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This research examines the emerging discourse around recent refugee settlement in Australia and its impact on emerging African communities. Borrowing from Foucault's power/knowledge and governmentality concepts, the research examines a number of social and institutional procedures, conditions and interrelationships that produce discourses in relation to African refugee settlement in Australia. The research employs two bodies of data to demonstrate how a refugee discourse has evolved in the Australian context and how this discourse is employed and exercised to affect the capacities of small African emerging communities. The first body of data is the documentation of debates and policy decisions that contributed to the growth of a refugee discourse and the second body of data is derived from focus groups and interviews with key actors in the settlement services community.

Based on the data the research demonstrates how emerging refugee discourses are manifested in the delivery of settlement services and in policy development. It analyses how the construction of discourse around refugees by the Australian public, settlement service providers and the African refugee settlers themselves has enabled a power relationship or strategic positioning through various tactics of governmentality. In other words the research investigates causes and consequences around the construction of a refugee discourse based on the theory that such a discourse is not innocent and always results in complex reconfigurations of power relationships.
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Chapter One:

Introduction

The aim of this research is to examine the emerging discourse around recent refugee settlement in Australia and examine its impact on emerging African communities. Borrowing from Foucault’s power/knowledge and governmentality concepts, the research will examine a number of social and institutional procedures, conditions and interrelationships that produce discourses in relation to African refugee settlement in Australia. This research employs two bodies of data to demonstrate how a refugee discourse has evolved in the Australian context and how this discourse is employed and exercised to affect the capacities of small African emerging communities. The first body of data is the documentation of debates and policy decisions that contributed to the growth of a refugee discourse and the second body of data is derived from focus groups and interviews with key actors in the settlement services community. The research questions were: is there a discourse in Australian immigration policy a specific to refugees? How has a particular discourse for African refugees emerged in contemporary Australia? How does this discourse manifest its influence in policies for refugee settlement? What is the impact of such a discourse on the settlement opportunities for African immigrants, refugees and community organisations?

In December 2007, the then-minister for Immigration and Citizenship, Kevin Andrews, stated that “Sudanese refugees face difficulties to integrate and adjust into the Australian mainstream community” (The Age 27 November, 2007). This statement was followed by a reduction of the refugee intake from Sudan. Given Australia’s unique historical background as a nation of immigrants and its apparent policy positioning with multiculturalism, Andrews’ brief statement raised questions about the attitude of the then Australian government toward the principals of an Australian multicultural society. Further, Andrews’ response reintroduced a number of public debates about immigration and multiculturalism in past decades that have proved not to be unusual in Australian society.
This research sets out to explain and document emerging refugee discourses, how the Australian governments’ policies and attitudes toward refugees are manifested within the context of such discourse and examine the impact such policies have had on new settlers.

This research is important because it reveals an assertion of a discourse that adversely affects the capacity of humanitarian refugees to experience settlement in their new country in a positive way, thus exposing a tension between an immigration policy that opens its door to people in need but is not prepared to ensure that they are welcomed and appropriately supported when they arrive and try to make Australia their new home. The research is framed by a Foucauldian theoretical framework that focuses on how the discourses about refugees and their settlement are exercised as technologies of government and how that exercise of power limits ad controls the experience of small communities, specifically African communities represented by small associations.

Foucault’s theorisation of power and knowledge provides grounds for a complex configuration of instruments, procedures and techniques in which power manifests itself and is analysed in modern societies (Foucault, 1980). Also, his concept of governmentality enables analysis of technologies employed by different governments at varying times (Foucault, 1991). Using these theoretical tools, this research will explore power/knowledge relations that are invested in refugee discourses and settlement policy in Australia. It identifies government rationalities for multiculturalism at different periods of Australian immigration history, and further analyses how technologies of domination have been deployed by various governments.

Stakeholders taking part in debates about multiculturalism and multicultural policies include the Australian general public, immigrants, refugees, governments, academics, independent committees, media and non-government organisations (NGOs). Such players constantly interact and create discourses on immigrants and refugees and governments continuously produce policies. At a site where the players intersect with each other, the research intends to examine the emergence of a refugee discourse and related settlement policies. In this context, the relationships are mutual and reciprocal, being the relationship between discourses and its policies. Governments make policies that are a part of discourse whereas service providers and various players deliver the service within the environment formed through generating
further discourses. This process results in collaboration, tension, conflict and progress, which leads to another cycle of discourse, eventually resulting in significant implications for the everyday lives of new African refugees and humanitarian entrants.

It is important to acknowledge my identity as the researcher. I have spent almost 10 years as a settlement service worker in South West Sydney, and three and a half years of those at an ethnic community organisation and 6 years at one of the Migrant Resource Centres in the metropolitan Sydney area. As my position was funded by the Department of Immigration and Citizenship, working as a settlement service worker provided me with an opportunity to gain ‘hands-on’ experience in implementing the Australian government’s settlement policy and to witness how the service affected the settlement process of African refugees. I have also witnessed some of the major changes in settlement policy over the last ten years and felt the impact of those changes for refugees and humanitarian entrants. This opportunity to interact with both a government funding body and refugee client groups presented me with a unique opportunity to perceive how the policy was set to deliver the services and how the policy is actually being implemented. In theory it is a rather simple model, in which taxpayers’ money is channelled to where needs exist. However complexity is added as service providers are brought in as agents acting on behalf of both sides. At the centre of these relationships among funding bodies, service providers and target communities, discourses emerged as a ‘currency of power’ (Foucault, 1980). Enabled by technologies of government, which will be further explained in the literature review chapter, discourses circulate through these relationships, manifest, subjugate and make strategic investments in the power relationships. This research documents and interprets how this process occurs in relation to African refugees, who are the latest settlers into Australian society.

Since the first immigration policy at the dawn of the Federation of Australian States, which is best described as the ‘White Australia’ policy, the nation has witnessed rapid changes in its demographic make-up, particularly in terms of countries of origin and the direction of multicultural policies to deal with new Australians. Australia now has cosmopolitan cities, where ethnic diversity is highly visible. Despite an apparent growth in multiculturalism and genuine attempts to realize a ‘fair go’ for all Australians, Australia’s immigration policy and the idea of multiculturalism remain highly contentious. This has been the case since the inception of multiculturalism policy, which was adopted under the Whitlam government (1972-1975). However, under the Liberal National Party Coalition led by John Howard (1996-2007), a number of policies were employed that produced the effect of dismantling the
foundations of Australian multicultural society (Ang & Stratton, 1998). Despite the underlying premise that Australia fundamentally needs a greater population to prosper as a nation, John Howard and his government devised measures that could only be described as ‘governing tactics’ that intended to create a politics of fear (Gale, 2004). This included mechanisms such as the introduction of the temporary protection visa, mandatory detention for onshore asylum seekers, invention of the so-called ‘Pacific Solution’ for immigration policy, an attack on Muslim culture and the official removal of multiculturalism (Metcalfe, 2010). Not only did the Coalition government’s policies stir up a heated resistance from some sections of Australian society, but they were the subject of strong international criticism (ABC Radio, Sydney, 6 July, 2010). Nevertheless, the Howard government enjoyed huge electoral success domestically until its defeat in December 2007 when the Rudd Labor government came into power. As these events unfolded, the settlement policy for newly arrived migrants and refugees underwent substantial changes. The settlement policy, which is mainly decided and implemented through the Department of Immigration and Citizenship, is also influenced by a number of service organisations and refugee rights advocacy groups and is an end product of discourses that matter to newly arrived migrants and refugees. New environments and philosophies imposed on players in the settlement policy brought about significant changes in terms of organizational orientation, funding arrangements, managerial practice and most importantly, its efficacy in providing support for the lives of new migrants and refugees.

In the “Report of the Review of Settlement Services for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants”, the initial government review of settlement policy in May 2003, it is possible to identify both ideological and philosophical detours from multicultural policy under the Howard government. The document is expected to provide useful clues to identifying key processes in the development of major discourses affecting the settlement service sector.

The key component of this research is to analyse the interrelationships between key players, their roles in creating and building specific discourses and finally, the effect of various discourses and policies on target groups through the delivery of settlement services. A Foucauldian approach is applied for the analysis of complex configurations of power relationships between the key players. In doing so it will determine the kind of knowledge
that is being produced on the subject of refugees, and by whom, and explore the intended and unintended results. Finally, the research will identify how it relates to the lived experience of newly-arriving African refugees.

**Definitions of key terms**

**Settlement policy**

Settlement policy is defined as a set of policies designed to assist the settlement of immigrants and refugees in Australia. It refers to a set of policies developed by the government, in particular, the Department of Immigration, and mainly implemented through the settlement service sector. Historically, it was first developed and introduced in the late 1970s after the Galbally Report was launched. Services such as hostels for migrants and English class were provided in the 1950s and can be viewed as a starting point of the settlement policy in Australia (National Archives of Australia, 2013). In 2010 the Department of Immigration and Citizenship supported approximately 150 Settlement Grant Program (SGP) and Integrated Humanitarian Service Scheme (IHSS) positions across the country. Their role was to implement the settlement service through a contractual agreement with the Department of Immigration. The majority of SGP positions are community-based but funded by the Department of Immigration. The policy includes English language education, housing provision, health, income support, orientation to a new country and community capacity building, to name a few. However, in this research a broad definition of settlement services is used. Under this broad definition, services that assist the settlement of immigrants and refugees are also a part of settlement service although they are not funded under SGP or IHSS.

**African refugee discourse**

African refugee discourse can be defined as ‘any written or spoken communication produced on African refugees in Australia’. It refers to what is said and written about African refugees, including that which is produced by the government, welfare service agencies, the mass media and the public. Here, African refugees are defined as ‘refugees from African backgrounds who came to Australia under the Australian government’s immigration policy’. This does not include African refugees in refugee camps overseas.
Settlement service sector

The settlement service sector refers to organisations and services that deliver settlement services to newly-arrived migrants and refugees. The sector consists of not-for profit organisations that are funded by the government, independent not-for profit organisations and for-profit organisations. The government-funded organisations predominantly deliver the Settlement Grant Program (SGP), the Integrated Humanitarian Service Scheme (IHSS), the Post Integrated Humanitarian Service Scheme (Post IHSS) and Complex Case Support (CSS) through Migrant Resource Centres (MRC), Australian Red Cross, Settlement Services International (SSI) and ethno-specific services such as Co As It for the Italian community, Chinese Australian Service Society (CASS) or private businesses such as the Australian Centre for Language (ACL). Another group of settlement service providers are church-based charity organizations such as Anglicare and Mission Australia. Settlement service sectors also include direct government services such as Telephone Interpreting Service (TIS) and Adult Multicultural Education Services (AMES). Furthermore, the Refugee Council of Australia has a central role in advocacy and Settlement Council of Australia (SCOA) operates as a network of settlement service providers. There are also many community and family services predominately established for the Australian born population that include a unit to serve newly arrived migrants and refugees such as The Smith Family and St Vincent de Paul Society.

Multiculturalism

In this research, multiculturalism is defined as a public policy in Australia that responds to and promotes cultural and ethnic diversity. It is generally understood as a policy that manages the development and consequences of cultural diversity in the interest of individuals and society as a whole (National Agenda for Multicultural Australia, 2012).

‘Othering’

‘Othering’ is a process that identifies those that are thought to be different from oneself or the mainstream. The process can reinforce and produce positions of domination and subordination (Johnson, 2004).
Technologies of government

Technologies of government in this research is a term based on a Foucauldian framework (Foucault, 1991), and is a set of tactics, strategies and devices that the government employs to enact technologies of self-mechanism. It is how a governing act of a particular power is rationalised and understood among its citizens and how its implementation is practiced upon its subjects. It is also a way to legitimise the governing of those, who are in power but whose rationale for the governing act has no fundamental and inherent grounds. In other words it is how governments make their citizens feel natural about being governed while being made subordinate to a government. Governments play a key role in creating discourses that constrain or enact the governing of subjects to internalize such discourses and lead to technologies of the self.

Neo-liberalism

Neo liberalism in this research refers to political economic philosophy or government policies based on such a philosophy, which is characterised by market oriented reforms. It rejects the Keynesian idea of a greater government role in the management of macroeconomics but instead focuses on the liberalisation of markets through various measures such as deregulation of financial institutions, privatisation of state enterprises, international trade liberalisation and tightened fiscal policy, particularly in relation to welfare state expenditure. Some of the features of globalisation such as vulnerability of domestic markets in developing countries against terms of trade and international movement of speculative flows of capital, are attributed to the rise of neo-liberalism.

Chapter Summaries

Chapter 2 is a review of the relevant literature on theoretical frameworks applied in this study. Michelle Foucault’s key concepts such as discourse, power and knowledge, and governmentality are reviewed as various mechanisms of producing knowledge and how such knowledge set conditions and discursive relations for subjects. The chapter outlines the theoretical framework upon which the study of refugee discourse and analysis of settlement services is based.
Chapter 3 is an outline of the research methods employed for the research and describes the processes that took place from the recruitment of participants to the semi-structured interviews and transcription of data. The two major research participant groups were the service providers’ cohort and the community leaders’ cohort.

Chapter 4 is body of primary data that includes a review of the history of Australian multiculturalism and settlement policy. It outlines the development of Australian multiculturalism since the ‘White Australian’ policy and key milestones that led to the development of settlement policy. The chapter includes analyses of the construction of refugee discourses throughout the history of migration and settlement.

In Chapter 5 key research findings and analysis from the interviews are documented. Based on the research conducted with 10 service providers of settlement service and 10 community leaders from migrant and refugee communities, narratives are provided in response to the key questions raised in the research. Within the data arising from the interviews with key stakeholders of settlement services, several areas of perceived failure that requires further discussion are identified.

In Chapter 6 the concluding discussion draws together the key findings about how a refugee discourse has emerged and its impact on emerging African communities in Australia and raises key issues for further research.

**Conclusion**

This research demonstrates how emerging refugee discourses are manifested in the delivery of settlement services and in policy development. It analyses how the construction of discourse around refugees by the Australian public, settlement service providers and the African refugee settlers themselves has enabled a power relationship or strategic positioning through various tactics of governmentality. In other words the research investigates causes and consequences around the construction of a refugee discourse based on the theory that such a discourse is not innocent and always results in complex reconfigurations of power relationships. The following chapter examines relevant Foucauldian theories in order to illustrate how the theorisation of such a process can assist in understanding of refugee settlement in Australia.
Chapter Two:

Theoretical Framework

Introduction

The main aim of this research is to identify and analyse how discourses on newly-arriving refugees and humanitarian entrants in Australia are being formed, constructed and developed. This occurs through identifying how such emerging discourses are reflected in the current neo-liberal context and through settlement policies that the Australian government, communities and society jointly create and implement. To ensure a thorough approach, the research will also examine underlying knowledge and discourses that are part of Australian culture and politics.

Theoretical frameworks for this study have been drawn from a number of sources. They assisted in determining the methodology, scope, and interpretation of data arising from document analysis, focus group and interviews. This research also identifies patterns of how the chosen theory is applied to diverse disciplines and to social science in particular. Finally, this chapter establishes links between the theoretical frameworks with current Australian multiculturalism policy in which the settlement policy on the refugee operates.

Michel Foucault’s theorisation of power/knowledge, governmentality, subjugation through techniques of self and bio-politics are the basic theoretical concepts that frame this study. In particular his conceptualisation of governmentality provides an important perspective to view broader governing rationalities that determine settlement policies for refugees and humanitarian entrants.

Power/Knowledge

Foucault (1990)’s well known analysis of power/knowledge is widely applicable to post-structuralist and modern social research. His concepts on power and governmentality have been proven useful in analysing increasingly complex social phenomenon that relate to modern politics. Although Foucault provided a rather comprehensive account of the analysis,
he was not very clear about how this analysis was to be used when attempting to find solutions to social problems or how to develop a better political system. No political programmatics follow automatically from his work (Barry, Osborne & Rose, 1996, p.4). This also contributes to numerous attempts by academics to build on his theoretical frameworks and many diverse reinterpretations.

His analysis begins from a suspicion about the process of how bodies of knowledge became authoritative and then circulated as truth (Foucault, 1979). He was interested in how statements are thematically organized and what processes are involved. He was concerned how it is that we know something, and the processes whereby something becomes established as a fact (Mills, 2003, p69). In other words, he was interested in what he called ‘discursive formations’ which he believed was a real source of force that constitutes power. In Birth of the Asylum, Foucault (1964) illustrated how judgment and observation as a tool of modern science replaced oppressive authoritarian confinements, yet opened up new power relationships that were less punitive but equally powerful. He gave examples of doctor-patient, teacher-student and priest-sinner relationships. Foucault saw the exertion of power as justified by emerging bodies of knowledge. Later, the conceptualisation of knowledge was expanded in Discipline and Punish (1977) where new possibilities of this knowledge as an innovative form of social control were introduced. According to Foucault:

Discipline constitutes ‘a physics of rational and multiple power’ focused on individuals. It works by rendering individuals visible, recording their attributes and performance, measuring their deviation from the norms around which particular disciplines are organized and comparing individuals to each other. At the core of disciplinary systems is a principle of coercion: the normal (as cited in Burchell, 1991, p.208).

Foucault argued that discourse joins power and knowledge. He described knowledge as being a conjunction of power relations and information seeking, which he termed ‘power/knowledge’ (Foucault, 1990). He stated that ‘it is not possible for power to be exercised without knowledge’, ‘it is impossible for knowledge not to engender power’ (Foucault, 1990). For this reason it is more accurate to use his term ‘power/knowledge’ to emphasise the way that these two elements depend on one another (Mills, 2003, p.69). Power is not owned by a specific institution; it circulates in the form of discourse. Foucault was not
interested in what power is, rather he was interested in how it operates, therefore, he focused on the complex configurations of instruments, procedures and techniques in which power manifests itself (Hindess, 2001, p.100). Power is exercised rather than possessed; it is not the privilege acquired or preserved of the dominant class, but the overall effect of its strategic positions. The conditions and interrelationships that power is exerted on others by individuals were not known. Furthermore, power is not exercised as an obligation or prohibition on those who ‘do not have it’; it invests them, is transmitted by them and through them (Rabinow, 1984, p.174). Power and knowledge directly imply one another. That there is no power relation without the corrective constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge, does not presuppose and constitute power relations at the same time.

The subject who knows, the object to be known and the modalities of knowledge must be regarded as so many effects of fundamental implications of power/knowledge and their historical transformations. In short it is not the activity of the subject of knowledge that produces a corpus of knowledge, useful or resistant to power, but power/knowledge, the processes and struggles that traverse it, and of which it is made up, that determines the forms and possible domains of knowledge.

(Foucault 1991:27-28)

Foucault practically dismissed the concept of truth. To him truth is constructed and kept in place through a wide range of strategies that support and affirm it and that exclude and counter alternative versions of events (Milld, 2003 p. 76). This implied that any knowledge, since it always endangers power by nature, is never neutral. It only contains elements that can qualify as truth at times when needed. In her example of knowledge being a power tool, Mills (2003) cited the post colonial theorists Edward Said and Mary Louise Pratt (Said 1978). The colonial authorities produced a great deal of detailed knowledge and information about the colonised country, maps, architecture, indigenous languages and customs of the people. Westerners in the colonial period imposed systems of classification on the colonised countries which they proposed as global objective systems of knowledge, but which were in fact formulated from a Western perspective with Western interests at their core (Mills, 2003, p.72).

Foucault was not concerned to set up the notion of truth in opposition to false ideas, but simply analyse the procedures which are used to maintain these distinctions (Mills, 2003,
What Foucault argued is that ‘it’s not a matter of emancipating truth from every system of power but of detaching the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social economic and cultural, within which it operates at the present time’ (Foucault, 1979, pp.59-66).

Foucault (1990) denied that power is sourced or held by a specific institution, and placed less emphasis on the role of sovereign power, which made it harder for academics and policy makers to prescribe solutions and policies based on an empowerment model. He was more interested in the emergence of governmentality and bio-politics that can be modelled from an 18th Century pastoral form of power. Nevertheless, Foucault viewed power in a positive light which made his position ambiguous and open to different interpretations today. Based on Foucault’s lectures and writings, Trainor (2003) argued that Foucault, in fact, condemned totalistic, unitary and theory driven thought; he was actually in support of open, pluralistic and flexible modes of theorising ‘truth’. For example some of the political campaigns in which Foucault was involved in the 1970s about the conditions in French prisons partially support this position (Mills, 2003, p.76). Nevertheless a re-evaluation of his position on the possibilities of applying his theory to political pluralism is outside the scope of this research.

