Promise to You* and the subtitle, *... and What we expect in return* (p. 11). In this section, there is an elaboration of ‘Australia’s democratic institutions, values and principles’ that underpin its ‘efforts in maintaining a socially cohesive, tolerant and harmonious nation’ (p. 11). The terms ‘values’, ‘rights’ and ‘privileges’ are used interchangeably with the distinction being made between what the nation’s ‘promise’ to new citizens was, framed as ‘rights’ and what the expectations were from migrants in return, framed as ‘obligations’. The text warrants citing in full:

Australia makes the following commitment to you and all Australians:

- the right to equity and freedom from barriers that derive from race, ethnicity or culture; and
- the right for all Australians to participate fully in our community and achieve their full potential, regardless of background.
- All members of the Australian community are expected to:

- have an overriding and unifying commitment to Australia, and to accept the basic structures and principles of Australian society;
- the rule of law, tolerance, equality of opportunity, Parliamentary democracy, freedom of speech and religion, English as a national language, and equality of the sexes and the races; and
- acknowledge that to express one's own culture and beliefs involves a reciprocal responsibility to accept the right of others to express their views and values. (p. 11)

Again, here we read the same principles, institutions and values that had been promoted in the FitzGerald Report and soon were to be included in the Australian Compact prepared by the Australian Citizenship Council. And like the Council, the booklet, *What it means to be an Australian Citizen* was addressing *all* Australians, that is, 'all members of the Australian community' whether they were born in Australia or were seeking the conferral of Australian citizenship.

Australian citizenship for a new century

In its report, the Australian Citizenship Council also recommended teaching citizenship to *all* Australian citizens whether native-born or naturalised. Of great significance too is the fact that the development of this report was being conducted on the eve of the Centenary of Federation celebrations as well as during the aftermath of Pauline Hanson's term in political life, a period characterised by divisive debates around national identity and the ongoing debates about the relevance of multiculturalism and who could call themselves 'true' Australians. Pauline Hanson rose to fame in the late

1990s with her party One Nation. The impact of her popularity and the damage it did to support for multiculturalism and ethnic relations in Australia cannot be denied. Jupp (2002) concludes that the rise of One Nation allowed some Australians to bring to the fore negative sentiments about immigration, multiculturalism and reconciliation which prior to the election of the Howard Government would have been deemed to be unspeakable or 'unfashionable' (p. 138). Thus, commenting on Pauline Hanson's maiden political speech in which she expressed her controversial views on Asian immigrants and Indigenous peoples, Howard was able to claim that 'people do feel free to speak a little more freely and a little more openly about what they feel ... I welcome the fact that people can now talk about certain things without living in fear of being branded as a bigot or as a racist' (Howard, cited in Jupp, 2002, p. 138). It was during this period of Hanson-mania that the Australian Citizenship Council was established so that confidence could be restored in the policy of multiculturalism among the population.

The report, *Australian Citizenship for a New Century* states:

The Council believes that the best way for the concept of citizenship to serve Australia as a unifying symbol is to focus on the broader meaning of the word citizenship that goes well beyond the legal status of Australian Citizenship. In this broader meaning citizenship encompasses ideals of civic life that can be seen as the public core values in a society whose people follow many different beliefs and ways of life, are of many different national and ethnic origins, and sometimes see themselves very strongly in terms of the particular region where they live. (2000, p. 6)

In this extract, we can see that the Council recognised the notion of public civic values as inclusive of difference. In promoting core civic values, the Council was drawing on the ancient Greek notion of citizenship where being part of a polity meant participating in political life. The Council believed that Australians did not see themselves as a distinct polity as the Americans do nor had they shown interest in ‘looking for the distinctiveness and the comparative success of the civic institutions that frame their citizenship because in the past, Australians saw their civic virtue as pertaining to their British heritage (Australian Citizenship Council, 2000, p. 9). According to the Council, an Australian Compact would address this lack of focus in Australian society.

In promoting the introduction of the Australian Compact, the Council stated emphatically that it did not wish to set up the notion of a single national identity. It warned that

... it might be better to proclaim not a ‘national identity’, but a national civic compact’. Such a compact could in practice be a statement that represents a form of ‘understanding’ or ‘agreement’ amongst Australians setting out commitment to our shared civic values which have evolved over many years. (2000, pp. 10-11)

The use of ‘compact’ in the title is interesting as it has the effect of emphasising the Council’s objective of commonality and mutuality for ‘compact’ infers a two-way process. This, too, is part of neoliberal thinking, what Foucault (1997) calls government for each and for all.

Comparisons between the Australian Compact and Australian values

In reading the Council's Report, what is immediately noticeable is its stark contrast with how Australian values came to be understood by the end of the Howard era. The Council's report emphatically stated that 'a national identity cannot be definitively captured and does not stand still' and is hence described as 'an argumentative matter' that can 'divide rather than unify' (2000, p. 10). The Multicultural Advisory Council, too, while drafting a New Agenda for multiculturalism had emphasised the constantly evolving nature of Australia's identity (NMAC, 1999). Howard, on the other hand, was adamant that celebrating differences led to divisions because differences resulted in 'tribalism' (Vasta, 2010). Instead, there should be a celebration of a unique and singular Australian identity that united the 'national family' (Howard, 2006). Yet this national family differed from the one that Grassby had mentioned back in 1973. The Council made the distinction between promoting a singular national identity for a more favourable 'national *civic* identity made up of the prevailing beliefs and practices of our "polity", and as a fundamental statement of our basic habits of citizenship' (2000, p. 10).

The principles included in the Australian Compact were the prelude to the Australian values included in the 2007 citizenship resource booklet *Becoming an Australian Citizen* and the *Australian Values Statement* that is still in use today. Although sharing similar themes, there were some significant differences between the 2000 version and the 2007 version of national values. A comparison between the Australian Compact and the *Australian Values Statement* is useful here in highlighting how the two texts portrayed the principles, institutions and values they incorporated. The proposed Australian Compact was defined as follows:

- To respect and care for the land we share;
- To maintain the rule of law and the ideal of equality under the law of all Australians;
- To strengthen Australia as a representative liberal democracy based on universal adult suffrage and on freedom of opinion;
- To uphold the ideal of Australia as a tolerant and fair society;
- To recognize and celebrate Australia as an inclusive multicultural society which values its diversity;
- To continue to develop Australia as a society devoted to the wellbeing of its people;
- To value the unique status of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

(Australian Citizenship Council, 2000, pp. 16-17)

To recapitulate, Australian values in the citizenship resource booklet and as part of the *Australian Values Statement* were defined as follows:

- 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

A close reading of the principles included in the Australian Compact reveals that they are written with the infinitive – expressing something that has to be done, enacted, and practised. Hence the use of the verbs ‘to respect’, ‘to maintain’, ‘to value’, ‘to uphold’, ‘to recognise’, ‘to continue’ and ‘to value’. In contrast, in the *Australian Values Statement*, nouns are used to express the particular values. Hence the use of ‘respect’, ‘freedom’, ‘equality’, ‘peacefulness’ and ‘tolerance’ foregrounded in each value statement. What this suggests is that in the Australian Compact, it is the ‘doing’ and the continuous negotiating of civic values that was emphasised, that is, the participation of its citizens. In the *Australian Values Statement*, the noun groups suggest a fixed notion and a set status that is not dynamic.

Most notable in contrasting the two lists of values is the omissions and changes in the 2007 version. Gone is the core civic value of ‘respecting and caring for the land we share’. Most significantly, gone too are the recognition and celebration of Australian multicultural society and diversity as well as valuing the unique status of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. These omissions in the 2007 values reflect the Federal Government’s policies on climate change, multiculturalism and reconciliation. Howard had refused to ratify the Kyoto Treaty; he rejected both the principles underlying multiculturalism and reconciliation and promoted instead the notion of ‘practical reconciliation’ during his final years as Prime Minister.

The concepts of multiculturalism and reconciliation were gradually eroded from the Howard Government’s policy portfolios and by the time of the implementation of the Australian citizenship test they had become non-existent knowledge for the would-be citizen. Yet the omission of multiculturalism and reconciliation in the Australian

citizenship test resources was in direct contradiction to the Australian Citizenship Council's document. In describing its commitment to reconciliation, the Council's report acknowledged past events that had given rise to the need for reconciliation and multiculturalism. For instance, in promoting a commitment to the land as a key civic principle, the Council was acknowledging that it has been 'an area of contention' ranging from dispossession of Indigenous peoples and squatters and the present day 'disputes between environmentalists and the timber industry' (2000, p. 11). The report acknowledged the 'good' with the 'bad' events in the nation's history, using such terms as 'the long, unhappy history of treatment of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples', 'the many forms of discrimination' in a 'declaredly intolerant society' and 'the periods of bigotry and prejudice' (2000, p. 12). It concluded that these civic values were 'imperfect' ideals that were not always practised well or shared by all Australians and that they were not an exhaustive list of civic virtues but merely 'the most basic and the most realisable' (2000, p. 12).

Examining the Council's 2000 report, *Australian Citizenship for a New Century* reveals the continuities and discontinuities in Australian citizenship discourses during Howard's time in office. There is continuity with the notion of defining core civic values as a mechanism to manage the Australian population. Yet there is discontinuity given the emphasis the 2000 report placed on multiculturalism and the complete omission of multiculturalism from the 2007 *Australian Values Statement*.

The Council's promotion of multiculturalism

The Council ... recommends that the principles of the 'Australian Compact' should play an essential part in discussion on the civic values involved in 'Australian multiculturalism'.

An emphasis of this kind can underline the differences between the idea of social cohesion (different social forces holding together) and the idea of social conformity (everyone being the same). Council believes that to speak of social cohesion is not to say 'you must all become like us', 'us' being an imagined 'typical Australian' who does not exist. It is to say that what we have in common, what holds us together, are the core civic values which, as Australian multiculturalism implies, include strong acceptance and respect for cultural diversity. (Australian Citizenship Council, 2000, p. 19)

The Council's recommendation that the Australian Compact and Australian multiculturalism be linked had been influenced by recommendations made in the 1999 National Multicultural Agenda which emphasised 'the concept of core civic values as part of a newly designed set of principles of Australian multiculturalism' (2000, p. 13). The Council had also proposed that the Australian Compact be included as part of a program that also included the Statement on Racial Tolerance and the Multiculturalism Statement (2000, p. 83).

The report *Australian Citizenship for a New Century* states that core civic values should be seen as part of the multiculturalism 'package' just as the Multicultural Statement had recommended that multiculturalism should be seen as promoting these core civic values (2000, p. 13). While it warns against 'nationalistic boasting or self-regard' (2000, pp.

14-5), it defended the use of promoting values arguing that they were the opposite of ‘nationalistic’ because they ‘proclaim that Australians can live together in peace and have a strong sense of community with their country even though they are different from each other in many ways’ (2000, p. 13).

The Council also emphasised that ‘the ideas about what is peculiar to the Australian experience change over time’ (2000, p. 14). On page 12 the report states:

The Council believed public acceptance of diversity can be one of the bases of social harmony. A peaceful and fruitful social cohesion does not come from imposing uniformity. It comes from accepting difference and negotiating it – and in looking not only for what divides but also what Australians have in common. And what Australians can be demonstrated to have in common is a ‘polity’ through which there can be peaceful change in a liberal and increasingly tolerant society. (2000, p. 12)

Hence, one of the main messages from the Australian Citizenship Council’s report, *Australian Citizenship for a New Century* was that differences could coexist and ensure social harmony. The Howard Government however, did not share this belief.

Australian citizenship ... a common bond

In its government response, *Australian Citizenship ... A Common Bond*, the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, Phillip Ruddock reiterated the Council’s support for Australian citizenship as a unifying force and a common bond, stating:

Australian Citizenship is a common bond at the heart of a unified and inclusive Australia and it is our shared civic values that underpin Australian citizenship, in both the broad and legal sense to unify us as a nation. (Commonwealth of Australia, 2001, p. 4)

Ruddock made several references to civic values in the government's response but it did not endorse the Council's recommendations in relation to the introduction of the Australian Compact. There is strong support recorded for the Council's first recommendation that the Commonwealth Government take a leading role in promoting broad civic values and the legal status of citizenship, the government response stating:

The Government believes that the civic values that underpin Australian citizenship, together with the legal status of Australian Citizenship, are central unifying elements in Australia's diverse society. They are at the heart of a unified and cohesive Australia and are symbolic of that unity. The Government agrees that more needs to be done to improve community understanding of these civic values and their role in bringing the nation closer together, as well as to promote the acquisition of Australian citizenship by eligible persons.

(Commonwealth of Australia, 2001, p. 8)

Yet this articulation of support for the concept of civic values was not carried through. In its second and third recommendations, the Council's call for a non-partisan declaration from parliament in support of the values outlined in the Australian Compact received the following government response:

The Government considers that the idea of an 'Australian Compact' is an innovative one and acknowledges that the values in the text proposed by the

Council are embedded in Australian society, institutions and value statements in one form or another. However, the Government believes that there is no strong community demand for an additional value statement sponsored by Government and therefore does not intend to pursue a declaration at this time.

(Commonwealth of Australia, 2001, p. 9)

It must be remembered that the government's response to the Australian Citizenship Council's report was released in May 2001. This was significant as the release occurred before the Tampa Affair (August 2001) and before the attacks of 9/11 and before the details of the Sydney gang rapes of the previous year were made public (Grewal, 2007). What this suggests is that at the time that the report was released, the discourses around terrorism and Islamophobia had not yet become prominent. As a result, there was no need to introduce the device of civic values to educate and protect against the violence and intolerance of the 'migrant other'. The year was 2001 and the nation was engaged in celebrating its birth of nationhood 100 years ago and among the Australian population popular discourse was still euphoric about the 'best Olympic Games ever' that had engulfed everyday life the previous year. The population had also been preoccupied with domestic concerns such as the republican movement of 1999. So citizenship's focus here was on whether the nation should become a republic and an Australian Compact outlining core civic values was rejected. During this time of strong nationalistic sentiments, it was not yet necessary to classify Australian values in order for migrants to understand them and adopt them in their daily lives.

One of the most feasible suggestions as to why the Australian Compact was rejected by the Howard Government in 2001 lies with the Council's attempt to link the notion of

core civic values with that of 'Australian multiculturalism'. In recommendation seven, the Council called for supporting civic values as part of the first four principles of Australian multiculturalism and 'that the principles of the Australian Compact' should play an essential part in discussion on the civic values involved in 'Australian multiculturalism' (Commonwealth of Australia, 2001, p. 10). The government's response was telling with its lack of support for the recommendation, stating that the government had already adopted the four principles of Australian multiculturalism recommended by the National Multicultural Advisory Council and concludes thus that 'discussion of the civic values involved in Australian Multiculturalism can proceed independently' (Commonwealth of Australia, 2001, p. 10). In other words, there was no need for government intervention in ensuring that the concept of civic values was promoted as part of Australian multiculturalism as this link could be made by individuals of their own accord or by different institutions such as the National Multicultural Advisory Council. For the Howard Government, these core values were to remain separate from the much maligned multicultural policy.

One of the few recommendations made by the report to which the government adhered was to strongly endorse the *Discovering Democracy* program of civics and citizenship education in the school system (Commonwealth of Australia, 2001, p. 11). The government's response was to allocate additional funding of \$13.4 million over a period of four years for the program (Commonwealth of Australia, 2001, p. 11). In recommendation 11, the government also endorsed the Council's recommendation of producing materials promoting citizenship by responding that it would continue with such materials as the booklet, *What is Means to be an Australian Citizen*.

The government was happy to support the recommendation that the AMEP play a significant role in ‘testing’ the requirement that prospective citizens have ‘knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of Australian citizenship’ for those migrants who completed the program (Commonwealth of Australia, 2001, p. 19). The government also agreed to retain the existing criterion for those not enrolled in AMEP (Commonwealth of Australia, 2001, p. 19). The government responses to the Australian Citizenship Council’s report, *Australian Citizenship for a New Century*, suggest that at that time, the notion of testing citizens via a formal computer test in order to see if they could understand and embrace Australian values had not entered into the imagination of the National Government. Council had discussed testing in relation to the English language and responsibilities of citizenship, bearing in mind that these were the main prerequisites stipulated in the old citizenship act before the requirement of ‘an adequate knowledge of Australia’ had been introduced in the amended act.

The Australian Citizenship Council’s brief of promoting national unity was purported to replace the previous Labor Government’s focus on rights and diversity in issues relating to Australian citizenship (Holland, 2010, p. 55) and highlights the main differences in how the Hawke/Keating and the Howard Governments translated the concept of citizenship in practice. Soon after the release of, *Australian Citizenship ... A Common Bond – Government response to the Report of the Australian Citizenship Council*, events occurred around the globe and close to home that were to shake up the confidence of the Australian population and create an atmosphere that would bring to the fore the idea that the Australian nation should protect its borders, its community as well as social harmony. In the Australian context, this threat to social cohesion was to be addressed by looking back at the Council’s citizenship report of 2000.

Australian citizenship: then and now

In July 2004, referring to the Australian Citizenship's Council's report, *Australian Citizenship for a New Century* released three years earlier, the then Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs, Gary Hardgrave declared that his government had 'embraced almost all the council recommendations' (Australian Government, 2004, p. 6). Yet despite the rhetoric, this was not the case. In his speech given to the Sydney Institute, Hardgrave identified the council report's two most significant recommendations as repealing section 17 of the Citizenship Act to allow Australian citizens to have dual citizenship and the recommendation to develop a nation-wide campaign to promote awareness and the take up of Australian citizenship among eligible migrants (Australian Government, 2004, p. 6).

In this speech entitled, *Australian Citizenship: Then and Now*, there was no mention of the Australian Compact which Stephen had identified in the opening letter of the report as one of the most important recommendations of the Council. There were, however, a significant number of references relating to Australia's national values. Yet the 'national values' advocated by the minister described some interesting differences to the values espoused in the Australian Compact. In *Australian Citizenship: Then and Now*, the notion of core civic values were once again reconceptualised and transformed, this time as a device to promote the economic efficiency of the Australian population as well as a mechanism of border security while still being connected to definitions of national identity as suitable knowledge that had to be acquired by Australia's migrant population.

In his opening address, Hardgrave, echoing the previous words in Howard's *Politics and Patriotism* speech of 1995, announced that Australian citizenship was the 'glue holding our culturally diverse society together' and the 'key to national unity' (Australian Government, 2004, p. 1). Linking the themes of Australian citizenship with national identity, Hardgrave stated that:

Any socially cohesive society must feature the principles of rights and privileges balanced by respect and responsibilities. In Australia, individual cultural heritage is predicated upon an overriding loyalty to Australia and the basic structures and values of Australian society. (Australian Government, 2004, p.1)

It is interesting that Hardgrave identified 'individual cultural heritage' as being based on loyalty to 'the basic structures and values of Australian society'. In the use of 'heritage' here it is ambiguous as to whose heritage he is referring, 'Australian citizens' or those wanting Australian citizenship. The paragraph that follows is suggestive in its denouncement of 'those' who hate Australia. The minister stated:

There is no doubt there are threats to Australia and our way of life in the post 9/11 era. There are those whose aim is the destruction of our way of life and values. Terrorists hate the freedoms of our democracy. (Australian Government, 2004, p. 1)

Hence we can assume from the statements that followed that 'those who hate our Australian way of life' were not Australian-born citizens but migrants who required the conferral of citizenship (2004, p.1). The Minister reminded listeners that:

Migrants have come to Australia because of the freedoms we cherish, our democratic system, and the values of equal opportunity and hard work on which our nation has been built. (2004, p. 1)

The minister stressed that in ‘uncertain times’ Australia needed to be ‘protected’ and that this could only be achieved ‘through a coherent set of national values, the unifying effect of the common bond of Australian citizenship’ and a shared future (Australian Government, 2004, p.1). Yet Hardgrave also suggested that some who come are terrorists who hate our way of life. The national values advocated by Hardgrave draw on notions of active participation. They were introduced as follows:

As Australians we have a responsibility to uphold and to take an active part in our vigorous democracy and system of Government. This means valuing parliamentary democracy and the Australian Constitution, freedom of speech and religion, the rule of law, acceptance and equality, and English as the national language. (Australian Government, 2004, p. 2)

New to this list of values was the declaration that Australia owed its heritage to the Western and Christian world. Interestingly, in this characterisation of Australia’s identity, Indigenous peoples were placed ‘outside’ of and separate from the national family:

The great success of Australia’s cultural diversity has been built upon our Western Christian society. Though we have a distinctly Australian culture and national identity, there is no point in denying our nation’s history and its roots. Just as Indigenous Australians have contributed significantly to our country, we must also acknowledge that British-style Parliamentary Democracy is at the

heart of the framework of our national values and laws. (Australian Government, 2004, p. 2)

It is in Hardgrave's speech that we also note one of the first texts that contain no mention of multiculturalism. The cultural diversity of the Australian population is acknowledged but it is promoted as an economic resource that should be exploited for the benefit it can deliver to the Australian nation:

At the same time, there is no doubt migrants from many countries and cultures have enriched our society and built our modern, culturally diverse nation.

Diversity brings with it significant economic benefits. We are now part of a global trading environment and the importance of trade and investment to Australia's prosperity continues to rise. Australia's diverse population and workforce is providing us with language skills; cultural understanding and knowledge; business networks and knowledge of business practices and protocols in overseas markets. Not to mention low cost intelligence about overseas markets, including intimate knowledge of consumer tastes and preferences. (Australian Government, 2004, p. 2)

In this above cited extract, the migrant with his/her economic values can be juxtaposed to the terrorists who hate Australian democracy. Johnson (2000) reminds us that the notion of mutual obligation is about attempting 'to encourage the development of a self-reliant citizen with a substantially reduced need for government services' (p. 105).

Perhaps, too, Hardgrave is offering a reminder that the policy of mutual obligation can remove the need for policies on multiculturalism and its services and benefits. It seems then that this report had more in common with the FitzGerald Report of 1988 and its

economic focus than the Australian Citizenship Council's report of 2000 to which it claimed to be referring. The Minister also stressed that migrants were to be made aware of Australia's values and their obligation to understand these values that characterised the Australian way of life:

We inform migrants about Australian values before and after they arrive and ensure they understand our culture and the concept of mutual obligation.

(Australian Government, 2004, p. 2)

The minister also made a connection with the values education program that had been introduced in Australian schools in order to inform young Australians of 'the values that unite and underpin us as a nation' (Australian Government, 2004, p.3). He gave examples such as singing the national anthem and raising the Australian flag in schools as unifying symbols that should be adopted by all Australians and then preceded to add that, 'the ANZAC tradition and the values it symbolises, such as mateship and shared defence of freedom and democracy, belong to every Australian' (Australian Government, 2004, p. 3). Hence migrants were being asked to embrace national myths and icons as part of the naturalisation process. This, too, emphasises how the discourse on Australian values worked as a government technology that drew on other institutions such as civic education for school children.

Hardgrave concluded his speech with the following words:

In this time of global change and upheaval, our newest migrants, particularly refugees and their families from war-torn Africa or from the former Yugoslavia, are recognising the value and status of Australian Citizenship which they are grabbing hold of with passion and enthusiasm as a statement of stability, of

belonging, and of faith that the future will be a better one – filled with peace, harmony and prosperity.

There has never been a better time to become an Australian Citizen. (Australian Government, 2004, p. 15)

Hardgrave's speech emphasised that membership of the state depended on migrants fulfilling what the state regarded as their economic obligations while the state itself had no real moral or ethical obligations to those living within the state (Stratton, 2011, p. 4). Stratton (2011) hence concludes that:

As state membership declined in value, nationalism became more important. The meaning of the experience of being 'Australian' became increasingly invested in national identity. And this identity was understood as simplistically unitary. (p. 4)

The National Framework of Values Education for Australian Schools

As Hardgrave had stated in his 2004 speech, the Howard Government had introduced the *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools*. At the same time, Howard legislated that in order for schools to receive continued federal funding, they had to install flagpoles and fly the Australian flag and school children had to sing the national anthem at school assemblies. Through the national values education program incorporated in the school curriculum, the Coalition Howard Government 'sought to impose its preferred understanding of binding national values' and this coincided with Howard's 'attempt to prescribe a conservative Australian history syllabus' (Macintyre & Simpson, 2009, p. 132).

Yet the values that school children were to learn about were not presented in the same way as the values that the whole nation was to embrace through the Australian Compact. The school statement listed the values as follows:

Nine Values for Australian Schooling

1. Care and Compassion

Care for self and others

2. Doing Your best

Seek to accomplish something worthy and admirable, try hard, pursue excellence

3. Fair Go

Pursue and protect the common good where all people are treated fairly for a just society

4. Freedom

Enjoy all the rights and privileges of Australian citizenship free from unnecessary interference or control, and stand up for the rights of others

5. Honesty and Trustworthiness

Be honest, sincere and seek the truth

6. Integrity

Act in accordance with principles of moral and ethical conduct, ensure consistency between words and deeds

7. Respect

Treat others with consideration and regard, respect another person's point of view

8. Responsibility

Be accountable for one's own actions, resolve differences in constructive, non-violent and peaceful ways, contribute to society and to civic life, take care of the environment

9. Understanding, Tolerance and Inclusion

Be aware of others and their cultures, accept diversity within a democratic society, being included and including others. (Commonwealth of Australia, 2005, p. 4)

Like its adult counterpart in the Australian Compact, these 'school' values were framed by neoliberal thinking, promoting 'care for self and others', 'seeking the truth' and 'contributing to civic life'. These values emphasised the responsibility of young individuals in governing themselves and their contribution to the whole of the Australian population. They were promoted as helping 'students exercise ethical judgement and social responsibility' (2005, p. 1). Embedded in these values were some of the key principles of the Australian Compact as the Framework states:

These shared values such as respect and 'fair go' are part of Australia's common democratic way of life, which includes equality, freedom and rule of the law.

They reflect our commitment to a multicultural and environmentally sustainable society where all are entitled to justice. (2005, p. 4)

What is also interesting in this document is the definition of values that is offered on the glossary page. Two views are expressed:

'... the principles and fundamental convictions which act as general guides to behaviour, the standards by which particular actions are judged as good or desirable'.

‘the ideals that give significance to our lives, that are reflected through the priorities that we choose, and that we act on consistently and repeatedly’. (2005, p. 8)

This definition recalls the definition of values provided by Mitchell in chapter four on Australian values. And the Australian Citizenship Council, too, had tried to capture the notion of core civic values as dynamic and inclusive. Yet it appears that the Howard Government did not share the Council’s views that multiculturalism, reconciliation and core national values were interrelated and as already mentioned, had shelved the report. Interestingly it was the Opposition Labor leader, Kim Beazley who was the next politician to make the suggestion that all visitors to Australia sign a values pledge as part of the visa application process for gaining entry into Australia (‘Beazley stands by visitor values pledge’, 2006). At the time, Howard condemned the proposal as being ‘unrealistic to expect tourists to adhere to such protocol’ (‘Beazley stands by visitor values pledge’, 2006). The concept of core national values would have to wait until the Howard Government’s final term in office before it would be considered to be more realistic.

CHAPTER SEVEN: FORGETTING MULTICULTURALISM – SECURING OUR BRITISH HERITAGE

What is asked is that Australian citizens make an overriding commitment to Australia – its laws, its values and its people. (Commonwealth of Australia, 2007a, p. 7)

Foucault said in one of his last interviews: nothing is more untenable than a political regime which is indifferent to truth; but nothing is more dangerous than a political system that claims to prescribe the truth. (Gordon, 1994, p. xl)

Hardgrave's 2004 speech, *Australian Citizenship: Then and Now*, signalled a 'new' way of describing the national civic values that were intended to instruct migrants on how to self-regulate their conduct in their pursuit of Australian citizenship. This new description prioritised an economic imperative. The following year, 'terrorist' events on the other side of the world were to usher in a nuanced shift in these discourses about national values and citizenship that focused on the fear of insecurity in contemporary societies. Meanwhile events back home such as the ethnic-fuelled riots among Australian youth on Sydney's Cronulla Beach raised concerns that migrants and naturalised citizens were not accepting the civic responsibilities of upholding the Australian way of life. A new crisis was thus invented that related to the threats that differences brought not only to social cohesion but also more seriously to national security.

In many other liberal democratic nations, declarations that governments needed to protect their population's unique national culture and values from outside threats had also been gaining momentum (de Leeuw & van Wichelen, 2012; Weedon, 2011). The discourse of values has not only infiltrated nations concerned with the impact of globalisation but a great deal of debate around core national values and national identity has also raised questions in relation to the continued significance of multiculturalism as an apparatus that can manage cultural diversity resulting from mass migration movements around the globe. 'New' technologies of government are being sought to combat the spread of insecurity and terrorism that many liberal-democratic nations fear is being caused by certain migrant communities, particularly Islamic peoples who have been allowed entry into their host nations.

In this chapter I focus on the final stage of transformation of Australian values during Howard's last years in office. Underpinned by the spread of Islamophobia, I examine key political speeches made by Prime Minister Howard, his treasurer, Peter Costello and his Education Minister Brendan Nelson that articulated their demands that migrants must adopt Australian values in order to act as good model citizens who would not threaten the Australian way of life. I also explore migrant perspectives on Australian values and examine how this particular order of knowledge they were required to learn worked to regulate their understanding of what it meant to be Australian during the Howard Government's final term in office.

Forgetting the -isms: The final transformation of Australian values

Declared threats to social cohesion and national values resurfaced immediately after the terrorist bombings in London occurred in the summer of 2005 (Cox, 2010). Shocked by the realisation that those involved in the London attack were home-grown British nationals, British Prime Minister Tony Blair had hastily responded by proposing to introduce deportation laws for terrorists (Cassidy, 2005). Asked to comment on Blair's proposal, John Howard responded as follows:

I think what Tony Blair is talking about, quite rightly, is that if somebody has come from another country and has failed to properly embrace the values of this society, his society – and I would apply the same to Australia – then the idea of taking away their citizenship is one that ought to be looked at. I mean, I think that when somebody comes to this country you enter into a mutual obligation understanding. You receive the benefits of living in Australia and in return you have an obligation to embrace and imbibe, the attitudes of this society. I think that's a fair balance and most Australians would see it in those terms. (Cassidy, 2005, p. 2)

Howard reminds us that the conferral of Australian citizenship, as I have argued in previous chapters, has always been promoted as a privilege granted to the migrant, privilege here being described as part of 'mutual obligation'. Privilege suggests something that can be taken away and so by stressing that the conferral of citizenship is a privilege Howard opens up the possibility of having the authority to remove citizenship from those displaying what his government would describe as deviant

behaviour.⁵ When asked by journalist, Barrie Cassidy if he was intending to formalise ‘the way we embrace these core values’ through perhaps a pledge of allegiance, Howard responded as follows:

Well the pledge of allegiance at the present time does contain a commitment to the values of Australia. I think it’s an ongoing attitude of mind. Let’s forget all the ‘isms’ we’ve had in relation to this, whether it’s an assimilation or integration or multiculturalism. I think the problem with those words is they mean different things to different people. My view, very simply, is that you come to this country, you have the incredible privilege of living in one of the best societies in the world and you have rights. But you also have the responsibility to endorse and imbibe and embrace the values of our society. And that, of course, includes free speech, but it also includes a respect for religious difference and it includes a total repudiation and rejection of violence or the preaching of violence or the endorsement of violence as a solution to political disputes. (Cassidy, 2005, p. 2)

Howard’s statement connecting the pledge with values is insightful here as this became the practice that was to be adopted by the successor Rudd Government and is discussed in chapter ten. Howard’s comments on forgetting the ‘isms’ is also interesting and it should be noted that the only ‘ism’ that he listed was that of ‘multiculturalism’. We should recall too that the FitzGerald Report warned against this same ‘ism’ as well as warning that multiculturalism meant different things to different people. Howard’s comment that values are ‘an ongoing attitude of mind’ suggests that these values that

⁵ The Australian Citizenship Act does not allow for an Australian citizen to be deported to another country.

Australians uphold are part of human nature, whereas for the migrant, these values are not a natural part of their being. They can only consider them to be an ‘an incredible privilege’ bestowed on them by the Australian Government, that is, something that has to be learnt, acquired but above all, earned. Thus Howard sets up a binary among ‘we’ Australians and those migrants who have to learn our superior values and abandon their attitudes of religious intolerance and violence. In this way, Australian values are introduced to the Australian community as the antithesis of intolerance and violence and as the remedy for the malaises of the other. Australia, the nation and its people, are presented as complete and finished products. Howard reiterated this view a few months later in his Australia Day address to the National Press Club, stating that:

Australia is a magnet for people from all corners of the globe not because of what it might become, but because of what it has become. (Howard 2006)

Howard’s comments are underpinned by this traditional discourse of differences between different civilisations, whereby some societies and their individuals are considered to be less advanced than others and this view is especially evident in the treatment accorded to non-Western immigrants and Indigenous peoples (Hindess, 2004, p. 313). According to this rationale, Muslim migrants must earn citizenship by adopting the Australian values outlined in the Australian citizenship test.