The research will primarily focus on how constructed scientific knowledge and ‘truth’ yield relevancy and insight into the analysis of the emergence of an African refugees discourse in Australia. There is little literature available on the settlement of African refugees, although there is increasing amount of literature in the area of health. This is in contrast with the fact that there is much discourse being generated about African refugees, which proves that scientific knowledge is being constructed without much scientific evidence. When Kevin Andrews, the then-minister for Immigration and Citizenship made the statement in December 2007, it was followed by an enquiry in the community sector about whether Kevin Andrews had any real evidence to support his claim (Media Release, Refugee Council of Australia, Oct 2007).

Foucault’s theorisation of power/knowledge provides useful grounds for the understanding of this contradiction and assists in identifying some of the key questions in the research such as; Without the existence of evidence, who produces such knowledge? Also, what is the purpose and what are the processes involved? In this research this is done primarily by examining the relationships among key stakeholders in settlement services, governments, social institutions and the African refugee community and by documenting how discourses are used as a means
of ‘othering’ in the current political, social and economic environment. According to Foucault’s view, it is of secondary importance whether Sudanese refugees have real problems or not, what is more important is that the government took the initiative of producing a refugee discourse, which is targeted due to certain power relations. Under the unequal power relationship between a seemingly caring government and new vulnerable refugees, it becomes even less relevant whether the claim was based on scientific research or not.

**Governmentality**

In his 1976 lectures at the College de France, Foucault noted a shift in the elaboration of power from a centralised colonial form of sovereignty to disciplinary and regulatory apparatuses of governmentality (Foucault 2003). Since the 1990s there has been an increase in the literature on governmentality, which examines a mode of modern government and its role in the legitimisation of governing people with totalising power, in other words rationale for governing the ‘conduct of conduct’ (Gordon, 1991,p.2). This analysis of governmentality had two objectives: (i) Foucault wanted to criticise current conceptions of power that perceived power as a unitary system, a critique undertaken most thoroughly in *Discipline and Punish* (1977) and volume 1 of *The History of Sexuality* (1979); and (ii) he wanted to analyse power as a domain of strategic relations between individuals and groups, relations where strategies were to govern the conduct of these individuals (Gutting, 2003, pp.126-127).

Foucault uses the term ‘governmentality’ in a very broad sense, similar to up until the 18th Century when it designated how the conduct of individuals or groups might be directed, the governmentality of children, souls, communities, families and the sick (Foucault, 2000, p.341). It did not only cover the legitimately constituted forms of political or economic subjection, but also modes of action, more or less considered and calculated, which were destined to act upon the possibilities of action of others (Dreyfus,1982, p.221). The combined word between ‘government’ and ‘rationality’ questions reasons for governing. Foucault explained in his 1976 lecture that governmentality is the ensemble formed by institutions, procedures, analyses, reflections, calculations and tactics that allow an exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has, as its target population, a principle form of knowledge political economy, and apparatuses of security as its technical means (Foucault, 1991, p.102). In other words, it created a shift from a colonial state power to one concerned with constituting individuals and populations within a framework of practising normalisation,
disciplining, regulation, constitution and exclusion that apply to a community or social body conceptualised in the form of a nation state. This has been often defined as ‘the conduct of conduct’ (Gordon, 1991).

In his widely cited book ‘The Foucault Effect’ (1991), Gordon identified a series of major phases of development of governmental rationalities. Understanding of governmentality and how it evolved throughout modern times are useful for the analysis of the current governing rationalities related to refugee and humanitarian issues. The overview of governmentality discussed below illustrates patterns and conditions on which the governing rationalities are grounded. It shows the inevitability of how we arrived at current governing rationalities, which inherited some of the characteristics from each period discussed below.

**Early Modern**

The focus of Foucault’s interest in modern governmentality consists of a realisation of what he calls the ‘demonic’ coupling of the ‘city game’ and the ‘shepherd game’: the invention of a form of secular political pastorate which couples ‘individualisation’ and ‘totalisation’ (Gordon, 1991, p.8).

Throughout the Middle Ages, the main political issues were the ‘advice to the prince’, or principality (Foucault, 1991, p.87). Ritualisation of the problem of personal conduct, the problem of the government of souls and lives by Catholic and Protestant pastoral doctrine is another important question (Foucault, 1991, p.87). The following period from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century had witnessed the two emerging trends of state centralisation and of dispersion and religious dissidence (Foucault, 1991,p.88). At the intersection of these two tendencies the problem emerged, of how to be ruled, how strictly, by whom, to what end, by what methods, etc (Foucault, 1991, p.88).

The principles of government are no longer part of and subordinate to the divine, cosmo-theological order of the world. The French politique theorist of the early seventeenth century Etienne Thuau wrote about ‘raison d’e’etat’.

The notion of state ceases to be derived from the divine order of universe. The point of departure for political speculation is no longer the Creation in its entirety, but the sovereign state. (cited in Gordon, 1991, p.9).
Foucault identified three fundamental types of government (Foucault, 1991, p.91), each of which relates to a particular science or discipline: the art of self government, connected with morality; the art of properly governing a family which belongs to economy; and finally the science of ruling the state, which concerns politics. The art of government is essentially concerned with answering the question of how to introduce economic attention of the father towards his family into the management of the state (Foucault, 1991, p.92).

The literature on the governing rationality in early modern illustrates that governmentality had existed from as early as pastoral teaching of Christianity. Governmentality requires a relationship between the ruler and the ruled. The two ‘individualising’ and ‘totalising’ characteristics emerged since the transfer into political pastorate and they still continue as a key feature of governmentality at present time (Foucault, 1991). This means governing rationality on refugees and humanitarian entrants must appeal to the whole population as well as deal with individual refugees and humanitarian entrants. Governmentality in early modern times also shows that it has established as a control over private domains including individuals and families, which had a greater implication in later years in terms of the emergence of society (Foucault, 1991). Also the early features of governmentality in the sovereign state have indicated control and accessibility of knowledge as an important aspect of governing rationalities (Foucault, 1991). Although individuals were no longer governed by shepherd pastoral power, the rulers now can discuss individuals and families in terms of building state’s strength. Perspectives on governmentality in the early modern era suggest that in the political arena, there is a type of conceptualisation that depicts the binary nature of relationships existing to be either the ruler or the ruled. There is no literature regarding refugees in the early modern years except for some biblical accounts of exodus, however it is not difficult to presume that refugees and humanitarian entrants would inherit natural characteristics of being ‘other’, which disturbs the conventional positioning of power relationships between the ruler and the ruled. Any ruler would feel urged to come up with governing rationalities to include a new population.

**Police State**

The early modern political concept is further developed into ‘police government’, a government that defines itself as being ‘of all and of each’: a universal assignation of subjects to economically useful life. It equates the happiness of its individual subjects with the state’s strength. Police is therefore a kind of economic pastorate (Gordon, 1991, p.12). Police was a
science of populations; the purpose was to maximise the numbers of people, since people were seen as being both the source and main instance of a nation’s wealth. Everything was to be administered: roads, canals, morals, health. It is a totalising political rationality (Osborne, 1996, p.100). Foucault’s well known discussion of the prison panopticon as a structure of surveillance is a symbol of the police government (Foucault, 1977). As Foucault observes, it is possible that never before or since has the activity of government been perceived as so essentially interdependent with the government of self, on the part ruler and ruled alike (Foucault, 1988). “Conduct’ is an important theme for the following reasons. The erosion of a feudal order in which personal identity was anchored in a hereditary status and an associated network of loyalties and dependencies; the impact of the Reformation, in terms of the religious problematisation of the individual, demand for a renovated and invigorated structure of pastoral guidance and the pervasive dislocation of public and private life by religious wars (Gordon, 1991, pp.12-3).

The governmentality of this period witnessed the further reinforcement of a state’s role in controlling individual subjects through its increased power in managing states’ economics, which consisted of individual families. In relation to the research questions, the literature demonstrates that in rationalising the governing act, controlling economic activity of individuals was effective, since government can always justify that the control is necessary for a nation’s wealth. The happiness of individuals matters to the state’s strength and the importance of the impact of knowledge on individual subjects was further realised. The literature indicates a potential misalignment in reciprocity in governmentality between the ruler and the ruled for refugees and humanitarian entrants. The tradition of governmentality under a police state suggests that incompatibility occurs inevitably while a new group in the population, whose entry into state sovereign power is not based on economy, emerges. There is a fundamental difficulty for government to apply the same governmentality to this new group, which does not immediately add to increased national wealth. Under neo-liberalism there is urgency for the governing power to hold new settlers economically accountable. There is a strong need for governing power to justify its performance in terms of increasing national wealth. The ‘otherness’ of refugees and humanitarian entrants is prominent in this sense and attempts are made continuously to create governing rationalities to justify and subjectify the new groups in the meantime.
Foucault (1991) has described the early modern conjunction of ‘raison d’e’tat’ (purpose of government) and science of policing as momentously original in both an epistemological and an ethical sense.

It constitutes the activity of government as an art with its own distinctive and irreducible form of rationality; and it gives to the exercise of sovereignty the practical form of a political pastorate, a government of all and each for the purposes of secular security and prosperity (Gordon, 1991, p.14).

Whereas police represented a political technology that could intervene as much as possible in the interests of happiness, liberalism invokes a kind of habitual suspicion relating to the means and ends of government (Osborne, 1996, p.101).

Foucault contrasts the emergence of liberalism with police states in the following.

If one governed too much, one did not govern at all. What was discovered, which was one of the great discoveries of political thought at the end of the eighteenth century, was the idea of society. That is to say that government not only has to deal with a territory, with a domain, and with its subjects, but that it also has to deal with a complex and independent reality that has its own laws and mechanisms of disturbance. This new reality is society. From the moment that one is to manipulate a society, one cannot consider it completely penetrable by police (Foucault, 1989b, p.261).

Foucault considered the popularity of Adam Smith’s The Wealth of Nations as affecting not only a transformation in political and economic thinking but also a transformation in the relationship between knowledge and government (Foucault, 1991). With the emergence of political economy he saw scientific objectivity depending on the maintenance of relative distance and autonomy from the standpoint and preoccupations of state. The regularities of economic or commercial society display a rationality which is fundamentally different in kind from that of calculative state regulation (Gordon, 1991, p16). It inaugurates a new mode of objectification of governed reality, whose effect is to resituate governmental reason within a

Liberalism can be accurately characterised in Kantian terms as a critique of state reason, a doctrine of limitation and wise restraint, designed to mature and educate state reason by displaying to it the intrinsic bounds of its power to know (Gordon, 1991, p.15). It is commonly understood as a political doctrine or ideology concerned with the maximization of individual liberty and, in particular, with the defence of that liberty against the State (Gordon, 1991, p.15). Liberalism fixes the terms of the problem of how political sovereignty must be exercised: what relationship must political sovereignty establish with this quasi-natural reality over which it presides but with which it cannot do just what it likes? What techniques, what procedures, what regulations and laws enable this reality to function in accordance with its nature and to optimum effect in the production of wealth and the promotion of wellbeing? (Burchell, 1996, p.25).

Foucault’s conceptualisation of governmentality suggested that the sphere of individual liberty should be seen as a governmental product, that is, as the effect of multiplicity of interventions concerned with the promotion of a specific “form of life” (Dean, 1991, p.13).

Society emerged as a new target to rule and it required a more complex art of governing incorporating the regularities of economic and commercial society (Gordon, 1991). State reasoning had matured under liberalism to reflect a new reality influenced by the Wealth of Nations, and the major features of governmentality focused on the control of the individual remained but in a much complex social setting. In relation to this research, governmentality during this period suggested that the ruler now had to deal with a more complex reality of society, which may include some sections of a fragmented society. Currently complex social settings do exist. There are sections of fragmented society that share same interests with refugees and humanitarian entrants, such as civic groups, churches and human rights activists, whose positioning is difficult to define by a traditional ruler or ruled model. The population has now increased expectations about individual liberty. The emergence of new groups such as refugees and humanitarian entrants potentially challenges the traditional governing rationale of economic prosperity and secular security, which have been popular grounds for governmentality. The literature review on governmentality points to the fact that the humanitarian issue might have served governmentality well under the Sheppard pastoral models (Gordon, 1991), nevertheless in light of a new emerging political economy, such
issues call for new governing rationalities to satisfactorily maintain legitimacy through efficient management of the economy and society. This in turn increasingly focuses on the accumulation of individual wealth in a new environment of laissez-faire economics as well as discourses as technologies of government to include these ‘odd’ groups.

Foucault on Civil Society

In comparison to John Locke’s early account of civil society which emphasises a reciprocal obligation between state and people, and the limitation of state authority for the preservation of individual life, liberty and property, Foucault provides a more complex account of civil society. There were emerging needs for a state to find a balance between the state’s exercise of power through its totalising legal and political forms, and its exercise of an individual form of power, which regulates the pursuit of individual interest (Burchell, 1991). Foucault saw civil society as a transactional reality existing at the mutable interface of political power and everything which permanently outstrips its reach (Foucault, 1979). Liberalism sets limits to what government can know or do through a civil society that must none the less be governed even if, as in the most radical proposals, it is sometimes maintained that civil society or the nation is entirely capable of governing itself.

society makes sense of the construction of the characteristically hybrid domain the public and private, of the utilisation of private forms of power for public ends (Burchell, 1996, 25).

For Foucault, civil society enables technologies of government and opens up the possibility of various interplays with political power.

Since Foucault’s analysis brings out the problematizing character of liberalism in relation to the existence of civil society as both the object and end of government, this political objectification of civil society plays a central role in determining a relatively open-ended and experimental problem of how to govern: that is of finding the appropriate techniques for a government oriented by a problematic of security. This ‘transactional’ domain at the frontier of political power and what ‘naturally’ eludes its grasp constitutes a space problematisation, a fertile ground for experimental innovation in the development of political technologies of government (Burchell, 1991, p.141). Various institutions then come in and play their parts.
What might be called a natural-social demand for order, or for mechanisms to integrate individuals into appropriate schemes of behaviour and activity, is met by an expertise licensed by the state but formally independent of it: medicine, psychiatry, psychology, criminology, pedagogy and so on (Burchell, 1991, p.142).

‘Correlate’ and ‘schema’ are two key words in defining Foucault’s civil society under liberalist thinking. Civil society was established as a critical concept, an instrument of critique. It outlined the correlate or schema for a possible liberal art of government. During the course of the nineteenth century, and throughout the present century, it was fundamentally recast into what some call the social, or just society, by governmental techniques we associate with the Welfare State. This is further explained by Burchell:

Today under the influence of neo-liberalism, another attempt is being made to transform it again to give it the capacity to function autonomously by reshaping its characteristic model of action (1996, p.28).

The key point arising from this discussion is that civil society is brought into being as both distinct from political intervention and yet potentially able to be aligned with potential aspirations (Barry, Osborne & Rose, 1996, p. 9).

In Chapter 5 it is explained how settlement services are subject to political process, which combined with bureaucracy, impedes the successful delivery of service. It does not seem to be clear to what extent that government-funded organisations can maintain the characteristics and autonomy of civil society, nor is it clear how much integration with the government, through government funding, disables those organisations. Application of technologies of government has become more complex with the ambiguous positioning of government-funded organisations in civil society.

**Power and Domination**

A central theoretical concept in Foucault’s social analysis is power. The problem for government is a missing link between two of Foucault’s major research interests after *Discipline and Punish* (1977): (i) genealogy of the state; and (ii) genealogy of the subject. In other words, governmentality is the connection between what he called ‘technologies of the self’ and ‘technologies of domination’, the constitution of the subject and the formation of the state (Lemke, 2000, p.4). Governmentality is a site where individual and state seek each other
through ‘technologies of self’ and ‘technologies of domination’ that leads to the legitimisation of institutionalising discourse as power (Smart, 1985, p.116). In this research, ‘technologies of self’ is applied to multiple players in the settlement service. ‘Technologies of self’ refers to the mechanism that individuals or ‘the ruled’ are integrated into structures of coercion and domination. It takes a form of self regulatory practice among key stakeholders. In the research it mainly concerns the relationship with stakeholders in the settlement service such as government funded service providers and small community organisations, which initiates processes and practices that have the effects of subordination. The technologies of self identified in the research work in conjunction with technologies of domination and affect the overall strategic positioning of refugees, governments, large service providers and small ethnic organisations such as emerging African communities.

Foucault (1988a) stated that if one wants to analyse the genealogy of the subject in Western civilization, one has to take into account not only technologies of domination but also technologies of the self. In this research some evidence will be presented to challenge whether there is a case where material issues such as funding have been used as a disciplinary tool within the settlement service sector. Some practices will be indentified, in which collaboration between technologies of self and technologies of domination led to subordination of particular groups.

A strategic game is an ordinary feature of human interactions that signifies structuring the possible field of action of others (Lemke, 2000, p.5). This takes the form of ideological manipulation, rational argumentation or moral advice but it does not necessarily mean that power is exercised against the interests of the other part of a power relationship. A power relationships under strategic games can also result in an ‘empowerment’ or ‘responsibilisation’. This view implies that the strategic positioning in power relationships among stakeholders around the settlement service can result in positive processes, desired outcomes such as empowerment for the target communities. Nevertheless it will be illustrated in the analysis chapter that the political positioning in respect to the settlement service has brought benefit to some part of the relationship while resulting in material barriers for other players in the delivery of settlement service.

Domination is a particular type of power relationship that is stable and hierarchical, fixed and difficult to reverse (Lemke, 2000, p.5). Foucault reserves the term ‘domination’ for what we ordinarily call ‘power’ (1988b, p.19). Domination refers to those asymmetrical relationships
of power in which subordinated persons have little room for manoeuvre because their ‘margin of liberty is extremely limited’ (Foucault, 1988b, p.12). However, states of domination are not the primary source for holding power. On the contrary, they are the effects of the technologies of government, which account for the systematisation, stabilisation and regulation of power relationships that may lead to a state of domination (Hindess, 1996). This research will reveal that how little control that refugees, have in the delivery of settlement services. As subordinated target groups or welfare service recipients, their ability to manoeuvre various relationships of power is very limited. This process of how technologies of government are enacted on refugees and humanitarian entrants, settlement service providers and the Australian public through various interplays and construction of discourses, is exemplified in Chapter 5 of this thesis.

**Foucault and Neo-Liberalism**

When Foucault was giving lectures at the College de France, there was little literature on neo-liberalism (Flew, 2012). His interest in neo-liberalism as a governmental rationality was to question whether different types of capitalism were possible through innovations in governmental practice and institutional frameworks (Foucault, 2008, p.94). There is also the rejection of the opposition between state and civil societies, government and market, and public and private. Foucault argued that such differences do not adequately reflect how political power is exercised through a profusion of shifting alliances between diverse authorities in projects that govern the many facets of economic activity, social life and individual conduct. This view is relevant to this study as it reflects the reality of diverse potential alliances amongst stakeholders in the settlement service. It is no longer a simple model where governments and NGOs oppose each other and find a balance. As research in this study found, under the current funding structure, NGOs have now become an integral part of the government and the relationship between NGOs and target communities has become ambiguous. Under neo-liberal rationalities, lip service is paid to the fact that the government intends target communities to be self-sufficient and self-reliant. However new Commonwealth management policy and cost saving drives against any systematic investment to make it happen. There are distinct characteristics in determining the Australian government’s strategic position identified as neo-liberalism, which is discussed further in Chapter 5 in this thesis. Harvey defined neo-liberalism as;
Neo-liberalism is defined as a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human wellbeing can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedom and skills within an institutional framework characterised by strong private property rights, free market and free trade (2005, p.2).

If this definition is adopted, neo-liberalism can be seen to govern its subjects, through structuring the possible field of action in which they govern themselves towards freedom (Flew, 2012, pp44-65). Through transforming subjects with duties and obligations into individuals with rights and freedom, modern individuals are not merely ‘free to choose’ but obliged to be free ‘to understand and enact their lives in terms of choice’ (Rose, 1999, p.97). This is an important modernist perspective that appears to be questionable in the context of this study.

Lemke (2000) summarised a critique of neo-liberalism as government rationalities in three areas, pointing to its limits and shortcomings. He proposed that Foucault’s governmentality reflects neo-liberal reality more accurately. In other words, departing from a common diagnosis of neo-liberalism as an extension of economy in politics, which proved that there was no market independence of the state by Marx, Foucault provides a viewpoint that a ‘retreat of the state’ is a prolongation of government, neo-liberalism is not the end but a transformation of politics, and that restructures the power relation within society. Today, we do not perceive a diminishment or reduction of state sovereignty and planning capacities, but a displacement from formal to informal technologies of government and an appearance of new actors on the scene of government (e.g. NGOs) (Lemke, 2000). The difference between state and society, and politics and economy does not function as a foundation or a borderline, but as an element and effect of specific neo-liberal technologies of government (Lemke, 2000). Foucault’s theoretical stance allows for a more complex analysis of neo-liberal forms of government that feature direct intervention through empowered and specialised state apparatuses that also characteristically develop indirect techniques for leading and controlling individuals (Lemke, 2000). The strategy of rendering individual subjects ‘responsible’ entails shifting the responsibility of social risks such as illness, unemployment and poverty (Danaher, 2000, pp 82-96). One key feature of neo-liberal rationality is the congruence it endeavours to achieve between a responsible and moral individual and one who is economically rational. It aspires to construct responsible subjects whose moral quality is based on their rationale to
assess the costs and benefits of a certain act as opposed to other acts. As the choice of options for action is (or so the neo-liberal notion of rationality would have it) the expression of free will on the basis of a self-determined decision, the consequences of any action are borne by the subject alone who is also solely responsible for them (Rese & Miller, 1992). This strategy can be deployed in many areas and leads to social responsibility becoming a matter of personal provisions (Falzon, 1998; Rose & Miller, 1992; Rose, 1996). This understanding of neo liberalism is critical for explaining the way governing rationalities are actualised in respect to the settlement policy in Australia. In particular neo-liberal technologies of government are elaborated in the data analysis section of this study, where settlement services are pressured to be ‘efficient’ and ‘value for money’ despite the fact that major settlement outcomes such as a sense of belonging and increased skill in accessing mainstream services still remain as unquantifiable. Through neo-liberal technologies of government, service providers are put in vulnerable situations, where the service focus is shifted away from clients to stakeholder relationships

Self government & Subject formation

Foucault’s governmentality eventually points to a subject formation that complements technologies of government or domination with the technologies of self (Foucault, 1988a). Foucault was unique in his attempt to analyse how technologies of power reach out to individuals and subjectify them (Foucault, 1982). Foucault’s invention of ‘bio-politics’, and ‘power over life’ are important themes in ‘Madness and Civilisation’ (1967), ‘Discipline and Punish’ (1977) and ‘The History of Sexuality’ (1979). Overall, three modes of objectification of the subject can be identified. These are the mechanisms of how governing authorities have control over individuals (Smart, 1985). The first mode is dividing practice in which subject is objectified by a process of division and categorization. It is through this process that human beings are given social and personal identity which is vulnerable to manipulation. The second mode is a scientific classification in which discourses of life, labour and language are structured into disciplines. The third mode is subjectification which is concerned about the way people turn them into a subject. This differs from the first two modes where the subject is in a passive, constrained position, compared to the third mode where the subject plays an active role in the process of self-formation. Again Foucault’s analysis of mental illness and the medical system in Madness and Civilisation (1967) serves as an example of subject formation. This is to say that the individual is no more than a site where discourses are played
out (Mills, 2003, p. 97). Foucault noted that a great number of Leper houses were built in Europe from the twelfth century onwards. In the seventeenth century, those leper houses were taken over to be used as asylums for those who were categorised as ‘socially useless’. All of people who could not work were placed in this category and confined. Through the process of medicalisation, madness has resulted in a greater stigmatisation of mental illness, therefore even when it is clear that psychological damage is the result of social conditions, sexual abuse or poverty, the individual is held to be at fault or to blame (Mills, 2003, p.102)

For Foucault, government, in particular, its liberal variant, is fundamentally a discursive activity that operates in and through individuals who come to occupy its subject positions (Foucault, 1982). This process of subjectification is commonly accomplished through the application of technical knowledge and through the role of expertise in various forms. It is when expertise is manifested in subjectifying practices through procedures, programmes and apparatuses that such activities become governmental. Typically, such practices entail the construction of ways for people to become subjective, a process that Hacking refers to as actively ‘making up’ people (Hacking, 1986, p.234). As will be seen in the analysis of data in this research such technical knowledge is utilised to ‘other’ refugees and humanitarian entrants and significant roles have been played by experts with such technical knowledge.

Discourses are continuously produced in a form of scientific knowledge, which repeatedly categorise and classify the refugees as unintegrated other. More active forms of self-subjectification will be illustrated in the analysis chapter as well, where the implications of a shift in government policy under neo-liberal rationalities is further analysed. It shows how under neo-liberal rationalities, African refugees, in particular, are given a social identity as ‘unintegrated other’ and how institutions such as settlement service can solidify this process by participating in discourse formation through their expertise and constantly describe them as ‘needy people’.

Foucault’s work is in essence a fundamental analysis of the nature of the human individual and a call to destabilise the subject (Mills, 2003, p.104). His work on the distinction between madness and sanity and the constructed nature of mental illness has been influential for both feminist theorists who are concerned to analyse the way that women are judged to be mentally ill, as well as those people who have suffered mental distress and have found themselves treated in particular ways by the medical establishment (Mills, 2003, p 104). This theoretical approach to understanding how discourses engender subjectification of individuals
provides insight into the current refugee discourses and some of the negative effects created as a result. Chapter 5 demonstrates how the settlement service sector is geared toward a ‘deficit model’, which looks at the target communities as a group deviated from norms, therefore in need of government intervention. Numerous government funding opportunities and programs are increasingly focusing on how to specially orient African refugees so that they can narrow down the extent of this deviation and finally be successful in their integration into mainstream Australian society. The data analysis in this study will reveal that there is no strengths based or assets based approach, which recognises the existing capacity of the target communities as a starting point. In fact according to the research there are material barriers that inhibit such strengths or assets based approaches. In this case the role or strategic positioning of service providers is particularly important as the research identified several areas of self subjectification in the form of service practices such as competitive funding system, administration structure, representation, consultation, inter-agency meetings, and advocacy.

**Foucault as a modern discourse**

The analysis in this research adapts a Foucauldian framework, and initially identifies key players and institutions that form modern discourses of refugees, as well as to investigate the power relations between the key players in line with the history of Australian multicultural policy. In this way, it is possible to understand the relevance of power/knowledge, governmentality and subject formation being re-interpreted for today’s neo-liberal, political and social reality that surrounds refugee settlements. In refugee discourse, the sovereign power becomes a significant player because it is the main administrative body that legitimately offers legal status to refugees and implements settlement policies. At the same time, it presents an interesting case of challenge that along with globalisation, refugee issues are a realm that sovereignty has increasingly less control over (Zetter, 2007). The limits and tensions the Westphalian state system has produced in modern days have been well documented in the areas of global warming, multinational businesses, international financial markets and global refugee issues (Zetter, 2007). At a temporal peak of the neo-liberal paradigm of Western liberal countries and the recent shift to worldwide conservatism after 11/9, it is of particular relevance that Wendy Brown (2006) used the concept of tolerance to show how noble humanistic ideology has been used as a principle of governance and political ideology, and imposed on individuals in modern political life. Her analysis provided a rich
account on the layers of interplay between tolerance and power relations (both involving sovereign and non-sovereign), and the processes of subjection (Brown, 2006).

The concept of tolerance opens up an ideal domain of depoliticization and privatization for dominant power since tolerance is preferred to emancipation and autonomy. The promotion of tolerance abandons participatory models of civic and political life. Through the routine privatization of sites of difference, citizenship and power become depoliticized (Brown, 2006, p.89). In summary, the cultivation of tolerance as a political end implicitly constitutes a rejection of politics as a domain in which conflict can be productively articulated and addressed (Brown, 2006, p.89). Under this tolerance discourse, concerns with free speech and dissent can be turned into a tactic of citizen subjection and technology of increased state power in a crisis, such as the recent war on terrorism (Brown, 2006, p.105).

Brown identified four main features of Foucault’s theory of governmentality and explained why his theory is insufficient to be applied in today’s political reality and sovereignty (Brown, 2006, p.81). Brown (2006) argued that firstly, governing involves harnessing and organizing energies in anybody who might otherwise be anarchic, self-destructive or unproductive. Governing thus concerns ‘the conduct of conduct’. Secondly, governmentality has multiple points of operation and application from individuals to a mass population. Thirdly, far from being restricted to rule, law and accountable power, it works through a range of invisible and non-accountable social powers such as pastoral power. Finally, governmentality employs and infiltrates a number of discourses ordinarily conceived as unrelated to political power, governance or the states through scientific, religious and popular discourses.

Brown explained that discourse of tolerance became popular today because it largely attributes to the effects of globalisation. In the Soviet Block during the aftermath of the cold war, tensions were reignited among those forced to cohabit in artificially drawn nation state boundaries, as a result Brown claims that there was the rise of ethnic, religious and national fundamentalism (Brown, 2006, p.19). Furthermore, the historically unprecedented mixing of the world’s people through migration and settlement led to ethnically and religiously diverse people living together (Brown, 2006, pp.85-86).

In the wake of the war on terror, Foucault’s focus on the interrelationship of war, sovereignty and the discourse of race is considered prescient. It helps us to focus on the logic or tactic of war as it operates in disciplinary technologies and corporate global thinking, and it orients the
re-examination of sovereignty and forms of rule associated with societies of control (Hardt & Negri, 2000). However, Foucault’s account of power without much attention to sovereignty presents problems and underestimates the role that modern sovereign governments play. Modern political power not only manages the population and produces subjects, but it reproduces and enlarges its political power (Foucault, 1979). There is a role for legitimizing these operations. The state plays this role as a singularly accountable object in the field of political power (Brown, 2006, p.83).

This thesis will illustrate how social inclusion, and community harmony replaces tolerance discourse. The issue or problematisation of refugees in general and African refugees in particular serves the depoliticisation and the privatisation of a class and equality agenda for the dominant power. Under current governmentalities, which subscribes to a neo-liberal paradigm, it is not the government’s inability to provide employment opportunities and adequate housing but it is refugee’s inability to integrate into mainstream Australian society and conform to existing social norms, that are highlighted. There is no domain of discourse related to ‘refugees and class’, ‘refugees and equality’, or ‘refugees and income disparity’. These issues become depoliticised and privatisated.

**Foucault and multiculturalism**

For the analysis of discourses of multiculturalism, in particular, and issues related to race, Foucault’s *Society Must be Defended* (2003) is often cited. There, he offers an explanation for the development of racism and provides important insights into the mythology embedded in the history of the divine right of kings and the emergence of the theory of rights during modernity. In relation to race, he defined it as a linguistic and religious marker that precedes the modern nation state. Foucault argues that race surfaces as a biological construct in the late 18th Century because disciplinary knowledge was introduced and regulatory mechanisms were developed to control the population. He describes this form of power as a ‘biopower’, arguing that race became a means of regulating and defending society from itself (Moreton-Robinson, 2006).

There is little literature available on refugee issues that look at the discursive formation aspect of Foucault’s governmentality in the Australian context. Sidhu and Taylor (2007) uncovered how recent movements towards the third phase of neo-liberalism has shaped some
of the refugee policies in Australia and identified important technologies that are being deployed by the Australian government. They researched educational provision for refugee youth and identified some of the languages, rationalities and practices being developed as discursive formations. In fact education is a field where a Foucauldian approach is widely applied. Foucault criticises human sciences and their role in the systematic development of large institutions such as prisons, hospitals, the military and education, which provides profound analysis of the failures of the modern project that education is supposed to advance (Foster, 1983, p. 9).

Based on Tickell & Peck’s (2003) categorization of the neo-liberal phase, Australia has entered into the third phase, termed the ‘rollout’ phase. This phase is described as a wider and deeper form of neo-liberalisation. Characterised by the neo-liberal state building, this variant shares the market logics of earlier forms of neo-liberalism but differs in its political rhetoric (Sidhu & Tayor, 2007). Roll-out neo-liberalism involves a rolling back of welfare policies and an attendant emphasis on ‘mutual responsibility’ (Giddens, 1998). Paradoxically, there is now a greater emphasis on inclusion, collaboration and partnership between state and non-state actors (Larner & Craig, 2005). After examining key government policy papers, this research identified some key factors in refugee discursive formations. The language of redistributive justice was conspicuously absent and replaced by phrases such as the need for ‘early intervention’, ‘a greater risk of isolation’, ‘at risk arrivals’ and ‘school children are seen to be at risk of not making successful transitions due to their pre-migration experiences’. A clear shift in emphasis from a socio-structural context of settlement to a level of the community and individual is noted (Sidhu & Taylor, 2007). Discursive links between transition and risk factors, such as pre-migration experiences and poor levels of social capital mean that the success of settlement is reframed as the responsibility of refugee communities and individuals. The impact of poverty, unemployment, racism and the responsibility of governments to provide well resourced services are rendered less important (Sidhu & Taylor, 2007).

In relation to policy issues, this research documented a rising trend of partnerships between government and community agencies. These partnerships are being deployed in capacity building, drawing together the institutional resources of government and non-government organisations, however, with strict delineations of the roles and responsibilities of government bodies that are informed by neo-liberal policy rationales. They rest on limited
budgets and create further burdens for the already over-stretched community welfare sector (Sidhu & Taylor, 2007). A governmentality of partnership and community in alliance with the individualized ethos of neo-liberal politics that feature greater emphasis on personal responsibility and control over one’s fate is not likely to live up to the promise of a holistic, integrated service delivery (Crawshaw & Simpson, 2002). On this point this study concluded that the overall effect of these partnerships is to fragment the equality agenda of previous times when society was understood to be influenced by embedded structural power asymmetries and required intervention, coordination and monitoring by the state (Sidhu & Taylor, 2007). This perspective contributes to the analysis of settlement policy, which is a reflection of the current governmentalities after economic rationalism. During a period of intense neo liberalism, the Australian government displayed contradictory and opportunistic approaches, including the specific problematisation of African refugees by implicitly labelling them as an unintegrated other, rather than recognising the failure of the government’s settlement service can be seen as one example.

Foucault’s theories of power/knowledge, discourse and governmentalities provide useful perspectives for the understanding of complex positioning and investment of power through various institutions in the modern world. These theories have been applied to this study of an emerging refugee discourse, implying a complex reality and arrangements surrounding settlement policy, which was originally intended to be a response to the Australian government’s humanitarian resettlement policy. Nonetheless, as the policy is an integral part of the Australian government’s domestic policy, it is required to be in alignment with governing rationalities. Complex strategic positioning occurs among key stakeholders such as the Australian government, government funded settlement services and small ethnic organisations. Discourses are continuously produced, claiming to be scientific knowledge and are the main instruments that endanger power based relations among stakeholders.

Conclusion

Through the above discussion, key theoretical and empirical grounds upon which the research rests have been identified. Foucault’s power/knowledge and governmentality provide conceptual guidelines that determined the direction and scope that the research is to take. The Australian government, ethnic community organisations, government funded settlement organisations, non government funded charity organisations, refugee research institutions and media, all play a significant part in producing discourses on refugees. The research will
further identify mechanisms of producing knowledge and how that in turn sets conditions and discursive relations for refugees. This facilitates the research to take a flexible yet focused approach and helps it avoid being a single dimension policy analysis. Study on different modes of governmentality covered in this literature review provides insights and enables analysis of current governmentality in Australia. Current governing rationalities that are increasingly economics driven and under constant pressure to satisfy wide electorate demands, clash with non-economic causes for humanitarian issues. This excise of power based on governmentalies opens up opportunities for some players while creating risks for others. From this perspective, the research will demonstrate how discourses on refugees generate tensions, contradictions and collaborations among the key players. Greater emphasis will be placed on the analysis of the Australian government’s settlement policy as it is recognized as a main avenue for formulated discourses. Both Brown (2006) and Sidhu and Taylor’s (2007) work provide useful examples of what can constitute knowledge within modern discourses of the politics of discourse within broad neo-liberal settings. Further documentation of discourses during this period reveals more detailed mechanisms of discourse formations and patterns of interrelationships surrounding the politics of refugees.
Chapter Three:

Methodology

The previous chapter has established the theoretical framework for this study, which aims to use the views and perspectives of individuals who both exercise and subject themselves to multiculturalism and refugee discourses and the power of such discourses. This chapter provides a description of the methodology employed in this research. Adopting a qualitative approach this study has two bodies of data, the first is a discussion using primary sources related to multiculturalism in Australia and the second is based on focus groups and interviews with key actors in the settlement sector. This chapter also provides brief descriptions about each process involved in the research from participant recruitment to the individual interviews that took place.

Semi structured interviews

The research data was collected from early 2011 over an eight month period. Twenty interviews were conducted during that period. The interviews targeted two different cohorts, community group leaders and settlement service providers in order to collect relevant data. Different sets of questionnaires were designed and used for each group. Around 10 simple open questions were asked (See attached appendix A). The questions were asked rather as a prompt for discussion then followed up by additional questions intended for more information or clarification and elaboration. At the beginning of each interview about 5-10 minutes were spent to allow interviewees to fully understand the information sheet which set out interviewees’ rights and privacy, and consent was obtained. Each interview lasted for 45 to 70 minutes depending on the respondent’s time availability, interest or venue availability. In order to protect their privacy, pseudonyms were used throughout this thesis to identify participants.

Participant Recruitment

Participants were invited to be part of the research based on their experience related to the research topic as suggested by Burgess’ (1996) ‘Purposive Sampling’. Community group leaders were recruited in response to invitations via email. Most community groups represented in the interviews were unstructured in terms of organisational development and they were in a very early stage of establishing a necessary community infrastructure. Flyers
and information sheets about the study were produced and used to supplement interview requests. Some community leaders were introduced by other community leaders who accepted the initial interview request.

The term ‘community leaders’ is a contentious one. It can be difficult to define. It is not uncommon that community elders are designated the role without any official election process. In African refugee communities it is often found that one of the community elders is regarded as a community leader. This role is both symbolic and practical. The community may have younger members as office bearers whose role is to administer community affairs. Nevertheless elders can still exert their influence. It is very common that there is more than one person or one group or a faction within the group that claims they are the ‘real’ community representative for a specific ethnic community. It was also evident that more than one person was sharing leadership without any official title used. For the sake of this research, ‘community leaders’ are defined therefore as people who play a leading or an active role in their respective communities and those who had an established a link with settlement service providers. The questions of legitimacy that may arise from internal community dynamics or issues relating to which organisation is to represent certain ethnic groups are outside of the scope of this research. Accordingly invitations were made to a wide range of different ethnic community organisations including African communities from countries such as Southern Sudan, Northern Sudan, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Nigeria and Ghana. The majority of the community leaders interviewed were Africans but there were some from the non-African communities. In those cases questions regarding discourse were not asked but material issues within the settlement service that the refugee communities faced were explored more. Service providers were recruited from a wide range of services in order to provide different perspectives on the interrelationships being explained in the research. The services included migrant resource centres, major religious charitable organisations, local governments, and the NSW state government. For some government agencies an additional letter was required from the managers to gain permission for an interview. The recruitment of this cohort took much longer than the community leader groups, mainly because government employees were all busy with work and seemed less enthusiastic about participating in research, which they have already done many times in their work. Also, at the beginning of interviews more time was spent to ensure the confidentiality of information and interviewees’ identity.
### Table 1: Research Participants: Community Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Organisation (pseudonym)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdulai</td>
<td>African Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karim</td>
<td>Sudanese Women’s Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ram</td>
<td>Burmese Rohingya Community in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td>Somali Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jok Martin</td>
<td>Sudanese Youth Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>Burmese Rohingya Community in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed</td>
<td>Northern African Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Sierra Leone Women’s Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akok</td>
<td>Sudanese Social Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Nigerian Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustapha</td>
<td>Sierra Leone Youth Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Research Participants: Service Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Pseudonym)</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yasmine</td>
<td>SGP worker, Migrant Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>SGP worker, Non secular charity organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>Chair person, Generalist service organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Chan</td>
<td>Manager, Government funded ethno specific organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toby</td>
<td>Client service worker, Migrant Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>SGP worker, Migrant Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong</td>
<td>SGP worker, Non secular charity organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Senior policy officer, State government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Burke</td>
<td>Community development officer, Local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Community development officer, Local government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus group participation

Prior to the commencement of individual interviews, a focus group was held. The use of a focus group enables the spontaneous exchange and development of ideas that “characterise social life outside the survey situation” (Engel, 2009, p.332). As the participants shared some commonalities of delivering community service or exercising leadership, the focus group setting allowed free exchange of ideas and opinions that provided important data to look into key research topics of discourse formation, technologies of government, and the settlement policies. However the main purpose of the focus group was to develop the scope of and determine the research questions. Seven community leaders representing five different refugee communities attended the focus group. As all of the participants had experiences in community development, dealing with service providers or governments, the discussion at the focus group gave participants opportunities to reflect on practices for their community, compared with other communities, and share their ideas and opinions. As often is the case in a focus group one comment for example triggered a chain of responses, an interaction described as a ‘synergistic effect’ (Berg 1989; Stewart and Shamdasani 1990). Often the community leaders work in partnership with key multicultural service providers and it is rare that they have opportunities to hear about other communities from the community leaders of those communities. As a result, the participants had a sense of belonging and felt encouraged to provide different perspectives as they sympathised with others.