During that same interview, Howard confirmed that he was convening a summit with Islamic leaders in order to address two main concerns.

Firstly, assure them that we’re all in this together, that they shouldn’t feel as though their whole community is under attack. That would not only be, counterproductive, it would be quite unjust because the overwhelming majority

of them share the abhorrence that we do about violence and terrorism. But they do have responsibilities and we have to guard against this country going down the path of other societies where you have closed cells which are really the product of people being able to operate with a degree of immunity within their own communities. (Cassidy, 2005, p. 2)

In this interview, Howard is not addressing the Muslim community as if they are part of 'mainstream' Australia. Instead he refers to the Muslim community as 'them' and Australians as 'we'. Hence, we can hear traces of the discourses of the danger of the other, the binary between 'they', 'them', 'the overwhelming majority of them', 'their own community' and 'we'. He implies that some Muslims in other nations have allowed terrorists to 'operate with a degree of immunity' suggesting that Muslim communities have not managed their citizens well, allowing some to 'slip through'. It suggests that these Muslim communities are accomplices to terrorism because of their inactivity to patrol it. As a result, Muslim communities can be judged as culpable. The government's proposed remedy for this problem was for migrants to adopt Australian values.

Putting aside Amanda Vanstone for Peter Costello's values

Most notably absent during this period of heightened debate around Australian values was the public presence of the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, Amanda Vanstone. During this time, Vanstone and her department had become embroiled in controversy surrounding the wrongful deportation of Australian citizens and permanent residents including Cornelia Rau and Vivian Alvarez Solon. In her place, two senior male politicians, the treasurer Peter Costello and

Education Minister Brendan Nelson kept the values debate alive in the public sphere. Speaking on the day of the Summit with Muslim leaders held in Canberra, on 23 August, 2005, Peter Costello commented in relation to concerns about anti-American attitudes among certain migrant groups and related this to anti-Australian values sentiments. Firstly, he elaborated on his vision of Australian values:

... this is a country which is founded on a democracy. According to our Constitution, we have a secular state. Our laws are made by the Australian Parliament. If those are not your values, if you want a country which has Sharia law or a theocratic state, then Australia is not for you. This is not the kind of country where you would feel comfortable if you were opposed to democracy, parliamentary law, independent courts and so I would say to people who don't feel comfortable with those values there might be other countries where they'd feel more comfortable with their own values or beliefs. (Jones, 2005)

In this passage, Costello, like Howard, sets up a binary between secular Australian values and theocratic Sharia law. Sharia laws are described as the antithesis of democracy, parliamentary law and independent courts, this portrayal conjuring a negative image of Sharia law governing people with 'mob mentalities'. These differences between secular democratic states and Sharia-based theocratic states are presented as not conducive to community life and social cohesion. Later in the interview, Costello continued:

Essentially, the argument is Australia expects its citizens to abide by core beliefs – democracy, the rule of law, the independent judiciary, independent liberty. You see Tony, when you come to Australia and you go to take out Australian citizenship you either swear an oath or make an affirmation that you respect

Australia's democracy and its values. That's what we ask of people that come to Australia and if they don't, then it's very clear that this is not the country – if they can't live with them – whose values they can't share. Well, there might be another country where their values can be shared. (Jones, 2005)

So for Costello, values are also described as 'core beliefs'. The interviewer, Tony Jones from the current affairs program, *Lateline*, pressed the Treasurer to respond if he was suggesting deportation for migrants who did not embrace Australian values. Costello did not respond directly to the question. Instead he alluded to the idea that those citizens who did not respect Australia's democratic values and who had dual citizenship should 'exercise their other citizenship' (Jones, 2005, p. 3). The suggestion of deportation emphasises the precarious status of citizenship for the naturalised citizen and reinforces the idea that the granting of citizenship is indeed a privilege that the dominant culture with its superior values can threaten to take away from the migrant who does not respect democracy and independent law.

In the same interview, Costello went on to discuss what he saw as Anti-American sentiments in Australia, conflating these with anti-Western sentiments:

In some terrorist minds, if you're hitting a Westerner, you're hitting a legitimate target. The point I want to make is that because we're Westerners, in the minds of some terrorists we can be targets. So it's in our interests to defend the values of the West and it's in our interests to explain our policy. It's in America's interests to defend its own image and I would urge it to do so and I would also say to Australia's security – ... When I say that there is a danger of anti-Americanism in Australia amongst Australians, what I'm saying is, particularly

amongst younger Australians, if they don't understand the events of 1942 when the US was the principal ally defending Australia and without which we wouldn't have been able to defend the islands to our near north, if they don't understand that, they may not understand what the importance of the American alliance is to the defence of Australia and our strategic interests. (Jones, 2005, p. 3)

Again here Costello's comments conjure up the populist debate of a clash of civilisations and the West's civilising role as it brought freedom to the Pacific during World War II. He makes three references to the West in the above cited extract. By pointing out those young Australians who do not understand the significance of 1942, it can be presumed that these young people did not have ancestors who would have been familiar with this kind of historical knowledge, that is, Anglo-Australians who made up 98 per cent of the population in the early 1940s. Brendan Nelson, the Minister for Education, too, a few days later, told Muslims to accept our Australian values or to leave the country.

We don't care where people come from, we don't mind what religion they've got but what we want them to do is to commit to the Australian Constitution, Australian rule of law and basically, if people don't want to be Australians and they don't want to live by Australian values and understand them, well then they can basically clear off. (Hawley, 2005)

There is an inherent contradiction in Nelson's words. He states that 'we don't mind' where migrants originate from or what religion they hold, instantly setting up a binary between we the Australian people who are committed to the Australian constitution and

the rule of law and those migrants from other national and religious backgrounds who reject Australian values and do not want to be like us Australians. The assumption then is that there are migrants who do not want to be Australian like us. As Hage (1998, 2003a) argues, it is 'we' who have the privilege of 'not minding' if different people migrate to our nation and it is 'we' who can demand that they commit to our Australian way of life. More significantly, adopting our values is about 'wanting to be Australian' and not just an Australian citizen with benefits.

Nelson's involvement in the values debate reveals how specific technologies of government are not limited to one policy portfolio but connect with others, whether it concerns the civic education of new citizens or the teaching of values to primary school children. As Minister for Education, Nelson introduced the Australian values framework for school children discussed in chapter six. He ensured that the national myth surrounding Simpson and his donkey became immortalised as a national hero in the minds of school children. During that August 2005 interview, he stated that:

Simpson, which is part myth and part truth, is about an unarmed man with a donkey who, over some 40 days, rescued a number of injured and wounded men. He was unarmed and he represents everything that's at the heart of what it means to be an Australian. Simpson was a man who was prepared to put the interests and welfare of other human beings ahead of his own.

... if we lose sight of what Simpson and his donkey represents, then we will lose our direction as a country. (Hawley, 2005)

Nelson's appreciation for the Simpson legend was significant and was reflected in his department's work on the Australian Values Framework in a poster promoting values in

schools where the image of Simpson on his donkey was superimposed as background. For Nelson, Simpson symbolised the Australian ‘ethos’ of mateship where Australians are prepared to put the welfare and interests of their mates ahead of their own.

The National Plan to Build on Social Cohesion, Harmony and Security

One of the main outcomes of Howard’s summit with Muslim leaders was the implementation of a national action plan. The *National Plan to Build on Social Cohesion, Harmony and Security* (NAP) was a government initiative that focused on reinforcing ‘social cohesion, harmony and support for national security’ as an ‘imperative in Australia by addressing extremism, the promotion of violence and intolerance’ and was offered as a response to ‘the increased threat of global religious and political terrorism’ (DIAC, n.d. p. 1). Its main objectives and targeted stakeholders were ‘to address issues of concern to the Australian community and to support Australian Muslims to participate effectively in the broader community’ ((DIAC, n.d. p. 1). That is, the government-produced action plan insisted that Australian Muslims had to take responsibility for their effective participation or more precisely, effective integration into the Australian community. In short, the national action plan was a product of Islamophobia that had been gripping most of the Western world for nearly two decades. It should be noted too that the NAP’s release coincided with the non-renewal of the *Multicultural Federal Policy Statement 2003-2006* and no other statement on multiculturalism was released during the Howard Government’s remaining time in office.

In this national action plan, the problem of national security was added to the portfolio of social cohesion. The plan identified that Australians were in danger of being attacked by terrorists and that Australian youth were most at risk in being involved in this behaviour. It details:

The NAP seeks to address the underlying causes of terrorism, including the social and economic factors that encourage radicalization and motivate extremist behaviour ...

Shared Australian values are set out in the Citizenship pledge and National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools. In addition, all Australian governments have various mechanisms in place to protect the rights of all Australians through legislation on human rights, discrimination and vilification. (DIAC, n.d., p. 2)

The plan also featured the notion of ‘shared Australian values’ as the solution to the national threats proposed by people of Islamic faith and especially ‘Australian youth’. It targeted five focus areas which included education, reinforcing values and civics education, informing Australians about religious and cultural diversity and the training of religious leaders and teachers in Australia. In relation to ‘reinforcing values and civics education’, the national action plan specifically encouraged support for the extension of Australian civics and values education throughout the education sector as well as among leaders and teachers from different cultural and religious backgrounds (DIAC, n.d., p. 4). This mirrored governmental activities that had been initiated elsewhere such as the case in Netherlands whereby citizenship tests were specifically introduced in order to target Muslim religious leaders to integrate into the more ‘progressive’ Dutch society (de Leeuw & van Wichelen, 2012).

The NAP was a disciplinary mechanism that was meant to prevent national threats from non-Australian citizens. These threats were mainly thought of in terms of terrorism. It can be read as a mechanism that deals with this emergence of the securitisation of citizenship as a paramount governmental concern and conceptualised in terms of ‘risk societies’ and moral panics. In many Western liberal democratic nations, similar discourses were unfolding as the effects of globalisation spread. Here were old arguments: differences caused disunity and multiculturalism led to tribalism. Media claimed a clash of civilisations unfolding among increasingly trans-national populations. Something was needed to combat the ill-effects of differences that were manifesting themselves in dangerous ways in riots in Leeds, Paris, and Cronulla. In Australia, it was the notion of Australian values that was offered by the Howard Government as a mechanism that would assure security among the ever-increasing culturally diverse population.

It’s official: Australian values as government-sanctioned national identity

A few months later, public cries for the adoption of Australian values intensified during the Cronulla beach riots in December 2005 between Australian youth. One month after the riots in his 2006 Australia Day address to the National Press Club, Howard once again reiterated his concern for the lack of understanding among some migrants in regard to Australian values:

Australia’s ethnic diversity is one of the enduring strengths of our nation. Yet 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. (Howard, 2006)

In his address, Howard not only accentuated the values he believed were common to British-Australians but he also established a duality between old Australia and Australia's ethnic diversity. He implied that people born in other countries have different values, which threaten 'our values'. He proposed that a sense of shared values should be our social cement, that is, the solution to the crisis. Also implicit in Howard's speech was the question of how migrants can share our values if we celebrate their diversity. The solution suggested by Howard was the citizenship test as it would 'teach' national values to migrant communities who would then willingly forgo their diversity, and so reduce the need for any future government to resort to coercive measures (Chisari, 2012a). So Howard, through the discourse of Australian values, attempted to establish a citizen norm shaped by a particular kind of ethnicity, religion, and neoliberal ideology into which all others were expected to integrate (Johnson, 2007). This particular kind of ethnicity was white, its religion was Judeo-Christian and it was premised on the self-reliant and individualistic liberal citizen. Howard continued:

It would however be a crushing mistake to downplay the hopes and the expectations of a national family. We expect all who come here to make an overriding commitment to Australia, its laws and its democratic values. (Howard, 2006)

The duality between ‘we’ and ‘them’, ‘self’ and ‘other’ continued. The focus on commitment still resonated from the days of the FitzGerald Report. The treasurer, too, continued with his emphatic articulation of Australian values. Speaking soon after it was revealed that Howard had reneged on his promise to bequeath him the Liberal leadership, Costello put up a brave front, using debates around citizenship and national values to fuel his political ambitions. At a speech for the Sydney Institute in February 2006 he emphatically stated:

If you loved Uruguay, wanted to speak Spanish, loved Uruguayan food, culture and political institutions you would not mark out Australia as the place to pursue these passions. The fact that you have moved to Australia says that there is something about Australia that you do not find in your country of birth ...

People come to Australia and become Australian citizens because they want to embrace the things this country stands for. We should be proud that people from all over the world come here looking for Australian values, our values and to embrace them. (Costello, 2006)

Costello had a narrow view of what he defined to be Australian which clearly did not include any Uruguayan influences. In offering up the Spanish language and food as different to that in Australia, Costello was presenting a narrow view of what could be classified as Australian. The presumption was that being non-Anglo was the same as being non-Australian. Costello went on to identify the uniqueness of Australian values in his speech. They were not exactly the same as those articulated by Howard.

Costello’s (2006) Australian values consisted of economic opportunity, security, democracy, personal freedom, the physical environment and strong physical and social

infrastructure. This emphasis on economics was not just because he was Treasurer but it was indicative of a more general and neoliberal way of thinking that is strong today.

It was during this speech that Costello (2006) made his infamous remark in which he described multiculturalism as ‘confused, mushy and misguided’ and insisted that becoming a citizen of another country ‘changes people’s identity’. He also stated that:

We have a compact to live under a democratic legislature and obey the laws it makes. In doing this the rights and liberties of all are protected. Those who are outside this compact threaten the rights and liberties of others. They should be refused citizenship if they apply for it. (Costello, 2006)

In mentioning ‘a compact’, it appears that Costello was making reference to the Australian Compact that was recommended in the report by the Australian Citizenship Council in early 2000. It is interesting to note that after most of the Council’s recommendations had been rejected by the Howard Government, the Australian Compact resurfaced in the public sphere, now reconceptualised as Australian values. It is significant too, that at this time, the national multicultural statement was not renewed in 2006 while talk on Australian values escalated.

And then the M-word became the ‘dirty’ word (until it was no more)

During the reign of John Howard, we have seen a shift in policy and rhetoric from multiculturalism to citizenship to values. This is not evolution but a revolution, as the values debate is becoming the contrast rather than the continuum of multiculturalism. (Wakim, 2006)

At the same time as politicians were voicing rather loudly their demands that migrants adopt Australian values or get out, discussion around multiculturalism became subdued, until one day, 'the M-word' (Ang, 2001) that could not be fully named became the 'dirty word' (Hart, 2006) and finally it became the silent word that was never heard again during the final days of the Howard Government. Throughout the lead up to the introduction of the Australian citizenship test, debates revolved specifically around the notion of Australian values. Here Australian values can also be equated with Australianness and the Australian way of life and are exclusively attributed to Howard's preferred 'mainstream Australia'. As Ang (2001) argues, such notions can marginalise non-Anglo Australians and places the 'mainstream' outside of 'multicultural Australia' and constructs a struggle between old and new Australia (p. 100). Stratton (2011) argues that the dismantling of multiculturalism as government policy revealed how the dominance of British culture still prevailed (p. 12). Related to Howard's objective of dismantling multiculturalism was his desire to 'transform Australian society' by championing assimilation as 'a function of the neoliberal promotion of individualism' (Stratton, 2011, p. 12). According to Stratton (2011), the Prime Minister wanted to eradicate all forms of group alliance because he feared that these threatened the level market playing field that was supposed to 'optimise economic practice and generate wealth for all' (p. 13).

The articulation of an Australian values discourse was also predicated on the problematic that certain sections within migrant communities had a values deficit. The Prime Minister continued in his media release only three weeks after responses to the Discussion Paper, *Australian Citizenship: Much more than a Ceremony* had been received, stating that:

When you look at the source countries for Australia, migrants now, they come from all around the world. Some of them come from countries that don't, as much as we do, respect the equality of men and women for example. They come from some countries where the levels of democracy are not as high as they are in this country so there's all the more reason why it's important that we emphasise these things, because they are things that it's commonly accepted bind the Australian community together. (Howard & Robb, 2006, p. 4)

Australian values were hence presented as the solution, that is, as a civilising force for some migrants who have neither the correct levels of respect for equality of men and women nor the 'correct' level of respect for democracy. Because of these deficits, it was implied that some migrant communities posed a threat to the cohesiveness of the Australian community.

Thus, by the end of his governments' fourth term in office, the focus on celebrating the population's cultural diversity that had been enshrined in the policies and services of multiculturalism had now become unacceptable to Howard's national vision and were replaced with a focus on emphasising the individual responsibility of those seeking to become naturalised Australian citizens.

The coming together of the Howard project

During Howard's reign as Prime Minister, a transformation occurred from the policy of multiculturalism being classified as national identity to Australian citizenship being defined as central to national identity. The transformation was part of the 'Howard

Project', as Kunkel (2008) described it, which championed a particular narrative that Howard believed tapped 'a new mood of national self-confidence' and 'an Australia at ease with the world and with itself' (p. 13). Similarly, the Australian values section in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* ends with:

Australian citizenship is more than a ceremony. It is at the heart of Australia's national identity in the 21st century, as a nation at ease with the world and with itself. (p. 7)

Johnson (2007) concludes that Howard's 'depiction of Australian liberal values was one that emphasised economic liberalism and the individual, but downplays the social liberalism that also influenced Australian institutions' (p. 204). She states,

Howard's view is not a pluralistic conception that allows for multiple versions of Australian identity; it is a version that attempts to shut down debate around issues that Howard has constructed as divisive. (2007, p. 205)

Stratton (2011) concurs and elaborates that Howard's agenda was to balance the dismantling of the policy of multiculturalism with 'a renewed emphasis on Australia's British cultural foundation' (p. 3). This was to be achieved through the policy of social cohesion which involved incorporating new migrants into the existing Australian culture and therefore preserve the established Australian way of life (Stratton, 2011).

Throughout these discourses about migrants needing to embrace Australian values, migrant voices have been ignored. In the next section, I detail a brief ethnography of migrant perspectives on Australian values. My objective is to suggest that rather than evaluating Australian values and multiculturalism as true or false, good or bad, it is

more useful to explore how these discourses are taken up, that is, to show the contact point between technologies of domination and techniques of the self (Procacci, 2001) and the relationship between truth and subjectivity.

Discussing Australian values – some migrant perspectives

The Howard Government may have had a particular view about what constituted Australian values yet for many migrants wanting to become Australian citizens, Howard's values were still thought of in terms of citizens' rights. Interviews conducted with 30 migrants from non-English speaking backgrounds who were contemplating taking out Australian citizenship in the near future, revealed how Australian values were taken up by migrant subjects in their process of negotiating 'becoming' and 'belonging' in Australia. What follows are selected extracts from an ethnography that illustrates how migrant 'consumers' incorporate Australian values into their everyday lives practising what Stratton (1998) and Noble (2009) have described as 'everyday multiculturalism', a new form of multiculturalism that moves 'away from the heat of moral panic and state – and media – driven anxieties about social cohesion' (Noble, 2009, p. 51).

During the interviews, it was not easy for participants to talk about Australian values. There was a sense of awkwardness and even unease among the aspiring Australian citizens. Some faces looked puzzled; *What are Australian values? How can we migrants know what Australian values are? Yes of course, Australian values are 'good values'. Can we talk about Australian culture and Australian people instead?* Rather than discussing Australian values per se, many of the interviewed participants preferred instead to talk about values in terms of how to define Australian culture and Australian

customs. They defined Australian culture and customs by describing what they understood by ‘a typical Australian’.

According to many of the migrants interviewed, ‘real Aussies’ were ‘easy-going’, ‘relaxed’ and ‘friendly’. They agreed that Australians loved drinking beer, going to BBQs and enjoyed participating in leisure activities. All of the group members agreed that in order to be able to call yourself ‘a real Australian’, you had to be born in Australia and have a white and British heritage. Cathy from Korea stated that Australians were ‘people whose background is English like the convicts’. She summarised Australian culture as follows:

I believe that Australian culture is unique. Most Australians have individual characters. I think Australians have a strong identity. If there are problems they require to know it and talk (about) what they want to do ... They don’t follow the way, they improve their way. I think they know (with certainty) what they want to be. (Being) Australian is confidence, grandly and candour.

Cathy’s positive evaluation of the Australian character was echoed in the comments of many of the other participants. Similarly, most of the migrants interviewed believed that individual nationalities displayed their own unique set of national values. While some were unable to or felt uneasy about discussing the concept of Australian values, they were nevertheless happy to discuss their nation’s own values. It was during these conversations about the participants’ own national values that discussion became more animated and participants became more willing and comfortable with elaborating. Xiao from China declared that:

My country also has values. They are respect for older people and love younger people. For example, when I was a child, my parents always told me ‘you should respect older people and teachers, protect and love the people who are younger than you’.

Also be diligent and thrifty. When I was a child, my teacher and parents taught me, if people want to have a good life, they have to study hard and work hard. And if people want to be a good person, they should be saving money for ourselves and for our next generation.

Many of the Chinese, Korean and Japanese participants believed that hard work and respect for elders were essential values to live by in their home nations. Migrants from other countries such as Iran and Indonesia stated that a core value of their nation’s identity was to gain a high level of education so that they could improve their and their children’s future prospects. Sherry from China believed that young Australian people had no real appreciation for and understanding of the difficulty of obtaining a good education for students from other countries:

Children in Australia under 18 years old, they have quite loose surroundings because it is much easier to get into a university.

Migrant values

Many recently arrived migrants from ‘non-Western’ and non-English speaking backgrounds remarked at how much leisure time is valued in Australian culture. Maryam from Iran stated how ‘Australians go to the beach, gym, nobody works!’ For many of the participants, then, ‘Aussie relaxation’ is viewed in ambivalent ways and

some laughingly implied that ‘being relaxed’ is the ‘real’ Australian value. Another clear distinction that was made by the migrants wanting Australian citizenship related to the concept of family values in different national contexts. Elena from Macedonia stated that:

And of course we have the difference between the values, the morality. We are not the same. But we keep, for example, something from our country. We don’t accept it if we don’t like it and for example, if I have a child one day, I can’t tell them, ‘now you (are) 18, you go from my home’. You know I will take care of that child, of course if he doesn’t have a problem like drugs or alcohol or something like that. But even when we have the children with drugs and alcohol the mothers, they try to do something to save their children.

Elena’s reading of values recognises differences among different cultures. She implies that as a Macedonian woman, it is not part of her cultural practice for young adults to leave home as soon as they turn 18. Drawing also on discourses relating to traditional gender roles, she relates how if she were a mother, she would provide assistance and a home for her children even if they had fallen on hard times. For Elena, values are a form of morality that is governed by place and tradition. She is making a comparison between what she perceives to be the individualistic focus in Australian culture and the more traditional family-based values of her country. Maryam, too, draws attention to the fact that values are cultural inventions:

But I think that it’s not 100 per cent guaranteed if you want to live in Australia, you should live like Australians. Because we don’t know that Australian lifestyle is the best in the world. So it’s really good (for) government to, it’s a really good opportunity that a lot of immigrants from different countries come to

Australia. It is a good that a government learn the best thing from each community from each country, from people.

What is most interesting about Maryam's comments is that she opens up the possibility of Australian culture being influenced by a variety of migrant cultures and practices. Hers is not a fixed reading of Australian identity but a multicultural one which allows for the perspectives of others. It stresses the dynamics and fluidity of subjectivities and highlights the nation as a project of 'becoming' influenced by a changing population. As Ang (2011) argues, ethnicities and hybrid ethnicities 'keep being articulated and rearticulated as people form themselves into identity groupings in their quest for a sense of belonging in an insecure, rapidly changing world' (p. 29).

The value of multi-culture

A great deal of discussion focused on the popularity of multiculturalism in contemporary stories of Australia. Many claimed that one of the main reasons for coming to Australia was because it was a multicultural nation that promoted freedom and democracy. Cherry from China states:

I believe that the unique Australian culture is multicultural society. There is no other country like Australia that contains different cultures from all over the world. But I also believe that there is a main aspect of Australian culture.

Cherry's comments draw on popular narratives of Australia as the quintessential multicultural nation. It is contrasted with her own nation that is traditionally seen as a

homogenous community. Natalia from Russia, too, eloquently elaborates on this theme of everyday multiculturalism in Australian culture:

In my view, Australian culture is unique from the rest of the world. It is a multicultural country. Every suburb is different. There is a different lifestyle. People wear different clothes and cook national dishes. Australia has many different types of restaurants, cafes. You can hear many languages everywhere in the street, on the train. I like Australia because I can see the whole world at the same time.

I think Australians value their independence more than others. They don't like to hurt people and I think they are very polite people as well but they are quite lazy and they are very slow at work. I feel respect for Australians because they love their country very much.

Natalia's comments highlight the everyday multicultural practices of Australian life (Noble, 2009; Vasta, 2010; Wise, 2009):

I know Russia is very different. Russia has dominant Russian culture and you can hear just one Russian language. Russians like their home or flat very much but I think Russian people are more closer to each other than Australians. Russians like to give advice to other people and they are very helpful people. (Most) Russians don't like Russia as a country and they criticise it very often because Russians have very difficult life.

What these excerpts suggest then is that while the Howard Government attempted to eradicate the policy of multiculturalism from the national psyche, many recently arrived migrants view it as an essential quality that makes up Australian culture. All the

speakers stated that Australia's multicultural make-up was a positive aspect of Australian culture. They described how they were able to practise and maintain their 'original' culture and especially their language. For these migrants, the discourse of multiculturalism was a reality that epitomised the Australian way of life more so than the notion of Australian values. This reflects the findings made in the 2006 report, *Connecting Diversity* in which young respondents from culturally diverse backgrounds viewed multiculturalism as 'a particularly Australian experience' (Ang, Brand, Noble, & Sternberg, 2006, p. 17).

Similarly, Rose from Korea expressed these sentiments with enthusiasm and optimism:

In my opinion, Australia is an exciting place, is able to learn in the world if we don't need to go to many countries to understand about the world because we live in the multicultural. I have many friends who are Russian, Chinese, Lebanese. I believe that a unique culture has disappeared in the world. The world is getting closer; it's called 'globalisation'.

Rose's comments embody the positive effects of globalisation. Rather than viewing these effects as the end of unique cultures, Rose sees a 'closer world' forming where would-be citizens can learn from each other.

For many of the migrants interviewed who were contemplating becoming Australian citizens, being Western, being white or being of a British background was only one aspect of being Australian. Many stated that part of the Australian identity was also being multicultural. Similarly, the respondents in *Connecting Diversity* elaborated on the 'paradoxes' of multicultural Australia. They qualified their support for

multiculturalism by stating that in order to avoid its leading to intercultural tensions, migrants had to adapt to the Australian way of life and ‘integrate’ (Ang et al., 2006, p. 18).

Conclusion

Despite explicit governmental intervention through the introduction of a citizenship test that sought to promote the adoption of Australian values as a way of life, many migrants continue to praise Australia foremost as a multicultural nation that values freedom and democracy and find discussion about Australian values to be less significant than discussion about multiculturalism. Indeed, many of the participants interviewed for this study proclaimed that multiculturalism was a key characteristic of the Australian national identity. This freedom and democracy valued highly by migrants, form part of the Australian values that Howard had claimed that some migrants were lacking in or that they failed to appreciate.

Australian values were promoted as a form of morality that governments were to use to govern a diverse citizenry into integration, and that individual migrants were to embrace in order to regulate their position within that citizenry. The discourse of Australian values thus witnessed a shift from being promoted as part of a technology of domination: the Australian people must embrace Australian values, to a technology of the self: individual migrants and refugees must study, learn to love and live by Australian values if they want to belong to the Australian community. Values are about the quest for human progress. Australian values were also predicated on the notion that they could replace the discredited policy of multiculturalism. In this way, the inclusion

of Australian values in the public sphere was an attempt by Howard to re-introduce an old narrative of Australian identity that was based on being Anglo, being white and being Christian. Australian values can also be understood as a new order of knowledge invented by governments in order to regulate the conduct of the nation's citizenry. In other words, government-sanctioned notions of core national values serve to normalise populations' behaviour and demand government of the citizen-self through the production of truths known as Australian values. Australian values then become a form of national identity that 'the other' must embrace.

The other new order of knowledge that was essential for integrating into the mainstream community and passing the Australian citizenship test was knowledge of Australian history and it is to this subject that I turn next.

PART THREE:HISTORY AS ESSENTIAL KNOWLEDGE

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE GREAT ACHIEVERS IN A STORY OF AUSTRALIA

The cry goes up that one is murdering history whenever, in a historical analysis – and especially if it is concerned with thought, ideas or knowledge – one is seen to be using in too obvious a way the categories of discontinuity and difference, the notions of threshold, rupture and transformation, the description of series and limits. One will be denounced for attacking the inalienable rights of history and the very foundations of any possible historicity. (Foucault, 1969, p. 15)

What do you think about a test? You mentioned history, what do you think it's testing?

I think the history of Australia first, 'cause if you want to be a citizen of one country, you should know the previous things that have happened in a country. I'm an Iranian. I read the history in my primary school but I haven't remembered any of that but if you want to become a citizen of another country it is really good to know the history. You may not remember it later but at least you have an overview of the country. (Interview with Maryam from Iran, 2008)

A Story of Australia in Becoming an Australian Citizen

A version of Australian history was included in the Australian citizenship test as part of the Howard Government's project to integrate migrants into the broader Australian community. At the release of the draft resource booklet *Becoming an Australian Citizen* in August 2007, the Minister for Immigration, Kevin Andrews (2007b) stated that the primary objective of the test was to secure the integration of new citizens into the

Australian community by ‘ensuring that people who wish to become citizens of Australia know something about our heritage, our history, the values we share in common’. In making integration dependent on a knowledge of history, Andrews was echoing the sentiments of his Prime Minister who had long held the view that knowledge of Australian history produced a united citizenry and that ‘our past is a legitimate source of pride as well as confidence and self-understanding’ (Howard, 1995, p. 1). Howard believed that knowledge of Australian history was just as significant to migrants as their understanding of Australian values for it was the events in the nation’s past that had informed those values as well as defined and shaped what he termed the Australian way of life. And it was through the acceptance of this officially sanctioned historical knowledge contained in citizenship test resources that migrants would become ‘real’, knowing Australian citizens.

In this chapter, I investigate how the subject of history rose in importance under Howard’s Prime Ministership and contextualise this through a brief discussion on the history wars. I conduct a textual analysis of portrayals of the first settlers, diggers and women in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*. I identify a ‘shift’ in the role granted by government to the subject of history as a new mechanism of integration, whereby knowledge of history becomes disciplinary rather than an informative mode of knowledge. That is, it becomes a form of knowledge which has as its final objective the production of ‘docile’ knowledgeable citizens who are encouraged to accept the official version of Australian history contained in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*.

Howard's history

The production of the nation involves not only image and myth-making – the telling of ‘official’ stories of origin – but also the everyday negotiations of what it means ‘to be’ that nation(ality). The production of the nation involves processes of self-identification in which the nation comes to be realised as belonging to the individual (the construction of the ‘we’ as utterable by the individual).

... the production of the nation also involves imagining the nation *space*: it involves the projection of boundaries (nationhood as cartography), and the telling of stories about the authentic landscape. (Ahmed, 2000, p. 98)

The government's desire to link history, national identity and citizenship was first articulated in January 2006 during the Australia Day address to the National Press Club when Howard (2006) stated that in order to produce ‘informed and active citizens’, young Australians needed to be taught ‘the central currents of our nation's development’ including Indigenous history, ‘the great and enduring heritage of Western civilisation’ and ‘the ideas that galvanised the Enlightenment’. During his speech, Howard directed his attention to Australian youth of ‘multiple categories’ stating that,

In the end, young people are at risk of being disinherited from their community if that community lacks the courage and confidence to teach its history. This applies as much to the children of seventh generation Australians or Indigenous children as it does to those of recent migrants, young Australian Muslims, or any other category one might want to mention. (Howard, 2006)

In the above extract, although Howard uses ‘multiple categories’ to describe the different groups that make up the Australian population (‘seventh generation Australians’, ‘Indigenous children’, ‘recent migrants’, ‘young Australian Muslims’), the concept of the Australian community is singular, as is that community’s particular history. The implication is that it is a ‘homogenous’ community or ‘national family’ with a unique history.

Howard’s preoccupation with the nation’s past is well-known. The way historical events were taught, portrayed and exhibited had become a long-term project of his and this interest was sustained throughout his tenure as Prime Minister (Bonnell & Martin, 2008; Macintyre & Clark, 2003; Stratton, 1998; Tavan, 2009). Even before his electoral victory in 1996, Howard had entered the debate in defending Australian history from what he saw as incumbent Prime Ministers and academic elites politicising and using history in order to push their agenda of political correctness (Johnson, 2000; McKenna, 1997). In a frank interview with the current affairs program, *Four Corners*, Howard spoke to journalist Liz Jackson on his future vision for Australia. Perhaps anticipating his electoral victory, Howard was articulating his desire for a happy and well-ordered Australian population, revealing that:

By the year 2000 I would like to see an Australian nation that feels comfortable and relaxed about three things: I would like to see them comfortable and relaxed about their history; I would like to see them comfortable and relaxed about the present and I’d also like to see them comfortable and relaxed about the future...
(Jackson, 1996)

In what has now become recognised as one of the most cited quotes of the Howard years, Howard's statement of desiring a 'comfortable and relaxed' population encourages multiple readings. To be 'comfortable' means to not be anxious while being 'relaxed' similarly can be understood as the state of experiencing no tensions or worries. Howard's bigger national project of requesting a relaxed and comfortable nation therefore was about reassuring the 'mainstream' that national insecurities and anxieties could be appeased. A desire for relaxation and comfort always presupposes a response to unease. Another definition of 'relaxed' then is to lessen the severity of, in this case, national guilt (Elder, 2007) about white 'settlement' and it also means to return to a state of equilibrium, invoking Howard's desire for 'balance', a term he borrowed from the conservative historian Geoffrey Blainey (1993). Comfort, too, has the meaning of easing or relieving pain and discomfort and of pacifying. So for Howard, desiring a relaxed and comfortable citizenry was part of affective governing.

It would take another ten years after his television broadcast expressing his desire for a relaxed and comfortable Australia for Howard to turn his interest to ensuring that new citizens adopted the correct version of Australian history, one that was balanced and recognised the numerous achievements of the Australian people especially the first white settlers. This desire for migrants to adopt Howard's preferred version of Australian history coincided with the emergence of the discourses around Australian values that his government was promoting following the Cronulla Beach Riots. Hence, through the figure of the model, docile, naturalised citizen, Howard hoped to secure the well-being of the Australian people and their national story, that is, the 'Howard Project' aimed to foster 'a renewed spirit of national self-confidence' (Kunkel, 2008, p. 14).

This quest for a relaxed and comfortable citizenry can be further contextualised through what has come to be known as the Australian culture or history wars, a period of intense debate spanning more than 30 years ‘over the degree and violence of killing on the Australian frontier’ (Curthoys & Docker, 2006, p. 229). These debates are often portrayed as two opposing sides, that is, a contest between the ‘black armband’ side that apparently ‘belittle past achievements’ and encourage a ‘guilt industry and impedes rational thinking on current problems’ (McKenna, 1997, p. 2) and the other ‘whitewash’ view held by those who are accused of not accepting ‘that past wrongs must be fully recognised before present problems can be resolved’ (McKenna, 1997, p. 2).

Howard set about producing a relaxed and comfortable citizenry through the use of various mechanisms that would address the issues that he hoped would finally put an end to the history wars. As already mentioned, he intervened in the development of the primary school curriculum by introducing A National Values Framework to enhance values education for young students. He was concerned about the layout of exhibitions in the National Museum of Australia suspecting it pampered to political correctness and commissioned a review which resulted in the contract for the museum’s Indigenous director, Dawn Casey not being renewed (Casey, 2006, p. 122). And in the same year that he had berated the teaching of history in his Australia Day Address to the National Press Club, Howard convened the History Summit of what he and his Education Minister Julie Bishop referred to as the “Sensible Centre” ‘in order to conduct a review of the teaching of history in high schools’ (Department of Education Science and Training, 2006). He had been critical of history education in Australian schools, accusing it of having fallen victim to postmodernist theorists who had poisoned it with ‘a stew of themes and issues’ rather than producing his preferred narrative format that,

in his opinion, best promoted the greatness of the Australian nation (Howard, 2006). Curthoys' critique of the Howard Government's policy on Australian history aptly captures the activities of its decade in office:

It sees history in national terms only, and is directing funds to those aspects of history that express a very particular narrow, and conservative national vision. It is a history which values military intervention, even when it may have not been justified, which emphasises sport and European foundations of the nation, which stresses achievements rather than difficulties and problems which have helped make us what we are. It has little time for social history, for women's history, for environmental history, or for Indigenous history when it actually has implications for action in the present. (2007, p. 8)

A good citizen then, should only focus on historical content that is 'complete' or 'finished' and that does not require 'action in the present', the preferred approach reflected in the historical content included in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*. Howard himself had articulated similar views stating in his 1995 *Politics and Patriotism* speech that 'the art of good statecraft has always been to preserve from the past that which continues to serve the national interest, while discarding the tired and the failed' (Howard, 1995, p. 9). Curthoys (2007) makes a similar point when discussing the Howard Government's Aboriginal policy, stating that the objective was to 'minimize, but not do away with entirely, recognition of past injustices towards Aboriginal people' (p. 8). She concludes that for the Howard Government it was vital that 'the past be separated rigidly from the present' and it insisted that any regrettable deeds in the past had nothing to do with the present day situation as the population needed to 'move on'. In short, there was to be 'no sense of reparation' (Curthoys, 2007, p. 8).

Viewing the nation's past from this perspective, aspiring citizens would learn that there were no 'Aboriginal problems' that they would have to engage with as new Australian citizens. Hence, the version of Australian history included in the resource booklet *Becoming an Australian Citizen* was not being used to provide a useful context or what Maryam at the beginning of this chapter had called an 'overview of the nation'. Instead it was used with the expectation that knowledge of this history would produce conforming, knowledgeable citizens, integrated into existing Australian norms and living by a specific set of values that they mastered through self-study.

History and national identity

John Howard's attempt to conflate history and national identity is nothing new. Historians have shown us that history has often been used as an essential form of regulatory knowledge to ascribe official versions of modern day national identities (Berger, 2007). Stratton (1998) writes that throughout his political career, Howard used the topic of history to reinstate a 'triumphalist version of Australian history' which in turn, 'legitimizes Howard's claim to the centrality of an Anglo-Celtic mainstream culture in the formations of Australian national identity' by excluding the 'other' like the Indigenous peoples and ethnic groups from this history (p. 105). Thus he concludes that battles over Australian history are also battles over Australia's identity which have the objective of asserting the 'positive "virtues" apparently manifested in that history as the basis of the Australian national identity' (Stratton, 1998, p. 120).

In his critique of modern history's Eurocentrism, Chakrabarty (1992) also writes that the role of history is related to universalising the nation-state as 'the most desirable

form of political community' (p. 350). He continues that the discipline of history is a knowledge form that corresponds to the nation-state and that makes it possible for nations to 'enforce their truth-games' (Chakrabarty, 1992, p. 350). Chakrabarty advocates a history that is not complicit with 'modernizing narratives' like that of citizenship, and states:

I ask for a history that deliberately makes visible, within the very structure of its narrative forms, its own repressive strategies and practices, the part it plays in collusion with the narratives of citizenships in assimilating to the projects of the modern state all other possibilities of human solidarity. (1992, p. 353)

Thus, Chakrabarty recommends an historical analysis by post-colonial historians that aims to 'provincialize Europe'. In the context of teaching history to aspiring citizens, we can put this 'provincialising' into practice by including histories from a range of sources and with a range of perspectives that neither present the national story as yet another example of Enlightenment success nor as a homogenous national community's ultimate march towards progress. This, however, was not the approach taken for the history depicted in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*.

Curthoys (2007), too, argues that history has very often been 'the handmaiden of the nation state' that organises its knowledge in national terms in order to explicitly serve the interests of the nation according to the mood of the time (p. 8). Berger (2007) reminds us how with most nations, history has become 'the foundation of national identity' and that this history has to be 'a preferably proud and heroic history'. This certainly was Howard's preferred singular interpretation of history. The effect was that it marginalised those not represented. Howard's insistence on the inclusion of

Australian history in citizenship test resources was motivated by his ‘own specific political and ideological interests’ (Tavan, 2009, p. 130) and it was a use of history that had its own particular ‘subtleties, nuances, purposes and meanings’ (Curthoys, 2007, p. 5).

The relationship between history and national identity can further be observed in discourses around the Australian citizenship test. Content relating to Australian history equated to 37 per cent of the total of the 46 page booklet which was considerable when compared with other mandatory forms of knowledge such as Australian values which constituted only seven per cent of the booklet’s total content. The five practice questions, too, included in the booklet and on the Department of Immigration and Citizenship’s website included a question on history which related to the iconic cricketer, Don Bradman. Yet, anecdotal reports from many test candidates suggested that there were not many questions relating to history included in the actual Australian citizenship test. Rather, the content of history included for self-study worked as a performative act that aimed to reassure the ‘mainstream’ community that new citizens would appreciate their history and its heroes during a period of time when the nation’s past was highly contested.

As Tosh (2008) argues, studying a nation’s history becomes synonymous with engaging in civic education as history’s place in citizenship becomes ‘an accepted piety’. So here we see the addition of citizenship discourses to the already conflated notions of history and national identity. Tosh’s (2008) argument is significant in illustrating how historical knowledge is viewed as a resource to ‘teach respect for the nation’ and for producing a ‘critically empowered citizenry’, that is, by studying the subject of history, citizens

acquire the ‘power of judgement’, and this produces informed public debates about current affairs. Yet there is also the traditional practice of putting history to work in order to ‘instil patriotism and deference’ in the population (Tosh, 2008). Instead Tosh (2008) advocates a ‘plurality of interpretation’ which can guard against the danger of history becoming propaganda.

The historian as expert

In the discipline of history, professional historians are often held up to be ‘experts who are more likely than others to fashion histories that are truthful – that represent the past as it really was’ (Neumann, 2008, p. 20). Historians have been described as ‘pedagogues of the nation’ and second only to military power, ‘the pen of the historian is the most powerful weapon of national ambitions’ (Berger, 2007). Tosh asks what should be the role of the historian, that is, the citizen-scholar and aptly concludes that:

Good citizenship consists in contributing (historians’) expertise to the national conversation: exposing politically slanted myth, placing our concerns in more extended narratives, testing the limits of analogy, and above all showing how familiarity with the past can open the door to a broader sense of the possibilities in the present. (Tosh, 2008)

In studies of governmentality, the role of expert is also associated with the role of truth-teller (Rose, 2000). Emerging out of nineteenth century liberalism, the government of individuals, families, markets and populations developed a form of authority that arose out of a ‘claim to knowledge, to neutrality, and to efficacy’ (Rose, 1996, p. 39). This expertise, as this form of authority is known as, makes liberal rule operable by offering

solutions to the ‘apparent oppositions between the need to govern in the interests of morality and order, and the need to restrict government in the interest of liberty and economy’ (Rose, 1996, p. 39). That is, it is through the authority of experts that governments ‘govern at a distance’ (Rose, 1996, p. 46). Rose (1996) concludes that advanced liberal rule ‘seeks to degovernmentalize the State and de-statize practices of government, to detach the substantive authority of expertise from the apparatuses of political rule’ (p. 41). In the context of the Australian citizenship test, these experts are relocated within bureaucracies and universities, requiring the employment of immigration officials and historians. Expert knowledge then seeks to govern through the ‘aspirations to self-actualization and self-fulfilment’ of the aspiring citizen (Rose, 1996, p. 41).

In the case of the Australian citizenship test, the Howard Government employed conservative historian John Hirst from La Trobe University as the expert who would write the definitive version of Australian history that was included in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*. Hirst had extensive experience working on government projects including participation in the History Summit and as a council member for the National Museum of Australia. Hirst had also served on the 1993 Prime Minister’s Republic Advisory Committee, the Commonwealth Civics Education Group and the Film Australia Board. As previously discussed, he had contributed to the production of the *Developing Democracy* teaching resources for primary school children.

Describing him as ‘one of our most eminent historians’, Warren Pearson, the National Director of the National Australia Day Council, commissioned Hirst in 2006 ‘to explore and question, to examine the nature and the roots of the national character so we might

better understand the people we have become' (Hirst, 2007a, 'Preface'). In the context of preparing resources on civic education for adult migrants and refugees, his employment was somewhat unusual. Despite being described as a 'historian-cum-controversialist' (Hirst, 2006), Hirst was not identified as a key player in the history wars and has been praised by scholars (Guyver, 2011) for his innovative and maverick methods and his 'cool eye' reflecting his 'traditional decency' as 'a scrupulous taker-apart of formulas' (Craven, 2010).

In search of good history⁶

Increasingly I have been attracted to the historical sociologists – particularly Ernst Gellner and his school – who know history is important but who tell only the history that matters for their purpose, that is, what explains the current configurations of society, politics and culture. (Hirst, 2008, p. 31)

Hirst(2008) evaluated the draft he was given by the Prime Minister to be included in the citizenship booklet as 'appallingly bad' with 'disconnected information' that he believed did not detail 'causes, consequences and significance' (p. 31). It is not publicly known who wrote this original draft on Australian history although Hirst (2008) confirms that all of the ensuing editing came from the Prime Minister's Office. After receiving the text, he offered to rewrite the text in a thematic format, knowing too well from his involvement with the History Summit that John Howard preferred history to be written as a structured narrative (2008, p. 31). To Hirst's surprise, the Howard Government accepted his offer and it also accepted his version that appeared in the

⁶ Versions of this chapter have been previously published. See Chisari 2009, 2012a, 2012b

ultimate version of *Becoming an Australian Citizen* with only minimal changes (2008, p. 28).

Hirst (2008) approached this project as ‘the recorder of myth and memory’ (p. 32) claiming that he was not embodying his own views and while not wanting to offend either the Liberal or Labor parties, he was attempting to represent an objective and non-political, ‘fair-minded and balanced’ portrayal of Australian history (p. 31). Foucault (1984) describes this as the historian’s belief in ‘an apocalyptic objectivity’ (p. 87). For Hirst (2006), history is the ‘discipline of studying the evidence’ (p. 3). Put another way, Hirst (2006) believes that the ‘test’ for determining if the discipline of history has been respected is to ask ‘has the evidence been produced to support this interpretation’ (p. 8). In relation to the citizenship resource booklet, he wanted to write a history that ‘should attempt to capture what Australians of today knew and valued and celebrated in their history’ (2008, p. 32). Hirst (2008) believed that in preparing such a history of the nation ‘for general use’, government should choose its historian and ‘if at all possible accept what he or she wrote rather than altering in-house’ because it would give ‘the government distance and may bring it credit’ (p. 32). Furthermore, a good historian, Hirst (2004) had suggested was one that shared his own mother’s good traits of being ‘calm and non-judgmental’ and ‘very unwilling to see wickedness’ (p. 87).

Despite his expressed desire for being a ‘fair-minded and balanced’ historian, Hirst saw no contradiction in publicly declaring his support for the Howard Government. Four years earlier in a newspaper article entitled *Why I vote for Howard*, Hirst divulged that the main issues that influenced his conversion to conservative politics were the

governmental treatment of multiculturalism and Aboriginal policy. On multicultural policy, Hirst (2003) wrote:

I was a critic of multiculturalism. Not because I was an opponent of immigration. I was opposed to multiculturalism when, as was often the case, it was presented as a program for the total reshaping of Australian society. Australia was to be remade by the contributions from all its ethnic groups. Old Australians were recast as one ethnic group among many, though the most despised and suspect, and they were certainly denied the status of the host culture.

As becomes evident from the textual analysis that follows, the theme of promoting ‘old Australia’ as the host culture in Australia’s identity still persists in Hirst’s *A Story of Australia*. In relation to ‘Aboriginal policy’, Hirst (2003) wrote:

I queried the approach that called for more land rights and campaigns against white racism as the solution to the problems of remote Aboriginal communities. I suggested that Aborigines were unemployed because they lived where there were no jobs and that would not be healthy until their communities ceased to be dysfunctional.

Hirst’s preferred story of Australian history hence was not to explore these ‘dysfunctional’ communities but to focus instead on the theme of progress and continuities and hence make them disappear or become more palatable for the national story. He strongly believed that there was ‘such a thing as an Australian national character’ (2007a, ‘Preface’) and it was these characteristics that he hoped to document in his historical writings. In the next section, I explore the portrayals of the great

achievers in *A Story of Australia*. I present a comparative analysis between three key texts. The first text is the draft written by Hirst before it was edited by the Prime Minister's office and which he later published in the book, *The Australians*. I compare this text with the final edited version of the historical content that was included in the citizenship resource booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen* and entitled *A Story of Australia*. I also engage with Hirst's article, 'Australia: The Official History', published in *The Monthly* in February 2008 which explained his method as an historian.

The founding population of Australia in *A Story of Australia*

The founding population of Australia was made up of the English, the Scots, the Irish ... Their lively spirit made its mark on the emerging Australian identity. (p. 28)

The history section begins on page 17 as part of the section entitled *Part 2 – Our land, our nation*. It is preceded by *Part 1 – What does being an Australian mean?* – and ends on page 33. The section *A story of Australia* is preceded by two subsections, *The Australian people today* and *Australia's name and symbols*. The section that follows entitled *Part 3 – Governing the country*, deals with civics information in Australia and is allocated only seven pages in the booklet while in *Part 1* there are only three pages dedicated to information relating to Australian values. Learning about Australian history was evidently an important and weighted component of the Australian citizenship test.

The historical content of *A Story of Australia* covers a range of topics beginning with *Early Australia* (p. 17), *Early European exploration* (p. 17), *Captain James Cook* (p.

17), *Convict settlers* (p. 17), *A harsh country* (p. 19), *Diggers* (p. 21), *Economy and politics* (p. 24), *Sport* (p. 26), *Nation* (p. 28) with a concluding section on *Aboriginal people* (p. 32). It begins with a brief description of Indigenous peoples' coming to Australia from Indonesia some 40 to 60,000 years ago (p. 17) and ends with the declaration that Australia faces an ongoing challenge with the plight of modern day Aboriginal people sharing in the life and prosperity of the nation (p. 33).

By his own account, Hirst (2008) did not write the introduction or the conclusion to this history section. He had proposed, instead, to commence his *A Story of Australia* with the section entitled *Convict settlers*, a field in which he has specialised. Hirst's proposed opening line read, 'Australia is unique in that most of its first European settlers were convicts' (2010, p. 28). In the final version of the booklet, this sentence is preceded by three added sections on Australian history entitled *Early Australia*, *Early European exploration* and *Captain James Cook* (p. 17) as perhaps, the un-named editors of the booklet may have determined that introducing convict settlers before portrayals of Indigenous peoples and Captain Cook was not an appropriate story-telling genre reflecting the Prime Minister's preference for a 'national story' that was continuous and linear in structure.

The official account of Australian history in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* is written as a thematic narrative that is mainly concerned with a nation's trajectory towards progress. It begins with the usual 'primary school project heroes' that feature all male European explorers and settlers such as Captain James Cook, Arthur Phillip and Lachlan Macquarie. Phillip is described as a benevolent leader who 'safely' navigated the First Fleet to Australia and 'took great care' in feeding the convicts in those early

days of British settlement (p. 18). Macquarie is ‘remembered with great affection’ for his compassionate treatment of ‘reformed convicts’ (p. 18). These settlers are described as ‘pioneers’ who conquered this ‘harsh country’, that is, ‘a hostile environment for humankind’ (p. 19) and ‘a country that can destroy you’ (p. 20). In this particular Australian narrative, the arrival of the British is described as a great peaceful and pioneering feat as the ‘first’ settlers tamed an inhospitable land. In this Australian story, it is the convict settlers who are attributed the success of nation-building as they found ‘new opportunities in this strange colony’ (p. 18). Readers are reminded that Aboriginal people, described at the beginning of this historical section as ‘hunters and gatherers’ (p. 17) who had ‘learnt to manage and live in this environment’ (p. 19), also ‘suffered’ during drought periods as ‘their population remained small’ (p. 19) for more than 40,000 years.

Hirst did not believe that general Australian histories should start with a ‘chapter describing Aboriginal society and culture’ because, as he had previously claimed, those kinds of histories were ‘a primitivist way of acknowledging the priority of Aboriginal occupation’ which, in his view, did not make for ‘intelligible history’ because there was no connection between this initial chapter on Aboriginal history and the rest of Australian history (2006, p. 63). ‘Primitivist’ refers to a way of juxtaposing Indigenous communities’ way of life with modern life and its technologically developed ways of living. Hirst (2006) further explains in his book, *Sense and Nonsense in Australian History*,

The European discovery rather than Aboriginal occupation constitutes Australia’s pre-history. Australia – its economy, society and polity – is a construction of European civilisation. Australia did not exist when

traditional Aborigines occupied the continent. Aborigines have been participants in Australian history, but that story begins with all the others in 1788. (p. 62)

For Hirst then, 'Australia' was a singularly British concept that did not exist even as New Holland when other non-British European explorers had 'discovered' it. The inclusion of the explorers Jansz, Vaez de Torres and Tasman on page 17 had not been proposed by Hirst in his draft. Furthermore, Hirst did not believe that the 'Aboriginal occupation' over thousands of years had made any lasting contribution to the continent as he continues that, 'the same land and resources which sustained scattered bands of hunter-gatherers were made to support within one generation of European settlement a much larger population settled in cities, towns and farms' (2006, p. 63). It is understandable then, that Hirst had wanted to start his official history in the citizenship resource booklet with the coming of the Europeans, the convict settlers whom he claimed had built the Australian nation (2006, p. 63) rather than the Aboriginal people who merely occupied space and did not make any use of the land or build cities.

For Hirst, like Howard, the idea of what Australia is never changes. He had previously written 'the history of the mother country cannot be left behind; it remains the context in which colonial society forms and lives' (2007a, 'Preface'). Hence there was no need to name Great Britain as the mother country in this text because for Hirst, the history of Great Britain or Europe works as a 'master narrative' and as 'a silent referent in historical knowledge' (Chakrabarty, 1992, p. 337). Hirst (2006) too makes a similar comment explaining his teaching of Australian history as follows:

Since Australia is an outgrowth of England, European civilisation is also the field of study for an intelligible history of Australia... Australian history not set within European civilisation will convey a very poor understanding of Australian society. (p. 78)

Hirst hence concludes this statement by stating that as part of his appointment at La Trobe University to teach Australian history, he began teaching ‘a course on European civilisation beginning with classical Athens’ that is, in his own words, ‘I am still fulfilling my brief – I am introducing Australian students to their history’ (2006, pp. 78-79).

Despite his protestations against a narrative format, Hirst also succumbs to conventions of a linear presentation of history where events show a trajectory towards improvement and a naturalised notion of progress. In his influential writings on postcoloniality, Chakrabarty describes this centring practice of history as essentially a European enterprise. This practice is reflected in the sub-section entitled *Nation* in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* which begins:

The founding population of Australia was made up of the English, Scots and Irish. They were different people with different traditions and had been in the past at war with each other... In this new country the three groups mixed with each other and did not live in separate communities.

On the whole they did not want old world disputes and bitterness to take root here. (p. 28)

The theme of the English, Scots and the Irish forming the Australian nation was repeated throughout Hirst's historical writings (2006, 2008, 2010). Hirst makes multiple references to this 'founding population'. Furthermore, in *A Story of Australia*, colonisation is not mentioned and the arrival of the British is described as 'a voyage of discovery' (p. 17). Nor is the violence that accompanied British colonisation recognised in the citizenship resource booklet as factual knowledge for aspiring citizens to learn. Hirst's expressed view was that colonisation by its very nature had to be violent and he scoffs at the notion that it could have been otherwise (2006, p. 83). In this way, we can infer from the content that was included in *A Story of Australia* that Hirst's expressed intentions of not recording his own views were not realised.

Diggers in a peaceful land

While the British settlers are recognised as the pioneers of the nation, the highest accolades in the resource booklet are reserved for the diggers of Australia. Two whole pages are dedicated to Australia's military prowess which is the same number of pages dedicated to Indigenous history. The section entitled *Diggers* begins with the following extract:

Except for small scale battles between settlers and Aboriginal people, Australia has been a remarkably peaceful country. There have been no civil wars or revolutions. It is strange, then, that it has a very strong military tradition and that the ordinary soldier, the digger, is a national hero. (p. 21)

This extract has been written from the viewpoint of white Australians as by promoting Australia's 'peaceful' military tradition, the booklet is drawing on a popular narrative advocated by many contemporary historians. Geoffrey Blainey (1993) has argued that 'Australia won democracy with relative ease in a series of bloodless steps' (p. 13). For critical historians and cultural theorists, the claim that there were only 'small scale battles' among Indigenous and white Australians is highly contested (Ryan, 2010; Schlunke, 2005) and is discussed in the next chapter.

Hirst's matter-of-fact style of writing overlooks this debate and focuses instead on informing the prospective citizen of the origins of the Anzac legend where the qualities of 'mateship, endurance' and 'humour in the face of adversity' are attributed to the ordinary Australian soldier (p. 21). The aspiring citizen reading this history is informed that today's diggers were considered 'larrikins' in the past but are now highly regarded as 'peacekeepers' that is, 'regular soldiers under tight discipline, not volunteers for a particular war, but retaining their Australian character and style' (p. 22). This trend of the 'militarisation of Australian history' (Curthoys, 2007) had begun under Keating and continued during Howard's term as Prime Minister. The Federal Government has provided massive funding to the Department of Veterans' Affairs and the Australian War Memorial in order to actively promote 'public knowledge and understanding of Australia's military heritage and its importance in shaping the nation' (Curthoys, 2007, p. 7).

In a similar way, this emphasis on Australia's military heritage with its accompanying heroes was also applied to the history that prospective citizens were to learn. In particular, the section on the *Diggers* foregrounds the story of John Simpson

Kirkpatrick as the man who embodies all these good characteristics of Australian diggers. More commonly referred to as *Simpson and his donkey* because he carried wounded soldiers on a donkey's back from the frontline to the shore, Simpson was a stretcher-bearer at Gallipoli during World War I and has become a national icon, immortalised in national monuments, political speeches and Australian folklore. The Howard Government, too, was a key proponent of promoting the Simpson legend, recalling Education Minister Brendan Nelson's comments in 2005 that Simpson and his donkey is an 'example of what's at the heart of our national sense of emerging identity... He was unarmed and he represents everything that's at the heart of what it means to be an Australian' (Hawley, 2005).

It is somewhat odd that the government held up an Englishman as embodying the Australian character when the Gallipoli legend is often seen as the time when the Australian diggers distinguished themselves from the British. The booklet states,

The soldiers had laid to rest the doubts that British colonists had gone soft in sunny Australia, or were infected with bad convict blood, or were too ill-disciplined to be good soldiers. (p. 21)

By today's standards, Simpson's desertion from his merchant ship in search of a better life in Australia in 1910 could be frowned upon. He becomes an unlikely hero when we acknowledge that asylum seekers who come illegally on boats to Australia's shores are labelled as queue jumpers yet they acted in a similar fashion to Simpson 100 years ago. It should be noted too that it is these asylum seekers who were the original target audience for the Australian citizenship test.

Other military stories about World War II included in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* were those of John Monash, 'who has come close to having heroic status' (p. 21) and that of Edward 'Weary' Dunlop, a doctor 'who protected his men at the risk of his own life and who ran the makeshift operating room that helped keep men alive' (p. 22).

Dunlop is described as the hero of the 'dreadful captivity' on the Thai-Burma railway:

One of the sharpest Australian memories of the war is the cruel treatment meted out to these men by the Japanese. Many died but Australians looked after each other better than the other captives and made less distinction between officers and men. (p. 22)

What is interesting about this extract cited above is that the Japanese are signalled out for their 'cruelty' while the Australian soldiers are held up as more egalitarian than the other captives. This extract reflects many of the myths of the Australian national character. Hirst (2007a) repeated this example again in his book, *The Australians*, this time repeating the examples of Gallipoli and Weary Dunlop and at the same time adapting the 'good old Aussie spirit' to a more recent event:

In 2002 many Australians were killed and injured in the terrorist attack in Bali. At the local hospital there was a shortage of everything the doctors needed, including pain-killers. Graeme Southwick, the Australian doctor who took charge of the 'Australian' ward, asked patients to assess their own pain level. Time and time again the patients said they were alright; they told him to give the drugs to the person next to them who was suffering more. (Hirst, 2007a, p. 1)

What is astonishing about this extract cited above is that the Bali bombing is presented exclusively as an incident that affected the lives of Australians. In fact, there were 88

Australians killed out of the total of 202 victims who originated from Indonesia and other nations. Thus, as with the example in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, Hirst only reports on the hardships faced by Australians caused by ‘cruel’ others which suggests that only the deaths of Australians are worth recording for posterity.

The non-chief human actors of history

Examples such as Simpson and the Anzac legend are useful for understanding the theme of ‘men making history’ that underlines much of the text in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*. This theme is also reflected in the booklet’s pictorial representations. Scattered throughout the pages from 17 to 34 are images of explorers, war heroes, diggers, more soldiers, drovers with their sheep, Aboriginal dancers, AFL and soccer players including ‘the best known’ Australian batsman of all times who requires no introduction. Surprisingly, Simpson and his donkey are not pictured, instead the legendary racehorse, Phar Lap is portrayed. Those men who have traditionally been celebrated as the great heroes in Australian history like Cook, Macquarie, Burke, Wills and Barton are also immortalised in the pages of *Becoming an Australian Citizen*.

Yet in relation to female achievers, the only well-known women pictured are the current reigning monarch, Queen Elizabeth II and the opera singer, Dame Nellie Melba. Other images of women in *A Story of Australia* show them in ancillary roles as wives and mothers in family portraits, white women of the Great Depression serving at a soup kitchen and a modern-day Indigenous woman serving food in a coffee shop. These are the faces of Australia according to the official booklet on Australian citizenship.

In *A Story of Australia*, there are short written descriptions of eight well-known Australian women. Three are sportswomen: two tennis players, Margaret Court and Evonne Goolagong who ‘won all the great international competitions’ in the 1960s and 1970s (p. 27) as well as Cathy Freeman who is described as ‘an Aboriginal athlete’ who ‘lit the Olympic cauldron’ (p. 27). The other five women granted a place in Australia’s history are Caroline Chisholm (p. 18), Nancy Bird Walton as ‘the youngest Australian woman to gain a pilot’s licence’ (p. 20), parliamentarians Edith Cowan and Enid Lyon (p. 25) and Louisa Lawson, the mother of Henry Lawson (p. 28). Louisa Lawson is praised for her work as ‘a newspaper proprietor, journalist, poet and feminist whose journalistic and political efforts did much to make the vote for women a precondition for a federated Australia’ (p. 28). The most comprehensive acknowledgement is reserved for Caroline Chisholm. The biographical text reads as follows:

English woman Caroline Chisholm who came to Australia with her army officer husband in 1838 became known as the ‘the Immigrant’s Friend’. She worked to improve life on the ships bringing people to Australia and helped people start new lives. She found accommodation and employment for women and girls and started a loan plan to break the cycle of dependence and poverty. (p. 18)

Although this list of women achievers is a little scant, there is nothing uncommon about their inclusion in an official history for migrant learners of Australian history. Yet what is extraordinary about their inclusion in the citizenship resource booklet is that with the exception of the three sportswomen mentioned, the other women included in the final booklet had not originally been proposed by the expert historian John Hirst. None of the above extracts relating to Chisholm, Walton, Cowan, Lyon and Lawson appear in Hirst’s original draft. They were added to the final version of *A Story of Australia* in

Becoming an Australian Citizen, an afterthought of editorial intervention. More remarkable is the fact that of the three sportswomen included by Hirst, two of the women, Goolagong and Freeman are Indigenous. Hirst's original draft read as follows:

Outcasts in other respects, Aboriginal people found a place in the wider society as sportspeople. The first Australian cricket team to tour England – in 1868– was Aboriginal. They did quite well and after each match they gave a demonstration of 'native sports', the throwing of spears and boomerangs. Evonne Goolagong, the tennis player was Aboriginal. Aborigines have been keen players of Australian Rules Football. They play barefoot on bare ground in their own settlements and at the highest level of the national competition. (Hirst, 2010, p. 42)

This extract evokes a theme of connection between indigeneity and sport where Indigenous peoples are believed to be 'natural' athletes. Hirst's omission of famous Australian women in his *A Story of Australia: The Official History* is not surprising when considering his strongly held and well-publicised views relating to what he identifies as women's lack of contribution to Australian history. For instance, in relation to Caroline Chisholm, Hirst would have seen no justification in praising her as he claimed that she had not initiated the campaign to break up the land held by squatters into smallholdings and concluded elsewhere that her contribution to this campaign was 'very little' (1995, p. 39).