Venues

The interviews took place at various venues. The initial focus group and subsequent interview with individual community leaders were held in the Metro Migrant Resource Centre in Campsie NSW. Usually the venue was negotiated with interviewees in order to give them the best access and comfort. For the community leaders cohort sites included personal homes, university and personal offices. For service providers interviews were mostly held in their offices or cafeterias nearby. The data was recorded using recording devices and the interviewees were briefed about the recording. The collected information was transcribed.

Ethical issues

Considering the unequal power relationship between the client groups and service providers, there is a possibility that when interview requests are made in person the target groups may have felt that a refusal to the request may have resulted in a disadvantage in accessing a
service or in less preferential treatment. In order to avoid this, attempts were made to rely on public promotion using advertisement on websites, wide distribution of research posters, and email distribution rather than individual invitations. Nevertheless due to the slow participation rate in the beginning by the community leaders, it was necessary to make invitations in person through service providers. In this case assurance was given at the start of interviews that the interview was only voluntary and there was no disadvantage for non participation at any stage. As stated above, all participants from both community leaders and service providers’ cohorts are referred to through pseudonyms in this research in order to protect their identity.

Utilisation of Primary Sources as Data for Analysis

Since the research focused on the examination of discourse it was natural that a number of research methods were employed to cover a variety of sources that form a discourse. Firstly the research aimed to examine current discourses on Australian African refugees and humanitarian entrants existing in the settlement service sector. Documentation of existing discourses on the subject to identify who produces knowledge about the subject, whether it is negative or positive, and how this portrays the subject was essential. In applying Foucault’s (1980) concept of power/knowledge, discourse formation and technologies of government, further analyses were made as to how discourses turn this knowledge into power and to identify the mechanisms that government employs to enact technologies of government. Through the secondary data collection, the relationship between key discourses, governments, media, service providers and target groups was investigated to identify how technologies of government work with settlement service sector working with African refugees. The research relied on the sources for secondary information and data collection as described below. There were five major documentary sources identified as relevant.

- Official documents deriving from the state

Australian governments produce a great deal of official documents. They are in the forms of government reports, audit reports, policy papers, parliamentary debates, questions and answers in Hansard, and consultation papers. Since the study included an examination of the Australian government’s settlement policy, policy documents on settlement policy and multiculturalism were especially relevant. More importantly, this study attempted to analyse public discourses on refugees and humanitarian entrants and to reveal the mechanism of technologies of government. Therefore it was critical to closely examine
not only policy prescriptions but also language and expressions that form a significant part of the discourse as important data for this study. Publications from the Department of Immigration and Citizenship, NSW Health, NSW Education, Office of Fair trading and the Community Relations Commission, and the NSW Audit Office were particularly relevant for examination of official documents.

**Personal Location of the researcher**

The researcher spent 10 years working as a settlement service worker, whose role was to deliver DIAC’s settlement service with a greater focus on community development. Here some reflection of the researcher will help understand the research process and how that informs the overall context of the research. Although the interviewees were recruited indirectly and impersonally, the majority of the participants were already people whom the researcher was familiar or acquainted with. The information that many of the community leaders cohort produced in the study and their manner of reporting or responding to questions were consistent with observations made to the researcher over a long period of time prior to the interview. These were grounded in a principal that their life was better than it was back in their war torn country and a strong self-awareness that they were new settlers in this country. This is not because they were simply aiming to be polite to the researcher or attempting to be displaying their sense of appreciation but rather they seem to have difficulty embracing the concept of being critical of a ‘free’ government service, which is embedded into Western ‘right’ based approach. This has significant implications for community leaders in terms of communicating with broader stakeholders such as governments and funded organisations. In my experience of this field this characteristic makes the position of target communities more vulnerable to manipulation and eventually weakens their voices. At the same time the respondents from the service providers cohort, contrary to expectation, were more honest and sometimes outspoken. Perhaps the formal interview settings, with an assurance to protect their identity, provided them with a rare opportunity to be critical about their service, employers and funding bodies The majority of the service-providers cohort acknowledged the limitations of their services and seemed to be genuinely sympathetic towards the some of the problematic issues around the settlement services and government polices.
Limitations of the research

There were limitations in this study. First there were no service providers interviewed from the Department of Immigration and Citizenship. This was mainly due to the poor response from the department. There are only a small number of staff in the settlement section of the department and even fewer senior staff who could comment on settlement policy, whom the researcher found inaccessible. Such inaccessibility suggests communication barriers with government agencies, which is one of the key findings in the study. As a result the information regarding the policy position and the rationale behind the policy were largely provided by other service providers and secondary sources. A further limitation was that most of the participants in the community leaders’ cohorts had good English proficiency therefore interpreters were not required, however, although their ability to understand the questions was competent sometimes their ability to articulate and express their opinion in English was limited. The employment of an interpreter to help interviewees to elaborate of their responses was considered unnecessary, also it was thought that it would possibly create a barrier for more engaging interviews. It was noted that during the interviews for some questions asked, although they were answered, the interpretation of the question was different from what the question intended to ask. Also in some instances they were able to give very short answers but not able to elaborate enough to form rich data. There were occasions where their short answers were not due to limited ability to express fully in English only but because the concept was foreign to the participant or there was a lack of understanding about an existing service system. The majority of respondents related their personal experiences of discrimination and prejudice they had faced in Australia but struggled to articulate its broader implications. It must be noted that the majority of community organisations in the study are based in the South West Sydney area and have localised characteristics which are different from the communities in the Western Sydney area. Therefore some of the research findings should be understood within such localised context.
Conclusion

Despite its limitations, the research was intended to explore what formed refugee discourses and the lived settlement experience of refugees and migrants, as accurately as possible. Interviews that took place therefore were given a great deal of flexibility in terms of questions used as prompts for further discussions and interview time to allow for a full testimony from each participant. Efforts were made to create a comfortable and friendly environment for participants, particularly for the community leader’s cohort. All twenty interviews were conducted successfully and the amount of information and the quality of data collected was rich and extraordinary. During the interviews it was felt that community leaders appreciated the opportunity to share their experience and express views. There was an exchange of good faith and sincerity conveyed mutually between the researcher and the interviewees. Based on the data collected though this process, the next chapter will provide an analysis and interpretation of the data. From the data there is a capacity to gain insight into the impact of what has emerged as a distinct African refugee discourse particularly in relation to settlement service.

In the next chapter an outline of the historical development of Australian multiculturalism and settlement policy will be discussed in order to establish the context in which African refugee discourse has emerged.
Chapter Four:

Multiculturalism and Settlement policy: formation of a refugee discourse

Introduction

Drawing on primary sources as a body of data, this chapter reviews the history of Australian multiculturalism and settlement policy. Key milestones in Australian multiculturalism, that led to the development of settlement policy are analysed as key elements in the emergence of a refugee discourse. An examination of migrant and refugee groups settling at various times and an analysis of surrounding discourses also provides evidence of an historically based refugee discourse that has been highly influential on settlement policy and practices.

In theory, discourses within migrant and refugee groups should be significantly different to each other, since migrants and refugees are admitted into Australia under varied rationales and principles. Migration is mainly understood as a movement of labour, as an element of production driven by economic incentives, whereas refugees are primarily a product of humanitarian need, with an exception for economic refugees and a significant variation of refugees exists according to their relative economic position (Collins, 1996). At one end of the spectrum, refugee groups arriving in Australia by boat without any possessions are often described as ‘boat people’ who escaped atrocities and disasters in their homeland. At the other end a spectrum, there are business migrants and overseas entrepreneurs who came to Australia with funds to invest, which was regarded as sufficient grounds for permanent residency. There is fierce competition to attract this particular group of migrants between the US, Canada and Australia (Collins, 1996). Some migrants can be rich before they come to Australia. Hence it is inaccurate to group these distinctly different groups into a single discourse. Nevertheless, in practice, the discourse for both groups has been integrated and used interchangeably. Ad hoc post-war policy decisions to accept Eastern European refugees to compensate for the shortage of British migrants provides an historical context for such merging of meanings and further complicates the context (Collins, 1991, p. 52). Current refugee selection policy reflects a ‘reserve of labour’ ‘warehoused’ in refugee camps (Brown
This research illustrates how this inter-changeable use of terms in relation to refugee discourse has been created by the interplay between government policy and public perceptions.

It is indisputable that Australia is a country founded on migration (Jupp, 2007, Collins, 1991 & Jakubowicz, 1981). With the one exception of its Indigenous population, the nation has been built by waves of migrants, each shaping a different era and identity. Australia has witnessed the transition from early xenophobia and a ‘White Australia’ policy to one of the most cosmopolitan countries in the world (Collins, 2006, p.136).

African refugee settlement in Australia became concentrated from the late 1990s to 2007 (DIAC Settlement Data, 2012). In 2008 there was a turn towards South East Asians as a source of refugee intake away from Africans (DIAC Settlement Data, 2012). It is uncertain on what grounds this shift occurred as there is very little information available regarding decisions on the makeup of Australia’s humanitarian intake. It is unknown whether the view expressed by the then-minister for Immigration and Citizenship, Kevin Andrews was in fact reflected in the policy or whether there was an existing policy, that required geographical regions that refugees were accepted from must change once every few years. It is evident that the period from 1994 to 2007 was dominated by the policy of the Howard’s Liberal-National Party Coalition government. Settlement policy and refugee discourses reflect Australian multiculturalism at that time. In this sense, documentation of Australian multicultural policy from assimilation to multiculturalism, combined with the recent disposal of the term ‘multiculturalism’ during the last period of the Howard Government provides an important historical context for understanding the emergence of a refugee discourse. Political changes occur along with changes of governments and international events provided key milestones for refugee discourse development in Australia. In particular the election win by the Rudd Labor government in 2007 offered unique opportunities to distinguish refugee policies between the two major parties. From examining dominant government rationalities on migrants and refugees at different times, the following discussion identifies patterns, background and characteristics that are distinct to each discourse formation.

The History of Australian Multiculturalism

There are several different ways to document Australia’s multicultural history. One way is to classify it according to changes of governments from the Chifley led Labor government
(1945-1949) to the Gillard led Labor government (2010-Present) or according to major milestones in Australia’s multicultural history. There are also key figures who have shaped the post war immigration policy such as Arthur Calwell, Jerzy Zubrzycki and Al Grassby (Multicultural Australia, 2011). It is also possible to document different ethnic groups that came to Australia at different times as a history, however, it is more appropriate and more consistent with the approach of this research that classifications are made according to key milestones that have shaped the development of Australian multiculturalism and discourses that had emerged from it. This begins with an overview of the early settlement period in order to illustrate some key debates around the Australia’s identity as a settler nation.

Early Settlement

In any country the composition of its first settlers or inhabitants is a prime factor in forming a national identity. Some countries pride themselves in maintaining racial purity for thousands years of national histories whereas some countries are proud of multicultural makeup of their national population. In both cases information on their national identities, whether it is truth or myth, they gave governments critical grounds on which their policies, propagandas and technologies of government took root. In light of the process of globalization, monocultural countries such as Japan and Korea, find it increasingly difficult to convince their people and particularly new citizens from intercultural marriages that maintaining racial purity is a good thing (Lee, 2008). Multicultural countries also struggle to ensure cultural rights for each ethnic group but seek to create a balance between dominating groups in their societies. In any case early settlers play very significant roles in shaping national identity (Moran, 2002, p.667).

In Australia Aboriginal people are thought to have arrived in what is now Australia around 40,000-75,000 years ago (Rasmussen, 2011). They spoke many separate languages and dialects, and their lifestyles and cultural traditions differed from region to region (Zuckermann, 2009). The British First Fleet of 11 ships carrying about 1500 people – half of them convicts, arrived in Sydney Harbour on 26 January 1788. About 160 000 men and women were brought to Australia as convicts from 1788 until penal transportation ended in 1868 (Eirich, 1990). The convicts were joined by free immigrants beginning in the early 1790s (O’Farrell, 1987). The wool industry and the gold rushes of the 1850s provided an impetus for increasing numbers of free settlers to come to Australia (O’Farrell, 1987). Scarcity of labour, the vastness of the land and new wealth based on farming, mining and trade made Australia a

From this brief history of Australian early settlers, a fundamental question emerged in relation to multiculturalism and community relations. Traditionally early Australian mainstream history often recognises European settlement as the beginning of Australian history (Mckenna, 2001). According to this view civilisation of this land, started with European colonisation. More recent histories include Aboriginal history, therefore in the context of 50,000 years of Indigenous people’s settlement, the two centuries of European settlement since Captain Cook’s arrival dwindle into insignificant, being no more than 0.5 per cent of the human story of Australia (Attwood, 1971, p.55). In this conception, Aboriginal history not only contests the European monopoly of the category ‘Australia(n)’, but also provokes fundamental questions concerning the nature of history itself (Attwood, 1994, pp.121-22). Under this Aboriginal history, the experience was that the existing population was largely massacred by the first group of migrants. A population of estimated 1.25 million in 1788 decreased to a mere 75,000 in 1799 (Butlin, 1993, pp.138-39). Settlers in Van Dieman’s land in Tasmania were authorised to shoot Aborigines (Hartwell, 2010). Unfortunately this was the first experience of ‘community relations’ or ‘multiculturalism’ to be recorded. British colonisation and the dominance of its descendants over the social structure, language, system and culture, suggests multiculturalism was fundamentally denied.

Multiculturalism, in this sense, would have meant reception of other ethnicities and their cultures under the UK colonial system of Australia just as it was desired by first settlers who tried to replicate the UK system through a parliamentary government established in 1823 under the NSW Act (State Archives of NSW, 2011). The tragic nature of first Australian ‘multicultural’ experience can be seen as the basis of denial of past history. For example Prime Minister John Howard declared that he wanted the historians to stop ‘using outraged words like genocide’ (Strakosch, 2005). A number of conservative commentators and historians have criticised the historians who used the term ‘genocide’. This was followed by an alternative ‘White Blindfold’ history as Reynolds has called it, a ‘history written for Caesar, victory history (Brantlinger, 2004). John Howard and his ilk were displeased by what they saw as the unpatriotic negativism in ‘black armband’ view of history, subverting a rosier version of the Australian past served up by early nationalist historians. In addition, prior events such as the Mabo and Wik land rights rulings and reports of the Royal
Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody and the enquiry in the state removal of Aboriginal children had potential legal implications that the Howard government wanted to avoid (Brantlinger 2004). The government’s denial of past history and its inability and incomensurability with multiculturalism is well illustrated in the comment below. In 1988 the Bicentenary Year of the First Fleet, Tiga Bayles, the chairperson of the New South Wales Aboriginal Land Council asserted:

> You think about what White Australia is celebrating today-200 years of colonisation, the 200 years since they invaded Aboriginal land. And some of the [white] people seem to expect Aboriginal people…to participate in the birthday party. What bullshit. That would be like asking the Jewish people to celebrate an anniversary of the Holocaust.


The above comment illustrates that in the construction of public discourse regarding the Australian identity, how ‘other’ is construed from an Anglo-centric view in order to justify Australia’s settler nationalism (Moran 2005). This has been a distinct feature of public discourse construction in Australia and will be further discussed later in this thesis.

**White Australia**

Prior to the White Australia policy, from 1830 there was a ‘new Britania’ policy which engaged deliberate efforts by the colonial government to host Britons (Mcqueen, 2008, Castles & Vasta 2004). In 1901 a newly formed federal government passed its first piece of legislation, the Immigration Restriction Bill 1901. Edmond Barton, the prime minister of the time stated that “The doctrine of man was never intended to apply to the equality of the English man and Chinese man” (Edmondson, 2009, p.4).

There is a scholarly debate around the true characteristics of the Immigration Restriction Bill of 1901 (Immigration Restriction Act, 1901). Some historians including conservative scholar, Windschuttle (2005), argue that the White Australian policy was introduced primarily due to economic and cultural decisions, not due to racial prejudice.

During this period Jewish migration took place. Prior to 1933, the size of the Jewish community decreased significantly due to intermarriage and assimilation (Rutland, 2006). It was even predicted that there would be almost no Jews in Australia by the 21st century.
however, the subsequent influx of migration proved that the prediction was wrong (Rutland, 2006). Jewish migration continued when some of the Jewish when 17 children, sponsored by the Australian Jewish Welfare Society, arrived in Melbourne (NAA, 2012). Australia agreed to take in 15,000 migrants at the Evian conference of ‘Intergovernmental Committees on Refugees’, which brought together delegates from 32 nations (NAA, 2012). In 1945, Calwell, the then immigration minister, supported the appeal from the Executive Council of Australian Jewry for admitting survivors of the Holocaust by introducing a family and friends reunion scheme, modest in scale, and financed by the Jewish community (Rutland 2005, Lack & Templeton, 1995, p. 6). Reflecting anti-Semitism, right wing nationalist publications such as the Sydney Bulletin and Smith’s Weekly created an impression that Australia was about to be engulfed by a menacing wave of aliens (Lack & Templeton, 1995, p. 7). The Liberal Party issued a statement reflecting its concerns about the preference for migrants other than British citizens (Collins, 1991, Migration Information Source). The Labor Party reiterated its guarantee that British migrants would far outnumber foreigners (Stokes, 1997, Lack & Templeton, 1995, p. 7). Liberal parliamentarian Henry Gullett sent a letter to the press:

The arrival of additional Jews is nothing less than the beginning of a national tragedy … In the last 50 years these people have swarmed all over Europe. We should remember that they are not European either by race, standards, nor culture … They secured a stranglehold on Germany after the last war during the inflation period, and in a very large part, brought upon themselves the persecution which they subsequently suffered. H.B. Gullett (as cited in Lack & Templeton, 1995, pp 23-24).

The record recorded that the Australian Jewish Welfare Association was sensitive to government and public sentiment and believed that any marked increase in Jewish migrants would jeopardise existing concessions to the Jewish community of sponsored migrants (NAA, 2012). The above comment could be considered the strongest racist remark ever made in public in Australia, however it informs why Australia remained a predominately white, Christian country for many years subsequently (Jayasuriya, 2003, p. 78). The Australian public and the Australian government considered the Jewish migration undesirable but the international community after the World War 2, disapproved this type of discrimination (Kepple, 2009). A set of assimilation policy and propaganda was employed. For example
Jewish migrants were encouraged to “act as exemplary citizens in the middle class Australian way” (Kepple, 2009).

The White Australia policy was remarkably successful to the point where in 1947 Census data showed the Australian population was over 90 per cent British and 99 per cent ‘white’. It was also overwhelmingly Christian, despite Australia being a secular society under its constitution (Jupp 2006). The White Australian policy was not for immigrants only. The policy was harshly applied to Aboriginal people, as a strong assimilation discourse emerged (Armitage, 1995). In the ‘white’ discourse of assimilation, to fulfil the dream of whiteness, the Aboriginal people of Australia, the non-white had to be included in or eliminated from the imagined white community (Elder, 1999, p.4). There were two dominant conceptualisations of how the assimilation of Aboriginal people would be achieved; in Ian Anderson’s words: “fuck’em white” and/or “train ‘em right” (as cited in Grossman, 1998). The so called ‘whitification’ was an example of discourses reflecting extreme assimilation policy. During the 1950s and 1960s the meanings of assimilation slip between these two conceptualisations (Young, 1995, p.9). It shows how hostile and extreme the public discourse was and provides the context for the analysis of the current discourse construction for the perceived ‘other’ in Australia.

While Australia has been declaring itself a multicultural society since the 1970s, the reality is that it is less so in religious and racial terms than many comparable countries (Jupp, 2006). It is, however, much more multicultural than it was fifty years ago. Much of the tension around immigration policy in Australian public discourse is due to this fairly rapid change (Jupp 2006).