In many of his other writings about colonial Australia, Hirst presents the making of the Australian nation as predominantly a masculine enterprise emphatically declaring that 'transformative' movements such as capitalism, industrialism and urbanisation were the

exclusive result of men's work, 'the chief human actors' of history (1995, p. 36). Hirst continues:

The chief human actors in this transformation were men: entrepreneurs, bankers, inventors, engineers, landlords, politicians. When history accounts for change, it inevitably concentrates on people of power and influence. (1995, p. 36)

Hirst wrote this telling extract in 1995 in an article for the conservative magazine *Quadrant*. The article entitled *History and Women*, later reprinted in his book *Sense and Nonsense in Australian History*, was intended as a review of the book, *Creating a Nation* written the previous year by feminist historians Patricia Grimshaw, Marilyn Lake, Ann McGrath, and Marian Quartly. In his review of what at that time was considered 'the first feminist history of the Australian nation' (1995, p. 38) Hirst accused its authors of attempting to 'feminise history', of writing historical 'falsehoods' and engaging in 'a feminist wail' (1995, p. 40). In his expert view, feminist historiography misses the point because, as he explains,

A nation-state is a public thing – a polity and a people's shared view of themselves. Defining the nation, ruling the nation and defending the nation have been mostly done by men ... No matter how able the historian, it is impossible to write an intelligible history of the nation and sustain this feminist claim for female influence. (Hirst, 1995, p. 38)

Some 12 years later, it does not appear that Hirst's views in regard to women's contribution to nation-building had altered. In *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, a 'prevailing masculinist and nationalist framework' (Damousi, 1999, p. 615) still prevailed with the only reference to female contribution being, '(w)omen too have been

honoured for their part in pioneering, often keeping the business or farm going when the man was away, or died' (p. 20). Here women are 'subordinate allies to men' (Hirst, 1995, p. 37) as they came to the fore of nation-building only when 'the man was away'. It should also be noted that in the sentence that precedes this last quote, the text defines 'a battler' as 'a person who survives even if they do not prosper' (p. 20). In Hirst's original draft, a battler referred only to 'a man' so that here again, the addition of women in *A Story of Australia* was an editorial intervention initiated by the government's editors.

The deliberate after-thought of Australian women in history in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* demonstrates that women are now included in many 'conventional' Australian histories, portraying them as 'players in the action' (Damousi, 1999, p. 613). Yet as Damousi (1999) notes, in many of these histories, there is still an absence of the treatment of gender as an important concept in national histories and as a separate category of analysis, that is, a cultural construct and process that is not incorporated in many texts. Gender hence is 'located exclusively where women are found' and is not seen to be interrelated with other issues such as 'race, nationalism, war and the state' (Damousi, 1999, p. 613). As Damousi (1999) eloquently argues,

Few histories consider the possibilities of integrating gender not only as a 'set of lived relations' but as a 'process' and symbolic system' which incorporates questions of language, space, and identity, as a means of shaping a more creative, innovative and complex narrative. (pp. 613-614)

To integrate gender into historical texts could create anxiety among conventional historians like Hirst because to engage in gender is to raise questions about how

knowledges are produced, contested, changeable, unstable and contingent (Damousi, 1999, p. 614). It is to challenge what is at 'the core' of Hirst's culturally constructed views on history, namely a teleological, male-dominated march towards 'bravery', 'progress' and 'celebration' as the following extract suggests,

People are stirred into hero worship by daring, recklessness, self-sacrifice, grace, a master player or a master spirit. For *obvious* reasons it has been mostly men who have been able to achieve heroic status, but not exclusively so. Britannia has stirred many *male British hearts*. Joan of Arc has inspired *French men*. There have been a number of Australian women heroes and stereotypes ... *An heroic figure of the opposite sex* can be more *attractive* – a thing undreamt of in postmodern, feminist philosophy. (my italics) (Hirst, 1995, p. 40)

With such emphatic assertions suggesting that men, not women make 'real' history defined by violence, conquests and notions of progress, it becomes clearer why Hirst did not include many women in his narrative of nation-building in *A Story of Australia*. For Hirst, the female hero 'inspires' men, 'stirs' men's hearts and is always presented in relation to men as 'the opposite sex' who can be found to be 'more attractive' (for men?). Gender and women were therefore not themes included in *A Story of Australia*. Writing in a different context about the blockbuster film *Australia*, Hogan (2010) identifies similar themes that promote and celebrate white masculinity while at the same time obscuring the contributions to nation that have been made by women and other minority groups (p. 74). In this way, the male heroes in these texts are used to 'naturalise white male dominance of the nation's economic, political and cultural institutions' (Hogan, 2010, p. 74) while women's roles are judged as 'only of the second or third rank' (Hirst, 1995, p. 36).

Closer scrutiny of these descriptions of women in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* relating to their participation in Australian history and the values that have supposedly been born out of this history reveal some contradictions. Lake (2007) makes the poignant revelation that the mistake that was made in the first print of the resource booklet about the date of Edith Cowan's election to parliament in Western Australia has a 'larger symbolic significance' because it reveals a mismatch between a 'government that preaches historical correctness and then gets its facts about the past wrong' while making such 'a fuss about defining the "equality of men and women" and "equality of opportunity" as "Australian values"'.

It must be remembered that one of the main arguments for introducing the citizenship test is so that migrants, and in particular Muslim migrants, would learn that Australia was a nation that valued equality among the sexes. Yet the kind of history that Hirst was proposing could also encourage inequalities between men and women for the new Australian citizen would learn that women sit on the sidelines of history in supporting roles only. And only through governmental, that is, editorial intervention, can women find role models in Australia's past so that they too can contribute to the growth of the nation. Lake (2007) accurately concludes that,

The careless substitution of 1923 for 1921 is symptomatic of a political project that invokes the principle of sexual equality not as a value in itself but as a means for denouncing other cultures' presumed denigration of women.

What this brief textual analysis suggests is that Hirst's desire for presenting 'balance' and to not 'present his own views' could not be realised as many of the views that he had expressed in earlier writings were recorded as historical truths in 2007 when he

included them in the draft history for the citizenship resource booklet. History, after all, is not an exercise in objectivity and Hirst cannot discard his own views. As the expert historian, Hirst may have attempted to portray a balanced history but history is always more complex than a simple moral battle between right and wrong. What Hirst's particular history does is to reinforce stereotypes and myths about the typical Australian. It does not create a space with which migrants can identify. As the next chapter reveals, the Indigenous peoples and migrants' roles in nation-building in the hands of the expert historian John Hirst were similarly non-events.

CHAPTER NINE: ABSURD HISTORY

... government policy did not so much control developments as provide reassurance to those who feared them. The assimilation policy reassured the old Australian population that the new migrants would change nothing, when plainly they would; multiculturalism reassures migrants that their culture will not die, when plainly it does. (Hirst, 2006, p. 72)

While the white settlers of convict times were championed as the nation-builders in *A Story of Australia*, other notable stories in Australia's past were not included for migrants to study in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*. These absent stories related to episodes in multicultural and Indigenous Australia. In this chapter, I firstly explore the significance attributed to the post-war migration program and I contextualise this in terms of multiculturalism's role in constituting contemporary Australian identity. I then present a study of Indigenous history in the citizenship resource booklet which remained silent on the denials and interventions affecting Indigenous Australians in contemporary Australia. I conclude that the teaching of history to old and new citizens should explore the ruptures and discontinuities of our past as this can provide alternative stories of Australia's past that are inclusive of the whole population and that can work towards reconciling these different communities that make up the Australian population.

Migration's non-contributions to nation-building

It would not be unreasonable to expect that a booklet intended for migrant use would include extensive information about what migration has meant for the Australian nation and its people. This could be a way of enticing prospective citizens to feel pride and

belonging in Australia and develop a sense of admiration for the migrants who have forged the way. This would also encourage the self-government of prospective citizens who know that they have a standard to live by and role models that they can emulate. This migrant history as recorded in official national histories could become the history of recently naturalised citizens. Yet this kind of thinking does not seem to have influenced the content chosen for inclusion in the resource booklet as migrant contribution in relation to the making of the Australian nation is not a major theme within the historical text. In fact, it is one of the prominent absent stories in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*.

The first reference made to migrants in *A Story of Australia* comes under the sub-heading of *A Harsh Country* and it describes the Snowy Mountains Scheme as a lasting legacy of the contribution of new migrants (p. 20). The passage reads:

To revitalize Australia after World War II the Australian Government developed a bold scheme to catch the waters of the Snowy River before they flowed quickly to the sea in eastern Victoria; divert them to flow inland for irrigation along the Murray and Murrumbidgee rivers, and as they fell into the rivers generate electric power. It was a massive undertaking which took 25 years to complete. Most of the workers were migrants to Australia. The Snowy Mountains Scheme is a lasting legacy of their contribution. (p. 20)

Hirst's description of the hydro-electric scheme attempts to capture the magnitude of the project as it was one of the nation's largest engineering projects but it does not reflect the social significance in relation to the formation of Australian identity. The official Australian Government website describes the scheme as 'a defining point in Australia's

history, and an important symbol of Australia's identity as an independent, multicultural and resourceful country' (Australian Government, n.d.). An anti-racism website for Australian schools run by the Department of Education website describes the scheme as follows:

The Snowy Mountains Scheme is widely recognized as the birthplace of multiculturalism in Australia. Workers from over 30 countries ...

Many newcomers were escaping the privations of war-torn Europe and were eager to start a new life in a new land. They brought with them new ideas, new customs and new cuisines, changing the Anglo-Saxon foundation of Australian society. Working together on the Scheme, they became part of the Snowy family, with former enemies and allies working side by side. (NSW Department of Education and Training, 2010)

Hirst's description of migrant contribution in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* does not have the same impact as the above description and he fails to mention the Snowy Mountains Scheme elsewhere in his writings on migration.

The next description of Australia's post-war migration program does not occur for another ten pages after the reference to the Snowy Mountains Scheme on page 30 under the sub-heading of *Nation* which briefly details the introduction of Australia's large scale immigration program as a policy to increase the labour force. This is the most comprehensive treatment of migration in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, the booklet intended for migrant use and it consists of the following passage and this too, warrants citing in full.

The new migration programme worked well and the new migrants were giving a new variety and vigour to Australian life. In 1967 the dismantling of the White Australia Policy began and in 1973 migration was placed on a totally non-discriminatory basis. Vietnamese, Chinese and Indians arrived and then migrants and refugees from the Middle East and Africa. Australia became a nation of all the lands, one of the great successes of the modern world, and has taken in a high proportion of newcomers in a short space of time. Twenty-two per cent of Australians are born overseas. (p. 30)

This short, lacklustre and modest description does not capture the magnitude and significance of the post-war immigration program in helping to forge Australian national identity. There is no elaboration on the ‘variety’ and ‘vigour’ of migrant contribution. Moreover, agency is awarded to Australia for ‘taking in’ newcomers and it could be argued that the program worked more than just ‘well’. This passage is followed by the reassuring statement that ‘the influence of Britain survives in Australia’s institutions, in many of its values and, of course, in its common language’ (p. 30). As was the practice during the years of the White Australia policy, British migrants are treated separately from all other migrants in this text. Clearly then, we can surmise from this historical text that non-British migrants were not among the great achievers of the Australian nation.

The brief treatment of the post-war migration program in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* reflects Hirst’s (2006) longstanding view that non-British migration was of little consequence to the nation’s push for progress. Hirst

believed that like the inconsequential contribution of women to Australia's nation-building, the non-British migrants who arrived after World War II made no lasting contribution to Australia's national identity. Indeed, Hirst (2006) takes issue with scholars and those he calls 'multiculturalists' who apply the notion of contribution in describing migration's role in Australian history (p. 70). He blames this on 'new age' schooling which dictates that 'migrant children must see themselves reflected when they study Australian history' and which would treat it as 'an affront' if students are 'introduced only to English, Scots and Irish and their descendants' remembering that he regarded these people not as migrants but as the founding population of the nation.

Hirst (2006) therefore concludes that although the effects of the migration program were 'broad' and created 'a more diverse, interesting and vibrant society' that brought economic benefits, at the same time 'the multiplicity of migrant groups makes it unlikely that any one will leave an enduring mark' (p. 71). Hirst (2006) also argued that immigration had the negative effect of making foreign policy 'more difficult to conduct since for many nations with which we deal there is a local constituency' (p. 72). He proposes that a 'more precise ethnic history' could be summarised with the following extract:

The English, Irish and Scots were the founding population; they and their children established the Australian nation. Of these the English were pre-eminent. They were the largest group and supported by the imperial power which transferred to the new society English institutions of government and law. The contribution of the Scots and particularly the Irish was to ensure that the identity of the new nation was British, not

English, and that the English held no privileged place within it. This nation was joined after World War II by numerous groups of non-English speaking migrants who collectively had the effects outlined above, but none of them individually exercised an influence similar to that of the founding minorities of the Irish and the Scots. The new migrants did not form regional enclaves, they intermarried with each other and the old Australians, and are broadly assimilating to the predominant culture. (2006, p. 72)

Perhaps the lacklustre portrayal of migrant contribution in *A Story of Australia* can be explained by migration's traditional association with multiculturalism and the author's long-held view about the 'absurdity' of multicultural policy. Writing in an ironic tone in *Sense and Nonsense in Australian History*, Hirst (2006) states:

We have reached the heart of the multicultural outlook: the denial of any superior legitimacy to the host culture. Insofar as multiculturalism makes what it calls 'Anglo-Celts' the equivalent of Italians and Turks, it denies the very notion of a host. We are all immigrants of many cultures, contributing to a multicultural society. This may serve the needs of ethnic politics. As serious historical or sociological analysis it is nonsense. To found policy on it may be perilous. (p. 22)

In Hirst's above summation of a host culture, the notion of an Indigenous host is unthinkable. And as the policy that inspired, guided and influenced Australia's immigration program for more than 30 years, the word, policy or ideology of

‘multiculturalism’ appears nowhere in the resource booklet for migrant consumption.

Hirst would see no contradiction in the absence of migrant ‘heroes’ and achievements in a book intended for the self-study and guidance of migrant candidates. This is because Hirst, too, had as his main objective in writing this history, the reassurance of old Australia. Parallels can be drawn with Hirst’s understanding of the assimilation policies of the twentieth century. Like Howard, Hirst did not condemn the policy of assimilation but rather saw it as ‘a welcoming attitude’ (2006, p. 19). He revealed his inclination towards supporting it in order to maintain Anglo-Celtic supremacy. Indeed, he offered up Anglo-Celtic relations as examples of ideal intercultural relationships. In *Sense and Nonsense in Australian History* just as in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, he wrote how ‘the English, Scots and Irish did not form separate enclaves’ but had formed instead ‘a common identity’ (2006, pp. 12-13).

In *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, Hirst alluded to how the White Australia Policy was introduced to restrict Asian immigration which threatened cheap labour and working rights. The booklet states:

The colonies took common action in 1888 to limit severely Chinese migration even though the numbers arriving were relatively small. The colonists, like most people then, believed that there were differences between races and that the Chinese were inferior, but they also did not want a society with deep divisions or where foreign outcasts worked for low wages and lowered the dignity of all labour. (p. 29)

The use of the conjunction ‘but’ is curious here as it has the effect of introducing contrasting information so that the reader can understand that the promoters of the White Australia Policy were only trying to prevent a divided society where ‘foreign outcasts’ lowered wages and the ‘dignity of all labour’. Hirst (2006) makes a similar argument elsewhere stating that the prohibition of Chinese and Pacific Islanders into Australia was spurred on by ‘the pursuit of racial purity and because of a reluctance to constitute the state on any other basis than equality of civil and political rights’ (p. 70). Hirst (2006) continues his explanation by labelling this practice of exclusion as a ‘process of nation building’ (p. 71). Elder (2007) argues that comments such as these about Chinese workers are based on the notion of Australian egalitarianism under threat and derive from Australia under colonial and federal White Australia policies trying to distinguish themselves from the ‘Asian other’ who it was believed did not understand egalitarianism, equality or democracy because of their backward and oppressed societies (p. 53).

A history of terra nullius

A Story of Australia celebrates the achievements of its white pioneers and ignores the episodes of massacres, deaths in custody and calls for reconciliation that have impacted on the Indigenous and Torres Strait Island peoples. Hirst does not refer to Indigenous peoples as the custodians of the land. He believed that recent historiography in Australia was governed by many controversies and that these controversies could be classified into two equal sides, a sort of level playing field that was played upon by key figures. Referring particularly to controversies that he labelled as ‘Aboriginal affairs’, Hirst

(2008) identified Keith Windshuttle and Andrew Bolt as representing the conservative side of the debate and Henry Reynolds and Robert Manne as representing the non-conservative side (pp. 31–2). These four men in their positions as journalist, political scientist and historian have contributed to the debates that have dominated the Australian history wars for over 20 years, including debates around Indigenous dispossession and reconciliation and denials and acknowledgements in relation to the forced removal of Aboriginal children from their families. Yet other prominent figures associated with the history wars such as Lyndall Ryan or Geoffrey Blainey were not selected by Hirst to represent his two sides of history (Chisari, 2012b).

In the pages on *Early Australia* (pp. 17-19) in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* there are no images of Aboriginal people. There are instead, colourful images of Cook's ship Endeavour, Captain Cook himself along with Governor Lachlan Macquarie, and another image of a convict ship, as well as a painting of the Burke and Wills expedition. These images evoke the narratives of European exploration, authority and benevolent colonisation. These images and the absence of Indigenous images, evoke a common thread found in many canonical, colonial writings in Australian history of terra nullius, a land belonging to no one and a time portrayed as 'Year Zero' waiting to be discovered (Bird-Rose, 2004) and waiting to be developed by the first white British settlers. As Elder (2007) argues,

As soon as the British arrived and cleared land, felled trees and quarried rock, they were erasing one narrative and writing another. However, the terra nullius story meant non-Indigenous peoples could imagine they were telling a story where no other story existed. The non-Indigenous story of bringing a wilderness

to life demonstrates how blind colonisers were (and often still are) to Indigenous narratives and how powerful the story of terra nullius is. (p. 150)

The dedicated section entitled *Aboriginal People* is included as the final section of *A Story of Australia* on pages 32 and 33. And again, Hirst's account of 'Aboriginal People' does not begin with his own words. Five additional paragraphs were included in front of Hirst's original text. These added paragraphs commence with the portrayal of 'Australian Indigenous culture' and the declaration that it is 'the oldest surviving culture in the world' stating as evidence some 250 Indigenous languages that are still active today. It continues that, at the time of 'pre-settlement' Indigenous communities were culturally and linguistically diverse. The position of the hunter-gatherer tradition is reiterated, and, the passage continues that the Aboriginal people did not exploit the land in spite of their classification as hunter-gatherers; 'Aboriginal people have strong hunter-gatherer traditions but have always had great respect and care for the natural environment' (p. 32). Again in this final sentence, the use of the conjunction 'but' prepares the reader for contrasting information. In this paragraph then, hunter-gatherer is juxtaposed with great respect and care for the land so that one way of reading this statement is to acknowledge that while 'Aborigines lived in harmony with the environment', they also caused what other conservative historians have described as 'discordant' consequences which are said to include the extinction of flora and fauna (Blainey, 2001).

The portrayal of 'early' Indigenous life in the citizenship booklet reflects the narratives promoted by historians who record history from the viewpoint of European and Enlightenment progress as a paramount objective for Australia and exclusively in terms

of economic achievement and success. The term ‘hunter-gatherer’ which has become a contestable discourse in itself, conjures up ambivalent images of ‘the Aboriginal’ as the ‘noble savage’, a relic usually exhibited in a museum, tied to the land while struggling against ‘his’ own ‘backward’, natural, childlike world. Using such descriptions can have the effect of questioning the survival and relevance of ‘traditional’ Indigenous peoples in contemporary society.

In the section on *Aboriginal People*, Hirst’s opening sentence was added to the preceding section about the Dreamtime and reads,

Dreamtime stories which talk about the Ancestors and Creation of the land give significance to all aspects of the landscape. Aboriginal descendants of particular Ancestral Beings have a very special relationship with the features of the land associated with the Ancestor. The success of Australia was built on lands taken from Aboriginal people after European settlement in 1788. (p. 32)

Such editing renders the paragraph incoherent as details about Indigenous ‘belief systems’ are concluded abruptly and without any seemingly relevant connection to Australia’s success being built on Indigenous land. So what at first appears to be some careless editing may have been an intentional add-on by the unknown editors to suggest a distinction between the ‘spiritual’ Indigenous peoples ‘natural’ way of life compared to the success and progress that were introduced with the onset of colonisation, or, as the citizenship booklet terms it, settlement. This view is further reinforced with the iconic images of didgeridoos and traditional Aboriginal dance as well as an artist’s impression of Aboriginal people (not referenced), images reminiscent of old

anthropological studies that relate to a static tradition and an essentialised past that is active in modern day only through the portrayals of ceremony and spectacle. The section continues,

The success of Australia was built on lands taken from Aboriginal people after European settlement in 1788.

The British people did not consider that it had to make a treaty with the Aboriginal tribes, who seemed to them to have no firm attachment to the land and did not cultivate it.

By contrast, (sic) America and New Zealand the British government did make treaties with Indigenous people. (p. 32)

One possible reading of this passage is that the American and New Zealand contexts were different from Australia because, we can presume the Indigenous peoples in these nations *did* have a firm attachment and *did* cultivate the land. There is also an implied contrast between the bad deed of ‘lands taken’ with ‘the success of Australia’, suggesting that the taking of Indigenous land was a necessary sacrifice undertaken for the good of the nation. The point is further emphasised through the use of ‘Indigenous’ to describe the Indigenous peoples of America and New Zealand. However, the term ‘Indigenous’ is not used in relation to Indigenous Australians. When the term Indigenous is used in the booklet, it has either not been written by Hirst, or it is used to describe culture rather than a population. Hirst (2006) did not like the term, because, as he had previously explained, the use of Indigenous leads to the use of non-Indigenous, which in Australia defines 98 per cent of the population ‘by what it is not’ (p. 95). Hirst (2006) further continues:

Non-Indigenous implies a people without roots in this place; it elides the fact that settlers have been here for eight generations, that they have formed a distinctive polity and are not Indigenous to anywhere else; they regard Australia as their home. (p. 95)

Clearly, by non-Indigenous, Hirst is referring exclusively to Australians who are descendants of the first settlers. Hirst makes no mention of Australians who do not have generations of ancestors in Australia. Nor does he account for ‘old Australians’ who have thousands of ancestors stretching over millennia, that is, he does not use the same argument that he uses for British Australians for Indigenous peoples, because, as his writings remind us, they did not develop the land, they merely ‘existed’. This naming and non-naming is indicative of a wider, deep-rooted national angst about the legitimacy of British colonisation in Australia. Elder (2007) argues that this non-Indigenous ‘anxiety stems from the repressed or denied knowledge that Australia is someone else’s place’ (p. 17). In this way, by not naming Indigenous Australians as Indigenous but preferring instead to use the term Aborigine⁷, doubt is cast on the possibility of dispossession because there are no ‘non-Indigenous’ people but only ‘settlers’ and as a consequence, there are no Indigenous people. Hence, there is no illegitimacy over the settlers making a home and developing Australia, rather than merely ‘occupying’ it as the (unsettled?) ‘hunter-gatherer’ Indigenous people had done. In this way, Hirst is attempting to produce a new form of Indigeneity for the Australian nation in the form of the white settlers. When compared with his writings on the

⁷In his original version, Hirst had used the term ‘the Aborigines’ throughout the text. Most of these examples were revised in the final version of the booklet to read as ‘the Aboriginal people’.

founding population, it becomes apparent that Hirst believes that it is only British contributions in the form of establishing cities that is valued as ‘civilisation’.

A need for intervention

The overall theme of early Australian history in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* is presented in modernist terms via the inevitability of progress and consequently the necessity of the demise of the Indigenous peoples, who by default, had to sacrifice the land and their ‘primitive’ way of life for the good of the nation. In his original version Hirst had elaborated on similar themes but they were not included in the final version of the booklet. The following section printed in italics was omitted from the booklet.

But many of the Aboriginal people in these remote locations do not live well. *The lands, even if well managed, would not support them; they have become dependent on welfare. Their health is poor. Too many children skip school.*

In the wider society Aborigines now go to university and hold professional jobs. They inter-marry at a high rate with non-Aborigines. They are no longer all outcasts. But these successes are undermined by the plight of the traditional people on their own lands. Here in the last thirty years things have got worse not better. There is now general agreement that welfare must stop; Aborigines must have real jobs; their children must be well educated. But if this happens can traditional culture survive? Will traditional people accept these new invitations to join the wider society?

This is the greatest dilemma facing Australian society. (Hirst, 2010, pp. 25-26)

This omitted passage recalls discourses surrounding the assimilation policy of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when governments regulated the lives of Aboriginal people in relation to their residence, employment, marriage and social life (*Aboriginal Protection Act (Vic)*, 1869). Elsewhere, Hirst (2007b) has expressed similar sentiments relating to the ‘dysfunctional life’ of modern day Indigenous peoples where, as he describes, ‘life on welfare is the norm and the single mum’s latest boyfriend bashes and sexually abuses her children’.

In another article in the national newspaper, *The Australian* to which he is a regular contributor, Hirst wrote in defence of the Northern Territory Intervention, that is, the Howard Government’s legislative response to the Northern Territory Government’s Inquiry into the *Protection of Aboriginal Children from Sexual Abuse*. He stated:

But in many Aboriginal communities, social organisation has completely broken down. The people have shown they are incapable of governing themselves. There is no point in consulting them about the creation of authority; *authority has to be created for them*. Their lives will then better match *our* own. (my italics) (Hirst, 2007)

Clearly, there are similarities with the ideas that he had hoped to elaborate in the resource booklet and the views that he has expressed in other publications. Hirst infers that Indigenous people who are ‘no longer all outcasts’, must accept authority so that their lives will improve by matching ‘our’ own, that is, the mainstream Australians who

are descendants of the white settlers who made this nation great. The passage cited above also calls to mind older discourses of Aboriginal protection policies. In 1947, A. O. Neville, the Chief Protector of Aborigines responsible for the welfare of Aborigines of ‘mixed blood’ from 1915 to 1940 wrote,

So far environment, which plays so great a part in moulding a people, has been utterly bad, but it is an environment which they cannot alter *unaided by us*, and it is their way of life more than their heredity which prevents *progress*. The fact that these people are coloured, and descended from so-called blacks, alone suffices to make assimilation in Australia difficult enough; but colour emphasised by faulty environment as in this case makes it practically impossible. *It is for us* to alter that environment. (my italics) (Neville, 1947, p. 74)

Thus, like the protectionist writings that had preceded him a century earlier, Hirst saw the end of traditional ‘Aboriginal communities’ and their ‘social organisation’ as inevitable and necessary. This is reflected in the proposed wording of the final paragraph in the history section of the booklet with the acknowledgement that ‘this is the greatest dilemma facing Australian society’ (Hirst, 2010, p. 26). No other comments are made. The editors of the citizenship booklet changed this sentence to read ‘Australia faces an ongoing challenge to ensure that the Aboriginal people fully share in the life and prosperity of the nation’. Hirst labelled this editorial change as ‘optimistic’ or perhaps he was anticipating the Northern Territory Intervention that was to come in June that year.

The white man's burden

The theme of attributing benevolence to white Australians in *A Story of Australia* has many examples. For example, in his attempt to present a balanced portrayal of Australian history, Hirst included details on the Mabo Decision and the ongoing association between historian Henry Reynolds and Eddie Mabo from his days working at James Cook University (Elks, 2012). 'Mabo' became a landmark decision in 1992 when the High Court ruled that native title to land was to be recognised by common law in Australia. Yet, Hirst's brief portrayal does not capture the extent of its significance to Australian history as the landmark decision is described as merely a 'separatist policy' which restored outback land to traditional societies. The booklet states

However, just at this time, Aboriginal leaders, with many white supporters, adopted a more separatist policy. Aboriginal people should own their traditional lands and, on them, maintain their traditional culture. The High Court in its 1992 Mabo decision restored unsold land to Aboriginal people if they had maintained their traditional ties to it. As a result Aboriginal people have become owners of vast areas of outback Australia. Here aspects of traditional society do survive. (p. 33)

The Mabo decision, in fact, discredited the previously supported notion that Australia was terra nullius, belonging to no one in 1770. It meant that there were grounds for Indigenous peoples to argue that their land had been wrongly taken by British colonisers and that they could make claims to have the land returned to them or be compensated for dispossession (Elder, 2007, p. 175). Yet Hirst's brief text ignores the relevance of possible repercussions and focuses instead on presenting the plight of Indigenous

peoples through the well-meaning but misguided actions of the ‘Australian community’.

The booklet states,

... Their civil rights were restored to them. The Australian people showed their willingness to see Aboriginal people become full members of Australian society when in 1967 they gave an overwhelming YES vote (90 per cent) to a proposal to change the Aboriginal sections of the Constitution ... (p. 33)

The 1967 referendum has become a momentous event in relation to Indigenous and non-Indigenous people for it determined that Indigenous peoples could now be counted in the national census. Hirst’s brief description of the event however does not capture this significance. Instead, the association of Indigenous peoples with belonging to tradition and the past is always present. In an earlier work, Hirst is more explicit about his criticisms towards Indigenous sovereignty and land rights when he writes,

Civil and political rights were rapidly restored to Aborigines from the 1950s. Settler Australians showed their willingness to see Aborigines become equal citizens by the overwhelming assent they gave to the 1967 constitutional amendment. But just at this point Aboriginal policy took a new separatist turn. The new policy proposals were for self-determination, land rights, a treaty, even Aboriginal sovereignty. These were the fruits of liberal fantasy conjoined with Aboriginal radicalism, which fed on each other. (2006, p. 91)

The two above cited passages have similarities as both award agency to the white people whose ‘willingness’ ensured the positive outcome of the 1967 referendum. Similarly, the resource booklet only alludes to Indigenous mobilisation, calling it ‘small Aboriginal groups’ who had lobbied the government for reforms of Aboriginal

protection policies (p. 33). The section concludes that the policy changed from protection to assimilation and then integration, but this was ‘more because after World War II world opinion had changed; racism was condemned and the new United Nations issued its *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*’ (p. 33). Again, this explanation denies Indigenous peoples any agency in fighting for Indigenous rights as the policy change is attributed to ‘world opinion’, which, we can assume, refers to at least a force beyond Australian Indigenous peoples. Eddie Koiki Mabo is not even named as the Torres Strait Islander activist who instigated the legal case and fought for native title for many years before his premature death. He is merely referred to as the name of a court decision. Hirst’s description, instead, focuses on the popular narrative of yet again connecting Indigenous people with tradition and the land, emphasising a fixed identity and a fixed place in the past rather than acknowledging Indigenous communities living in the present or the future, and as such, negates the struggle for land rights and Indigenous sovereignty as merely ‘liberal (white?) fantasy’.

As the following passage suggests, benevolence is also attributed to the squatters, the missionaries and Governor Macquarie who were the active agents, ‘maintaining’, ‘employing’, ‘attempting’ and ‘offering’ their benevolence to the Indigenous peoples:

The Aboriginal people were not without friends. Some squatters were able to maintain good relations with them and employ them on their sheep runs. Missionaries attempted to convert them to Christianity but with only very limited success. Governor Macquarie ... took a special interest in them, running a school for their children and offering them land for farming. But very few Aboriginal people were willing to move

into European society; they were not very interested in what the Europeans had to offer. (p. 32)

This passage is underpinned by many of the values promoted by the citizenship test, extolling the virtue of Christianity and its white disciples who tried to ‘civilise’ Indigenous people through offers of education and work. As Perera (2009) argues, particular versions of Australian history such as these serve ‘to incorporate and rehabilitate the history of its exclusions’ (p. 649) or more precisely, they aim to absolve the nation from any evil doing by stating that there was no evil intention but only the deleterious effects of colonisation. The Indigenous peoples, on the other hand, remain the ‘white man’s burden’ and were not always appreciative of European offers. Their ‘limited success’ connects them with tradition and the land, emphasising a fixed identity and a fixed place in the past rather than acknowledging Indigenous communities living in the present or the future.

The section cited above goes further to emphasise the benevolent attitude of the governors who did not harm Aboriginal people in the absence of a treaty.

The early governors were nevertheless told to ensure that Aboriginal people were not harmed. Of course the taking of their land and the arrival of thousands of foreigners harmed them. This contradiction made it impossible for governments to effectively protect Aboriginal peoples. (p. 32)

Hirst (2006) believed that the advent of settlement, by its very nature, involved violence. So this passage implies that it is to the credit of the early governors that many Indigenous peoples were not harmed. Instead, the taking of aboriginal land and British

colonisation is described somewhat confusingly as a 'contradiction' and a conciliation. The further use of the term 'of course', difficult for migrants of non-English speaking backgrounds to understand, hopes to appeal to the mainstream as common, ordinary language. Indeed, expressions such as 'of course' and 'everyone agrees' feature throughout Hirst's academic writing as he attempts to create a history that is simple, ordinary, natural and uncontested.

No Stolen Generations

Hirst believed that his portrayal of 'frontier' conflict in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* was not partial as he wrote in *The Monthly* that his treatment of frontier conflict survived in the final version of the booklet even though it 'was not close to the Windshuttle school' (2008, p. 34). By this, we can presume that Hirst judged his final version to be 'balanced' illustrating the two sides of the history wars. Hirst further elaborates that while the editors of the resource booklet deleted his few lines on historical controversies over Aboriginal deaths, in the final version of the booklet, 'the signal that these were matters of controversy survived' (2008, p. 34). In the citizenship book, the extract appeared as follows:

There has been great debate about how many Aboriginal people were killed in the frontier battles. Many more Aboriginal people than settlers were killed. (p. 32)

Again, here Hirst creates the notion of two equal sides, that is, a struggle between the Aboriginal people on one side and the nation's pioneers on the frontier side. As an historian true to his discipline, Hirst made it imperative that controversies were out in

the open. This may have been due to his understanding of balance in history. The following section written by Hirst was not included:

A ratio often used is ten Aborigines for every one settler. Working from this, historians have estimated that 20,000 Aborigines were killed overall. Others argue that this is much too high and that killings should not be assumed without good evidence. (2010, p. 47)

This omitted passage reiterates Hirst's concern for balance in history. Yet the statement of 'good evidence' is interesting and falls victim to Windshuttle's way of thinking who refuted the works of historians such as Ryan as 'bad evidence' (Windshuttle, 2005).

Hirst chose to emphasise instead the punitive nature of the killings of 'Aboriginal people who had speared settlers or taken sheep and cattle' (p. 32). And by further labelling these atrocities as 'punitive expeditions' which suggests legitimate (disciplinary) punishment and 'an equally sided frontier', Hirst ignores the considerable amount of evidence that confirms that punishment equated to deaths and massacres (Schlunke, 2005).

Drawing again on Windshuttle's main thesis on the fabrication of Aboriginal history, Hirst concludes in the resource booklet that 'everyone agrees that the greatest killer of Aboriginal people was disease' (pp. 32-3). By appealing to 'everyone', that is, the consensus of 'everyone agreeing' Hirst implies that this is incontestable, commonsense knowledge. Furthermore, death by disease suggests that Aboriginal deaths were unpreventable and inevitable, a fluke of nature. And by further not acknowledging that many of the diseases that killed Indigenous people were introduced by colonials as a common practice of colonisation, it also allows British Australians, past and present, to

distance themselves from this historical act as it draws attention away from the other causes of death including massacres by white settlers. The ‘British settlement’ of Australia is hence presented as unproblematic because it is not defined as colonisation, for colonisation, according to Elder (2003) can be described as ‘a sore’ in the nation’s past that reveals ‘the original unauthorised boundary crossing’ (p. 222).

Perhaps the greatest omission in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* is any reporting or mention of the Stolen Generation. Nowhere among the 46 pages of the booklet are those two words cited together. This is not surprising if we consider Howard’s stand. Ever since the *Bringing Them Home Report* was released in 1997, which detailed the shameful protectionist policy of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the Prime Minister refused to accept many of the findings and ignored the recommendations for an official apology and compensation. Hirst, too, had stated that he did not want to offend either major political party in writing this official history and perhaps it was to appease the Prime Minister’s refusal to acknowledge the Stolen Generation that he did not name them in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*. What is surprising about this omission is that Hirst (2006), himself is not a denialist and has even advocated for an apology to the Stolen Generation. The omission of the term Stolen Generation suggests then that only the positions of Bolt and Windshuttle were represented by omitting the term ‘Stolen Generations’ from the citizenship resource booklet. Instead, its long history is merely alluded to with such phrasing as

Aboriginal people could be told where to live, had to seek permission to marry and could have their children taken from them. There has been a great debate too on the intent of these policies, particularly over the forcible removal of children from their parents. (p. 33)

Conversely, there is no reference to an official apology that was demanded by victims and supporters alike. Similarities can be made with the approach that was adopted in relation to the language that was to be used in the National Museum of Australia (Casey, 2006, p. 118). The former director of the museum, Dawn Casey elaborates:

- Australia was ‘settled’, not ‘invaded’
- Aborigines were ‘dispersed’, not ‘massacred’
- Children were ‘removed’ for their own good, not ‘stolen’
- ‘Some’ Aboriginal people and children, not ‘generations’, suffered from the impact of ‘settlement’, not ‘colonisation’
- The word ‘genocide’ was banned in relation to Australian history. (2006, p. 118)

A similar approach is adopted throughout the portrayal of Indigenous history in the resource booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen*. And like the National Museum of Australia, this approach was about using any means available ‘to perpetuate the myths that represent what it means to be Australian’ (Casey, 2006, 119).

Hirst’s original version of the portrayal of the Stolen Generation had included more details but it was removed by the Prime Minister’s office. It continued,

Were mixed-blood children taken from their parents so that they would marry white and hence colour would be bred out (which is how some administrators talked) or was this taking children from rough camps and giving them a chance in life? (Hirst, 2010, p. 48)

In this omitted interrogative passage, Hirst adopts the paternalistic tone so favoured by supporters of the assimilation policy and he also uses the racialised term of ‘mixed

blood’ which is highly contested today. Comparisons can also be made with the current Northern Territory Intervention policy that is still in place where Indigenous peoples are being rescued from themselves, and particularly the children who are being ‘protected’ from Indigenous adults. Throughout these policies of ‘protection’ there is the underlying theme that Indigenous people need the support of mainstream white Australians. We can take this one step further and accept that Indigenous peoples have benefited from the arrival of the European colonial settlers and the Australian nation, formed only after 1788. New migrants wishing to take the test, therefore learn that the descendants of these civilising settlers have every right to call themselves the true Australians, the makers of the Australian nation.

The ‘correct’ Australian history

In the portrayal of early history in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, its authors and editors were concerned with producing historical truths that maintain narratives of white domination in contemporary Australia and as a means to emphatically announce to the outside as well as the inside world who it was that made up the ‘authentic Australian people’. This debate, according to the booklet’s historian, is propagated as sense and nonsense, as progress and tradition, as Windshuttle and Reynolds. So rather than enforcing exclusion as many have claimed, the role of the Australian citizenship test with its accompanying history and values was, more specifically, an attempt to inscribe in official documents who are the real citizens of Australia and to legitimate the non-Indigenous peoples’ dominant place in the Australian community to new citizens.

However, the knowledge of Australian history that citizens-to-be were to learn through the self study of the citizenship resource booklet does not represent the truth of what ‘really’ happened but rather it should be understood as a production of what the Howard Government and its expert historian, John Hirst wanted new citizens to take as truth. In effect, it was an attempt to ‘normalise’ history and to ‘normalise’ Australianness. That is, through its depiction in the official citizenship resource, the text *A Story of Australia* provided an order of knowledge which was assumed to be that which a ‘normal’ citizen would come to agree is the foundational reality of Australia.

The significance of promoting a particular version of history with claims that it is a ‘balanced portrayal’ and a fair description of a two-sided debate is that it renders this particular history as incontestable and hence works to exclude anyone who may think otherwise. That is, it defines the standard of what is a good citizen. Migrants therefore become subjects by being classified in terms of their acceptance of this ‘normal’ history. Those who do not accept this history are deemed irrational and deviant. As Pugliese (2002) argues, enforcing a particular version of Australian history that excludes details about Indigenous dispossession allows the dominant Anglo population to maintain ‘its position of privilege’ by having its migrant-cum-citizens ‘reproduce their own internal systems of othering: Anglo as other to migrant as other to Indigenous’ (p. 15). In this way, it not only privileges Howard’s preferred version of the past but it simultaneously projects and shapes a vision of the future for the Australian population whereby migrants become accomplices of colonisation (Pugliese, 2002, p. 10).

This portrayal of Australian history also renders alternative perspectives on Australian history as unthinkable. Thus, in writing this official history Hirst remained true to his

understanding that a good trait of historians is one in which they are ‘very unwilling to see wickedness’ (2004, p. 87). Wickedness implies a deliberate act of evil and so by not identifying wickedness, Hirst’s writings suggest that there were no deliberate acts of violence on the part of the white settlers. There was merely colonisation, which by his own definition, had to be violent (2006, p. 83).

According to Hirst, a good historian should also be of a calm nature and avoid being judgmental (2006, p. 8). Therefore Hirst is not alarmed nor does he offer criticism of past policies of assimilation and protection as he believed that he was merely stating objective facts as well as presenting the two exclusive versions of popular history that he had identified in contemporary Australian historiography. Used as part of a test that determines the conferral of citizenship, such programs are useful in ‘scrutinising’, ‘surveying’ and ‘disciplining’ (Perera, 2009, p. 655) the citizen-in-the-making. In this way, migrants could regulate their understanding of the national story by accepting who the real, non-Indigenous citizens of Australia are and what historical knowledge to believe in order to become one.

Migrants reading Australian history

Maryam’s comments at the beginning of this section on *History as Essential Knowledge* resonate with the portrayals of Australian history in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*; clearly, while attempting to give ‘an overview of the country’ the authors of this history failed ‘to remember it all later’. And the impact of this selective remembering is significant. While *A Story of Australia* informs the migrant candidate preparing for the test that the Indigenous peoples were neither colonised nor even invaded by the British,

it also attempts to regulate the understanding of migrants who want to become Australian citizens that Australia does not have a shameful past in terms of violence against and dispossession of Indigenous peoples and the myth of terra nullius. Yet Foucault reminds us that subjectivities are not fixed and individuals have the capacity to accept, contest, negotiate and produce multiple ways of being and make multiple readings of the nation's truths.

For Malcolm, a Sudanese refugee who had spent four years in a refugee camp in Kenya before he was able to migrate to Australia, the particular silences in the citizenship test resource booklet's version of Indigenous history were of concern to him. Asked how he, himself, would portray Aboriginal history for a citizenship test resource booklet, he explained:

Firstly, I would include their way of life before white settlement; then how did they resist the new invasion and lastly I would describe their culture after they lost to the white people. Like this:

As a result of white people's policy after their invasion of Australia, the number of Aboriginal people in Australian society cannot compare with non-Aboriginal people. For example, in government departments, I have never seen any Aboriginal person in high positions such as the minister for Foreign Affairs or the Transport minister. This means that Aboriginal people do not receive the same level of education like the white people who hold all of the important positions.

Everywhere I go, such as in a bank, I never see an Aboriginal man or an Aboriginal woman as a bank teller or working in a service industry. I only see

Asian people and white Australians which must mean that Aboriginal people do not have the same job opportunities as white people.

For Malcolm, there is a disjunction between official histories of white benevolence and what he saw, or more precisely who he did not see in the streets of Sydney. For Malcolm, too, it is important that official histories contain negative stories of invasion and lack of job opportunities that affect the Indigenous peoples of Australia. Malcolm, as a refugee who has endured much hardship and with little opportunity to practise his profession of journalism in his adopted 'land of freedom', it is important that official accounts attend to 'all of the Australian people including Aborigines'.

Neumann (2008) attempts to disrupt the practice of focusing only on history as a record of heroic deeds by great men. Discussing the potential of 'experimental histories' instead, he explores how these particular versions can work to disrupt the continuous flow of traditional histories that ignore the marginalised and the defeated, that he refers to as the 'trash of history' (2008, p. 27). Yet for Chi from China, it is still the 'big events' of history that everyone must know:

Why is history important for new citizens?

Chi: Because it's common knowledge.

What do you mean by common knowledge?

Chi: I mean it's a normal thing. It's the common knowledge, the big events that everyone knows. In China I know Chinese history. If I become an Australian citizen I need to know Australian history. It's similar to identity. It's knowledge that educated people have. It's, in Chinese, *suzhi*, a personal quality.

Chi's labelling of *suzhi* as the human quality that regulates Chinese society shares many similarities with Foucauldian ways of thinking about the governing of self and others.

Chi's reflections raise many questions in relation to *A Story of Australia*: Are the events that everyone must know an adequate form of knowledge? What if there are events that not everyone knows or accepts? How is this contestation about the nation's past to be captured? And how do we know that we need or want history? As Morris (1996) states,

Wanting history, non-historians do not usually want just anybody's history, or even simply to be touched by the dignity and authority that historicity still endows. We may want 'our own' histories, the more strongly if we do feel denied history, or subjected to history, in the past; or, histories that potentially may have something to do with us – histories that pressure us, solicit, engage, or confront us, histories unsettling the frameworks in which we desire and evaluate 'change'. (p. 9)

In attempting to respond to this question of wanting history, the participants I interviewed were not forthcoming. I turn my focus then to my own experience as the daughter of migrants. What this history does for me and my daughters is to ignore the stories that have touched our lives. For what does it say about my parents' experience arriving in Australia in the early 1960s, my mother working in the factories of Surry Hills during the day and raising children by night while my father worked on the railways at Darling Harbour before it was a tourist destination, and then caught a train to his night job as a kitchen hand in those Italian bars that served espressos so that they could save to buy a house in the 'land of opportunity'. What the history in *A Story of Australia* does is to negate the hardships that migrants have endured during the process of nation-building. It trivialises the hardships of my great uncle who found his way to

Australia as a prisoner of war in the early 1920s and who made it 'big' owning the old chook farms where today university students go to study at 'Macquarie'. It belittles his stories because migration, according to Hirst, 'must always be more or less traumatic' (2006, p. 20). *A Story of Australia* also renders invisible my two aunts who married by proxy men they did not know so that their families could come and make a life with them as 'ancillaries' in a distant land.

Like a cranky old schoolmaster, Hirst's history seems to shake a metaphorical finger at all this nonsense and absurdity about migrants, women and Indigenous peoples, calling for some common sense in the national story rather than grand liberal gestures:

Is it seriously being suggested that Australian society should have contrived to have these migrants distributed evenly through the hierarchies of skill and wealth in the first generation, even though so many of them arrived without skill, capital and knowledge of the language? What a piece of social engineering that would have been. The immigration officer at the foot of the gangway as the ship from Italy berths: 'All those from Calabria will be brain surgeons'. (2006, p. 21)

Hirst was right; my mother, a Calabrian migrant woman, did not become a brain surgeon. But that misses the point for she achieved much more in her own story of Australia.

PART FOUR: REFORMING THE AUSTRALIAN CITIZENSHIP TEST

CHAPTER TEN: HISTORY AS NON-ESSENTIAL ... YET NICE TO KNOW

History has a more important task than to be a handmaiden to philosophy, to recount the necessary birth of truth and values; it should become a differential knowledge of energies and failings, heights and degenerations, poisons and antidotes. Its task is to become a curative science. (Foucault, 1984, p. 90)

I think history has been the object of a curious sacralization ... Under the sign of the history cross, all discourse became a prayer to the god of just causes. (Foucault, 1994c, p. 280)

While the focus of the new test will be on the Pledge of Commitment it is also important to provide prospective citizens with broader information on Australia including Australia's history and notable Australians. To maximise this understanding, the Government fully supports the Committee's recommendation to redevelop the resource book in two separate sections – testable and non-testable. (Australian Government, 2008, p. 3)

Since October 2009, migrants who want to become Australian citizens are obliged to study the new resource booklet, *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond*. This booklet is the accompaniment to the newly revised citizenship test that was implemented under the Rudd Government after a government review committee found the original citizenship test to be wanting. The new test differs significantly from the citizenship test produced under the Howard Government, especially in relation to what content is deemed to be relevant and assessable for migrant-citizens. Under the new test,

knowledge of Australian history is no longer considered to be essential to be granted Australian citizenship. Knowledge of Australian values, too, has been replaced with knowledge of the beliefs and principles embedded in the citizenship pledge.

Before examining the review process and its recommendations in relation to Australian values and the citizenship pledge, in this chapter, I continue my exploration of the relationship between official histories, national identities and citizenship, focusing on the new version of Australian history that was included in *Australian Citizenship: Our common Bond*. I investigate how content on Australian history that had been included as essential knowledge in the original test became non-testable but is still included in the new citizenship resource booklet, *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond* as ‘nice to know’ information. Through a textual analysis of the section titled, *Our Australian Story*, I examine how women, migrants and Indigenous peoples are portrayed in the new booklet. I compare some of this content on Australian history with its equivalent in the old booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen* in order to problematise the claim that the discipline of history consists of objective truths and to move beyond the history wars that have dominated recent debates in politics and historiography. Following Foucault (1984), I suggest that history should instead be viewed as a ‘curative science’ (p. 90), that is, a transformative form of knowledge that focuses on the discontinuities as well as the continuities in Australia’s past and which has the potential to ‘delimit truths’ (Weeks, 1982) and thus heal the fatal impact of an official history dominated by notions of progress and achievements.

A newly elected government⁸

The changes introduced to the Australian citizenship test were implemented against a backdrop of public euphoria that had gripped the nation after the election of the Rudd Government and which consequently resulted in the removal from office of the Howard Government in November 2007. Rudd's electoral victory was seen to herald a new period of transformation and inclusion. It was described as the coming of a 'new intellectual culture' with the promise of 'deep thinking and balanced analysis' (Nile, 2007). Rudd's victory not only represented a vote for 'generational change' but it was also praised as a vote for 'a compassionate society' (Nile, 2007).

Immediately after being sworn in as Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd ratified the Kyoto Protocol in order to demonstrate his government's commitment to addressing climate change ('Australia ratifies Kyoto Protocol', 2007). The draconian Pacific Solution which involved off-shore mandatory detention of asylum seekers was abandoned by the Labor Party and Rudd's electoral victory was also declared as the 'end to the culture wars' (Nile, 2007; Riley, 2003; Throsby, 2008). Rudd's first year as Prime Minister in 2008 was an eventful year that reflected a burgeoning 'mood' for social change both nationally and internationally. In January in the United States, Americans witnessed the swearing in to office of their first black president, raising hope that racial relations among Americans would improve and that the war on terror would end. Back home, in February, Rudd, as Prime Minister, made an official apology to the Stolen Generations. In April Rudd convened the *Australia 20 20 Summit* with the objective to 'shape a long term strategy for the nation's future' ('Australia 2020 Summit', 2008).

⁸ A version of this chapter has been previously published. See Chisari, 2011.

The summit consisted of ‘1000 leading Australians’ who were to ‘debate and develop long-term options for the nation across ten critical areas’ which included concern for the ‘future of Australian governance’ and ‘the rights and responsibilities of citizens’ (‘Australia 2020 Summit’, 2008).

This euphoric anticipation of a better future for the nation’s population also spilled into popular culture with the film *Australia*, celebrating the apology made to the Stolen Generations. Baz Luhrmann’s film became a box office hit and was later taken up by *Tourism Australia* to promote the nation as a desirable destination for international tourists. Langton (2008) praised it as an ‘eccentrically postmodern account of a recent frontier’ that ‘has leaped over the ruins of the “history wars” and given Australians a new past’. She concluded that the film presented ‘an alternative history from the one John Howard and his followers constructed’.

It was in this spirit of change and national euphoria that Kevin Rudd announced in his first summer as Prime Minister that his newly-elected government would convene a committee to review the Australian citizenship test. While the Rudd Government reiterated its commitment to testing aspiring citizens on their knowledge of Australia, at the same time it acknowledged that the particular form of knowledge included in the 2007 test was in need of reform.

The Rudd Government announced the appointment of an independent review committee on 28 April 2008, just six months into the implementation of the Howard-introduced citizenship test (Evans, 2008). The committee was to be chaired by senior public servant Richard Woolcott and its operations and recommendations are discussed in the

next chapter. On announcing the convening of the review committee, the government did not identify any distinct problematic in the operations of the test. Senator Evans, Minister for Citizenship, explained that the role of the review committee was to ‘examine the operation and effectiveness of the test’ (Evans, 2008). He stated that ‘now that it has been in place for six months, it is timely to review it to make sure it is achieving its proper purpose as an effective pathway for residents to become citizens’ (Evans, 2008). The senator commented that:

The committee will examine aspects of the content and operation of the citizenship test, including the experiences of the applicants and the impact on citizenship applications, and consider ways to improve its operation and effectiveness. (Evans, 2008)

Although there was no explicit statement made that the test was ineffective or even controversial, the desire to ‘improve its operation’ suggests that the old test was indeed in need of improvement. The review committee however, had stated that its aim was to review any unforeseen consequences of the test. The committee reported that marginalised refugees were most at risk of failing the test and that there had been a drop in the uptake of citizenship. The review committee’s report stated:

The objective of the review was to identify any unintended consequences arising from the introduction of a citizenship test, including any barriers which may have been created to the acquisition of Australian citizenship by migrants and refugee and humanitarian entrants to Australia (regardless of background, education, skills or literacy), and to make recommendations to address these. (ACTRC, 2008, p. 7)

The review committee's role was significant as the definition of 'review' suggests, referring to a form of examination with the intent to correct or initiate change. The convening of the committee was also significant because the newly elected Rudd Government could not be seen to be intervening too closely or too soon in initiating changes to the citizenship test. It required the employment of expertise in the form of a review committee in order to provide 'this essential distance between the formal apparatus of laws, courts, and police and the shaping of the activities of citizens' (Rose, 1990, p. 10). In this way, the review committee was not expected to produce truths about the Australian population or the nation's history as had been expected of Hirst for the original citizenship resource booklet. Its role instead was to reform these truths and test their validity.

On announcing a review of the Australian citizenship test, Senator Evans made the following assertion:

To ask them (test candidates) to sit a test in English when they have very low or no literacy skills and then to ask them about Don Bradman and his cricket record for Australia, magnificent as it was, is probably a bit confronting for them.
(Cited in Coorey, 2008)

This example illustrates the volatility of what constitutes 'suitable knowledge' to be studied by new citizens. In citing Don Bradman as an example of what would be changed in the new citizenship test, Senator Evans was referring to the 'political interference' (Coorey, 2008) that had been displayed by John Howard in the development of the original citizenship test. Through the use of experts, Evans in the form of a review committee could distance himself from any accusation of political

interference on his part and perpetuate the notion of the test being an objective exercise in reform.

In downplaying the significance of the iconic cricketer, Don Bradman in the Australian citizenship test, Evans was contradicted by his own Prime Minister. Always the astute politician, Rudd reassured the Australian community that content from the old test relating to the iconic cricketer, Donald Bradman would remain in the revised test. Rudd stated that ‘the Don is safe’ (Coorey, 2008) for perhaps he did not want to upset the broader Australian community by trivialising the sportsman who has been described as ‘the embodiment of Australian nationhood’ (Hutchins, 2002, p. 2). As Hutchins (2002) argues, despite Bradman’s support for conservative politics, his relevance to modern day notions of Australian identity is viewed as ‘apolitical’ by the broad political spectrum for he ‘represents a past in which certainty and stability in economics, social relations and family life appear to be assured’ (p. 20). The past that Bradman represents stood ‘in sharp contrast to today’s globalised world where the techno-economic imperative guarantees uncertainty, fragmentation and instability’ (Hutchins, 2002, p. 20).

A history not to be shared by all Australians

The Australian review committee concluded that a great deal of content included in the original resource booklet was considered to be ‘trivial’ and that this had the potential to hinder understanding of the civic responsibilities of Australian citizenship. In its recommendations concerning the development of resources, the committee stated the

booklet should ‘be developed by professional educators who are experienced in civics and citizenship education’ (ACTRC, 2008, p. 24).

As a result, Australian history is no longer included as part of the essential knowledge in the revised Australian citizenship test. While the committee did not specifically signal out historical content as trivial or irrelevant, it can be assumed that it was this particular historical content that was not considered essential for determining the conferral of citizenship because the content of Australian history has now been moved to the non-assessable section of the new book, *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond*. Furthermore, the review committee (2008) had stated that the original resource booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, had been ‘widely criticised’ during the consultation process (p. 12). The report stated:

While many said that the book was interesting and provided information of which they had been unaware, most said that it represented a particular view of Australian society and history that might not be shared by all Australians. As a basis for a test, it was seen to contain too much that was irrelevant to citizenship. (ACTRC, 2008, p. 12)

As a result of these comments, the committee determined that ‘the book should be rewritten and divided into testable and “nice to know” sections’ (2008, p. 12). The Committee’s rationale for dividing the book into two categories was that it would lessen the fear of sitting a test because the assessable material would not be scattered throughout the book but contained in one section. The committee (2008) believed that ‘this would also assist community and educational organisations in formulating programs that provide avenues of learning that lead to becoming an Australian citizen’

(p. 12). The committee placed a great deal of emphasis on the pedagogical processes that it believed were essential to conducting the Australian citizenship test. In particular, the committee's recommendation seven stated that although this 'broader information on Australia' was not to be tested, it should continue to be included in the resource booklet because it 'may be of interest to prospective citizens' (ACTRC, 2008, p. 4).

What is interesting here is that although the committee acknowledged that this information was not relevant to demonstrating citizenship potential and that it might not be inclusive or 'shared' by all Australians, it was still considered 'interesting' and 'nice to know' information. That is, there were national truths that still had to be included in the resource booklet, as it seems that the topic of history, as Foucault implies, was too 'sacred' to be completely removed from citizenship texts. It must be remembered too that there has been a long traditional link between citizenship and history. More interestingly, the review committee made the following recommendation in relation to the new citizenship resource booklet:

The Committee considers that the resource book should be made available for use as an official government gift. The book could also be presented as a gift by the government to officially acknowledge and congratulate 18 year olds who enrol to vote. The general interest expressed in the consultations suggests that it might also be published more elaborately as a commercially available coffee table book. This enhanced edition could be provided in Australia's overseas missions as an official memento of Australia. (ACTRC, 2008, p. 47)

The citizenship resource booklet, in an 'enhanced' format could hence become a 'memento of Australia' for its broadened readership to include all Australian citizens at

their coming of ‘civic’ age as well as replacing the gift of the native plant presented to the naturalised citizen at the citizenship ceremony. The suggestion was that the new resource booklet was not a temporary, disposable resource that would be thrown out and forgotten after migrants had become naturalised Australian citizens. Bennett (1998) argues that objects and techniques such as art catalogues and guided tours in museums allow users to have ‘a more individualized relation to its content including its historical content’ (p. 121) and the same can be argued in relation to the citizenship resource booklet. That is, the receivers of the book would be able to read it at their own pace and contemplate the history that was reported in the booklet in order to understand history’s significant role in forging national identity. It was to be treated as a keepsake, something that is precious and worthy of collection and which had corrected the biased history that had engulfed the first booklet as this new version was to represent a ‘truer’ and more balanced history of Australia, warts and all.

‘Nice to know’ history

In October 2009, the booklet *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond* was released. The new citizenship resource booklet replicates most of the format of its predecessor booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen*. It is an A4 size, 76-page booklet with a thick cover printed on matt paper and with many of the same pictures and images recycled from the old booklet. It has a sleek layout and it is written in a jargon-free style that is more sympathetic to readers who do not have English as their first language. This suggests that it was not affected by the urgency that had plagued and undermined the language and accuracy of the old booklet. In this new booklet, there are more images and pages than in the old booklet. Unlike its predecessor booklet, it acknowledges all of

the images used. It does not, however, provide any details relating to who was responsible for its development as it only lists the Communications Branch within the Department of Immigration and Citizenship as the key player in its production.

The booklet is divided into approximately two equal sections; the first section from pages four to 35 comes under the title of *Testable section* and the second section is titled *Non-testable section* and runs from pages 38 to 76. Test candidates should study the content contained in the first section as all test questions are based on this content which is divided into the following sub-titles: *Australia and its people* (p. 8), *Australia's democratic beliefs, rights and liberties* (p. 16), *Government and the law in Australia* (p. 22), *Glossary of testable section* (p. 30) and *Practice test questions* (p. 34). The second section contains non-testable content which means that test candidates do not need to read it because no test question is based on this information but they can however read it for their own pleasure and education.

The non-testable section of *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond* is divided under the following sub-titles: *Australia today* (p. 38), *Our Australian story* (p. 54), *Glossary of non-testable section* (p. 72), *For more information* (p. 74) and *Acknowledgements* (p. 76). The historical sections of the new booklet are spread over 17 pages which is the same amount of pages dedicated to Australian history in the old booklet. Presented as recently revised, this new version of Australian history raises expectations that it will correct what was found wanting and irrelevant in the first booklet. The following textual analysis focuses on exploring the section entitled *Our Australian story* and it includes some comparisons with the old booklet's historical contents.

Our Australian Story

In *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond*, the section on Australian history begins on page 54 and ends on page 71. It is written under the more inclusive title of *Our Australian Story*. The format will be familiar to ESL teachers/practitioners versed in genre theory. Addressing the reader directly, this account of the nation's past opens and ends with the gentle disclaimer that this 'glimpse into our Australian story' (p. 71) is only a 'brief history' and 'by no means the full story' (p. 55). The orientation informs the prospective citizen that 'it will give you an idea of the events that have shaped our country and our culture' (p. 55). Knowledge here has a causal relationship with experience and observation, traits that equip the self with good moral conduct and feelings towards the nation. In this account there is the desire for a 'full story', that is a set of finite facts that need to be 'unearthed'.

The 'glimpse' into historical truths begins by acknowledging that 'for thousands of years the land was inhabited and cared for by the Indigenous people' (p. 55) and then a complication is introduced in the narrative: 'the arrival of the First Fleet in 1788 meant their world would change forever' (p. 55). The final two sentences, the coda that make up this introductory paragraph end on a positive (perhaps even pedagogical) note, offering soon-to-be citizens absolution from the evils of the past and hope for the future:

Over the past 200 years, Australia has learnt many lessons about equality and human rights on its path towards multiculturalism and reconciliation. The reforms we have made mean that the Australian community that you are now joining is one where every person feels included and valued. (p. 55)

It is with this brief 105-word paragraph that the section *Our Australian Story* launches into a thematic presentation of Australia's contested past, a past that has as its teleological goal the production of a well-ordered, happy and prosperous population, realised through an articulation of the desirability of reconciliation and multiculturalism.

Notable Australians

New to the citizenship book, *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond* is the inclusion of boxed texts with pictures and descriptions of well-known Australians. In the *Our Australian Story* section alone there are eight text boxes describing the life and achievements of Caroline Chisholm (p. 57), Catherine Spence (p. 61), Simpson and his donkey (p. 63), Sir Charles Kingsford Smith (p. 65), Sir Edward 'Weary' Dunlop (p. 67), Dr Victor Chang (p. 70), Albert Namatjira (p. 70) and Eddie Mabo (p. 70). These are the historical figures whose achievements the authors of the revised book deemed 'nice to know' for aspiring citizens.

Chisholm is among one of 11 recognisable women pictured in the new booklet compared with only two well-known women (Edith Cowan and Queen Elizabeth II) who had been included in the original booklet. She is described as a 'leading social reformer' and 'the migrant's friend' (p. 57). Chisholm's inclusion represents a shift in focus towards recognition of women as actors in Australian history that the old booklet had denied. For instance, included in the section detailing the 'Aussie battler', page 59 states that:

Male and female pioneers are honoured for their courage during these hard times. Women often had to keep the business or farm going when the men were away or had died. (p. 59)

The other notable ‘boxed’ woman, *Catherine Spence (1825-1910)* in *Our Australian Story* does not occur until page 61 under the sub-heading of *Suffrage*. Spence is described as ‘a writer, preacher, feminist and suffragette’ who was the ‘first woman to stand for Parliament’ (p. 61). Like Chisholm, she, too is recognised for helping others in need like homeless children but perhaps her most well known contribution is her position as Vice President of the Women’s Suffrage of South Australia (p. 61).

The topic of suffragettes is granted a sub-section of its own in *Our Australian Story*, as are other categories that are traditionally associated with men, like *The squatters and the farmers* (p. 60) and *Settlers and pioneers* (p. 59). The new booklet states:

‘Suffragettes’ was the term used around the world for women who campaigned for the right to vote in elections. During the 1880s and 1890s, every colony had at least one suffrage society. Suffragettes collected thousands of signatures on petitions to present to their colonial parliaments.