**The Policy of Multiculturalism**

Public acceptance of the immigration program was based on the promise of the preservation of the British character (Lack & Templeton, 1995, p.14). Determination to reinforce the distinctly British character of Australian society resulted in a ‘Bring out a Briton’ campaign (DIAC 2012). Assisted passage, the financial assistance to new migrants with the cost of sea passage, was redesigned to attract British migrants. The Britons remained by far the largest single source of migrants until 1970 (Hammerton & Thomson 2005, DIAC 2003). British migrants were not subject to the conditions and constraints that other migrants and refugees faced (Hammerton & Thomson 2005, Collins, 1991). They were free to compete with Australian-born citizens in the labour market, in housing and in the field of politics.
(Hammerton & Thomson 2005, Collins, 1991). They were not considered as ‘secondary citizens’ like other migrant groups (Collins, 1991, p56). The number of British migrants declined sharply after 1971 (Lack & Templeton, 1995, p.74). British migrants were sought after as skilled migrants and apparently had linguistic and cultural advantage over other migrants groups. Nevertheless many British migrants went back home as the UK recovered gradually from the depression (Hammerton & Thomson 2005). However some cities in Australia witnessed the congregation of British migrants much like other migrants groups (Lack & Templeton, 1995, p.88).

In order to compensate for the shortage of British immigrants, Calwell tried to recruit migrants from Western Europe and Scandinavia but had little success (Markus 1984). He then turned his attention to the war refugees held in camps in Germany. He accepted 12,000 Eastern Europe a commonly known as the ‘Baltic’ refugees intake in 1947 (Collins, 1991, p23). This is an example of how refugees were recruited as migrants to solve labour shortages in Australia and it partially explains why ‘refugees’ and ‘migrants’ are used interchangeably in public discourses.

From 1947 to 1951, just under 180,000 refugees came to Australia from Eastern Europe. The Australian people were never worried about accuracy in labeling newcomers. They included people from Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Russia and the intake accounted for just under 40 per cent of total net intake but outnumbered the British intake (Collins, 1991, p55).

Despite the government preference and passage assistance, the number of British and Northern European migrants fell sharply in the 1950s (Ongley, P. & Pearson, D. 1995). Migrants from Southern Europe increased rapidly and they mainly came from Italy, Greece and Malta (Lever-Tracey & Quinlan 1988). Southern European migration began to decline in the late 1960s, and in the period from 1966 to 1971, the average annual Southern European intake was just under 14,000 (Collins 1996). To permit migration from non European countries, a further dilution in racial preference was required. For example, Turkish migrants were considered ‘Honorary Europeans’ in that period (Collins, 1996, p.25).

The ‘New Australians’ of the assimilation period entered an Australia that was overwhelmingly Anglo-Australian in ethnicity and culture and in which the immigration intake was still shaped by the White Australia Policy (Jupp, 2007). Under the assimilation policy, new arrivals were expected to learn English, adopt existing cultural norms and
become indistinguishable from the Australian born population as soon as possible (Department of Immigration and Citizenship 2003).

During the assimilation period, the provision of settlement services was based on the view that most new arrivals would readily assimilate to the Australian way of life (DIMIA, 2011). Collins argued that Australia in the assimilation period had an essentially ‘two-class’ immigration program and settlement ideology (2003, p.6). Under this system, British immigrants were treated as equals to Australian-born citizens, while non-British migrants were relegated to inferior positions in both the labour market and Australian society more generally (Collins, 1991, p.23).

By the mid 60s, there was a growing awareness that assimilation policies had not succeeded in removing or sublimating the ethnic identity of many of the groups who had arrived as immigrants. An inquiry into poverty and inequality experienced by people for whom English was not the first language, and their relative isolation from the wider Australian community, highlighted the limitations of assimilation policy (Commission of Inquiry into Poverty, 1975). The 1975 Henderson inquiry showed that non-English speaking migrants suffered from high poverty rates (Burnett, 1988, pp.6-7). It appears that poverty drove large numbers of immigrants, mainly British, Dutch, Scandinavians and Germans, not the war refugees, to return to their countries of origin (Jupp, 2002). The 1973 report of the ‘Inquiry into the Departure of Settlers focused attention on high migrant departure rates and the need to provide new arrivals with services in the initial settlement period if they were to stay and settle successfully (The Immigration Advisory Council Committee on Social Patterns, 1973).

A series of measures were developed to counter the White Australia policy since the post war mass immigration program was established (Jordan, 2006). In 1957 a decision was made to grant Australian citizenship to Asians (Jordan, 2006). Further, in 1958 the notorious dictation test was abolished (Brawley, 1995). The Australian Labor government cabinet approved a submission that recommended the liberalisation of entry of mixed races in 1965 and the ALP dropped references to the ‘White Australia’ policy (Jupp, 2002). Significant policy reforms broadened eligibility criteria for permanent settlement of non-Europeans in 1966 (Tavan, 2005). Following the patterns of other migrant groups, and particularly after rebuilding European economies in the 1950s and 1960s and consequent scarcity of ‘acceptable’ migrants, Australian immigration authorities began to look toward Asia (Coughlan, J & McNamara, D.
They were also under increased pressure from the small Asian community within Australia, churches and a progressive network of campaigners concerned to end the White Australian policy (Multicultural Australia, 2011). Asian migration increased significantly after the abolition of the White Australian policy and by 1980, 22 per cent of Australia’s migrant intake came from Asia (Jupp, 1998).

The White Australian policy formally ended in 1973, a year after the Whitlam government won the election (Jupp, 2002). Further measures were introduced to abolish remaining evidence of racial discrimination in Australian immigration policy. The White Australian policy had become dysfunctional in a number of ways. By restricting the migrant intake to European societies, which were losing the incentive to migrate to Australia, Australia was failing to attain a high migrant intake (Jayasuriya 2003, p.115). With the demise of colonialism and increasing contacts between Australia and neighbouring countries, the policy was becoming a source of national embarrassment (Meaney, 1995). Furthermore, as neighbouring Asian countries achieved rapid economic development and increased importance on the world stage, the policy became contrary to Australia’s economic, social and political interests (Jayasuriya, 2003, p. 115). It was also due to the approval of the 1975 Racial Discrimination Act, which made the use of racial criteria for any official purpose illegal.

The history of early Australian immigration policy and public discourse suggests that the policy was a fundamentally subtle balancing act or ‘compromise’ between Australia’s need for more labour and efforts to maintain an Anglo-Australia. Transformations in policy were predominantly ad hoc responses to the realisation that Australia could no longer meet these competing goals at the same time.

**The Asian Migrant Debate**

This section details discourses that emerged when Asian immigration began in Australia, which became known as the ‘Asian migrant debate’. The ‘Asian migrant debate’ was the first public engagement that showed how public discourse about a particular refugee group emerged and circulated and how it affected settlement policies in Australia. It also illustrates the patterns of how discourses are formed around Australia’s national identity and ‘otherness’, which is also relevant to the emergence of an African refugee discourse.
After the fall of Saigon in the Vietnamese war, a massive number of Vietnamese refugees fled the country in small boats. Initially there was resistance to the admission of large numbers of Vietnamese refugees in Australia (Jupp, 1998, p.120). However, soon stories of murder, rape, pillage and drowning of boat people received wide Western media coverage (Jupp, 1998). It was estimated that some 30,000 to 40,000 boat people did not make it to unknown destinations and died at sea (Collins, 1991). As a result, the US government, conscious of mounting international pressure, changed its stance and negotiated safe passage for refugees with the Vietnamese government. Australia soon followed the US and Canada and negotiated agreements with the Vietnamese government to allow refugees to come to Australia (Collins, 1991, pp 62-3).

The settlement of Vietnamese refugees in Australia was particularly hard as there were no established communities into which these refugees could enter to help ease the problems of settlement (Once Upon a Time in Cabramatta, 2012). Problems stemmed from the refugees being identifiably as different and they were often subject to hostile responses from established communities into which they moved, where prejudice and racial intolerance were entrenched (Collins, 1991, p.50). As Hage noted, the public response towards Asian migrant was different from other migrant groups. Asian migrants are the first group that triggered a nation wide debate on migration. Eastern European migrants also triggered public debate but it was different in scale, scope and intensity (Hage, 2003).

East Asians and South East Asians had been subjected to racial discrimination, even prior to Federation in Australia (Choi, 1975, Castles & Vasta, 2004). Chinese migrants had been depicted as a threat to job security during the mining boom and were regarded as an inferior, yet threatening, culture to White Australia (Choi, 1975). The official ‘White Australia’ policy resulted in deporting a handful of Asians who had been allowed into Australia on humanitarian grounds during the Second World War, yet this outraged many Australians who believed in a ‘fair go’ (York, 1996, p. 5).

In 1982-83, Asia produced the largest source of Australian immigration for the first time in over a century (Jupp. 1998). Asian migrants attracted more criticism than any other group. For example a conservative historian, Professor Geoffrey Blainey triggered a nation-wide debate on Asian migrants in 1984, when he argued that the government was moving too fast on Asian immigration ahead of public opinion (Collins, 1996). He criticised the ‘Asianisation’ of Australian immigration policy (Blainey, 1984, Castles et al, 1988). He believed that a
rapid intake of migrants from cultures very different from Australia could threaten the tolerance that was so carefully nurtured over the years, leading to tensions and threatening social cohesion (Blainey, 1984, p. 30). He also rejected the argument for economic benefits from Asian migrants, saying Asian migrants did not bring employment, for example he stated that: “They were poor and unskilled. Their English skill is poor. They could not buy a Commodore and they were increasingly unemployed” (Blainey, 1984, p. 74). A number of academics such as Betts, supported Blainey’s view and criticised other intellectuals for not being honest on the issue (Betts, 1988, p.119, Letters in Sydney Morning Herald, 24 May 1984).

Despite the mounting evidence that new Asian migrant groups had integrated well, overall community attitudes towards Asian migrants remained unfavourable (Jayasuriya & Pookong, 1999, p. 73). In 1981, an Australian National Opinion Poll survey claimed that it had evidence to show some fear of racial trouble, widespread resistance to Asian immigration and a strong intent to keep Australia White (Goot, 1984, p.17). Further in 1983, the Moss Cass Report stated that:

The overwhelming preference was still for the British, followed by northern European groups then by southern European and Jews; least preferred are the Middle Eastern and Asian groups. These studies of ‘social distance’ revealing a degree of xenophobia, anti-Semitism and racism have been confirmed by several attitudinal surveys

(CASS 1983, p 72).

The FitzGerald report into Immigration policy (1988) pointed out widespread community confusion and distrust of multiculturalism. It also indicated that multiculturalism is linked in the public mind with immigration, rather than as a policy to manage the nation’s cultural diversity, and it was perceived as sectional and divisive (Ho, 1990).

The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) report of 1991 concluded that ‘the victims of racist intimidation, harassment and violence on the basis of ethnic identity are most likely to be Asian or Arab Australians (HREOC, 1991,p.175). The report also found that negative attitudes and discrimination occurred at times of economic recession (HREOC, 1991, p.2). The heated immigration debate also contributed to the development of a hostile attitude towards Asian migrants. Jayasuriya and Pookong (1999) pointed out the negative impact that previously mentioned opinion poll generated on attitudes to Asian migrants. They
argued that opinion polls are not just a record, but in fact create opinions and that politicians whose leadership style and performances are heavily constrained by polling, respond to them quickly (Jayasuriya & Pookong, 1999, p.74). The generally negative attitude towards Asian migrants and multiculturalism contrasted at times with results obtained by more carefully designed attitudinal studies or opinion surveys such as those conducted by the Australian National University (Goot, 1997). One ANU study exemplified how public discourses were prone to manipulation and aimed at certain outcomes in order to satisfy political strategic positioning and how devices such as opinion polls are used as tactics for serving governing rationalities at the time (Goot, 1997).

More recently a different anti-Asian discourse emerged. In 1996, in her maiden speech as independent MP at Parliament, Pauline Hanson said she believed the country was in danger of being swamped by Asians (Australian News Commentary, 1996). The then Prime Minister John Howard responded to Hanson by stating that a number of comments she made were ‘an accurate reflection of what people feel’ (Healey, 1997, p.21). It was not until October 1996 that Parliament passed a resolution condemning racism in a fear of losing Asian export orders and overseas students (Castles & Vasta 2004). Ghassan Hage argued that the rise of Pauline Hanson was a conservative form of White cultural politics and part of a broader ‘discourse of Anglo-decline’ suggesting that the success of Asian migrants was a threat to the core values of White Australia (Hage 2003, p.66).

It is also important to note that the political response to native title rights became a significant backdrop to the emergence of a retreat from a bipartisan position of tolerance on issues such as immigration and multiculturalism (Adams, 1997). Ang (1999) explained that Hansonism was a suppression of the history of colonisation and the indigenisation of a White presence. She pointed out that there was a spatial dimension, as well as a racial one (Ang, 1999). In other words Australia’s geo-economic imperative forced many Australians to have a different perception of Asia. In the era of rapid globalisation and the emergence of regional trade blocs, Australians were faced with a new paradigm, that is, Asianise or perish (Louw and Loo, 1997). Castles and Vasta (2004) also pointed out the fear Australians had of being colonised by people from the far more populous countries of the region. According to Hage (1999), Hansonism was an expression of anxiety over this perceived new challenge. This anxiety was exacerbated by the then Labor government’s moves towards the creation of an Australian republic and finally the government’s decision towards settling Indigenous people’s ‘land
rights’, which revived irrational fears of territorial decolonisation (Hage, 2003, p62). Hage argues that Australia’s debate on multiculturalism has traditionally centred around the construction of an ‘un-intergrated other’ (Hage, 2003, p.65). ‘The Asians’ have always been Australia’s favourite ‘others’ until replaced more recently by ‘Muslims’ (Hage, 2003, pp66-67).

Although there has been a shift from monocultural assimilation to multiculturalism, there is a ‘new racism’ or ‘cultural racism’, which is increasingly used in a language of ‘culture’ rather than a traditional language of racial superiority (Jayasuriya & Pookong 1999, pp.82-83). Ability to conform to a dominating culture becomes new ground for discrimination or exclusion (Jayasuriya & Pookong 1999, pp.82-83). Racism is no longer a question of equality but rather one of inclusion and exclusion, of belonging and acceptance (Jayasuriya & Pookong 1999, pp.82-83).

According to Ien Ang (1996), the adaptation of multiculturalism as official government policy, shifting from the White Australian policy not so long ago, has created its own problems. She observed that ‘social inclusion by virtue of othering’ meant that Asians and in particular Asian women experience exclusion everyday. She argues that Australia’s economic motivation to integrate with Asia does not mean that people of diverse ‘Asian’ origins living in Australia are no longer constructed as other to the Australian self but that the status of that otherness has changed (Ang, 1996). This is further explained by Ang when she observes that:

‘Celebration’ of cultural diversity and of ‘tolerance’ as a prescribed virtue, it produces an ambivalent relationship between majority and minority subjects. On an individual level what people experience from a simple instance of social exchange is an acute moment of awkwardness which points to a semiotic realm beyond the simple binaries of acceptance and rejection, tolerance and intolerance, racism and anti-racism—a moment of profound ambivalence shared by both sides of the party, but keeping them worlds apart, a true moment of ‘communication breakdown’ (Ien Ang, 1996, p43).

Ang’s observation signifies the existence of the gap where multiculturalism as a government policy operates in isolation of what people really experience, the failure of multiculturalism as a frame for human communication.
Historical Development of Australia’s Settlement Policy

Australia’s Settlement policy is a reflection of multiculturalism in the context of the social, economic and political climates in which it was developed. In the first decades of Australia’s immigration program, the needs of newcomers were mostly ignored. These errors have been viewed by some as errors of carelessness and neglect (Grant 1983, p.256). Martin suggests that policies of dispersal and non-confrontation were used as a solution to the perceived ‘threat’ of pluralism (Martin 1971,p.103). Martin also regarded ethnic identity and the role of ethnic groups as one of the bases of pluralism in contemporary western democracies (Martin, 1975, p11) and saw assimilation as the ideology of settlement (Burnette, 1998, p.4). However multiculturalism replaced such policies in the early 1970s (Burnette, 1998, p.7).

Australia’s settlement policy has become a major instrument for the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs to implement the policy of multiculturalism since it was introduced in 1982 in the form of the government assisted Community Refugee Settlement Scheme (CRSS), (DIAC, 2012). Analysis of Australia’s settlement policy is important in this research because it is a measure of the effectiveness of multiculturalism as well as an indication of responsiveness to the needs of the broad community concerning refugee settlement. It is also a key technology of governmentality on refugees in Australia. The Australian Government and community did not expect newly-arrived migrants and refugees to require a settlement policy aimed to equip them, not only economically, but also with various social and cultural aspects of life in a new country (Jupp, 2002). Settlement policy has evolved as it has been widely acknowledged that early access to appropriate settlement services enables new arrivals to move towards active economic and social participation in Australian society as a self-reliant and valued member (DIMIA 2003, Waxman, 1998). At that time narrowly defined needs for an immigration paradigm resulted in many highly skilled and professionally trained Eastern European refugees being employed in labouring jobs with no social contact with Australians and no desire to stay (Martin, 1978). Consequently the Australian government was alarmed by a large number of immigrants returning to their home lands (Gmelch, 1980). This provided the motivation and context for the Gallaby inquiry, which is discussed later in this chapter (Cox, 1996, p.9).

In 1972, Martin’s study found that refugees encountered difficulties in establishing an equal footing with those born in Australia. The study also found a growing public perception that Australians were the givers and refugees were the recipients (Collins, 1996, pp. 56-7).
Between 1948 and 1954, refugee workers were largely ignored by trade unions. Martin was concerned about the ability of ethnic groups to influence policy decision-making by governments and public/private institutions (Collins, 1996, p. 129). Such concerns resulted in the ‘Immigration Reform Group’, which was formed by a number of Melbourne academics and prominent citizens, to study Australia’s immigration policy (Walter & Macleod, 2002). The group’s arguments and publications were circulated through universities and churches (Lack & Templeton, 1995, p. 169). This was an important emerging discourse that aimed to counter negative perceptions of refugees. According to Lopez (2000), such an emergence of a new discourse was a result of consistent lobbying by a multiculturalist group consisting of academics, anti-Vietnam War movement participants and radical leftist who took an advantage of a rapid rise of the New Left and counter-culture created from the Vietnam War and conscription. Many of the principal multiculturalists were Anglo-Australians and ethnic community leaders mainly remained narrowly focused on issues such as welfare, homeland affairs, and internal politics of their respective communities (Moraitis, 1974).

The multiculturalists achieved a number of breakthroughs as they were appointed influential positions in the government and numerous advisory committees, which included first inclusion of multiculturalism in the immigration policy of a major party by Malcom Fraser in 1973, who was recently appointed as Opposition Spokeman on Labour and Immigration (Moraitis, 2000)

When the Whitlam government abolished the Immigration Department in 1974, its function was redistributed to the then Department of Social Security, Education and Labour (Jupp, 2002). The most important structural change affecting migrants at this time was the introduction of Commonwealth government funding for the Telephone Interpreter Service introduced in 1973 (Lack & Templeton, 1995, p. 90). Al Grassby, Immigration Minister in the Whitlam Government, was regarded as a catalyst in promoting and accepting a multicultural Australian society. He had a vision of a pluralist Australia;

How often do our television screens reflect anything like the variety of migrant groups encountered in a real-life stroll through our city street? The image we manage to convey of ourselves still seems to range from the bushwhacker to the sportsman to the slick city businessman. Where is the Maltese process worker, the Finnish carpenter, the Italian concrete layer, the Yugoslav miner or the Indian
scientist? Where do these people belong if not in today’s composite Australian image? Are they to be non people because they do not happen to fit American oriented stereotypes of our entertainment industry?

(Grassby, 1973, pp. 3-6).

Al Grassby was appointed Commissioner for Community Relations in 1975 and his office became a focal point for developing multicultural policies (Jupp, 2007, p. 37).

In an important submission to the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs in 1975, Martin, based on her research, criticised Australia’s resettlement policy because it failed to distinguish between refugees and other migrants and failed to offer them a real opportunity to gain equal access to available resources (Martin, 1972). Martin was highly critical of policies that encouraged refugees into the workforce before they had acquired sufficient English language skills (Martin, 1972). She also pointed out that there were no clear guidelines within statutory services and entitlement for refugees. As a result, refugees perceived government services as arbitrary and unpredictable (Martin, 1972). The criticism still remains relevant according to Lack & Templeton, as Australian government’s settlement policy, in general, did not reflect the real situation of target groups (namely, group structure, attitude, values and self images), (1995, p. 190). Martin (1972) studied the transition of Australian society into an ethnically pluralist society and identified four structural reasons for an ethnic pluralism. Throughout her study, greater emphasis was placed on the important role ethnic organisations play. Martin’s four structural reasons are first, there is an existence of barriers to structural assimilation, second, ethnic minorities strongly depend on cultural traditions third, minority groups function as interest groups capable of promoting political and economic interests of minority groups, and fourth, some minority groups are created by structures external to them such as political parties or churches (1972, p. 6). The four structural reasons for ethnic pluralism that Martin identified 40 years ago are still important today as was found in this study.

One of the first acts of the Fraser Government that came to power in late 1975 was to create a new Immigration Department under the title of ‘Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs’. This new name showed that Fraser aimed to encourage policies related to settlement (Jupp, 2007, p. 38). In 1977, Melbourne lawyer Frank Galbally was appointed as Chair of an Inquiry into Post-Arrival Programs and Services for Migrants’ established by the Fraser
Government (Claydon, 1981). The Galbally report published in 1978 was considered to be a landmark in Australian multicultural policy (Claydon, 1981). It recommended the establishment of an ethnic broadcasting service, an Ethnic Affairs Branch, an Ethnic Affairs Council and the establishment of national network of Migrant Resource Centres (Jupp, 2007, p. 39). The Galbally report moved settlement services towards a greater participation of ethnic groups and lesser concern with British migrants (Jupp, 2007, p. 90). For example recommendations were made based on the following four principles:

- Equality of opportunity and equal access to programs and services for all
- The right of all Australians to maintain their culture
- The need for special programs and services for migrants to ensure equality of access and provision
- The programs should be designed and operated in full consultation with migrants, emphasizing self-help (Galbally Report, 1978).

As a result of Galbally report, substantial development of settlement services and multicultural policies were achieved as well as an official multicultural discourse. According to Cox (1987), this included services such as orientation programs for migrants at hostels, interest free loans to refugees, the Community Refugee Settlement Scheme (CRSS) and increased funding grants for ethnic communities. According to Freeman & Jupp (1992), the Adult Migrant Education Program (AMEP) was expanded and the Multicultural Education Program was introduced into schools. The Commonwealth Government also funded migrant resource centres, which began to provide information and referral services and facilities for migrant community activities. This period also saw the creation of the Special Broadcasting Service (SBS), thus creating the opportunities for diverse cultural broadcast media.

By the 1980s, Australia’s settlement policy was well developed and compared favourably with policies in most other immigrant societies. The services, however, were limited by the Immigration Department’s small budget allocation (Jupp, 2007, p 91). In 1988, the Hawke Labor Government (1983-1994) established the Committee to Advise on Australia’s

---

1 The formal title is ‘Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services to Migrants’, published in 1978, the report represented a key development of multicultural policy. It made 57 recommendations in relation to equity and
Immigration Policies (CAAIP), to be chaired by Fitzgerald. Its role was to “set the foundations for taking Australian immigration policy into the next century”. Prior to publication of the Fitzgerald Report, a heated debate on Asian migrants was led by the conservative academic Geoffrey Blainey (1984). Consequently the Fitzgerald report became highly controversial and was regarded as seriously flawed on the grounds that it underestimated the contribution of migrants and reflected a ‘dissident voice’ (Collins, 1996, p. 291). The report produced the unintended result of the federal opposition leader John Howard breaking with the consensus of a bipartisan immigration policy, and announcing that he would reduce Asian migration, if necessary (Collins, 1996, p. 286).

Under the Liberal/National Party coalition government, a broad strategy for the settlement of immigrants to Australian society was developed in 1988 by the Ethnic Affairs and Settlement Committee of National Population Council (NPC 1988). Settlement was defined as:

The process by which an immigrant establishes economic viability and social networks following immigration in order to contribute effectively to, and make full use of opportunities generally available in the receiving society (p.4)

A number of settlement program initiatives were recommended and implemented by the Commonwealth government as a result. They provided a foundation for the strategic development and implementation of a settlement policy for the following three decades. The programs have evolved, adopted different names, expanded, shrunk and sometimes been recycled. The basic elements of the Settlement Program, Australia, 1991, DILGEA (Annual Report 1990-1991) are provided to outline the Settlement Program as detailed in the following table.
Table 3: Major Settlement Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translating and Interpreting Services (TIS)</td>
<td>The Department operates a national 24-hour, seven days-a-week translating and interpreting service for non-English speakers.</td>
<td>Program still runs in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP)</td>
<td>The AMEP provides English language learning opportunities for recently arrived adult migrants.</td>
<td>Program still runs in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant-in-Aid (GIA) Scheme</td>
<td>The GIA scheme funds community organizations to assist recently arrived migrants and special groups.</td>
<td>Program still runs in 2012 with new name Settlement Grant Program, SGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Services for Refugees</td>
<td>The range of services for refugees includes on-arrival accommodation through migrant centres and flats and loans to help clients move into private accommodation.</td>
<td>Program still runs with new name Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Scheme, IHSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Affairs</td>
<td>The objective of the Department’s Ethnic Affairs program is to facilitate understanding between government and ethnic communities.</td>
<td>Program still runs with new name multicultural affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Language Services Arrangements</td>
<td>Program intended to achieve economies of scale and efficient use of language and other resource among different federal departments</td>
<td>Ceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Access Project Scheme</td>
<td>MAPS assists the settlement of migrants by facilitating their access to general community.</td>
<td>Ceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Equity and Access Projects Scheme</td>
<td>PEAPS assisted organizations applying for funding from other scheme</td>
<td>Ceased</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The programs that ceased have been redirected and integrated into other projects or schemes. The Pilot Equity and Access Project Scheme was a ‘once off’ project and did not produce significant results to justify continuous funding. The ‘Report of the Review of Settlement Services for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants (2003)’ is a key document, which is the
first review of settlement policy since the release of Galbally report. The report named two visible trends in the direction of the delivery of settlement services in Australia:

First there has been a trend within Australian social policy away from directions and control by government and towards partnership between government and the private and community sectors. Second there has also been a whole-of-government shift towards an outputs/outcomes framework. This is associated with other significant changes in public management such as competitive contracting and tendering, contestability, market testing, and benchmarking (DIMIA 2003, p.190).

The two trends identified above have significant implications in terms of settlement service delivery. In the following data analysis chapters barriers that such trends have caused are identified as they emerged as key themes during the interviews. In fact the two trends are contradictory because, as shown in the analysis, changes in public management have made it difficult to form genuine partnerships away from directions and control by government or in Foucauldian terms to avoid the technologies of government.

**Engagement**

Paul Keating, Australian Prime Minister between 1991-1996, promoted a strong policy of engagement with Asia (Keating, 2000). Throughout his tenure he expressed determination for Australia to be integrated into the Asian economy and geopolitics. In particular he placed greater emphasis on improving bilateral relations with Indonesia, which he believed to be the key to other South East Asian countries (Dalrymple, 2003, p.162). His policy has been described as a blend of internationalist economic rationalism and cosmo-multiculturalism (Castles, 1997). It is uncertain that what kind of impact the policy brought to the development of refugees and migrant policy, especially when Australia had had a nationwide heated debate on Asian migrants under previous governments. However, it is believed that progress was made in the broad areas of multiculturalism, Aboriginal affairs and the Republican movement during his leadership. Prime Minister Keating’s domestic policy on multiculturalism and Aboriginal affairs were closely linked to his support for the Australian Republic Movement (Keating, 10 Dec 1992, Philip1997).

Under Bob Hawke and Paul Keating, the Labor party was in government in Australia from 1983 to 1996, the years of the Mabo and Wik rulings, the reports on deaths in custody and “the stolen generations,” and increasing Aboriginal activism. (Healey, 2009, Kauffman, 1998...
& Butt 2001). After this period there was a backlash, fueled by increasing anxiety among white Australians about Aboriginal gains in land rights and other areas (Brantlinger, 2004). Also the Labor government’s leadership recognised the need for a new national identity reflecting the nature of modern Australian society, and saw implications for the positioning of an Anglo identity within broader conceptions of a new national identity (Keating, 1995). A discourse that meant that ‘ethnic’ began to confront “Anglo” privilege by attaching an ethnicity to Anglo culture emerged (Johnson, 2002, p.175). In the previous era, ethnicity was constructed only in terms of the ‘other’. Prevailing discourses had meant that “Anglos” had never thought of themselves as an ethnic group. Now “Anglo” Australians were being asked to accept a new reality of a cosmopolitan form of national identity to embrace ethnic diversity and to give up their privileged position in a post assimilation society (Johnson, 2002). Paul Keating criticized how the asylum seeker debate in Australia was a discourse of racial undertones and particularly John Howard’s administration for constructing mandatory detention for non-citizens, which Paul Keating established in 1992 for performing health and security checks, into a quasi penal structure (The Australian, 23 Mar 2012).

Keating’s Labor government attempted to reconstruct governmentalities based on a new national identity agenda and also to enhance relationships with Aboriginal and ethnic communities (The Age 2003). There was a possibility of building new public discourse on refugees and humanitarian entrants as a result. This suggests that as proposed in Foucault’s conceptualization of power, institutions with dominant power in terms of forming strategic relations can have greater and positive influence in constructing dominance as a means of the exercise of power.

**Settlement Policy under the Howard Government**

It was predictable that under the Howard Liberal/National Party government, Australian multiculturalism and settlement policy would take a backward step compared to the previous Keating government (Collins, 1988). Prime Minister John Howard, as a leader of the opposition during the Keating government, advocated for ‘dismantling multiculturalism’ on a number of public occasions (Collins, 1988). Therefore public discourse on multiculturalism was significantly altered under his reign. The Coalition government worked assiduously to depict multiculturalism as something for a ‘cultural elite’ and for well-educated cosmopolitan professionals, so called “caffe latte drinking classes” of the inner-suburban in large cities (Burchell, 2001, p.234). Hodge and O’Carroll (2006) documented the phasing out of
‘multiculturalism’ and increased use of ‘tolerance’ under the Howard government. They analysed the paradox of a tolerance discourse in the Australian context. For example, the then Federal Health Minister Tony Abbott criticised the political correctness of multiculturalism, which forced Australian to tolerate the intolerable and become pretentious (Hodge & Caroll 2006).

As discussed in the previous chapter, tolerance is a hybrid domain between private and public, which enabled politicians to problematise sensitive issues in a non-political context (Brown, 2006). The documented word ‘tolerance’ was finally disappearing from the Department of Immigration’s policy papers in 2003 (Review of Settlement Service, 2003), compared with its policy document of 1996 (Hodge & Carroll, 2006, p. 45). Later the term tolerance was replaced by harmony and diversity. The shift occurred during the end of Howard’s first term in the office. In ‘A New Agenda for Multicultural Australia’, an official government publication had a foreword by the then prime minister, which described Australia as an ‘open and tolerant society’ (DIMA, 1999, p.3). The document stated that government policies and principles were based on ‘tolerance, humanity and mutual respect’ (DIMA, 1999, p.6). Subsequently in a new paper ‘Multicultural Australia: United in Diversity: Strategic Directions for 2003-2006’, the word is replaced by harmony, diversity, respect, acceptance, cultural enrichment (DIMA, 2003, p.6). John Howard’s new multiculturalism is based on his belief in the essentially European nature of Australian society as stated in a speech to the Chinese Chamber of Commerce in 1998:

We are, as all of you know, a projection of Western civilization in this part of the world. We inherited the great European values of liberal democracy (as cited in Hage, 2001, pp. 27-31).

Despite the ‘new’ names and description, his new multiculturalism is comparable with a return to the insular values of the 1950s and with exclusionary immigration policy (Castels & Vasta, 2004). These values were reflected in the new settlement policy and service delivery as detailed in later chapters in this thesis.

The Tampa affair, which refers to the incident in August 2001 when the Howard government refused permission for the vessel MV Tampa carrying 438 Asylum seekers to come into Australian waters, presents an extreme case of public discourse, governmentality, power and refugee policy (SMH 2004 06,Oct).
The Tampa incident in particular highlighted how the politics of fear were played out by the government to attract electoral votes (Sun Herald, 30 August, 2004). In 2001 it was widely believed that the Coalition government would lose the federal election (Sun Herald, 30 August, 2004). On August 27, Prime Minister Howard and the Immigration Minister, Philip Ruddock denied the entry of Tampa, which was seeking urgent medical assistance. Referring to the asylum seekers on board, Howard was adamant that none of the “boat people” or “illegal migrants” would succeed in setting foot on Australian territory (Reuters, 24 March 2006, Mungo 2002).

Later evidence emerged that John Howard had misled the public deliberately by hiding some details such as the medical assessment (SMH 2002 28,Oct). The then opposition leader Kim Beazley signaled bipartisan support by agreeing to the government’s positions, despite the mounting international criticism, subsequently John Howard won the election.

The numbers of ‘boat people’ during the mid-1990s were not high by international standards no more than 4000 in a year but it provoked a media campaign and popular outrage (Castles & Vasta 2004). The enormous electoral success displayed after the Tampa incident was a reflection of public sentiment again, which appeared to be vulnerable to state manipulation.

In more recent years, John Howard’s Coalition government implemented a series of settlement policies that reflected both conservatism and neo-liberal views (Manne 2008). Most notoriously, the government created a temporary protection visa, which denied access to welfare services for some asylum seekers. This measure was considered to be a creation of a sub-class of refugees that threatened the integrity of the government’s refugee service (Edwards, 2003). On August 9, 2008, after the election of the Rudd Labor government, the temporary protection visa was abolished. The policy during the Howard’s coalition government can be contrasted with the Liberal Coalition government during 1977-82, which adopted an expansionist approach to deal with refugees from Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos in a more careful and considered manner rather than fuelling fears and hostilities as the Howard government did (McMaster 2001, p.54).
The Impact of the War on Terrorism

Even though September 11 was an event that took place in the USA, it significantly affected the refugee discourse in Australia. A series of changes took place on a global scale in the aftermath of September 11, namely, the strengthening of national citizenship and the rise of nationalism and social exclusion towards Islamic culture, which became prevalent following US President George Bush’s powerful statement, ‘You are either with us or with the terrorists’ (Bush, 2001). Australia also followed the footsteps of the USA and introduced similar ‘homeland security’ measures (The Australian, 10 September 2011). Some of the global trends and domestic policies had implications for domestic refugee discourse in Australia, in particular in reference to Muslim refugees who migrated to Australia from the mid-1990s. The government generated discourses that suggested that Afghans were really Pakistanis linked to terrorists aboard Tampa and were probably rich (Jupp 2002).

The ‘refugee crisis’ and the subsequent ‘war on terror’ was reflective of a politics of ‘race’ and a new era in Australian political life (Gale 2004). Prime Minister Howard took the opportunity to lead the federal election campaign with the slogan ‘We decide who comes to this country and circumstances in which they come’ (SMH, 6 December 2001). While this implicitly breached the UN Convention on refugees, of which Australia is a signatory, the principle of national sovereignty has been rigorously asserted ever since (Brennan 2003). Both the 2001 and 2004 elections were fought essentially on security, to the advantage of the ruling Liberal-National Coalition (Warhurst & Simms 2002; 2005). Howard successfully managed to create ‘good refugees’ and ‘bad refugees’ discourses in Australia. By 2002 after 9/11 and the Bali bombing, a concern was raised that too many Muslims were being admitted into Australia, or that Muslims born in Australia were alienated and hostile towards mainstream values (Sydney Morning Herald, 22 Jan 2004). The London bombing of 2005, which was committed by locally-born Muslims extended this ‘Muslim suspicion’ to locally born and converts in Australia (Clyne 2005). Muslim asylum seekers from Afghanistan, Iran and Iraq were effectively discouraged by arrests at sea (Jupp 2006). While toughened security measures were not specifically directed against Muslims, media and public statements to the contrary increased hostility, culminating in a major riot in Sydney in 2005 (Jupp 2006).
Key events and the shift of policy from border control to internal security sealed the position of the Muslim as the unquestionable “other” in Australia (Cogan, 2005). One example was the way reports were phrased. For example the media reported ‘Lebanese gangs’ raping Anglo-Australian girls (Hage, 2003 & Grewal, 2007). These types of reports presented Muslims as a new threat to Australia’s Western civilisation (Hage, 2003, p67). The expression of ‘kill the Lebs’ during the Cronulla race riot just before Christmas, 2005, illustrated the perceived contradiction between the official rhetoric of multiculturalism and the reality of its unpopularity (Jupp 2006). A number of conservatives called for an end to further Muslim immigration, banning of the hijab in schools, compulsory assimilation tests before naturalisation, reconsideration of the whole thrust of multiculturalism and a return to traditional values (Jupp, 2007, p. 116).

There are many ways to examine at increasing a tendency to stereotype and exclude Islam. Rattansi and Westwood (1994) put forward views that anxiety over world order and the increasing heterogeneity of Euro-American societies have also contributed towards a perceived crisis in ‘national security’ and a decline in the material comfort of Western space and territory. According to Jayasuriya and Poolong, this anxiety has been expressed as a ‘new racism’ or as a ‘cultural racism’:

The discourse of ‘new racism’ or ‘cultural racism’ serve to rationalise the social dynamics of economic competition and perceived sense of relative deprivation, and enables the dominant groups to assert their hegemony over alien groups in society (1999, p.84).

According to Jupp (2006), the Australian experience of actual terrorism or mass people smuggling is very limited, despite the controversies aroused nationally and internationally by its exclusion and detention policies over the past decade. Moreover he pointed out that Muslim communities in Australia are less likely to become recruiting grounds for terrorists due to the small size of individual communities. It is apparent that the refugee issue was being used as a technology of government, through the exploitation of a deep rooted fear that the country would be invaded by foreigners (Castles & Vasta 2004).
The impact of neo-liberalism in Australia

As discussed in the previous chapter, neo liberalism is a distinct governing rationality for many governments today. It will therefore provide a good example of how governing rationality is shaping discourses and subsequently service provision.

Since the mid 1980s, the Labor government conformed, along with most Western nations, in adopting neo-liberal economic policies as the effects of globalisation became more apparent (Beeson, 1998). Neo-liberalism has been characterised as corporatisation, privatisation and dismantling of state organisations in Australia (Farrar & Inglis, 1996, p. 76). The process may be seen as a systematic evacuation of a social democratic culture and its replacement by the market (Farrar & Inglis, 1996, p. 76).

The full embrace of neo-liberalism in Australia and the Western world, by left and right governments alike, has marginalised certain groups, mostly the least powerful and privileged (Hage, 2003). When a global competition to attract transnational capitalism becomes fierce everyday, major world capital cities need to present themselves as a suitable place to invest (Hage, 2003). Major international cities showcase multiculturalism as ingredients for aesthetic cosmopolitan cities (Hage, 2003). Asylum seekers and welfare recipients are not parts of the attraction. Those opposing neo-liberalism often do so on the grounds of morality and compassion but find it impossible to reverse the trend. According to Hage, refugee issues invoked by neo-liberal policy inflicted paranoia (2003, p.7, 20, 111). By the middle of the 1990s, multiculturalism lost its shine.

Under both the Labor and the Liberal party, government programs that had once been tailored for different groups were “mainstreamed.” That is to say, in welfare, community, and labour market arenas, government funding for programs of integration were increasingly generically directed rather than specifically targeted at particular minority groups with their particular needs in mind (Beckett, 2001, p.271).

The implications of ‘mainstreaming’, under which the settlement service is operating, with an assumption that refugees and migrants can receive culturally and linguistically appropriate service from the ‘mainstream services’ is further discussed in Chapters Five and Six in this thesis. In a sense, Australian immigration policy was economically rational long before the recent term was invented (Jupp, 2007, p. 137). It has always been inseparable from national economic policy. Throughout the history of migration, a popular perception persists that
migrants take jobs away from Australians, as well as lower wages and contribute to the deterioration of working conditions (Ongley, P & Pearson, D 1995). For this reason trade unions have been traditionally concerned about the level of migrant intake (Jupp, 2007, p. 141).