Women in South Australia won the right to vote and seek election to parliament in 1895. Women in Western Australia won the right to vote in 1899. In 1902, Australia was the first country to give women both the right to vote and the right to be elected to the Australian Parliament. Indigenous women (and men) were not granted the right to vote until 1962. (p. 61)

These two paragraphs dedicated to describing the plight of suffragette women offers

considerable more detail than the original booklet. In *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, in which the term suffragette was not used, the fight for women's vote was described briefly as follows:

About 1900 Australia became known as the social laboratory of the world. Political rights were widespread. Most men had had the vote from the 1850s; women then gained the vote, in South Australia first in 1894 and in the new Commonwealth in 1902. Governments were active in protecting wages and living conditions, giving help to farmers and pensions to the old. (p. 25)

In the original booklet, the women's vote was included with other social achievements while in the new booklet, the suffragette movement was presented as a global phenomenon and the discrimination against citizenship rights for Indigenous peoples is acknowledged. Edith Cowan and Enid Lyons have been retained as important figures in Australian history in the new citizenship resource booklet.

Unlike in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, migrants too, like women, receive more favourable treatment in *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond*. The booklet states:

In the early 1800s, English, Scottish, Welsh and Irish settlers were the main groups in the colonies. Their heritage was the basis of the new nation ...

However, there were also small groups of migrants from Europe and Asia.

European arrivals in the 1800s included Italians, Greeks, Poles, Maltese and Russians as well as French settlers working in the wine industry. (p. 60)

Hence there is a stark contrast between both booklets in relation to how they represent migrant stories. In the new booklet, the Welsh are named for the first time as belonging

to the ‘first’ settlers who included the English, Scottish and Irish. The new booklet lists other migrant groups such as ‘the Chinese migrants of the gold rushes and the “Afghans”, that is, people from Iran, Egypt and Turkey who operated the camel “trains” through the outback’ (p. 60). However, the highest accolade for migrant contribution to nation-building is reserved for the Snowy Mountains Scheme in which 70 per cent of its workers were migrants. The booklet describes it as a ‘massive project’ and ‘an important symbol of Australia’s identity as an independent multicultural society and resourceful country’ (p. 68). The new booklet concludes that in relation to migration,

Australia has become a nation of all lands, one world ... It is a multicultural society of harmony and acceptance. (p. 69)

Chang, Namatjira and Mabo are three notable male additions to the historical content appearing together on page 70 of *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond*. Namatjira was an Indigenous artist and Mabo was a Torres Strait Islander who fought for native land rights, recalling that in the original history penned by Hirst, reference to ‘Mabo’ only appeared as a ‘separatist policy’ and not as a person. In the new booklet, ‘Eddie Mabo is remembered for his courage and for gaining land rights for Indigenous Australians’ (p. 70). Described as ‘one of Australia’s greatest artists’, Albert Namatjira is praised with the following description:

He and his wife were the first Aboriginal people in Australia allowed to become citizens. This meant they could vote, enter a hotel and build a house wherever they liked. Albert’s Australian citizenship highlighted the fact that other Aboriginal people did not have these rights.

His life showed non-Indigenous Australians the injustice of racist laws and contributed to changes for Aboriginal people. (p. 70)

Chang is described as ‘one of Australia’s best heart surgeons’ who was born in China and came to Australia when he was 15 years old. The description continues:

He worked at St. Vincent’s Hospital in Sydney where in 1984 he set up the first Centre in Australia specialising in heart transplants. In 1986 Victor Chang was made a Companion of the Order of Australia, the highest Australian award. (p. 70)

Hence these three men who were not part of the great white achievers in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* were recognised in the new booklet as model citizens who made lasting contributions to the broader Australian community.

Indigenous Australians

Portrayals of Indigenous peoples too have significantly been rewritten in *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond*. Content on Indigenous history has now been placed at the head of the historical section of *Our Australian Story* under the title of *Indigenous Australians*. This section threads the theme of the past, present and future of Indigenous cultures throughout its paragraphs. It not only acknowledges that Indigenous people ‘inhabited’ and ‘cared’ for the land before 1788 but it qualifies this point by highlighting that Indigenous cultures are ancient and ‘continuous’ and still alive today as ‘about 145 languages are still used today’ (p. 55). This theme of connection with the past and the present is reiterated throughout the text with examples such as ‘the Dreaming continues to be important to Indigenous people today’ (p. 55). First contact between Indigenous peoples and the white settlers is described as follows:

When they first settled in Australia, the British Government did not make a treaty with the Aboriginal people. The Indigenous people had their own economies and their ancient connection to the land. The Government could not recognise this because there were no such systems of belief in Europe. Aboriginal people did not grow crops or set up homes to stay in one place as the British did, so the Government thought they had no sense of ownership. The Government felt free to take over the land. (p. 58)

This above cited explanation is offered from the viewpoint of non-Indigenous Australians and as a gentle justification of how the British settlers came to settle on the land. The language of modernity and European exploration (Enlightenment) is used as it was used in the original resource book. Under the section of *Early European exploration*, Portuguese and Dutch explorers are attributed with ‘discovering’ parts of Australia (p. 56) and Abel Tasman is attributed with ‘discovering’ the coast of a new land (p. 56). New knowledge in the form of William Dampier being the first Englishman to set foot on Australian soil (p. 56) is included in the new resource booklet. In the old booklet, early European exploration had begun with narratives of Captain Cook. Yet the new book is similar to the old version in that what all of these portrayals of European pioneering explorers have in common is that there is no account of their contact with Indigenous peoples. The emphasis, instead, is on their physical contact with the land. Two images are included on this page which highlight this materiality with the land, *Abel Tasman’s map of New Holland, 1644* and the painting depicting *The First Fleet sailed from Britain, arriving in Sydney Cove in 1788* (p. 56).

Similarly the dedicated section on Indigenous peoples in *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond* also adopts the primary theme that Indigenous peoples have a connection with the land. For instance, the new booklet states:

Governor Macquarie offered Aboriginal people their own land for farming and set up a school for Aboriginal children. However, very few Aboriginal people wanted to live the way the settlers lived. They did not want to lose their cultural traditions. (p. 58)

We must recall that in the first resource book, *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, the above passage was described with less subtlety, stating that ‘very few Aboriginal people were willing to move into European society; they were not interested in what the Europeans had to offer’ (p. 32). So gone is the patriarchal ‘them’ verses ‘us’ tone that had plagued the original booklet as understanding of different cultural traditions is now acknowledged in the second booklet. Yet, the second version still accepts the notion that it is Governor Macquarie and the white colonisers who had the power to ‘offer’ Indigenous people their own land and it is because of their ‘cultural traditions’ that is, there is continuity in presenting Indigenous Australians as connected to the land. As Elder (2007) argues, it is still the white coloniser who is defining Indigenous identity (p. 149).

Aboriginal history, as part of, and not separate from, the ‘bigger picture’ of Australian history is also reinforced through images such as the full page depiction of Uluru, inlaid with an image of decorated didgeridoos. There is also an image depicting Aboriginal art in Kakadu (p. 55). It is suggestive of narratives of Australia as an ancient land and

acknowledges Indigenous people as the original owners of the continent although it does not refer to Indigenous communities as custodians of the land.

Under the title of *Inland exploration*, the Aboriginal people are credited with being able to live in the Australian environment ‘though they too suffered in times of drought’ (p. 58). What is particularly interesting in this section is the shift that occurs in descriptions of the land. For instance, the fatal Burke and Wills expedition is described and the expert help they received from the Aboriginal Yandruwandha people is acknowledged (p. 58), yet here for the first time we see the land being attributed to *all* Australians: ‘It is a tragic example of the harshness of our land’ (p. 58). Hence, through European ‘exploration’ and the progress/nation-building that it initiated, non-Indigenous people have appropriated the land as ‘our’ harsh land. Drawing on Morris, Elder (2007) argues that non-Indigenous narratives such as these are organised around notions in which the white settlers become the victims of the land, that is, they become victims of the bush and desert ‘as inhuman agents of de-population’ in an ‘uninhabited land’ (p. 155). Furthermore, these kinds of descriptions have the effect of condensing and censoring a history of Aboriginal deaths and shift the responsibility for this colonial violence to a ‘homicidal land’ (Morris cited in Elder, 2007, p. 155).

Unlike its predecessor booklet, *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond* acknowledges some evil-doing on the part of the white settlers:

The early governors were told not to harm the Aboriginal people, but the British settlers moved onto Aboriginal land and many Aboriginal people were killed.

Settlers were usually not punished for committing these crimes. (p. 58)

The extract continues with the admission that ‘hundreds of thousands of Aboriginal people died’ in these ‘battles’ (p. 58). Like its predecessor booklet, it attributes these deaths to the spread of disease, but in this version, there is acknowledgement that the white settlers were responsible for spreading diseases:

The biggest killers of Aboriginal people were the diseases that the Europeans brought to the country. The loss of Aboriginal life was catastrophic. In Victoria in the 1830s, the Aboriginal population was about 10 000 peoples. In 1853, only 1907 Aboriginal people were counted. (p. 58)

So here we see clearly how the narrative that the original booklet promoted of white Australia having a predominantly peaceful history in which ‘Aboriginal people were not without friends’ (p. 33) has been disrupted. There are many discontinuities and continuities between the two booklets. Both government narratives promise that acceptance of their version of history will foster belonging in the wider Australian community. The second book appropriates the history and experiences of Indigenous people. It does this while taking credit for its good deeds. It does not address the Northern Territory Intervention and why the government continues with the policy. It makes no reference to compensation for the Stolen Generations and does not address the continued marginalisation of Indigenous peoples.

Remembering the Stolen Generations

We need to claim a place for the importance of the politics of emotions, because to do so is to engage in a broader project of acknowledging loss and grief as a part of Australian cultural identity. We need history to do this, at both the level

of collective and individual memory. It is when we change the dominant story of who we are that history has a revolutionary part to play in contributing to and enriching our cultural sphere... The challenge is to identify new gaps, and to fill them with a new past, and we need this in order to make history messy and emotional. (Damousi, 2002, p. 111)

The most striking contrast between the two booklets destined for use by aspiring citizens is their treatment of the Stolen Generation. The old citizenship booklet produced under Howard's term in office reflects his denial of the Stolen Generations as the assimilation policies are referred to exclusively in the following extract.

To manage this process they took away their civil rights. Aboriginal people could be told where to live, had to seek permission to marry and could have their children taken from them. There has been a great debate too on the intent of these policies, particularly over the forcible removal of children from their parents. (p. 33)

The same section in the new booklet reads as follows:

In the late 1800s, the colonial governments took away Aboriginal rights. They told the Aboriginal people where to live. They told them who they could marry and they took many Aboriginal children away from their parents. These children were sent to 'white' families or government orphanages. These practices no longer exist but they remain a cause of deep sadness for the Aboriginal people and for many Australians. (p. 60)

Surprisingly, although the passage does not use the passive voice like the first extract, it still fails to name the Stolen Generation. This does not occur until page 71 but it does so in an interesting context. Under the title of *Indigenous people – two decades of change*, the extract reads:

In May 1997, the ‘Bringing them home’ report was tabled in the Australian Parliament. The report was the result of an inquiry into the removal of large numbers of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families. These children came to be known as the ‘Stolen Generations’. As a result of the report, thousands of Australians showed support for their Indigenous fellow Australians by marching together on the first national ‘Sorry Day’ in 1998. (p. 71)

As Damousi (2002) argues, there can be no denying the significance of the *Bringing them Home* report in informing the general public of the existence of the cruel practice that was not widely known among non-Indigenous communities at the time of its production. The *Bringing them Home* report examined the experiences of people who had been taken away and in highlighting the damage that these practices had had on children and their families, the report had the effect of ‘fiercely (challenging) the practice of removal and institutionalisation’ (Damousi, 2002, p. 108). Damousi (2002) concludes that ‘(a)buse, trauma and emotional anguish characterise the memories which are documented in this report’ (p. 108). The report also focused on the processes of monetary compensation and healing for these traumatised victims of human rights violations which called for ‘an acknowledgement of the truth’ and ‘the delivery of an apology’ (Damousi, 2002, p. 108).

The new resource booklet certainly captures the importance of the report as it makes *Bringing them Home* the active agent in the above passage cited from the resource booklet, *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond*. Yet it does not capture the element of human suffering that Damousi discussed as ‘the importance of the politics of emotion’. There is no mention of the trauma experienced by members of the Stolen Generations and the inquiry’s calls for compensation are not mentioned. The reader is directed to the report rather than the victims’ stories and the migrant-cum-citizen is advised that it is because of the report that thousands of Australians showed their support for their fellow Indigenous Australians by participating in a symbolic march. The apology that the report had recommended was elaborated on and continues in a separate section.

In the new booklet, *The Apology to the Stolen Generations, 2008* is granted its own title and explanation.

On February 13 2008, the Australian Prime Minister made a national apology to the Stolen Generations in the Australian Parliament. He spoke on behalf of all Australians. He said sorry for the way Indigenous Australians had been treated in the past. He said sorry especially for the way the Indigenous children had been taken from their parents. (p. 71)

In the above cited extract, it is the position of Prime Minister and not Kevin Rudd the person that is emphasised as the important actor in making the apology, a technique used so as to make the apology durable and which creates the effect that it is the nation that is making the apology, not the man. The apology, too, is granted a life of its own:

The *speech* was aired on television and radio stations. Thousands of Australians gathered together in public places to listen to the ‘*Sorry*’ *speech*. The *speech* officially listed past injustices and apologised for them. This was an important step towards the healing of the Indigenous people and to making sure that these injustices would never happen again. The *Sorry speech* was an important step forward for all Australians. (my italics) (p. 71)

Despite its self-congratulatory tone and its disappointment in delivering change to the Indigenous victims, ‘the speech’ has been applauded both globally and locally for its symbolic significance. Johnson (2010) argues that this is a form of affective citizenship whereby apologising for past wrongs signals ‘the development of more racially inclusive conceptions of citizenship rights and entitlements’ (p. 499). The healing here is carried out by the object of the speech and Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. Citing Margaret Atwood’s words, Damousi (2002) concludes that the ‘past no longer belongs only to those who once lived in it; the past belongs to those who claim it, and are willing to explore it, and to infuse it with meaning for those alive today. The past belongs to us, because we are the ones who need it’ (p. 112).

Hage (2003a) too alludes to the affective qualities of history:

...(migrants) who are ashamed by Australia’s past could not possibly be shamed unless they feel that Australia has offered them something so valuable that they feel strong affective ties towards it. ... Shame can only come from caring and caring can only come if one feels pride in what one has inherited. It is because I am so proud of what Australia has offered me (democracy, freedom of speech, the good life, etc.) that I care about it. (p. 106)

The description of the apology is the final word in the new citizenship booklet, *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond* as this is the last page of the booklet. It is an end point and something that has been completed. What this suggests is that even though the new test and booklet have been championed as fairer and more inclusive, they still record history from a predominantly white perspective and the second booklet still portrays non-Indigenous Australians as the romanticised active agents in all that is good in Australian history. That is, all of the mechanisms used such as the report, the speech and the position of the Prime Minister are granted agency. These are the elements in Australian history that have acted heroically and produced national truths. So despite the claims of a more tolerant society with balance, this mechanism of government, this revised Australian citizenship test still has as its tolerators and active agents its white people, that is, its ‘experts’, those report writers, the speech writers and speech givers who instruct migrants on how to regulate their conduct by adopting this ‘inclusive’ history so that they can achieve belonging.

At the end of the section of *Our Australian Story*, it is recommended that prospective citizens go out on their own and ethically regulate their conduct by seeking further knowledge on Australian history. This ending encourages the reader to embody Australian history, look at dates and monuments, wear poppies and travel around. The section ends with the following extract:

These pages have given you a glimpse into our Australian story. You might find that this new knowledge has opened up your awareness of your environment. You might start looking at the dates on old buildings and placing them in a historical context. When you are offered a poppy to wear on 11 November, you will know that it is to remember our fallen servicemen and women. When you

meet Indigenous Australians, you will have a sense of the ancient cultures that guide them. We urge you to expand your knowledge by using local resources and through travel. The more you know, the more you will notice. (p. 71)

So like the making of the pledge, reading this ‘nice to know’ history acts as a technology of the self. Knowledge here becomes a virtuous act that is included in order to ensure that migrants take the correct messages from the history that is portrayed in the citizenship booklets. It is an order of being that makes the aspiring citizen appear to be ‘worthier’ because s/he has taken the time to learn this history. Similar to Bennett’s argument in relation to culture’s reforming role, we can therefore view this ‘nice to know’ history as also having an impact on migrants who ‘aspire to ... choose such a course of life for themselves as a matter of personal responsibility or self-regulation’ (1998, p. 124). Yet in the context of the new Australian citizenship test, the role of history rather than being a reforming science should be viewed instead as a curative science which heals the injustices of the past.

History as a curative science

Making history ‘nice to know’ thus moves it away from the debates about the history wars and notions of right versus wrong history, good versus bad history. Including it as ‘nice’ knowledge offers further possibilities for viewing history as a curative science. That is, by attempting to address the prejudices and gaps of the history portrayed in the old test, the new booklet includes some other episodes that work towards healing and reconciling the nation. New citizens are asked to embody history and discipline their bodies through exploration so that history becomes a dynamic form of knowledge. This

is not a more ‘truthful’ history because it acknowledges some aspects of regrettable and at times violent episodes for there are still the absent stories such as references to mandatory detention of asylum seekers and the Northern Territory Intervention. Yet the Australian citizenship test review committee felt that it was still nice to know. In this way, this history becomes ‘performative’ as a nice, palatable and balanced history that addresses the wrongs of the past.

However, this more conciliatory version of Australia’s past does not prove that the history wars are over, for despite broadening its categories of what constitutes historical truth, these truths still privilege an exclusive white perspective. Indeed, we need to discard this way of thinking that frames the past as an ethical struggle between right and wrong and a moral battle between victors and losers. If we cease thinking of our nation’s history as a battleground between celebrators and mourners and we stop framing our national identity in terms of achievers and those who were not interested in building the nation, then we recognise that these ‘war’ discourses are only the products of ‘games of truth’ invented by governments, expert historians and their institutions. In this way, official texts can produce the possibility for a range of players from new directions to participate in what content can be included as historical truths in Australian stories and what is possible in productions of official Australian identities. The Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee (2008) understood this potential impact as it has recommended ‘the government commit to reviewing the content of the book at regular intervals given the evolving nature of Australian society’ (p. 25).

In disrupting the ‘self-evident’ notion of a ‘balanced history’ of facts with its evocation of an equal society and by exposing how governmental institutions have used these texts

as instruments of social management (Bennett, 1998), we can come to understand that there are other ways of being Australian and multiple versions of Australian history. In this way, we broaden understanding of Australia's past by drawing on alternative stories of Australia including the 'ruptures', 'failings' and 'poisons' and counter-stories that come together to form the multiplicity that is Australian identity.

In this way, the production of official histories can work towards producing a 'curative science' that heals the fatal impact of the past and that puts an end to the discourse of history wars. In this way, history becomes 'a differential knowledge of energies and failings, heights and degenerations, poisons and antidotes' (Foucault, 1984, p. 90) which has the capacity to transform Australian society into a society inclusive of all Indigenous, non-Indigenous and migrant citizens and which can work towards reconciliation of the nation's history, and perhaps, even of its people.

Furthermore, the 'nice to know' history in *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond* is a form of knowledge that instructs individuals about the art of living. It is a way of life that is always part of the subject citizen. 'Nice to know' history is also about education as pleasure. Becoming a good Australian citizen then is not just about learning the rules, the civic rights and responsibilities but it is also about the pleasure of belonging through knowing. The review committee's decision to keep history in the book then is an invitation for the migrant to have access to part of the subject position of being Australian and it is an invitation for the migrant to become a knowing citizen.

CHAPTER ELEVEN: FROM AUSTRALIAN VALUES TO THE CITIZENSHIP PLEDGE

In the philosophical tradition dominated by Stoicism, *askesis* means not renunciation but the progressive consideration of self, or mastery over oneself, obtained not through the renunciation of reality but through the acquisition and assimilation of truth. It has as its final aim not preparation for another reality but access to the reality of this world. The Greek word for this is *pasaskeuazo* ('to get prepared'). It is a set of practices by which one can acquire, assimilate, and transform truth into a permanent principle of action. (Foucault, 1988, p. 35)

It is important to define what is expected of an Australian citizen, for all Australians no matter how they became citizens, and the best way in which this can be achieved. The objectives of citizenship need to be considered in this context. If our aim is social cohesion and inclusion, which we consider it must be, then any test or assessment should be designed to provide an opportunity for individuals to learn about the responsibilities and privileges of Australian citizenship. This is separate from what may simply be useful knowledge about this country to assist individuals in integrating into the community. (ACTRC, 2008, p. 1)

Having just provided a comparative textual analysis of the history content included in the two citizenship resource booklets, I now return to the review process of the test that had recommended these changes. I provide an overview of the reforms introduced to the

citizenship test after the recommendations made by the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee in 2008 and the government response to the committee's report. I explore how the concept of promoting Australian values as essential to the conferral of citizenship has been replaced by an emphasis on the Australian Citizenship Pledge of Commitment, a pledge that works as a technology of the self to transform truths into 'a permanent principle of action' for the migrant citizen. I conclude this chapter with a brief ethnography detailing how migrants negotiate becoming an Australian citizen.

Reforming the Australian citizenship test

Australia is a work in progress, changing and evolving. Over the last 220 years all Australians, except the Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islanders, have come from somewhere else. We are all immigrants, refugees, or the descendants of immigrants, refugees or transported convicts. For the majority of residents home is now here. We have come together to forge a multicultural society in this ancient continent, which is part of the increasingly inter-related, globalised world of the 21st century.

Modern Australia, still a relatively young nation, is a country of great potential. Immigration, as a key part of nation building, is essential to realise that potential. Moreover, citizenship is an important concept closely linked to nation building through the strengthening of national identity. (ACTRC, 2008, p. 1)

It is with these opening lines that the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee's report, *Moving Forward Improving Pathways to Citizenship* begins. These paragraphs are written in the format of a letter addressed to the Minister for Citizenship,

Senator Chris Evans by the Chair of the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee, Richard Woolcott. The letter outlines the new Rudd Government's alternative approach to citizenship testing and its desired outcome for the Australian population. Perusing these opening paragraphs of the committee's report, it becomes apparent that one of the committee's primary objectives was to address the controversial aspects of Howard's citizenship test including its portrayal of Australian identity and the insignificant role that it had granted to immigration in nation-building endeavours. In the 'Foreword' to the 2006 Discussion Paper initiated by the Howard Government, *Australian Citizenship: Much More than a Ceremony*, Andrew Robb wrote that 'Australia has successfully combined people into one family with one overriding culture, based on a set of common values' (DIMA, 2006). By contrast, the opening sentence of the citizenship test review committee's report states that 'Australia is a work in progress, changing and evolving' (ACTRC, 2008, p. 1). In these two brief yet telling examples, we can see how Richard Woolcott stressed continuing change and movement in the national story, while Andrew Robb promoted a fixed past and a nation that was complete.

There are many other examples within the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee's report that illustrate how differently the Rudd Government was going to approach the Australian citizenship test. For instance, as cited above, the committee's report begins by informing the interested reader that all non-Indigenous Australians have originally come from 'somewhere else'. This is in contrast to the first citizenship test resource booklet's repeated emphasis that British settlers were the true achievers and builders of the Australian nation. Furthermore, in Woolcott's opening statement, the nation was reinstated as a 'multicultural society' for it must be remembered that under the Howard Government, the word multiculturalism disappeared from all official

documentation relating to the Australian citizenship test. Furthermore, in the review committee's report, it is the land and not the Indigenous peoples that is ancient and Australia's place in 'a globalised world' is reiterated rather than emphasising Australia's alliances with Britain and America as the Howard-inspired test had done. Finally, in complete contrast to the previous lack of recognition attributed to role of immigration, Woolcott and the committee recognised that immigration is 'a key part in nation-building'. Hence, this new test is about the desire to 'move forward' and build cohesion, inclusion and integration among the Australian population, expressed as an alternative rather than a continuation of Howard's exclusive policy of integrating migrants into the mainstream.

The expert committee members

The Rudd Government employed 'seven eminent Australians' to convene as members of the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee. The committee members included Richard Woolcott AC, former diplomat and distinguished public servant, Rechelle Hawkes, OAM, a former Olympian recipient of three gold medals with the Australian women's hockey team, Paula Masselos, former SBS radio director, Juliana Nkrumah, advocate for women and refugee rights, Warren Pearson, specialist in the promotion of civics and citizenship for Australia Day and now Assistant Secretary for Multicultural Affairs, former Vice Admiral Chris Richie of the Royal Australian Navy and legal and citizenship expert, Professor Kim Rubenstein from the Australian National University. Each of these committee members brought their own expertise to the discussions in relation to how to improve the Australian citizenship test for migrants and refugees who want to become Australian citizens. The combined experience of the

committee members was broad and their respective disciplines were deemed essential to establishing what constitutes a good citizen in contemporary Australia. We can recall that in contrast, the Discussion Paper, *Australian Citizenship... Much More than a Ceremony* did not list any of the names of the members who made up the Citizenship Taskforce responsible for the production of the test.

The committee's chair, Richard Woolcott AC, is a well-respected, retired public servant who had worked for more than 40 years as a diplomat in Asia, as Australian Ambassador to the United Nations, as Secretary for the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade and in other prominent roles for both major political parties that spanned the years of Menzies' term in office to the Rudd Government (Attard, 2008). Senator Evans described Woolcott as 'an excellent ambassador for multicultural relations' and only two months after his appointment as chair to the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee, Woolcott was once again asked to assist the Rudd Government with political relations in Asia (Attard, 2008). Although not a supporter of the test itself, Woolcott believed that he had a role to play in promoting an alternative kind of national identity to the one that had been defined by the Howard Government in the original citizenship test resource booklet. In an ABC radio interview conducted by Monica Attard, Woolcott divulged that he did not personally think that there should be a citizenship test and that the test was 'a bit intimidating':

Particularly for some of the people like the UNHCR refugees who come from conflict areas like Sierra Leone or Liberia or the Congo and have been through traumatic experiences and maybe don't speak English at all and are very glad that they've come to Australia, they've been offered a new home here under the Refugee category but then face the additional hurdle of a test and I think some

sort of arrangements or consideration needs to be made for that group. (Attard, 2008)

Despite his personal views, Woolcott conceded that the continuation of a citizenship test had bipartisan political support and that he should respect this policy adding that he had always valued citizenship:

And we have to draw a distinction between what a person would really need to know to be a good citizen of this country and I guess that is about democracy and the rule of law and ... maybe just useful to know to be a member of the wider Australian community. (Attard, 2008)

Woolcott had been critical about what had been included in the booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, ‘particularly about the distant past: who was our most famous cricketer; who was our most famous billiards player’ (Attard, 2008). Instead, he interpreted the Act’s requirement that new citizens need to have an adequate knowledge of Australia to include the principles of ‘democracy and the rule of law’. The principles of democracy and the rule of law, however, had already been defined as part of Australian values under the Howard Government. Yet in Woolcott’s comments, he did not identify them as being part of the Australian values discourse but rather as pertaining to the area of civic responsibilities.

In announcing the convening of the committee, Senator Evans stressed the importance of the public consultation process in which the committee was going to engage:

To provide members of the public and interested parties with an opportunity to have their views considered, the committee will undertake a public consultation

process. This will assist in identifying a range of feedback on the experiences and the opinions of the test from those who have already been through the process. (Evans, 2008)

Thus the process involved in reviewing the Australian citizenship test can also be seen as reassuring 'the public and interested parties' that they can participate in governing society. Similarly, those applicants who had already sat the test could report on their experience in the hope of helping others. Just like the Discussion Paper prepared under the Howard Government, the review process worked as a mechanism of government that had as its objective consensus among the population. The report's declared objective was to ensure that aspiring citizens could reassure the Australian community that they understood the institutions and responsibilities of Australian citizenship.

Recommendation two of the Committee's report states:

To demonstrate to the general public that people applying for citizenship have satisfied the legislative requirements when making the Pledge of Commitment.
(ACTRC, 2008, p. 4)

It is still the 'general public', like former Prime Minister Howard's 'mainstream' Australians who are identified as key stakeholders in this desire for reassurance. That is, reassurance is required for the existing Australian community whether it be figured as Woolcott's 'general public' or Howard's 'old Australia' that make up his mainstream. Governmental reassurance was still required for governing the conduct of each and all.

The consultation process

It is noteworthy in our experience and in the original consultations undertaken prior to the implementation of the test that organisations linked to migrant support programs generally oppose any form of citizenship testing, while individual contributors tend to support some form of test. Many individuals are themselves products of the Australian immigration system and see an inherent value in the notion that citizenship is something to be earned. This particular observation strengthened our resolve to recommend a fair and equitable way of testing for the conferral of Australian citizenship. (ACTRC, 2008, p. 11)

The committee invited over 700 organisations and individuals to submit their responses (ACTRC, 2008, p. 10). It received a total of 179 submissions (ACTRC 2008, p. 13). In addition, the committee consulted with 130 organisations and individuals over a six-week period, targeting those groups who had originally made submissions to the Discussion Paper, *Australian Citizenship ... Much more than a Ceremony* (2008, 11). The consultation process was widespread across Australia and consisted of face-to-face and telephone interviews (ACTRC, 2008, p. 11).

Reporting on its consultation process, the committee found two major commonalities among respondents. Firstly, the committee was ‘struck’ by the predominance of representations from refugee and humanitarian groups (2008, p. 11). The committee acknowledged that their findings were significantly influenced by these organisations, particularly since they came to be recognised as ‘the most disadvantaged, both by their circumstances and the nature of the (original) citizenship test which affectively discriminate(d) against them’ (ACTRC, 2008, p. 11). The *Australian Citizenship Test*

Snapshot Report (October 2008) had also reported that refugees who took the test had the highest failure rates.

The other commonality among respondents was the recognition that there was a need for ‘education in the civic responsibilities required of Australian citizens and the desirability of community involvement in providing this education’ (ACTRC, 2008, p. 12). Many lamented the demise of the *Let’s Participate* civics program with no government funded educational programs offered to aspiring citizens to replace it (2008, p. 12). The review committee also reported that there was ‘a strongly promoted view’ that resource materials should be provided in multimedia format (2008, p. 12). The booklet *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond* that accompanies the current citizenship test also became available by order and free of charge in DVD format from the Department of Immigration and Citizenship’s website.

The committee reported that ‘opening statements during consultations generally began with firm opposition to any form of testing’ (ACTRC, 2008, p.11). The consultation process also revealed that despite legislation requiring only a basic knowledge of the English language, the original citizenship test and its resources were ‘biased towards those who were literate in the English language’ (ACTRC, 2008, p.11). The following section details two submissions that highlighted many of the concerns that were typical of a majority of submissions and highlight the Review Committee’s conclusion that the test was still very unpopular among organisations working with refugee communities and human rights issues.

Submissions to the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee

The Refugee Council of Australia (RCA) (2008) made a seven-page submission to the Australian citizenship test review committee. Previously it had also made a response to the draft Discussion Paper, *Australian Citizenship: Much More than a Ceremony* as well as providing a submission to the Senate Legislative and Constitutional Affairs Committee Inquiry into the Citizenship Amendment (Citizenship Testing) Bill 2007 (RCA, 2008, p. 1). In its submission to the Test Review Committee, it reiterated its opposition to citizenship testing suggesting that the allocated \$80 million funding for the testing program could have been ‘allocated more appropriately to settlement services, English language training and broader human rights education’ (RCA, 2008, p. 2). The Council was highly critical of the test, reminding the review committee that there were parallels with the testing process of the White Australia Policy and that it had the potential to operate in ‘an exclusionary manner’ as the test presented an ‘insufficient appreciation for Australia’s existing rich multicultural heritage’ (RCA, 2008, pp. 1-2).

In relation to *Becoming an Australian Citizen*, the Refugee Council of Australia stated that the resource booklet did ‘not acknowledge the universality of values of human rights or notions of democracy and the rule of law with which many refugees have significant affinity’ (RCA, 2008, p. 4). This is an important criticism directed at Howard’s assertion that the notions listed under Australian values such as democracy and the rule of law are exclusive to Australia and other liberal-democratic nations. The Council proposed that if there must be a requirement that aspiring citizens demonstrate an adequate knowledge of Australia, then government could engage in alternative measures to testing that could be provided by community education, including a range of community media used to ‘deliver public programs about Australia’s history, human

rights and democracy' (RCA, 2008, p. 6). One of the Council's most telling comments related to the citizenship test's aims of ensuring that applicants value the institution of citizenship, that they possess a basic level of English and have an adequate knowledge of Australia (RCA, 2008, p. 4). The Refugee Council of Australia stated:

It should be noted that the legislative articulation of such criteria for applicants for citizenship promotes the notion that citizenship obtained through application is one that is deeply qualitatively different from that conferred upon individuals born in Australia to an Australian citizen or permanent resident. (2008, p. 4)

Thus the Council recognised that the implementation of the Australian citizenship test for migrants seeking the conferral of Australian citizenship was a discriminatory mechanism that kept migrants 'out' rather than 'in' the broader Australian community. In a similar way, the submission made by the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) (2008) expressed concerns about the negative impact of testing on certain immigrant groups. In particular, it recommended that 'the content and format of the test should be modified to diminish its discriminatory impact' and that 'support services be extended to support the capacity of applicants from NESB and refugees' (HREOC, 2008, pp. 2- 3). The HREOC stated emphatically that the citizenship test was not achieving the goals that had been identified in the 2006 Discussion Paper which included identifying whether applicants understood the responsibilities and privileges of becoming an Australian citizen and encouraging applicants to find out more about the Australian nation (2008, p. 5). HREOC implored the committee to 'reconsider and clarify what it is seeking to achieve from the citizenship test and whether, in view of its discriminatory impact, the test is the best way of achieving these goals' (2008, p. 5). The submissions made by HREOC and the Refugee Council of Australia had a

significant impact on the recommendations made by the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee.

The Committee's recommendations

The Committee made 34 recommendations in its report and the government accepted most of them. The key findings of the committee are listed as follows:

- Citizenship is a valued and important concept and is a key factor in nation building. Its acquisition should be encouraged and facilitated by government.
- The purpose of any citizenship test should be to assess whether a person who wants to become a citizen is conscious of the main responsibilities underpinning the Citizenship Pledge of Commitment.
- The present test is flawed, intimidating to some and discriminatory. It needs substantial reform.
- The legislative requirements for a 'basic knowledge of the English language' and an 'adequate knowledge of Australia and of the responsibilities and privileges of Australian citizenship' requires definition before a revised and more appropriate test can be established.
- Alternative and improved education pathways to acquire citizenship need to be established for different categories of people seeking citizenship.
- The special situations of refugee and humanitarian entrants and other disadvantaged and vulnerable people seeking citizenship must be addressed.
- The test questions (at present confidential) should be published in any revised test.

- The content of the resource booklet should contain relevant, clearly defined testable information.
- The resource booklet should be re-written in basic English by professional educators.
- There should be a more coordinated whole-of-government approach to civics and citizenship policy and programs. (ACTRC, 2008, p. 3)

In summary, the Committee found that while citizenship is ‘a valued and important concept’, the Australian citizenship test produced under the Howard Government as the mechanism that was to promote the take up of citizenship among migrants was ‘flawed, intimidating to some and discriminatory’ and required ‘substantial reform’ (2008, p. 3). In relation to the legislative requirement of the test assessing a candidate’s adequate knowledge of Australia, the committee found that this required a clear definition that was not present in the ‘old’ test and that there ‘should be a more coordinated whole-of-government approach to civics and citizenship policy and programs’ (2008, p. 3). This recommendation recalls a similar recommendation made by the Australian Citizenship Council in 2000 in which civic education was promoted as a priority for *all* Australians. To this day however, citizenship is framed as the concern of those subjects who want to become Australian citizens and not those who are born with the status of Australian citizens.

The Rudd Government accepted the majority of the review committee’s recommendations. The most notable exceptions were that the government did not maintain the pass mark at 60 per cent but raised it instead to 75 per cent for the revised test. The other main recommendation rejected by the Rudd Government was to not

publish the test questions so that they would be available to the general public. The government claimed that these decisions would ‘maintain the rigour of the Australian citizenship test’ (Australian Government, 2008, p. 3). This view reflects the notion that examinations are instruments of government that put the emphasis on ‘finding out’ the candidates ‘deficit knowledge’, that is, they emphasise what candidates do not know rather than what they do know and in this way, examinations work as a disciplining tool on the migrant body. In the section that follows, I focus on the report’s recommendations which dealt specifically with ‘defining an adequate knowledge of Australia and responsibilities and privileges of Australian citizenship’ (ACTRC, 2008, p. 4) as it related to knowledge of the Pledge of Commitment.

The Pledge of Commitment

The Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee stated that the pledge that was made at the citizenship ceremony was one of the most significant aspects of the process of becoming an Australian citizen. The pledge is not merely a symbolic ritual but it is an official requirement made at citizenship ceremonies. It has been an integral part of becoming an Australian citizen since the introduction of the citizenship act in 1949. In the new test, the pledge replaced the prominence that had been given to Australian values under the Howard Government. Indeed, in the new citizenship booklet there is no mention of Australian values. In their place is the pledge that reads as follows.

*From this time forward,
I pledge my loyalty to Australia and its people,
whose democratic beliefs I share,
whose rights and liberties I respect, and
whose laws I will uphold and obey.*

What is particularly interesting in the wording of the pledge is that the entity of Australia is separated from its population (I pledge my loyalty to Australia *and* its people). Foucauldian ethics reminds us that in everyday life, we not only care for our selves but we also do this by caring for others and in this case, care of others relates to the Australian population. The word oath, too, has the meaning of ‘swearing the truth’ and this we can relate to the principle of knowing yourself where knowledge is related to truth. To make a pledge is also defined as to give a solemn assurance and here again we see how the pledge works as a technology of the self aimed at governing the individual while at the same time assuring the Australian community. The swearing of the pledge can therefore be seen as an embodied act of demonstrating suitability and knowledge of Australia. Ahmed (2000), too, writes that,

The construction of the nation space takes place alongside the production of national character as instances in which ‘the nation’ itself is fleshed out as *place* and *person*. The nation becomes imagined as a body in which personhood and place are precariously collapsed. Through a metonymic elision, the individual can claim to embody a nation, or the nation can take the shape of the body of an individual (‘bodyspace’). (italics in original) (p. 99)

Placing the focus of Australian citizenship on the Pledge was articulated in

Recommendation 6.8 which stated:

The legislative requirement to have an ‘adequate knowledge of Australia and of the responsibilities and privileges of Australian citizenship’ be linked to concepts and information people need to understand in order to make the Pledge of Commitment. (ACTRC, 2008, p. 25)

The government ‘strongly’ supported this recommendation of ‘having the Pledge as the centrepiece of Australian citizenship testing (Australian Government, 2008, p. 2). The Government’s response continued:

The concepts contained in the Pledge lie at the heart of Australian citizenship and reflect the very core of a vibrant and healthy community of citizens.

The Pledge joins all Australians in a statement of unity and it is crucial that prospective citizens understand its concepts. (2008, pp. 2-3)

Interestingly, the pledge had been proposed as the solution to the problems of the Australian citizenship test even before the review committee had begun its public consultation process. In its terms of reference, the review committee stated that:

The Australian Government believes that a citizenship test can play a valuable role in both encouraging people to find out more about our great nation as well as understanding the responsibilities and privileges which being an Australian citizen brings. This knowledge will help ensure that people understand the significance of the words of the Pledge of Commitment which new citizens make at their citizenship ceremony. (ACTRC, 2008, p. 50)

As was recommended by the Committee and accepted by government, the underlying principles of the pledge are explained in the new citizenship booklet, *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond*. They are unpacked over four pages from pages 16 to 19 and are categorised under the titles of *Australia’s democratic beliefs, rights and liberties*. These include

- Parliamentary democracy
- The rule of law
- Living peacefully
- Respect for all individuals regardless of background
- Compassion for those in need
- Freedom of speech, of expression, of association of religion and secular government
- Equality in Australia
- Equality of opportunity, equality of men and women

These beliefs, rights and principles unpacked as part of the pledge share many similarities with the list of Australian values that had been outlined for the original Australian citizenship test and which still form part of the *Australian Values Statement*. If we compare the two citizenship resource booklets that elaborate on the pledge and Australian values, we can see that the relevant texts are indeed similar in wording. The table on the next page compares the two texts.

<i>Becoming an Australian Citizen, 2007</i>	<i>Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond, 2009</i>
Part 1 What does being an Australian mean? Australian values	Part 2 Australia's democratic beliefs, rights and liberties
	<i>Our democratic beliefs:</i>
Support for parliamentary democracy and the rule of law (p.6)	Parliamentary democracy (p.17)
	The rule of law (p.17)
Peacefulness (p.7)	Living peacefully (p.17)
Respect for the equal worth, dignity and freedom of the individual (p.5)	Respect for all individuals regardless of background (p.17)
Tolerance, mutual respect and compassion for those in need (p.7)	Compassion for those in need (p.17)
	<i>Our freedoms:</i>
Freedom of association (p.6)	Freedom of association (p.18)
Freedom of speech (p.5)	Freedom of speech and freedom of expression (p.18)
Freedom of religion and secular government (p.6)	Freedom of religion and secular government (p.18)
	<i>Our equalities:</i>
Equality under the law (p.6)	Equality in Australia (p.19)
Equality of men and women (p.7)	Equality of men and women (p.19)
Equality of opportunity (p.7)	Equality of opportunity (p.19)

As the table reveals, most of the beliefs, rights and liberties that are embedded in the Pledge and that are outlined in *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond* are the same as the Australian values that were defined in *Becoming an Australian Citizen*. The wording of the two texts is also very similar as are many of the examples used to illustrate the points. The most notable exception occurs around the principles of respect for the individual, tolerance and compassion. In *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond*, defining the Australian people is inclusive of Australians ‘from countries all around the world’ (p. 17) and differences are acknowledged and respected. The new booklet states,

People come to settle in Australia from countries all around the world. Many people have a different cultural heritage with different beliefs, and traditions. In our democratic society, we are all free to follow and share these beliefs and traditions as long as they do not break Australian laws.

We value this freedom and expect all Australians to treat each other with dignity and respect, regardless of their race, country of origin, gender, sexual preference, marital status, age, disability, heritage, culture, politics, wealth or religion.

We value this mutual respect for the dignity of all people. (p. 17)

Its equivalent in the old citizenship resource booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen* outlines the point as follows:

Individual Australians are free and equal and should be treated with dignity and respect. They enjoy basic freedoms – such as freedom of belief and speech, religion, peaceful assembly and association – subject to the law and as long as one person’s freedoms do not harm others.

Australians reject the use of violence, intimidation and humiliation as ways to settle conflict in our society. (p. 5)

The text in the revised booklet is more inclusive of difference with its use of ‘we’ to incorporate all Australians. The text included in the first citizenship booklet seems defensive, suggesting that Australians need to protect their freedom and equality, that is, Australia should be treated with ‘dignity and respect’ by unnamed threats. Another significant difference between the two citizenship resources is how they describe the treatment of others. In the new booklet, ‘mateship’ and volunteering is promoted and it is declared that ‘our government also supports Australians in need through social security and other services’ (p. 17). In the old booklet, mateship and volunteering are also advocated but the granting of social security is qualified:

Government support in the form of a social safety net for those who struggle through life through no fault of their own is part of Australia’s egalitarian ethos. (p. 7)

These two examples highlight the different political approaches adopted by the Howard and Rudd Governments in relation to social welfare policies. In the second example, it is only deserving citizens who self-regulate their conduct through ‘no fault of their own’ who should be entitled to social security. Furthermore, in the revised booklet, there is no mention of tolerance as a principle that embodies the Pledge of Commitment. In Howard’s version of the test, however, tolerance was a key theme, described under the title of *Tolerance, mutual respect and compassion for those in need*. The extract reads,

On the whole, Australians support the principle of ‘live and let live’. Tolerance and mutual respect towards all people, whatever their background, is valued as a

result. Australia prides itself on being an egalitarian society where no one is regarded as better than anyone else by virtue of who they are or where they were born. (p. 7)

So while the old booklet conflates the three notions of tolerance, mutual respect and compassion for those in need, the new booklet removes the notion of tolerance and deals exclusively with the notion of *Compassion for those in need* (p. 17). It becomes one major concern of the citizenship pledge and is discussed in terms of mateship and mutual help.

The omission of tolerance from the new citizenship resource booklet reflects an interesting shift. As Schirmer, Weidenstedt and Reich (2012) argue, tolerance leads to binaries that divide the population into ‘majorities and minorities’, that is, a ‘hierarchical relation of insiders and outsiders’ (p. 1053). Citing Brown, they elaborate that the notion of tolerance is no more than ‘a way to manage the presence of the undesirable, the tasteless, the faulty – even the revolting, repugnant or vile’ (Schirmer et al., 2012, p. 1053). These comments call to mind similar comments made in the FitzGerald Report about the ‘repugnant’ other described in chapter four.

Hage, too, has written extensively about the role of tolerance in maintaining inequalities among white-Anglo and non-Anglo migrant Australians (1998, 2003b). He argues that to tolerate migrants is not just about white-Anglo Australians accepting the ‘other’ but it is ‘to accept and position the other within specific limits or boundaries’ (1998, p. 89). Furthermore, by combining the notions of tolerance with the notion of respect as was done in the old citizenship booklet, Schirmer et al. argue that this ‘confuses rather than

enlightens' as tolerance and respect used synonymously have the effect of blurring the differences between the two terms (2012, p. 1055). They advocate instead for intercultural relations to be understood through the notion of respect where respect means to treat people as 'a person endowed with agency that "makes a difference"' (2012, p. 1051). The new citizenship booklet seems to capture this mood of respect for the migrant as opposed to mere toleration.

What this comparison between the principles included as Australian values in *Becoming an Australian Citizen* and beliefs and principles identified as embodying the words of the Pledge illustrate is that there is an order of continuity between the two tests introduced by the two governments on opposite sides of the political spectrum. Despite their different labelling, Australian values and the citizenship pledge are very similar in detail. In this way, both Australian values and the principles of the pledge work as a disciplinary power on a population/citizenry. Legislating that Australian values were a mandatory form of knowledge for aspiring citizens was presented as a way of encouraging a particular way of being an Australian citizen and similarly making the pledge at citizenship ceremonies becomes a performative act that interpellates the individual as the model and 'knowing' Australian citizen. It is, as Foucault (1988) states, 'a set of practices by which one can acquire, assimilate, and transform truth into a permanent principle of action' (p. 35). With the pledge, it is the ethical subject-citizen who is put in the spotlight, continuing neoliberal emphasis on the individual as well as being a performative act that offers 'material' reassurance to onlookers that new citizens promise loyalty to Australia and its people.

A speech made by the Minister for Social Inclusion, Tanya Plibersek

I tear up when I see new citizens take the oath or the pledge and I tear up when I repeat the pledge myself ... It is simple and beautiful. (Plibersek, 2011, p. 7)

At her address to the Sydney Institute on 27 September 2011, Federal Minister for Social Inclusion, Tanya Plibersek stated that the pledge is 'simple and beautiful' and proposed that 'every Australian child should learn the pledge by heart and say it regularly at school'. Like Costello and Nelson who had been called upon under the Howard Government to promote the virtues of Australian values, this time it was Tanya Plibersek as Minister for Human Services and Minister for Social Inclusion who was asked by Julia Gillard, the first woman elected as Australian Prime Minister to espouse the virtues of the citizenship pledge. Plibersek is a popular minister, who, as the daughter of migrants and mother of three, is often called upon to be the pleasant face of issues surrounding the policy of immigration and 'social issues'. The policy of social inclusion falls under this label of social policy and it came to replace the emphasis Howard's Government had placed on social cohesion.

In an interview with Adam Spencer on 702 ABC radio, Plibersek elaborated on her speech of the previous day, stating that Australian values were expressed beautifully in the words of the pledge. Questioned by Spencer if indeed, notions like mateship and egalitarianism were unique to Australia, Plibersek responded as follows:

We are phenomenally fortunate in this country and I don't cop that sort of, 'we're all the same. We've all got universal values'. But I gotta say, in Australia we express those values and we live them in our laws in a way that a lot of countries don't.

...I don't think that being proud of your country means thinking that the rest of the world's awful. But I do think that we have a really rich history and a future that we can be very optimistic about. And that's part of the reason that we have such a cohesive society, such an inclusive and open society is because we do have these fundamental Australian values that focus on egalitarianism, on mateship, on a fair go. (Spencer, 2011)

Plibersek's comments were reminiscent of the discourse on Australian values that was so prominent under the former Howard Government. Plibersek talked about Weary Dunlop caring for the prisoners of war as an example of the unique egalitarian values of Australians who looked after the soldiers first and the Australians who cared for each other, unlike the English where hierarchies between officers and enlisted soldiers were enforced. The old citizenship booklet too, had made reference to Weary Dunlop 'who protected his men at the risk of his own life and who ran the makeshift operating room that helped keep men alive' (p. 22).

The main objective of the speech had been to highlight the government's policy of social inclusion which, under Plibersek's portfolio, had incorporated the notion of Australian values and the citizenship pledge. During the speech, the minister stated that she made no apology for her approach of 'requiring more from disadvantaged jobseekers'. The minister stated:

...Labor is also delivering unprecedented investment to close the gap for Indigenous Australians ... While Labor's reform agenda builds on the Australian tradition of giving a helping hand and a fair go – our programs also

reflect the value of self-reliance. We are happy to help out as long as we believe people are doing what they can to get back on their feet if they are able.

This is what I mean about enduring Australian values guiding what we do and how we do it as a nation. (Plibersek, 2011, p. 5)

Howard had made similar comments in his 2006 Australia Day address to the National Press Club, about ‘the Australian ethos of a fair go for all’,

... This government has reinforced Australia’s safety net, but we also believe in the principle of mutual obligation. By this I mean not only that individuals ought to do something in return for the support they receive from society and the government to help people in need, they need to be willing to do something to help themselves. Far from undermining social protection, policies that promote responsible behaviour and self-reliance are essential pillars of a compassionate Australia. (Howard, 2006)

During her speech for the Sydney Institute, Plibersek also suggested that all school children should make the pledge, just as Hardgrave had stated in his 2004 Sydney Institute speech, *Australian Citizenship: Then and Now* encouraging ‘all school children to celebrate the values that unite us as a nation and to use national symbols, songs and statements, such as the Australian Affirmation’ (Australian Government, 2004, p. 15). This affirmation is the same as the pledge that migrants make at their citizenship ceremonies but it is called an affirmation when it is made by those who are already Australian citizens. The Minister’s emphasis on the pledge reflecting our history and tradition is also reminiscent of Howard’s promotion of Australian values and Australian history. Hence the citizenship pledge, a ceremonial ritual that has traditionally come

under the portfolio of multiculturalism, immigration and citizenship, was transformed by the Gillard Government to become an embodied practice of social inclusion. In this way, learning about Australian values and performing the pledge both work as technologies of the self for the migrant who is a self-reliant individual drawing on her/his freedom.

Plibersek spoke of this self-reliance while trying to distance herself from the policies of the previous Howard Government, stating that Howard ‘adopted the language of mateship but not the values’ and concluding that ‘part of being Australian is that notion that we are self-reliant, we are tough ... but we are very quick to lend a hand’ (Spencer, 2011). Thus Plibersek highlights not only the continuities with the Howard Government but she also offers reassurance that Australia is special and that her government is working towards securing a happy future. She states that love for one’s country is indivisible from love of one’s fellow citizens (Plibersek, 2011, p. 6) and concludes her radio interview with the following words:

If we learn about our rights and responsibilities, more importantly our responsibilities as citizens, if we learn about our history, I think people understand that being Australian is about more than beaches and BBQs and Southern Cross tattoos on their back. It’s about our rich history and tradition and looking after each other, a fair go, mateship, egalitarianism. We call it social inclusion now. (Spencer, 2011)

Migrant perspectives on the pledge and being Australian

The Gillard Government and Minister Plibersek's praise of the citizenship pledge was not always shared by migrants. Of the participants I interviewed, not one mentioned the pledge without my initiating the discussion. Kim from Korea stated that the citizenship ceremony was not memorable for her.

I do not remember my citizenship ceremony. The ceremony really did not mean much to me. Maybe I stood and read the pledge from a piece of paper or maybe I just mumbled the words because I had to. I felt nothing in saying the words. I can never call myself Australian even now that I am a citizen. I will always be Korean.

Lisa from Taiwan thought that when she became a citizen in 2001, she had sworn allegiance to the Queen. She is surprised when I tell her that there has been no official oath of allegiance to the queen since 1993.

Lisa: I think I had to raise my hand when I made the Pledge.

Really. Are you sure? They don't do that anymore.

Lisa: Maybe. I can't remember for sure if I raised my hand. Anyway, it was stupid and I asked myself 'Why are they making us do this thing?'

In general, the migrants I interviewed for this study were not aware that mandatory questions on Australian values had been removed from the new test and that now the focus was on the citizenship pledge. Lily from China was concerned that now that the pass mark was 75 per cent, the test would be more difficult to pass. She had told me that even when the Howard test was in place with its Australian values and Australian

history, she had been told by friends that the actual multiple-choice questions focused predominantly on the responsibilities and ‘rules of Australia’.

Gina, a woman from Vietnam who had just passed the test stated that the test was easy. She explained that she had prepared for the test by paying \$15 to an online Internet site with practice questions. That is, she ordered her conduct in order to maximise her potential to become a model Australian citizen. For many migrants interviewed, Australian citizenship was still all about gaining freedom and democracy in a good society. And it is these notions of freedom and democracy that the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee had hoped to capture as representative of the true meaning of the pledge for migrants.

The committee understood that the pledge, too, like Australian identity, was in state of constant flux, stating that,

The ideas underpinning the Pledge and the legislative requirements linked to the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship may evolve and change, and so to that extent, this information should be reviewed periodically. (ACTRC, 2008, p. 23)

The pledge that is in the spotlight today is the same as the Pledge penned under the Labor Government in 1993. Prime Minister Howard did not change any of the wording of the ‘simple yet eloquent pledge’ (Howard, 2006) during his time as Prime Minister despite the fact that he was a staunch monarchist. Nor did he resurrect the recommendation made in the FitzGerald Report to legislate that new citizens read a comprehensive declaration pledge about the institutions and principles of the Australian

nation at citizenship ceremonies. It could be argued, however, that by saying the pledge and living by Australian values, migrants continue to renounce their original values.

Belonging in Australia – an unrequited love?

I began this study with the intention of exploring what recently arrived migrants think about becoming Australian citizens. My objective was to see how they constituted themselves as knowing citizens. I wish to conclude this study with some comments from migrants on their understanding of belonging in Australia. I target ‘belonging’ because it was Howard’s claim that the acquisition of the ‘correct’ knowledge through the successful completion of the Australian citizenship test would signal that migrants had reached a point of belonging in the community. Belonging also captures the notions of loyalty, allegiance and active participation that have informed popular understandings of citizenship in its short history in Australia. I also refer to belonging as an unrequited love for the migrant because it is desired by them but not always reciprocated by ‘the nation’. My interview with Gina from Vietnam captures well that mood of belonging.

In Vietnam, Gina had been a language teacher and a journalist. She had been sponsored by her son to come to Australia in search of freedom and to remove herself from a violent home. Gina believed that the Australian citizenship test was ‘a good idea’ but could not elaborate on why. I asked her if she believed that all migrants should have to adopt the Australian way of life in order to be considered good Australian citizens:

My opinion is that they should not adopt the Australian way of life. Each individual should choose the way of life they want.

The Australian way of life is (about) culture. Differences in culture lead to many problems so if they choose to live in here, they have to learn and change many habits. Sometimes misunderstanding of culture makes them trouble. But Australian society is excellent. Australian people are friendly and helpful. It does not have many hard rules and it is safe.

But there are also disadvantages when they adopt the Australian way of life. Migrants forget their own origins when they move here which I do not think is a good thing. I believe they should try to be themselves. Many people forget their mother tongue and cannot communicate with their own people. For example, I am Vietnamese. I have my cousins and they live in France. Their parents are Vietnamese but they cannot speak the Vietnamese language. They just speak French. I cannot speak French so when we meet each other we cannot speak together. We love each other but when we want to talk together, their mother has to translate for us. That is not good and it makes it difficult to understand each other.

Gina highlights the difficulties faced by families living transnational lives. Adopting this way of life, becoming a knowing citizen for Gina was not commensurate with being a good citizen:

But I don't think it is the way of life that people adopt that is important and which makes a person a good person or a bad person. For example, in Cabramatta where almost all Vietnamese people live there, they just speak and use all the services in the Vietnamese language. There are many businesses of Vietnamese people and they are successful. They should maintain their culture but they contribute more tax for the government and they follow the laws of

Australia. They are good citizens. So in my opinion, Australia is a free country so each individual can choose the way of life they want. The most important thing is they have to become good migrants.

Despite Gina's views about guarding her cultural practices, eventually she concedes to the government's push for new citizens to adopt the Australian way of life.

For me, I want to become an Australian citizen and want to adopt the Australian way of life because I love the way that Australian people treat each other. I love Australian society and the Australian government, the way the government takes care of people and runs the country very well. The education system of Australia is very good and it is the number one reason for me to choose to live here.

Twenty-year-old Carlo from Northern China best captures the sentiments of many when he stated:

After I become an Australian citizen, the ceremony will more promote me to belong in Australia. I like Australia for many reasons so I should belong to Australia. Belonging is important because we live in this country.

Hence for Carlo, like many of the migrants interviewed, becoming Australian was associated with the notion of belonging. Yang from China agreed with her compatriot stating that:

Becoming an Australian citizen makes a person more Australian. As an Australian citizen, you can have better life with other Australians. You can understand Australian values. You will be proud of your new life. Becoming an Australian citizen, you will know more Australian culture and knowledge.

Australia is a very beautiful and safe country. It is an independent mainland. It is surrounded by sea. As an Australian citizen, you live here and you will feel very comfortable. You will feel happy too.

Helena from Greece expressed a different view as she explained:

By becoming an Australian citizen, it does not mean that we are more Australian in my opinion. The way to be someone Australian is by assimilating the culture, by speaking English or joining the work force or by loving this country and respecting the laws. Therefore becoming an Australian citizen does not make someone more Australian because the qualities are common to every country.

I asked some of the interviewees to discuss who could call themselves Australian. I also asked if they believed that they belonged to the Australian community. Eduardo, a 19year-old from Ecuador stated:

I think that everybody can belong in this community. If we accept the rules and we accept the customs here. I think that everyone can be part of the community that has more than one community. This is a multicultural society. I feel that I belong in the Australian community. Why? It is easy in here and that means that I left everything back (home) and now I just want to have a good life here, a life full of opportunities with the things that improve me and make successful my life.

Lisa, a Chinese woman in her early 30s made the following comments:

Firstly, Australians should be citizens. Secondly, they have to live in Australia for some years. They are studying or working in Australia and it can show their value. And they have to be a part of the society.

In Lisa's opinion, the status of Australian citizenship has to be earned through time and effort. Interestingly, Lisa concluded that 'another way you can call yourself Australian is if Australians accept them', highlighting how the government of self also involves how that self is viewed by others. I asked Lisa if she thought she belonged in Australia. She replied:

No, I don't think so now. Yes of course because when I chose to migrate to Australia, I should create a good life for myself. It's my responsibility or I should still stay in China. Being a citizen doesn't mean I belong in Australia. I think I need some years to improve my skills in Australia. Firstly I need to study English. Language is difficult for every migrant. Secondly I need to study the country's culture and customs and join these. Thirdly, I will get some friends and have hobbies. I respect and wish good will to others. Lastly, my life and work can embody my value in Australia.

Again there is emphasis in the above extract that migrants must take responsibility and regulate their own path to integration and belonging in the Australian community. It is interesting that Lisa describes how the way she lives is what gives worth, or value in Australia.

Shirley, an accountant from China expecting her second baby highlights the tensions of being a transnational citizen:

I don't feel that I belong to the Australian community. This is important for me to belong in Australia because we chose to migrate to Australia. Our family still lives in my country. We can't just change our ancestry. But Australia is new life for us.

A final word from the knowing citizen

After our interview, Lee from China, a mother in her 50s living with her son emailed me these comments below to explain why belonging is important to her:

Belonging to Australia is important to me. It means being an active participant in the society and being recognised for my value. The significance to me is that I have got a place and I have been accepted in the new homeland.

But I don't think I belong to Australia now. Belonging to Australia is a challenge for all migrants. For example, no friends and no job... But belonging to Australia isn't the same with being a citizen. It needs some conditions. When I enjoy the rights of a citizen, I'll have certain responsibilities. Belonging to Australia means not only satisfying my livelihood, but also showing my knowledge which can be turned to a resource in the community. I believe that the people who are confident are proud to belong to Australia.

Now I don't think I belong to Australia yet. I hope that I'll belong to Australia one day. It's important to me.

Hence, by achieving a sense of belonging many of the migrants believe that they will demonstrate their 'value' as knowing citizens.

CONCLUSION: BEING AUSTRALIAN TODAY



This year on Australia day, I attended my local council's citizenship ceremony. It was held at Cabarita Park. This park, located in the municipality of Canada Bay, is a popular picnic location for families and its waterviews make it a popular venue for wedding shoots, especially in the Federation Pavilion Rotunda. The rotunda is named Federation Pavilion because it is the very same structure in which 'the nation was born'. Originally located in Sydney's Centennial Park, the pavilion was the venue where the first Governor General of Australia, the first Prime Minister and the first cabinet were sworn in at the official inauguration of Federation on 1 January 1901. Concord council bought the rotunda in 1903 and moved it to its current location.

The pavilion is only a shadow of its former glory. A wooden skeletal frame is all that remains as all of its distinctive ornate plasterwork had disintegrated and had been removed before its move to Concord. Standing there now in Cabarita Park it 'looked more Australian' than its Corinthian-inspired original as it was painted in Federation colours, making it more suited to the Australian ethos of ordinariness and egalitarianism.

There were the usual dignitaries at the citizenship ceremony, the Mayor, Angelo Tsirekas, the local member, John Sidoti and a representative for the federal member. There was also the Australia Day Ambassador, actor Simon Westaway and a representative of the Ambassador's sponsor, Woolworths. At this ceremony, 34 migrants became Australian citizens. Most of them had originated from Korea, China and Thailand. At the party afterwards there was a sausage sizzle and guests ate lamingtons washed down with cups of teas. Although a hot and muggy day, it still felt like the right thing to be doing on Australia Day. The woman who had sung the national

anthem at the end of the ceremony stayed on and entertained the new citizens and their families.

I mingled with the guests at the BBQ. A woman initiated a conversation by commenting on 'the lovely ceremony'. 'It was not like this for me when I became a citizen many years ago,' she told me. There were no bouquets of native flowers presented to the new citizens. The woman, Brigitte was from Mauritius and she had come to Australia some 46 years ago. She particularly liked the Mayor's speech as he spoke of Australia being 'the black caviar of the world' because it was such a great place to live in. The Mayor had spoken of the values that each new citizen had brought to the nation. From the Thai migrant he had learnt of family values. From the Chinese migrant he learnt about hard work. Before the large-scale immigration program, he said, 'there were only chops, chips and burgers'.

Bob, an RSL man, did not like the Mayor's speech. He told me that it was 'all good and well' for the mayor to talk about the values that migrants brought to Australia but it should not be at the expense of recognising what was already here. Bob, an elderly man proudly wearing his RSL tie, told me that 'this is a country of freedom, that's why people come here'. According to Bob, for the mayor not to acknowledge this original value was disrespectful to 'those who fought the war under the Australian flag'. As I listened to Bob, I remembered the words of John Hirst and Peter Costello. Bob even made reference to the Mother Country. He told me that the soldiers who fought in the war did so in order to keep the country free because 'it's only now that we know that there was no danger but they didn't know that then that the fear of invasion was not

real’. I asked him what he thought were the original values. ‘Well you know, like that egalitarianism,’ he said.



Australian Citizenship Ceremony, Federation Pavilion, Cabarita Park, Australia Day, 2013

On the evening news that Australia Day, every television channel carried images of Prime Minister Julia Gillard presiding over a citizenship ceremony in Canberra that witnessed English actress Miriam Margoyles become an Australian citizen. Margoyles was not the only Briton making the Australian citizenship pledge as migrants from the United Kingdom made up the majority of the record-breaking 17, 059 new citizens. The Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, Chris Bowen told news reporters that the new citizens had originated from 145 nations. The theme for this year’s Australia Day citizenship ceremonies was ‘unity in cultures’.