As an economic rationalist ideology became prevalent in the public service, American notions of ‘cost-free immigration’ and ‘user pays’ were introduced (Jupp, 2007, p.148). The idea that immigrants should have equal public service entitlement attracted much criticism from opponents of multiculturalism and supporters of economic rationalism (Jupp, 2007, p. 148). In relation to the rise of Pauline Hanson and the One Nation party, Beckett (2001) pointed out that it was not only anger expressed by rural and regional Australia on multiculturalism, but it was also an anger expressed towards neoliberalism. Ironically John Howard could not deliver a cut in Asian immigration because Asia was the source of skilled and business migrants, as well as full fee paying students (Castles & Vasta, 2004). The key political argument for the One Nation Party was centred on an agenda, which was pitted against welfare recipients, Indigenous Australians, recent immigrants, especially those from Asian origins, and big governments, globalisation and big business. Essentially ‘Hansonites’ were able to articulate the bewilderment and anger felt in rural and regional Australia as a way of life based on family farms, local businesses and indeed traditional Anglo-Australian cultural values was eroded by globalised economic rationalism (Beckett, 2001, p.272).

The impact of neoliberalism in relation to refugee discourse is multifaceted. As was the case in Canada, not only were there a cuts in government settlement service provision but there was also reduced economic opportunities for new arrivals overall (Morris 1997). Under neoliberal ideology, ‘individual responsibility’ is given much emphasis, and newly arrived refugees, who are already bewildered by new environment, would soon find themselves stigmatized as unable to integrate into and make contributions to the mainstream society (Healey &Renouf, 2005).

**New Policies Under the Rudd Government**

The Rudd Labor government, which came to power in December 2007, has shown a continuous bipartisan approach in some areas such as the citizenship test and removal of ‘multicultural affairs’ from the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA)’s portfolio (McNevin, 2011). These were very controversial issues that
caused nationwide debate in the last years of the Howard government. Nevertheless the policies were continued under the Rudd government without visible modification of the previous government’s policies. However, in areas such as ‘Pacific Solution’ (government policy since 2001 to send asylum seekers to detention centres in the Pacific ocean) and the treatment of Temporary Protection Visa (TPV) scheme, the Rudd government displayed swift policy change and determination (Mansouri, F. & Leach, M. 2009). Within seven months of being in power, the Labor government announced the abolition of the Nauru detention centre and the TPV schemes in July 2008 (Mansouri, F. & Leach, M. 2009). In a public forum titled ‘Refugee Policy under the Rudd Government’ held on 17 November 2008, Senator Chris Evans, Minister for Immigration and Citizenship stated that the previous government’s policy was ineffective and costly (Evans, 2008). He revealed that the administration of the Nauru detention centre was costing tax payers more than $300 million (Evans, 2008). The TPV regime has been proven to be ineffective in reducing the number of undocumented arrivals and it created a ‘second rate integration system’. Evans (2008) described the last government as creating fear though its refugee policy. The Labor government promised continued reforms in a number of areas including examining the arbitrary nature of refugee status determination as conducted by the department (Evans, 2008).

A Specific African Refugee Discourse

The examination of newspaper articles and researches papers suggest that the first specific African refugee discourse in the Australian context emerged in 2003 when then immigration minister, Gary Hardgrave announced a refugee intake from Africa. The media response that followed primarily portrayed African refugees as exotic and ‘primitive’. For example, The Sunday Telegraph reported that African refugees would be instructed on how to use modern appliances (23 May, 2003). Since then the depiction of African refugees as people, who have not experienced industrialisation, has become a distinct feature of a specific African refugee discourse. In 2006, the then Minister for Health minister, Tony Abbott, announced extra medical screening to prevent diseases being carried into Australia by African refugees (AAP, 10 March, 2006). Newspaper articles reporting crimes committed by African refugees started to surface in 2007, which included sexual offences (AAP, 18 June, 2007). In 2007, prior to the controversial Kevin Andrews comment, the Australia First Party circulated a racial pamphlet in Western Sydney stating that African refugees were a threat to jobs, health and public safety (Sydney Morning Herald, 10 August, 2007). Then, the above mentioned
comment by Kevin Andrews in 2007 sparked a nationwide increase in African refugee discourse in Australia. Numerous newspaper articles and comments were made immediately after the Kevin Andrew’s remark. Notably, the then Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, Senator Chris Evans in the following Rudd government stated that “The previous minister's comments were politically motivated”, “we have a job to do rebuilding confidence and our international reputation” (Sydney Morning Herald, 9 March, 2008). The announcement of Kevin Andrews to reduce the African refugee intake followed by his remark also caused criticism from refugee advocates and church groups (Sydney Morning Herald, 4 October).

Although there were sympathetic views towards African refugees which suggested a lack of appropriate support (VOA, 07, 2006), hostility and prejudice towards African refugees were expressed by the Australian public (The Gold Coast Bulletin, 06 October, 2007). The articles that tried to portrayed African refugees as unhealthy continued, as The Advertiser reported that “health professionals are being warned one in three African refugee arrivals to South Australia have parasites” (15, October 2007). An open letter was written by a number of refugee support groups that the contributions made by African refugees to the Australia society must be acknowledged and the decisions regarding refugee intake must be based on humanitarian needs that refugees present not on the prospect of integration. Signatories to the letter include Amnesty International, World Vision, A Just Australia, the Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission, Refugee Council of Australia, Caritas Australia, Australian Lawyers for Human Rights, St Vincent de Paul Society, the Liquor Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers' Union, and the National Council of Churches in Australia (ABC, 15 October, 2007).

In a brief analysis of prominent newspaper reports about African refugees fell into various themes that emerged. There was, however, a typical media portrayal of ‘ethnic crimes’, in which the offenders were identified according to ethnicity and refugee background. Alternately, there were also many responses to Kevin Andrews’ comment, raising concerns about unjust nature of the comment and political implication that the comment resulted in. The response includes the coverage of the then opposition leader, Kevin Rudd, who questioned the political motive behind the cut in African refugee intake (AAP, 2007). At the same time there were opinions published in support of Kevin Andrews’ view, mostly from smaller regional press. There were also articles focusing on stories of individual African refugees. These included personal stories of life hardships that African refugees endured, which often included the descriptions of how far African refugees walked without food to
reach refugee camps were frequently written. Finally there were also articles introducing research on recent African refugee arrivals, particularly in the areas of health, family and education. What the news articles had in common was the fact that they were based on research that raised concerns about the challenges and potential issues that new African refugees bring with them. Through these articles the perspective of successful ‘integration’ was repeatedly questioned.

The themes in news articles implied the uniqueness of a specifically African refugee discourse in comparison with other previous discourses. First it was rare that a particular community, a Sudanese community, was identified for its inability to integrate whereas in the past it was more likely around racial groups that discourses were constructed for example, as Asians and Southern Europeans. The Kevin Andrews comment was made in a reference to a particular community, the Sudanese community, a community where the distinction between Northern Sudanese and Southern Sudanese is stark. However this does not mean his comment contributed to forming a specifically Sudanese refugee discourse as all African refugee communities were indiscriminately affected by his claim. As discussed further in the next chapter, the comment informed Australians, who did not even know that Australia was receiving refugees from Sudan. Second the numerous descriptions about individual African refugees settling into a new country were constructed as exotic. Most articles contrasted how different African refugees are, which served as hints of challenges ahead of their integration. Third it was also unique that there were not as many research cited in the media when previous refugee groups settled. Although the data on volume of research that took place for each refugee group is not available, the amount and intensity of articles that cited the research suggests that there was a deliberate effort from media to portray African refugees in a certain way.

Another characteristic of the African refugee discourse the use of social media. That assisted a public contribute to the construction of a specific African refugee discourse, which had become increasingly prevalent is readers opinions and feedback to electronic publications in the form of ‘ripples’. One of the advantages of this medium is that it ensures honest expression of opinions and views due to the anonymity that technology provides. The examination of some of the opinions posted on the websites of major publications and popular cyber forums revealed that there were a great number of people explicitly opposing
the intake of African refugees and expressing racist views. Some of the opinions posted when negative news articles on African refugees were published are as follows.

“These Africans just don't fit into a civilised society.”

“Why can't people just live in their own nations for?”

“If Africa was managed by the whites for the good of all African people then migration of people would stop.”

“Africoons stabbing island boongs? This is excellent news. Africoons are like king cobras in the sense that they are potentially dangerous to Aussies.”

(www.topix.com/forum)

The majority of the opinions rarely commented on the incident reported. The debates centred on the perceived inferiority of the African race and their inability to integrate into the Australian society.

Another form of discourse emerged from online campaigns by racist organisations. ‘White Pride’ organisations such as Stormfront, which was affiliated with the Australian First Party, ran an organised racial vilification campaign via pamphlet distribution and web publication (Sydney Morning Herald, 09 August, 2007). A derogatory pamphlet that contained drawings of Africans was distributed in the Hoxton Park area. The pamphlet also contained messages that Africans do not assimilate well and are violent, and set out so-called “well-known facts” about their intelligence. “They have absolutely no respect for the laws of the land, let alone human life,” the leaflet claimed. It criticised “bleeding-heart government-funded” social agencies such as the Blacktown Migrant Resource Centre and church groups (Sydney Morning Herald, 09 August, 2007).

Despite some of the features of African refugee discourse, according to Clemence Due (2008) an emerging African refugee discourse inherited characteristics of discourses for earlier settler groups, which was focused on whiteness as the normative mode of belonging and the ability of a new group to conform to the norm.
…You’d think from the hate–dancing party on Andrews’ head that never before have we set quotas on refugees from any one area and only now will we act I this “racist” way.

False, Governments from both sides have set such quotas, and have no option, given there are more than 20 million refugees looking for homes.

Limits must be set as must quotas for refugees from any particular are-not just to spread our help but to quietly ensure we don’t take in so many from one particular group so as to overwhelm our ability to absorb them


In his analysis Due explained that such articles implied that a finite number of people were allowed from ‘particular groups’ who would be able to be ‘absorbed’ by the white nation (Due, 2008). He argued that in such articles there was an underlying denial of Aboriginal sovereignty as the phrase indicated that it was white people who absorb Aboriginal people and any new group must be able to be absorbed as white people (Due, 2008). Another observation that he made was the continuous denial of the existence of racism in Australia. For example,

It would be a great mistake, however, to condemn Australia as a racist society and Australians as collectively as racist. The days of institutional racism have long gone with the dismantling of the White Australia policy and Aborigines obtaining the vote

(Faran Farouque, 11 October 2007, The Age).

Due (2008) further argued that the denial of the existence of racism is a common tactic for maintaining white hegemony and discourses that describe Australia as a generous refugee receiving country were prevalent, while any view that perceived Australia as a racist country was continuously dismissed.

Henry-Waring (2012) also provided his analysis on refugee discourses, which focuses on ‘Otherness’ and ‘Whiteness’. He characterised the Australian refugee discourse as ‘meta-discourse of Otherness’, which simultaneously normalizes whiteness yet fixes and essentializes difference as negative Otherness. There is not yet a formal multicultural strategy
or policy devised or adhered to, and as a result there are critical gaps in service provision (Dunn, et al, 2001). He criticized the current multiculturalism as self-congratulatory but not open to self-scrutiny’ it only focuses on ‘exoticisation’ and consumption (Henry-Waring, 2012).

He asserted that:
Refugee discourses act as hegemonic carriers of ideology and power, which give primacy to Whiteness, at the direct expense of those defined as ‘Other’ (Henry-Waring 2004).
Such analysis on African refugee discourse bears a great deal of resemblance with the analysis made by Hage (1998) and Ang (1998) about discourses related to earlier refugee groups.

The Refugee Council of Australia published its annual submission to the government in 2011, “Australia’s Refugee and Humanitarian Program 2011-2012, Community Views on Current Challenges and Future Directions”. In section 6 Public Discourse on Australia’s Refugee Polices provided current analysis on the issues. It stated that over population, water security, and caring for vulnerable and marginalized Australians are factors that form arguments against taking a more humane approach to refugees. In particular there is wide public concern regarding government expenditure in relation to asylum seekers. The submission raised concerns about the negative impact that such discourses can result in by providing an example of African community member from Brisbane who commented about the appearance of graffiti on African-owned and operated shops, urging Africans to “go back to your country” (RCOA 2011).

The Refugee Council of Australia (2011) issued a warning, based on consultation findings that current public discourse on African refugee could result in detrimental consequences for African refugees:

Australian community does not get to see what refugees and asylum seekers do or how Africans contribute. Other negatives from the public discourse are also overlooked, such as the psychological impact on some former refugees who relive traumatic experiences as a result of negative media coverage and other who respond by withdrawing from wider community contact because of feeling that they are being rejected by Australian society.
The submission also raised concerns for those refugees who arrived by boat. They are not able to interact with broader community members in fear that people would find out they were ‘boat people’ and associated them with negative images (RCOA, 2011).

The ROCA recommendation included urging Australian government and politicians take on a more proactive role in engaging with the media on asylum and refugee issues, with the development of a government communication strategy to support the Refugee and Humanitarian Program. It also recommended that DIAC consider funding the development of a NGO-coordinated national training and media strategy to improve the quality of reportage on refugee and asylum seeker issues and enable refugees and the organizations working with them to engage with the media and the Australian public (RCOA, 2011).

Conclusion

Many opinions and views on refugees and migrants contribute to a dominant discourse at any given time. As demonstrated in the above discussion, immigration policy has been an area that has always produced heated debates and witnessed diverse views from different sectors of society, resulting in varied discourses and tensions between them. From sensationalising tabloid editorial to talkback radio shows, the topic of refugees has never had a shortage of input to form generally negative discourses.

Australian governmental policy and public ideas of multiculturalism have seen significant progress. Being a country with a clearly racist migration policy until the 1970s, Australia has, despite such a beginning, become the most cosmopolitan country in the world (Birrell 1995). Australian multiculturalism can claim credit that it has never faced violent racial conflict on a scale witnessed by other multicultural Western societies. There is no doubt that the Australian people have displayed a great deal of openness and willingness to live with diversity. Yet, there are many areas where multiculturalism as a government policy or a social ideology needs improvement. Such a philosophy is reflected in settlement policy and the delivery of services. There have been many of evaluations regarding the success and efficiency of settlement services, which will be discussed in Chapter Five in this thesis. Nonetheless the most significant settlement issues identified 30 or 40 years ago such as employment and housing still remain as great barriers for the successful settlement of migrants and refugees (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2009).
While the Australian government now pays lip service to multicultural policy, only a small proportion of the funds allocated to multicultural programs and services are directed toward labour market programs for migrants and refugees (Kyle & Macdonald 2004). The inability of multiculturalism to significantly reduce structural inequality is a serious shortcoming of Australian multiculturalism (Collins, 1996, p. 239). Additionally some commentators have questioned the effectiveness of Australia’s settlement policy without adequately acknowledging class dynamics (Collins, 1996, p.239). Jakubowicz’s (1989) study on the welfare of migrants shows how a welfare state model can be analysed in the Australian context and how strategic positioning of each player plays a part in the service delivery. It displays complementary characteristics that go with governmentality since both are concerned with state’s perceived role and the practical function of the government services.

Offe notes in his discussion of Keynesian welfare states that;

> The means by which the welfare state intervenes consists of bureaucratic rules and legal regulations, monetary transfer and the professional expertise of teachers, doctors, social workers, etc…the welfare state can be said to be partially dispel motives and reasons for social conflict…performs the crucial functions of removing some of the needs of the working class from the arena of class struggle and industrial conflict

(Offe, 1984, pp194-195)

In the Australian context, immigrants had been recruited in order to advance capitalism in the post-war period and the welfare provision was made available to such migrants for the pragmatic belief that an immigrant would go back to their country of origin if life was too hard in Australia (Jakubowicz, 1989). Another strong motivation was the fear of “ethnic ghettos”, which made any government look bad (Jakubowicz, 1989). In response the government has devised a way to do this in an economically rationalised pattern under the underlying government’s principle of strong assimilation (Wilton & Bosworth 1984). The Grant in Aid scheme, which was instituted in 1969 by the Immigration Department, adopted a
model that government funded positions were employed in ethno-specific organisations, and later by MRCs as well, after the recommendation of the Galbaly Report. This arrangement resulted in a number of current inherent characteristics (Jakubowicz 1989, pp8-15). Services and subsequent redirecions of funds created an ethnic ‘petite bourgeoisie’ and ‘intelligentsia’ thorough the creation of ‘ethnic’ jobs (Jakubowicz, 1989). The service had effect of ‘protecting’ mainstream organisations from demands of ethnic communities. There was a heavy reliance on volunteer organisations and attempts at developing a ‘community’ structure in order to carry the burden of welfare (Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, 1985). With such arrangements in place, the government and funded organisations opted for the strategy of mainstreaming, the principle being that mainstream services should be able to respond to the needs of migrants, which emerged as a cost saving measure for the fiscally constrained government. Since then the strategic positioning of key players has taken place along both economic and ideological axes. The rise of the neo-liberal economic paradigm and the gradual demise of multiculturalism were two powerful contextual factors.

Jakubowicz (1984) observed that, in the Australian context, state action began at the Federal level in support of cultural liberation of ethnic minorities. Over time, such concerns were submerged under politically astute analyses of the changing base of Australian political life; and in a period of heightened class struggles and economic restructuring, an opportunity to use ethnicity to mediate and defuse class conflict was evident (Collins, 2006 & Jakubowicz, 2001).

In the meantime, refugee issues have become highly politicized. The notion of legality is employed in the construction of a binary between deserving and undeserving refugees, that is, those who warrant rights under the international covenant on refugees and those who jump the ‘queue’ are not seen to be deserving of a humanitarian response (McMaster, 2001, p.67). The notion of an orderly offshore ‘queue’ has been critiqued as a means of maintaining a binary representation of offshore refugees and ‘queue-jumpers’ (McMaster, 2001, p. 67). This representation seeks to reconcile the apparent incompatibility of Australia being a compassionate humanitarian nation and the policy of mandatory detention of Asylum seekers, including children (Gale, 2004). The immigration and asylum seekers policy under the Howard government was described as ‘mess’ by the Rudd government (Evans, 2008). Its tactics and strategies surrounding detention policy has been proven ineffective in stopping
people smuggling. In 2010-11 the Commonwealth spent around $390 million on post-arrival settlement services for both humanitarian entrants and migrants (NSW Audit Office, 2012). Evans also revealed the arbitrary nature of refugee policies under the previous government, when many refugee applications were determined without interviewing the applicants (Evans, 2008). This chapter examined the major milestones in the development of Australian multiculturalism and settlement policy and the refugee discourse that emerged from that history. The chapter also covered how different dominant discourses on refugees were strengthened by negative media. This chapter provides a context for further analysis of what and how technologies of government are used, how the key institutions establish strategic power relations with each other, and how refugees are subject to government and develop mechanisms.
Chapter Five:

Research Findings

The researcher’s interest in African refugees discourse, among all refugees in Australia is a result of the following three factors. Firstly the research interest came about the time when it was African’s turn out of all the waves of migrants who came through Australia. It also coincides with researcher’s position as small and emerging communities worker at a migrant resource centre. In recent days African refugee communities are the largest component of small and emerging communities, which means there is wide recognition that African communities are in the process of settlement currently. The relatively small size of settlement service in comparison with other major government services such as health and education, there seemed to be disproportionate media and social attention given to settlement service, and this has triggered academic interest that there must be something else happening.

Secondly African refugees mark an era that it is possible to research into the patterns of settlement of different waves of migrant groups with distinct characteristics and backgrounds whereas there was not enough ground to qualify for patterns established yet when it was an era of Asian migration. As explored in the earlier chapter, Asian migrant discourse was formed around the fact that they were different from other European migrants. As another very different group emerges, the extent the earlier study found about other groups can be retested in light of establishing new facts. Lastly the apparent sense of panic or urgency displayed in the discourse around African refugee settlement at the pivotal point of neo-liberalism ideology casts an interesting contrasts that some of the research themes rest on. It is about the question whether the difference is mainly perceived in terms of African refugee’s inherent cultural or life experience difference, or of imagined and propagated perception that the Australian public developed about the potential impact that African refugees might bring into such a neo liberal mode of communities.

In this chapter, analysis of the data collected from the 20 interviews with the community leaders and service providers is presented. In the process of analysis of the interviews, key themes emerged, as some areas were frequently mentioned by the interviewees as significant factors affecting emerging African communities and the effective delivery of settlement services. The data gathered provided insight into settlement of African refugee communities and how the construction of a refugee discourse affected their settlement. The discussion,
based on the key themes, uses the knowledge of the research participants to explore how technologies of government are exercised in the government funded services and how power and a refugee discourse is imposed through such technologies.