Most newspapers carried stories of citizens making the Pledge of Commitment on Australia Day. It appears then that the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee’s recommendation of emphasising the Australian citizenship pledge was heeded by the

Australian community. Yet surprisingly, the day before Australia Day, *The Sydney Morning Herald* reported that Les Murray, the author of the pledge thought it was 'heavy and pompous and sort of farting with sincerity'. Murray was specifically referring to the affirmation, an oath similar to the pledge made by those who are already Australian citizens as a way of demonstrating their loyalty to the nation. This Australia Day saw over 100 councils host affirmation ceremonies around the nation. What was common in newspaper and television news stories on this Australia Day was that there was no mention of the Australian citizenship test. There was no talk of Australian values either, nor of Australia's contested past or of the Labor Government's return to mandatory detention of asylum seekers. There was instead talk of opportunities in the 'greatest country of all'.

The lack of discussion about the Australian citizenship test on Australia day this year suggests that the test has become part of common practice. That is, the revised Australian citizenship test has slipped into the realm of the everyday. It is no longer controversial and barely rates a mention in the media. It appears then, that it has achieved its goal of producing the knowing citizen who reassures the mainstream that the Australian way of life will prevail for it must be remembered that the process of reassuring and making something secure has the effect of altering the very thing that is being secured. In this way, in attempting to reassure the Australian population, that population itself becomes transformed and the Australian way of life becomes re-imagined in multiple ways.

In this study I have explored the organised ways by which migrants and refugees become Australian citizens. I have focused on the implementation of the Australian

citizenship test and the knowledge required in order to pass the test. Under the Howard Government, this essential knowledge was dominated by the notion of core civic values. These Australian values, it was claimed, emerged as the solution to concerns for security and were predicated on the notion that citizenship was about active participation and not the acquisition of rights. This shift from a discourse of rights to a discourse of values paralleled a shift in the way citizenship was imagined. Citizenship became enmeshed in notions of national identity and the need to live the Australian way of life. This shift also reflected the ambivalent relationship between multiculturalism and Australian values.

In the early days of the multicultural policy, core values were articulated as part of the mechanisms for managing the population. Yet when Howard came to office, his government gradually dismantled the policy of multiculturalism and core values became disassociated from it and reconceptualised instead as mechanisms that would secure the nation from the dangerous differences emanating from certain groups of migrants and refugees.

The discourse of Australian values was promoted as part of a technology of the self whereby individual migrants and refugees must study, learn to love and live by Australian values if they want to ensure belonging in the Australian community. In this way, the inclusion of Australian values in the public sphere allowed Howard to re-introduce an old and popular narrative of Australian identity that was based on being Anglo, being white and being Christian. The ten principles of Australian values could also be understood as a new order of knowledge invented by governments in order to regulate the conduct of the nation's citizenry. Their purpose was to normalise the

population and demand self-government of the citizen. In effect, Australian values became a new way of defining Australian identity.

The introduction of the Australian citizenship test also called for another order of knowledge that was essential for integration into the mainstream community. This was knowledge of a particular narrative of Australian history. Aspiring citizens had to learn a version of history that was claimed to be balanced, fair and adequate. In this official version of history, the settlers and the diggers were the nation-builders while the contributions of women, migrants and Indigenous peoples were considered negligible. In this particular history, colonisation, dispossession and the Stolen Generations were never acknowledged. This form of knowledge did not appear anywhere in the official resource booklet, *Becoming an Australian Citizen*.

A new Rudd Government in late 2007 also initiated changes to the Australian citizenship test. The Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee was commissioned to reform the contents of the test. In October 2008, just two years after the original Australian citizenship test had been implemented, the Rudd Government introduced the revised test with its accompanying revised booklet, *Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond*. Under this new test, knowledge of Australian values was no longer required and knowledge of Australian history was relegated to the ‘nice to know’ section of the booklet. Yet this ‘nice to know’ history continues to privilege an exclusive white perspective where the benevolent deeds in Australia’s history are still attributed to non-Indigenous Australians.

In place of knowledge of Australian values that the Howard Government had made mandatory, in the new Australian citizenship test, aspiring citizens must learn about the principles embedded in the citizenship Pledge of Commitment. The textual analysis of these principles has revealed that these principles of the pledge are similar to the concepts that were defined as Australian values in the original test. Hence there are orders of continuities and discontinuities between the Howard test and the Rudd-Gillard test. Both tests hoped to produce proper, knowing Australian citizens and both tests hoped to reassure the broad Australian community that the 'Australian way of life' would survive in the twenty-first century.

This study helps us to understand that there are other ways of being Australian and alternative perspectives on Australian history. In acknowledging this, we can work towards producing counter-memories and we can perform alternative and multiple ways of being Australian. Becoming a good Australian citizen then is not just about learning the rules, the civic rights and responsibilities and the history of a nation in order to pass the official Australian citizenship test. It is also about the pleasure of belonging through knowing.



Australia Day 2013, Federation Pavilion, Cabarita Park

REFERENCE LIST

Aboriginal Protection Act (Vic), (1869).

Ahmed, S. (2000). *Strange Encounters: Embodied others in post-coloniality*. London and New York: Routledge.

Allison, L. (28 September 2007). Citizenship test is the new Aussie cringe, *ABC News Opinion*. Retrieved from <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2007/09/28/2045805.htm>

AMEP Research Centre. (2002). *Let's participate: a course in Australian citizenship Workbook 2* (2nd ed.). Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections of the origin and spread of nationalism* (2nd ed.). London: Verso.

Anderson, N. (2008). The stories so far. In N. Anderson & K. Schlunke (Eds.), *Cultural theory and everyday practice* (pp. 48-58). South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Andrews, K. (2007a). Citizenship - Committing to a way of life. *The Sydney Papers*, 19(3), 152-159.

Andrews, K. (2007b, 26 August). Subjects: Citizenship test resource book released. *Department of Immigration and Citizenship*. Retrieved 22 October, 2012, from http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/download/media/pressrel/4SCO6/upload_binary/4sco61.pdf;fileType=application/pdf

- Ang, I. (2001). *On not speaking Chinese: living between Asia and the West*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ang, I. (2008). Cultural studies. In T. Bennett & J. Frow (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of cultural analysis* (pp. 227-249). Los Angeles and London: SAGE.
- Ang, I., Brand, J., Noble, G., & Sternberg, J. (2006). *Connecting diversity: Paradoxes of multicultural Australia*. Artarmon, NSW: Special Broadcasting Service Corporation.
- Asad, T. (2003). *Formations of the secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford USA: Stanford University Press.
- Attard, M. (2008). Richard Woolcott: Australia's envoy to South Asia. Retrieved 12 August, 2012, from <http://www.abc.net.au/local/stories/2008/06/13/2274013.htm>
- Australia 2020 Summit. (2008). Retrieved 13 September, 2012, from <http://web.archive.org/web/20080214182739/http://www.australia2020.gov.au/about/index.cfm>
- Australia ratifies Kyoto Protocol. (2007, 3 December). *The Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved from <http://www.smh.com.au/news/environment/rudd-signs-kyoto-deal/>
- Australian Citizenship Council. (2000). Australian citizenship for a new century.
- Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee (ACTRC). (2008). *Moving forward...improving pathways to citizenship: a report by the Australian citizenship test review committee*. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Citizenship.

Australian Citizenship: Our Common Bond. (2009). Belconnen, ACT: National Communications Branch of the Department of Immigration and Citizenship.

Australian Citizenship Council. (2000). *Australian citizenship for a new century: A report by the Australian Citizenship Council, February 2000*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia. Retrieved from <http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/53892/20070509-0000/www.citizenship.gov.au/law-and-policy/legislation/report.html>

Australia. Department of Immigration (1952). *Australia and your future* (8th Ed.). Australian News and Information Bureau for the Department, London.

Australia. Department of Information (1945). *Know Australia* (2nd ed). Australian Department of Information, Melbourne.

Australian Government. (2008). *Moving forward... Improving pathways to citizenship. Government response to the Report by the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee*. Retrieved 25 January, 2013, from www.citizenship.gov.au/_pdf/government-response-to-the-report.pdf.

Australian Government. (n.d.). The Snowy Mountains Scheme. Retrieved 25 January, 2013, from <http://australia.gov.au/about-australia/australian-story/snowy-mountains-scheme>

Australian Government. (2004). *Australian citizenship: then and now: Speech to the Sydney Institute by the Hon. Gary Hardgrave, MP Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister*. Sydney. Retrieved from <http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=%28Id:media/pressrel/jkbe6%29;rec=0;>

- Australian Government. (2008). Moving forward... Improving pathways to citizenship. Retrieved 16 September, 2012, from http://www.citizenship.gov.au/_pdf/moving-forward-report.pdf
- Batainah, H., & Walsh, M. (2008). From multiculturalism to citizenship. In C. Aulich & C. Wettenhall (Eds.), *Howard's fourth government* (pp. 227-243). Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Beazley stands by visitor values pledge. (2006). *News.com.au*. Retrieved 2 July 2012, from <http://www.news.com.au/top-stories/beazley-stands-by-visitor-values-pledge/story-e6frfkp9-1111112216401>
- Bennett, T. (1998). *Culture: A reformer's science*. St Leonards NSW: Allen and Unwin.
- Bennett, S.-J., & Tait, M. (2008). The Australian citizenship test. *Queensland Law Student Review*, 1(2), 75-87.
- Berger, S. (November 2007). History and national identity: why they should remain divorced. *History and Policy*. Retrieved 22 October, 2012, from <http://historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-66.html>
- Bigo, D. (2002). Security and immigration: Toward a critique of the governmentality of unease. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 27, 63-92.
- Bird-Rose, D. (2004). *Reports from a wild country: Ethics for decolonisation*. Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Blainey, G. (1993). Drawing up a balance sheet of our history. *Quadrant*(July-August), 10-15.

- Blainey, G. (2001). Green Crusades. *Boyer Lectures, Radio National*. Retrieved from <http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/boyerlectures/lecture-2-green-crusades/3501920>
- Bonnell, A., & Martin, C. (2008). Australia's history under Howard, 1996-2007. *ANNALS American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 617 (May).
- Casey, D. (2006). Reflections of national museum director. In M. Lake (Ed.), *Memory, monuments and museums*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Cassidy, B. (2005, 07/08/2005). Insiders: Conference to discuss extending counter-terrorism laws: interview with Prime Minister John Howard. Broadcast 7 August 2005. Retrieved 20 February 2012, from <http://www.abc.net.au/insiders/content/2005/s1431937.htm>
- Castles, S., & Davidson, A. (2000). *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Chakrabarty, D. (1992). Provincializing Europe: Postcoloniality and the critique of history. *Cultural Studies*, 6(3), 337-357.
- Chisari, M. (2009). Critical constructions of a national Australian identity, in A. Mahboob & C. Lipovsky (Eds.), *Studies in applied linguistics and language learning* (pp. 14-28). Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Chisari, M. (2011). Testing citizenship, regulating history: The fatal impact. [online]. *M/C Journal*, 4(6). Retrieved 28 May 2012 from <http://journal.media-culture.org.au/index.php/mcjournal/article/viewArticle/409>.

- Chisari, M. (2012a). The history and values of Australian citizenship testing. In C. Elder & K. Moore (Eds.), *New voices, new visions: Challenging Australian identities and legacies* (pp. 137-151). Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Chisari, M. (2012b). History and governmentality in the Australian citizenship test. *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, 26 (1), 157-168
- Committee to advise on Australia's immigration policies. (CAAIP) (1988). *Immigration: A commitment to Australia*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Services.
- Commonwealth of Australia. (1999). A new agenda for multicultural Australia.
Retrieved 11 May, 2012, from
http://www.immi.gov.au/media/.../multicultural/pdf_doc/agenda/agenda.pdf
- Commonwealth of Australia. (2001). *Australian citizenship ... a common bond - Government response to the Report of the Australian Citizenship Council*. Canberra.
- Commonwealth of Australia. (2007a). *Becoming an Australian citizen: Citizenship: Your commitment to Australia*. Canberra ACT.
- Commonwealth of Australia. (2007b). *House of Representatives: Australian citizenship amendment (citizenship testing) bill 2007: Second reading; speech*. Canberra.
Retrieved from
http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/genpdf/chamber/hansardr/2007-05-30/0010/hansard_frag.pdf;fileType=application%2Fpdf.
- Coorey, P. (2008, 30 January). Citizenship test: Bradman not out, *Sydney Morning Herald*.

- Costello, P. (2006, 23 February). Worth promoting, worth defending: Australian citizenship, what it means and how to nurture it: Address to the Sydney Institute Thursday, 23 February 2006. Retrieved 12 March, 2012, from <http://www.treasurer.gov.au/DisplayDocs.aspx?pageID=&doc=speeches/2006/004.htm&min=phc>
- Cox, L. (2010). The value of values? Debating identity, citizenship and multiculturalism in contemporary Australia. In C. Slade & M. Mollering (Eds.), *From migrant to citizen: testing language, testing culture* (pp. 77-97). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Craven, P. (2010, 20 August). Looking for Australia, Book Review, *The Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved from <http://www.smh.com.au/entertainment/books/looking-for-australia-20100820-135mz.html>
- Curthoys, A. (2007). History in the Howard era. *Teaching History*, 41(1), 4-10.
- Curthoys, A., & Docker, J. (2006). *Is history fiction?* Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Davidson, A. (1997). *From subject to citizen: Australian citizenship in the twentieth century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Damousi, J. (2002). History matters: The politics of grief and injury in Australian history. *Australian Historical Studies*, 33 (118), 100-112.
- de Leeuw, M., & van Wichelen, S. (2012). Civilizing migrants; integration, culture and citizenship. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 15 (2), 195-210.
- Dean, M. (2010). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, London, New Dehli, Singapore, Washington: SAGE.

Department of Education, Science and Training. (2005). *National framework for values education in Australian schools*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Retrieved from

<http://www.valueseducation.edu.au/values/default.asp?id=8757>.

Department of Education Science and Training. (2006). *The Australian History Summit: Transcript of proceedings, Parliament House*. Canberra, ACT.

Department of Immigration and Citizenship. (n.d.). Living in Australia: A National Action Plan to Build on Social Cohesion, Harmony and Security. Retrieved 20 January, 2013, from <http://www.immi.gov.au/living-in-australia/a-multicultural-australia/national-action-plan/nap.htm>

Department of Immigration and Citizenship. Living in Australia: Australian Values. Retrieved 24 May 2012, from <http://www.immi.gov.au/living-in-australia/values/>

Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs. (1997). *What it means to be an Australian citizen*. Canberra.

Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs. Achievements of the Good Neighbour Movement 1949-1972. Retrieved 24 January, 2013, from www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/doc/deptimm_3.pdf

Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMA). (2006). *Australian citizenship: Much more than a ceremony, Discussion Paper*. Canberra.

Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMA). (2007). Summary Report on the Outcomes of the Public Consultation of the Merits of Introducing a Formal Citizenship Test.

- Department of the Parliamentary Library. (2002). Changes in the Australian oath of allegiance Retrieved 24 March, 2013, from http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;page=1;query=MajorSubjectId_Phrase%3AF2Y;rec=10
- Dutton, D. (2002). *One of us?: A centenary of Australian citizenship*. Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Elder, C. (2005). Immigration history. In M. Lyons & P. Russell (Eds.), *Australia's history: Themes and debates* (pp. 98-115). Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Elder, C. (2003). Invaders, illegals and aliens: Imagining exclusion in a 'White Australia'. *Law, text, culture*, 7(221-244).
- Elder, C. (2007). *Being Australian: narratives of national identity*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Elks, S. (2012, 2 June). Historian Henry Reynolds recalls the passion of Eddie Mabo, *The Australian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/historian-henry-reynolds-recalls-the-passion-of-eddie-mabo/story-e6frg6nf-1226380959592>
- Evans, C. (2008). *Independent committee to review citizenship test*. Canberra. Retrieved from <http://www.minister.immi.gov.au/media/media-release/2008/ce08039.htm>.
- FitzGerald, S. (1996). FitzGerald immigration policy review, 1988. Retrieved 24 December, 2012, from <http://www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/library/media/Audio/id/416.FitzGerald-Immigration-Policy-Review-1988>

Fortier, A-M. (2008). *Multicultural horizon: Diversity and the limits of the civil nation*.

London and New York: Routledge.

Fortier, A-M. (2010). Proximity by design? Affective citizenship and the management of unease. *Citizenship Studies*, 14(1), 17-30.

Foucault, M. (1969). *Archaeology of knowledge*. Milton Park UK: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1984). Nietzsche, Genealogy, History. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader: An introduction to Foucault's thoughts*. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the Self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 16-49). Amherst, USA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 87-104).

Foucault, M. (1994a). Governmentality. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Power* (pp. 201-222). New York: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1994b). 'Omnes et singulatim': Toward a critique of political reason. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Power* (pp. 298-325). New York: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1994c). On the ways of writing history. In J. D. Faubion & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Aesthetics, method and epistemology* (pp. 279-295). New York: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Foucault, M. (1997). The ethics of the concern for self as a practice of freedom. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth: Michel Foucault* (pp. 281-301). New York: The new press.
- Fraser, M. (1981). Inaugural address on multiculturalism to the Institute of Multicultural Affairs. *The Malcolm Fraser Collection at the University of Melbourne* (30 November).
- Georgiou, P. (2008). *The new Australian citizenship test - a template for national identity*. Paper presented at the Australian Citizenship - Is it really worth having?, Manning Clark House Weekend of Ideas.
http://www.manningclark.org.au/html/Paper-Georgiou_Petro-The_new_Australian_citizenship_test.html
- Gordon, C. (1991). Governmental rationality: An introduction. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 1-51). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gordon, C. (1994). Introduction by Colin Gordon. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Power* (pp. xi-xli). New York: The New Press.
- Grassby, A. (1973). A multi-cultural society for the future. Retrieved 21 March 2013 from www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/doc/grassby_1.pdf
- Grewal, K. (2007). The 'Young Muslim Man' in Australian public discourse. *Transforming Cultures eJournal*, 2 (1).
- Guyver, R. (2011). The role of government in determining history curriculum: lessons from Australia. *History and Policy*. Retrieved 11 August 2011, from <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-120.html>

- Hage, G. (1998). *White Nation: Fantasies of white supremacy in a multicultural society*. Sydney: Pluto Press.
- Hage, G. (2003a). *Against paranoid nationalism: Searching for hope in a shrinking society*. Annandale NSW: Pluto Press.
- Hage, G. (2003b). On Worrying: the lost art of the well-administered national cuddle. *Borderlands e-journal*, 2(1). Retrieved 24 March 2012 from, http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol2no1_2003/hage_worrying.html
- Hart, C. (2006, 4 November). Multiculturalism is a dirty word, *The Australian*.
- Hart, C. (2007, 31 March). Booklet delays citizenship test, *Weekend Australian*.
- Hawley, S. (2005). PM - Teach Australian values or 'clear off', says Nelson. Retrieved 1 November 2012, from <http://www.abc.net.au/pm/content/2005/s1445262.htm>
- Hindess, B. (1996). *Discourses of power: From Hobbes to Foucault*. Oxford, Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hindess, B. (2004). Citizenship for all. *Citizenship Studies*, 8(3), 305-315.
- Hirst, J. B. (2003, 5 July). Why I vote for Howard, *The Age*. Retrieved from <http://www.theage.com.au/articles/2003/07/04/1057179153313.html>
- Hirst, J. B. (2006). *Sense and nonsense in Australian history*. Melbourne: Black Inc. Agenda.
- Hirst, J. B. (2007a). *The Australians: Insiders and outsiders on the national character since 1770*. Melbourne: Black Inc.
- Hirst, J. B. (2007b, 26 June). John Hirst: The myth of a new paternalism, *The Australian*.

- Hirst, J. B. (2008, 6 February). Australia: The official history, *The Monthly*. Retrieved from <http://www.themonthly.com.au/print/781>
- Hirst, J. B. (2010). *Looking for Australia*. Collingwood, Victoria: Black Inc.
- Hogan, J. (2010). Gendered and racialised discourses of national identity in Baz Luhrmann's Australia. *Journal of Australian Studies*, 34 (1), 63-77.
- Holland, A. (2005). The common bond? Australian citizenship. In M. Lyons & P. Russell (Eds.), *Australia's History: themes and debates* (pp. 152-171). Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Holland, A. (2010). Australian citizenship in the twenty-first century: historical perspectives. In C. Slade & M. Mollering (Eds.), *From migrant to citizen: testing language, testing culture* (pp. 39-59). Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Howard, J. (1995). Politics and Patriotism: A reflection on the national identity debate. Retrieved 24 December, 2012, from <http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;orderBy=customrank;page=0;query=politics and patriotism;rec=8;resCount=Default>
- Howard, J. (2006). 'A sense of balance: The Australian achievement': John Howard's Australia Day address to the National Press Club. Retrieved 20 July, 2012, from <http://australianpolitics.com/2006/01/25/john-howard-australia-day-address.html>
- Howard, J. (2010). *John Howard: Lazarus rising*. Pymble NSW: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Howard, J., & Robb, A. (2006). Transcript of the Prime Minister the Hon John Howard MP joint press conference with Mr Andrew Robb, Parliamentary Secretary to

the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, Phillip Street, Sydney.

Media Release 11 Devenber 2006.

Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC). (2008). Submission by the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission to the Australian Citizenship Test Review Committee. Retrieved 21 January, 2013, from http://humanrights.gov.au/legal/submissions/2008/20080605_citizenship_test.html

Hutchins, B. (2002). *Don Bradman: Challenging the myth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Irving, H. (2000). Citizenship before 1949. In K. Rubenstein (Ed.), *Individual community nation* (pp. 9-20). Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing.

Isin, E. (2004). The neurotic citizen. *Citizenship Studies*, 8 (3), 217-235.

Isin, E. F., & Wood, P. K. (1999). *Citizenship and identity*. London: SAGE Publications.

Jackson, L. (1996). An average Australian bloke. *Four Corners*. Retrieved 21 October, 2012, from <http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/content/2004/s1212701.htm>

Johnson, C. (2000). *Governing change: From Keating to Howard*. St Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.

Johnson, C. (2007). John Howard's 'Values' and Australian Identity. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 42(2), 195-209.

Johnson, C. (2010). The politics of affective citizenship: from Blair to Obama. *Citizenship Studies*, 14 (5), 495-509.

- Jones, T. (2005). Respect Australian values or leave: Costello: Lateline TV program transcript. Retrieved 23 July, 2012, from <http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2005/s1444603.htm>
- Jordens, A.-M. (1993). *Redefining 'Australian citizen' 1945-1975* (Vol. Working Paper No. 8). Canberra: Australian National University.
- Jordens, A.-M. (1994). *Promoting Australian citizenship 1949-1971*. Canberra: Administration, Compliance & Governability Program, Research School of Social Sciences, ANU.
- Jupp, J. (2002). *From White Australia to Woomera: The story of Australian immigration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Klapdor, M., Coombs, M., & Bohm, C. (2009). *Australian citizenship: A chronology of major developments in policy and law*. Department of Parliamentary Services: Parliament of Australia.
- Koeth, E. (2010). *Multiculturalism : a review of Australian policy statements and recent debates in Australia and overseas*. (6). Retrieved from <http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=Id%3A%22library%2Fprspub%2F272429%22>.
- Kunkel, J. (2008). Reflections of the 'Howard Project'. Retrieved May 2008 <http://www.ipa.org.au/publications/1245/reflections-on-the-%27howard-project%27>
- Lake, M. (2007, 29 October). Wasn't this a Government obsessed with historical 'truth'?, *The Age*.

- Langton, M. (2008, 23 November 2008). Faraway Downs fantasy resonates close to home, *The Age*. Retrieved from <http://www.theage.com.au/articles/2008/11/23/1227375027931.html>
- Liberal Party of Australia. (1988). *Immigration and ethnic affairs policy: Liberal/National Parties*. Barton ACT: Parliamentary Library of Australia.
- Lowenheim, O., & Gazit, O. (2009). Power and examination: A critique of citizenship tests. *Security Dialogue*, 40 (2), 145-167.
- Macintyre, S., & Clark, A. (2003). *The history wars*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Macintyre, S., & Simpson, N. (2009). Consensus and division in Australian citizenship education. *Citizenship Studies*, 13 (2), 121-134.
- McKenna, M. (1997). Different perspectives on black armband history: Research Paper 5 1997-98: Parliament of Australia.
- McNevin, A. (2011). *Contesting citizenship: Irregular migrants and new frontiers of the political*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Miller, P., & Rose, N. (2008). *Governing the present: administering economic, social and personal life*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Miller, T. (1993). *The well-tempered self: Citizenship, culture, and the postmodern subject*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Miller, T. (2001). What it is and what it isn't: Introducing ... cultural studies. In T. Miller (Ed.), *A companion to cultural studies* (pp. 1-20). Malden Mass. USA: Blackwell Publishing.

- Miller, T., Lawrence, G., McKay, J., & Rowe, D. (2001). *Globalization: and sport: Playing the world*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Mitchell, W. J. T. (2005). Value. In T. Bennett, L. Grossberg & M. Morris (Eds.), *New Keywords: A revised vocabulary of culture and society*. Maiden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Morris, M. (1996). History in Australian popular culture. (PhD), University of Technology, Sydney, Sydney.
- Murdoch University. (2011). Sir Walter Murdoch. Retrieved 30 January, 2013, from <http://www.murdoch.edu.au/vco/secretariat/records/people/sirwaltermurdoch.html>
- Murray, D. (2003). *Integrating citizenship content in teaching adult immigrants English: An evaluation of Let's Participate: A course in Australian citizenship*. Sydney: AMEP Research Centre.
- Neumann, K. (2008). But is it history? *Cultural Studies Review*, 14 (1), 19-32.
- Nile, R. (2007). End of the culture wars. Retrieved from http://blogs.theaustralian.news.com.au/richardnile/index.php/theaustralian/comments/end_of_the_culture_wars
- National Multicultural Advisory Council(NMAC). (1999).Australian multiculturalism for a new century: Towards inclusiveness. Retrieved 24 December, 2012, from http://www.immi.gov.au/media/publications/multicultural/.../report_no_graphics.pdf

Noble, G. (2009). Everyday cosmopolitanism and the labour of intercultural community. In A. Wise & S. Velayutham (Eds.), *Everyday multiculturalism* (pp. 46-65). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

NSW Department of Education and Training. (2010). Racismnoway: Factsheets: The Snowy Mountains scheme - birthplace of multiculturalism in Australia. Retrieved 20 January, 2013, from <http://www.racismnoway.com.au/teaching-resources/factsheets/37.html>

Oxford English Dictionary. Retrieved 22 February 2012
<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.uts.edu.au/view/Entry/221253?rskey=gBAaPI&result=1-eid>

Palmer, A., Bell, R., Martyn, A., O'Neill, P., & Prince, P. (2005). *Australian citizenship bill 2005 Australian citizenship (Transitional and Consequential) Bill 2005*. Department of Parliamentary Services: Parliament of Australia.

Perera, S. (2009). White shores of longing: 'Impossible subjects' and the frontiers of citizenship. *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, 23 (5), 647-662.

Plibersek, T. (2011, 27 September). Minister for Human Services: Australia's social inclusion heritage - past, present and future: Address to the Sydney Institute. Retrieved 10 March, 2013, from http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/65939/20111115-0804/www.mhs.gov.au/media/speeches_and_transcripts/2011/09/27_september_2011_-_address_to_the_sydney_institute.html

- PM's Muslim comments 'offensive'. (20 February 2006). *The Sydney Morning Herald*.
Retrieved from <http://www.smh.com.au/news/national/pm-stands-by-muslim-comment/2006/02/20/1140283978611.html>
- Procacci, G. (2001). Governmentality and citizenship. In K. Nash & A. Scott (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to political sociology* (pp. 342-351). Malden USA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Pugliese, J. (2002). Migrant heritage in an Indigenous context: for a decolonising migrant historiography. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 23 (1), 5-18.
- Rabinow, P. & Rose, N. (1994). Introduction: Foucault today. In P. Rabinow & N. Rose (Eds.), *The Essential Foucault* (pp. xii-xxxv). New York and London: The New Press.
- Ray, R. (1988). Government response to the Report of the CAAIP. Retrieved 24 December, 2012, from http://www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/doc/ray_2.pdf
- Refugee Council of Australia (RCA). (2008). Submission to the Review of the Australian citizenship test. Retrieved 21 January, 2013, from <http://www.refugeecouncil.org.au/r/sub/0806-Citizenship.pdf>
- Riley, M. (2003, 10 September). Sorry, but the PM says the culture wars are over, *The Sydney Morning Herald*.
- Robb, A. (2011). *Black dog daze: Public life, private demons*. Carlton Vic: Melbourne University Press.
- Rose, N. (1990). *Governing the soul: The shaping of the private self*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Rose, N. (1996). Governing 'advanced' liberal democracies. In A. Barry, T. Osborne & N. Rose (Eds.), *Foucault and political reason* (pp. 37-64). London: UCL Press.
- Rose, N. (1996). Identity, genealogy, history. In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 128-150). London: SAGE.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, N. (2000).
- Rose, N., O'Malley, P., & Valverde, M. (2006). Governmentality. *Annual Review of Law and Social Sciences* (2), 83-104.
- Rose, N., O'Malley, P., & Valverde, M. (2006). Governmentality. *Annual Review of Law and Social Sciences*(2), 83-104.
- Rubenstein, K. (2006). Australian citizenship: Discussion Paper on the merits of introducing a formal citizenship test. ANU College of Law, Centre for International and Public Law Retrieved 31 August, 2011, from <http://law.anu.edu.au/cipl/expertopinion.asp>>
- Ryan, L. (2010). 'Hard evidence': the debate about massacre in the Black War in Tasmania. In J. Docker, F. Peters-Little & A. Curthoys (Eds.), *Passionate Histories: Myth, memory and Indigenous Australia*. Canberra: ANU epress.
- Scheurich, J. J., & Bell McKenzie, K. (2005). Foucault's methodologies: Archaeology and genealogy. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Schirmer, W., Weidenstedt, L., & Reich, W. (2012). From tolerance to respect in inter-ethnic contexts. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38 (7), 1049-1065.

- Schlunke, K. (2005). *Bluff Rock: The autobiography of a massacre*. Fremantle, WA: Fremantle Arts Centre Press.
- Spencer, A. (2011). Interview with Tanja Plibersek. Sydney: ABC Radio.
- SSCLCA. (2007). (Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs). *Estimates (Additional Budget Estimates)* 12 February. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Stephen, N. (2000). The first half-century of Australian citizenship. In K. Rubenstein (Ed.), *Individual community nation* (pp. 3-7). Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing.
- Stratton, J. (1998). *Race daze: Australia in identity crisis*. Sydney: Pluto Press.
- Stratton, J. (2011). *Uncertain lives: Culture, race and neoliberalism in Australia*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.
- Stratton, J., & Ang, I. (1998). Multicultural imagined communities: Cultural difference and national identity in the USA and Australia. In D. Bennett (Ed.), *Multicultural States: Rethinking difference and identity* (pp. 135-162). London and New York: Routledge.
- Tavan, G. (2009). Testing times: the problem of 'history' in the Howard Government's Australian citizenship test. In K. Neumann & G. Tavan (Eds.), *Does history matter? Making and debating citizenship, immigration and refugee policy in Australia and New Zealand*. Canberra: ANU E Press.
- Throsby, D. (2008, 26 August). A truce in the culture wars, *The Sydney Morning Herald*.
- Tosh, J. (2008). Why history matters. Retrieved 12 August, 2011, from <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-79.html>

United Nations. The universal declaration of human rights: History of the document.

Retrieved 18 May 2012, from

<http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/history.shtml>

Vasta, E. (2010). The controllability of difference: Social cohesion and the new politics of solidarity. *Ethnicities*, 10 (4), 503-521.

Wakim, J. (2006, 15 December). A new lease of life for White Australia, Opinion, *The Age*. Retrieved from <http://www.theage.com.au/news/opinion/a-new-lease-of-life-for-white-australia/2006/12/14/1165685821331.html>

Walters, W. (2012). *Governmentality: Critical encounters*. London and New York: Routledge.

Weedon, C. (2011). Identity, difference and social cohesion in contemporary Britain. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 32 (3), 209-227.

White, R. (1981). *Inventing Australia: Images and identity, 1688-1980*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Windshuttle, K. (2005). *The fabrication of Aboriginal history*. Sydney: Macleay Press.

Wise, A. (2009). Introduction: Multiculturalism and everyday life. In A. Wise & S.

Velayutham (Eds.), *Everyday multiculturalism* (pp. 1-17). London: Palgrave Macmillan.