**Theme 1: Funding**

The first theme that emerged from the data was the issue of ‘funding’. Throughout interviews with community leaders and settlement service providers, it was evident that funding had made a significant impact on the formulation of settlement policies and the delivery of settlement services. The majority of respondents in the service providers’ cohort agreed that there was an ever-increasing funding-driven approach in the sector which was intensified after removing core funding for DIAC funded organisations. It was also evident that there was a strong preference to utilise large charities as service providers under the Howard government, an approach that was identified by the respondents as a major milestone in the delivery of settlement services. The following summary of the status of the organisations represented in the study shows the significance of funding arrangements in terms of service delivery and the impact of a refugee discourse on emerging African communities.

Apart from the government agencies’ employees, most respondents stated that their organisations were currently receiving, or have received, local, state or federal government funds. The amount of monies received for services represented in this study varied from two thousand dollars to over a million dollars. The portion of the settlement service project fund in their overall organisational budget also varied significantly from 60 per cent to 100 per cent. Overall, the larger the community organisation, the more diverse its funding sources were.

One large charity organisation had made internal arrangements to subsidise the settlement service component within the organisation through contributions from a private trust and in-kind managerial support. For medium to larger organisations there had been a noticeable change in the composition of funds, where a shift away from a multicultural services related portfolio to family services was increasingly evident. Most small ethno-specific organisations represented in the study received local council funding or a very small federal government grant, such as volunteer grants or Harmony Day celebration grants. Some ethno-specific organisations also received funds from their country of origin through embassies in Australia. Some of the activities funded through overseas governments overlapped with activities covered under settlement services. In this case, there were no particular funding rounds for
these types of overseas government funds, however, they were usually subjected to acquittal. There was a huge discrepancy in the amount of funding between generalist organisations and small ethno-specific organisations. In this study of the impact of the refugee discourse on emerging African communities, the fact that the funding was identified as the most significant factor before other issues, implied that a neo-liberal reality had emerged as a dominant discourse, which determines government policies and operations of government funded community services. This prioritisation was supported by the Department of Immigration and Citizenship in the ‘Report of the Review of Settlement Service for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants’

> There has been a whole-of-government shift towards an outputs/outcomes framework associated with other significant changes in public management such as competitive contracting and tendering, contestability, market testing, and benchmarking (DIMIA 2003).

This statement is an indication of changing government policy that indicates the funding arrangement for settlement policy will be done in line with the broader government’s public management policy. More evidence will be presented throughout this section for the current ‘funding driven’ approach of the sector and how it fits into a neo-liberal reality as an underlying government rationality.

**The SGP fund**

The Settlement Grant Program (SGP) was introduced on July 1, 2004, following a review of settlement services by the Australian government. The fund aims to deliver services that assist eligible clients to become self-reliant and to participate equitably within Australian society as soon as possible after their arrival. The SGP funding is provided on a project basis and offered for periods of one, two or three years (DIAC, 2006).

Under the SGP over 34 million dollars was awarded in 2008-2009, an increase of 9.6 per cent from the previous year (DIAC, 2011). Over the period, approximately less than 5 per cent of new applications were recommended (DIAC, 2011).
The SGP grant is the primary source for the Australian government to assist newly-arriving migrants and humanitarian entrants to Australia. It is estimated that there are approximately 200 SGP-funded positions in community organisations and local governments (DIAC, 2011).

The interviews revealed that settlement service providers understood that the government budget and level of funding for refugees and humanitarian entrants is limited. It was a strong view that the currently low level of funding level is not justifiable when compared to government spending on border controls and management of detention centres. The settlement policy clearly indicates the government’s rationalisation on refugee issues and settlement. It presupposes government’s role and responsibility in assisting newly arriving refugees and humanitarian entrants after offering refugee places. The policy recognises needs for both the government’s agenda and target groups’ prompt independence.

The concern about inadequate amount spent on the SGP was widely expressed by the service providers in this study. The SGP funds are strictly project-based, meaning that any organisation under a contractual obligation to deliver settlement programs did not receive any portion (previously known as ‘core funding’) for administration expenses. Organisations received project grants that contain the administration components in the grant awarded to the project. The removal of this core funding was the most contentious issue (CRC, 2006), when DIAC released the ‘Report of the Review of Settlement Services for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants’ in 2003.

The usual SGP project consists of three components: (i) direct client service delivery; (ii) community capacity building; and (iii) integrated service planning. The major component of direct client service delivery is casework. In terms of cost, casework and integrated service planning do not incur significant project costs apart from salary costs. However it is difficult to conduct these activities without appropriate levels of budgets. Community capacity building refers to activities intended to empower target groups systematically through organised training sessions, community events, fundraising, mentoring leadership courses and initiating social enterprises to enable small and emerging communities to assist their new arrivals. According to DIAC statistics, this service declined sharply throughout 2008-2009 compared to previous years (DIAC, 2011). DIAC’s views of the SGP represent how governmentalities have been used around refugee issues and the program. The program is an acknowledgement of welfare provision as a responsibility of the state. Exercising a Western welfare state tradition, the government has been assigned a responsibility to provide a
government service, which is, in this case, to ensure that the settlement process of newly arriving refugees is easy and smooth (DIAC, 2003). At the same time this provides new power to the state. The government is now responsible for the successful settlement of newly arrived refugees and humanitarian entrants and newly arrived refugees and humanitarian entrants are subject to government control and policy through the implementation of settlement policy. The government has power to impose Australian norms and values on refugees and educate them to become good citizens. The settlement policy clearly describes its aim which is to assist the new arrivals to become a part of ‘mainstream community’ (DIAC, 2003). Welfare is a new field where the authority of experts has new roles in defining relations between politics and management of economic and social affairs of individuals (Rose 1991, p.48). As Jakubowicz (1984) also pointed out, Australian ethnicity or multicultural affairs policy provide politicians with an opportunity to mediate and defuse class conflict while refugee issues become politicised. This is an example of how any governing power constantly rationalises the excise of its power and, at the same time have the population subject to its power. Settlement services, as a part of government’s welfare service provision, is a means to justify the extension of government control to new arrivals as well as a way to defuse any tension that may arise. Successful settlement of new arrivals is a practical accomplishment that the government can claim.

The program at the same time inherits a liberal mode of government which aims to work through a community of independent persons as a practical accomplishment of the government (Hindess 1996, p72). Numerous references have been made in the policy for ‘independence’ and ‘self reliance’ of the target communities by conforming to the Australian norms and values (DIAC, 2003).

The removal of ‘core funding’

As mentioned previously Migrant resource centres (MRC) and migrant service agencies (MSA) have been the main service outlets for settlement services since the 1980s. Recommendation 43 is the key recommendation made in the “Report of the Review of Settlement Services for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants”. It states:

That, within two to three years, MRC/MSA core funding be combined with CSSS core funding, with all grants applicants to compete for one, two or three year funding to meet service delivery needs identified through needs based planning processes.
Core funding refers to financial contributions from DIMIA under individual service agreements that cover the general operational and administrative costs of the agency, such as rent, rates, and staff salaries for coordinators and administrative assistants. Prior to 2003, MRCs received core funding as determined by the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs. However, this funding was removed following Recommendation 43 (see reasons below). DIAC identified that the core funding model posed a barrier to making improvements in service delivery for intended clients.

Core funding obscures the cost of delivering outcomes and can divert funding from settlement service activity to administration of other services. A portion of core funding effectively subsidies management and overheads associated with delivery of a range of services to a clientele that goes beyond the settlement services target groups. *(Report of Review of Settlement Services for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants, 2003, DIAC).*

Another rationale was to ensure that more than a third of total community grants was spent on core funding. Despite the number of consultations and submissions, the review claimed to be biased, admitting that the decision to align broadly with shifts in the management of Commonwealth programs has been operating from an outputs/outcomes framework since 1998. Stakeholders who have been consulted generally supported core funding of MRCs *(Report of Review of Settlement Services for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants, DIAC, 2003, p.238).*

James, a SGP worker from a migrant resource centre stated that:

*It is not only MRC core funding, these days there is no grant that sufficiently funds an administration portion. It is a start of vicious cycle. Services apply for as many funding applications as they can put their hands on in a hope to achieve economies of scale for the organisations. They end up running poor projects at the sacrifice of quality of client service (James Burke, 19/09/2010).*

Service providers who commented on the removal of core funding invariably stated that as a result things became harder. There was not a single response that suggested that the removal actually promoted better resource allocation or improved service.
**Impact of new funding policy**

When a new funding policy for settlement services was flagged prior to 2006, many organisations feared they would not survive. According to Mr Khan, a community leader who served a community for over 30 years, the removal of core funding restricted community capacity-building and took away opportunities to grow as an organisation. He remembered a time when there was a Grant in Aid in the 1980s instead of the SGP.

*The name of the current SGP was changed from Grant in Aid (GIA) to Community Settlement Service Scheme (CSSS) and then to Settlement Grant Program (SGP). Although the amount of fund was smaller than SGP, GIA had more flexibility and it targeted more towards organisational growth. The government responded to a variety of community initiatives and activities. As funding is linked to projects without core funding support, it is harder for ethnic communities to achieve organisational growth while meeting the requirements of a project (Mr Khan, 09/10/2010)*

Mr Khan expressed a view that, because services are more specialized, there is a need for professional staff, whereas in the past, a great deal of community services were delivered by volunteers. As a result, additional money was spent on the cost of the project rather than on salaries. Under the current arrangement, with more experienced staff being paid high salaries, there is less money to spend on actual projects. Established organisations encourage staff to take training, often fee paying courses or seminars during the funded period. Therefore, by the time the cost of rent, administration, IT support and training fees are deducted, many SGP workers end up with minimal funds to spend on the project for the whole year, sometimes as little as $20-30 per week. The study revealed that this type of budgeting results in a situation where SGP-funded organisations have to apply for additional funding to maintain operational expenses.

Moreover, most African community organisation representatives and leaders who were interviewed in this research were from small and emerging communities in a financially unstable situation. Only one service provider from an established ethnic community group stated that he could not complain about the current funding granted to his organisation compared with other community groups reflecting a discrepancy in funding between new and established communities. For example, small African communities lacked the funding to
provide the necessary organisational infrastructures. Without an effective organisational structure, organisations struggle. According to the research participants, in organising community gatherings and events, it was difficult to convince the community of the capacity of leadership. Jok Martin, a young Sudanese community leader said in the interview that his group no longer receives any funding because group leaders are too busy to put forward funding applications and they do not receive information regarding available funding. According to him there was a time that everyone was very enthusiastic.

*The community was very excited about receiving small grants from the government. However it did not take long until they realised that when the project was finished, there was not much left in the community, no community infrastructure, no community assets whatsoever.*

(Jok Martin, 12/12/2010)

The adverse impact of the new policy was evident from data in this study. A SGP worker stated that the most serious issue arising was that there was no scope to take a holistic approach to the root causes of barriers for successful settlement. The majority of refugees and humanitarian entrants faced issues related to employment and education. These issues were not a major part of DIAC’s direct portfolio, as responsibility for employment and education lay with the Department of Education, Employment Science and Training (DEEWR). However, it was evident that settlement services needed to be coordinated with relevant departments. With its current level, SGP did not allow much scope to take an interdepartmental approach.

Lisa, a SGP worker at a medium size charity organisation revealed that

*Employment and education are areas that require significant levels of investment. With the current level of funding from DIAC it is impossible to address the issues. It is rather tokenistic. Look at the social enterprise initiative. The government has been very enthusiastic in promoting social enterprise hoping that it will provide immediate solutions to the economic recession and unemployment. Grant consultants are strong advocates for social enterprise now. Although it sounds innovative and DIAC wants to do it, the methodology is ad hoc.*

(Lisa, 17/01/2011)
Under the current DIAC services of SGP, IHSS and post-IHSS, the issues could only be addressed partially and sporadically. The NSW Audit report (2012) pointed out a lack of capacity with Community Relations Commission, which is a lead government agency in NSW, in planning and coordinating NSW agencies in essential service areas. The report (2012) also criticised the Commission’s inability to play any role in coordinating services with federal government agencies. As a strategy to deal with unemployment, particularly at the beginning of the financial recession in 2009, the department strongly encouraged social enterprise. The supported activities of social enterprise included identifying feasible social enterprise structures and assisting the establishment of social enterprise. Nonetheless, within SGP scope, virtually no resources were available for such developments. Although social enterprise may be appealing and DIAC desired to encourage it, its implementation was not feasible.

The scarcity of resources, combined with a lack of funding opportunity, resulted in difficulties with finance for most small organisations. The impact of this trickled down to the everyday operation of the organisations. When the SGP fund from DIAC was not available, according to the community leaders interviewed, small community groups would look for alternative state government grants, local council grants or other community funds such as Community Development and Support Expenditure (CDSE). The research participants also revealed that these small projects are more suitable for established communities because the contribution to building community infrastructure or the establishment of organisational structures was not significant. According to Patricia who is a community development worker with extensive experience as a SGP worker, the efficacy of small grants is not clear. She stated that:

*For funding bodies, including local governments, the funding has developed into a compromise to overcome pressure and produce certain outcomes without the required level of investment. At this level, rather than create major changes in partnership with communities, the aim was to satisfy as many community groups as possible. Furthermore, there is criticism of how the grants were allocated. If a funding body is to choose between 10 recipients each receiving $10,000 and 100 recipients each receiving $1000, the funding bodies will choose 100 recipients* (Patricia, 02/02/2011).

Ibrahim, a Lakemba based African community leader expressed a view that the best chance they have in receiving funding is when it is linked to projects that the community identified
as less important, but when the government identified it as a high priority. This then became a political and symbolic process. Mr Ram, a community leader from an emerging South East Asian community remarked on the funding policy:

*I am ridiculed by my community when I suggest a community harmony event to my people. They do not understand. When more than half the community is out of work without adequate housing, community harmony is not a priority. However this is the only government funding we can get here in Lakemba.*

(Mr Ram, 15/11/2010)

It was the general view of research participants that desperate community groups apply for grants thinking that it is better than nothing, but they soon realised it was not sufficient to bring about any substantial change or to employ any staff who have the necessary skills to run community projects and empower target communities. It had not contributed to building any community infrastructure. The harmony projects act as a technology of government to serve governments’ agenda. For governments it is a way of reorganising problems of the ‘other’. The self promotion by the government on diversity paradoxically shifts focuses and takes opportunities away from more urgent issues related to successful settlement.

Based on the interviews it is clear that the funding policy for settlement services posed a number of serious material constraints. Under the current funding policy, service organisations have to rely on project based funds which do not recognise the needs to establish a sustainable organisational structure. There is an implied assumption that funded organisations already have a sound and stable financial and administrative system that can support the successful implementation of proposed projects. Except for a very small number of large non-secular charitable organisations, the research found that this is not the case. On the contrary the current funding system had created a situation where many service organisations had to apply for a number of funds and run projects in order to collectively recover their administrative costs and continue to run the organisation. In particular, community organisations from small and emerging communities faced strong competition with other service organisations and failed to engage in community capacity building in a systematic way. Unfortunately without adequate organisational capacity in place, the projects that are run by these communities were less likely to succeed, thus further disadvantaging
them from applying for larger grants that could provide opportunities to establish better organisational structures. The prevailing funding structure had the detrimental effect of taking services’ focus away from clients to stakeholders and funding bodies. In reality in the absence of systematic support for organisations, meeting the clients’ needs with projects becomes a means to earn funds, through which the funded organisations were sustained.

According to Foucault (1990) power is not owned by a specific institution. Power circulates in the form of discourse. Power is the overall effect of strategic positioning. Power invests in those who ‘do not have it’. It is transmitted by them and through them (Rainbow, 1984, p.174). The research found that many issues in the settlement service centred around funding and complex arrangements that were made among stakeholders for the implementation of funded projects. Funding was a key factor determining the position of each player, therefore understanding how the funds were allocated was very important. The interviews revealed wide discrepancies between target communities’ priority and funding bodies’ priority. There was no funding available that targeted communities simply to identify their needs and address those needs. All funding came with a set of criteria and priorities that was set out by funding bodies to achieve prescribed funding goals. This had an impact on resources being directed to organisations that could carry out funding bodies’ preferred priorities not necessarily the most disadvantaged communities. Despite the government’s consistent promotion of self reliance, this fundamentally impeded community development of target communities. As a result target communities ended up with assisting funding bodies’ priorities, which often aligned with a political agenda, leaving them without the power to determine how funding should support their interests.

The popular ‘community harmony’ project for instance was the government’s early intervention strategy for any racial tension. It was not a new refugees’ priority but the host society’s imagined priority. It was questionable whether DIAC had had an appropriate evaluation mechanism in place for its claim that the old funding model had not promoted efficiency in service delivery. The review did not have information on measures that were used to reach conclusions about the inefficiency of funded organisations. However interviews with service providers revealed that already heavily government funds dependent service providers had no choice but to accept whatever was offered in order to sustain the financial viability of community organisations. The case of changed funding arrangements illustrated how governmentality provided a site where individuals and the states sought each other out through ‘technologies of self’ and ‘technologies of domination’, which led to legitimisation
of institutionalising discourse as power (Lemke, 2000). The natural desire of the target communities to build community capacity was reciprocated by the government’s response to inject funds. Nevertheless terms and conditions were determined by expertise manifested in subjectifying practices through procedures, programmes and apparatuses. Here techniques of the self were integrated into structures of coercion and domination (Foucault, 1993).

**Theme 2: Relationships with funding bodies**

At the centre of Foucault’s conceptualisation of power and technologies of (1990,1991), there are complex interrelationships that define strategic positioning of key players. It is through these interrelationships that a structure is constructed, in which power is invested. In the system of settlement service delivery it was also through the interrelationships of stakeholders that a system of service delivery was defined and maintained. The following will examine the relations between funded organisations and funding bodies.

**Grant consultant**

A relationship with a funding body cannot be simply defined as a relationship between the funding organisation and the funded organisation. Generally, government funding bodies have grant consultants who liaise with a funded organisation, monitor funded projects and on some occasions, collect information from target communities in relation to matters beyond settlement. Typically one grant consultant manages multiple grants across a number of funded organisations. According to funded organisations interviewed, grant consultants were the face of the Department and a person with a great deal of influence. Also arising from the research, it was found that funded organisations mostly had good relationships with grant consultants and felt positive about their existence. Patricia, an experienced SGP worker commented on grant consultants:

*We have had some nice ones. Some of them are quite sympathetic. They cannot change things but it is still nice to have someone with better understanding*

*(Patricia, 02/02/2011)*

Nevertheless, opinions were divided about the roles the grant consultants played. Often, grant consultants had more contact with funded organisations, which provided them with an opportunity to understand and be sympathetic towards the funded organisation’s activities.
Nevertheless, compared to the heavy influence they had on the management of projects, their ability to effectively monitor the project was limited. Usually grant consultants monitored how many information sessions were held and how many people attended during the reporting period according to the details in the funding agreement. According to the research participant Patricia, consultants’ assessment of the project was solely based on two written reports and two interviews, although the frequency of reporting changed slightly over the years. Also some monitoring interviews took place over the telephone. There was no existing mechanism for grant consultants to get feedback from service users of funded projects.

According to the interviews many grant consultants had very limited experience or interactions with refugees. There were community liaison positions in the Department of Immigration, but their role was to collect general information from communities with no particular regard to the settlement service. A part-time SGP worker working with a small and emerging communities project revealed that she had never met the grant consultant. She said it was always the management of her organisation that dealt with the grant consultant. Furthermore, she had never had an opportunity to communicate with the grant consultant directly. Some SGP workers interviewed tended to express a negative viewpoint that the relationship with the consultant was limited to the progress of work programs and the worker felt that no feedback was sought outside the work program. They said that the work program had been the only focus. Any feedback, apart from the work program, was hardly noticed. Usually funded organisations received their instalment payment from the grant for the next quarter upon the approval of the grant consultants. The grant consultants played a significant role in negotiating work programs. They provided a list of recommended activities for target communities and finalised the contracts after negotiating with the funded organisations. In the absence of real knowledge about community work and the appropriate evaluation mechanisms, the existence of grant consultants and their roles were difficult to justify. It is suggested that the grant consultants exist mainly to manage the stakeholder relationships and the target communities. The research participants revealed that in the absence of more established evaluative tools, which are more reflective of the impact of services on the target communities, the delivery of settlement service could be framed in accordance with the ‘stability’ of the stakeholder relationships. In the absence of direct communication or exchange of information between the funding body and the target communities, many of the assumptions that were made were based on a dominant discourse. The ‘popularity’ of
harmony projects provided an example of how community needs were defined by dominant discourses.

**Bureaucracy**

It was unclear from the interviews whether any clear difference existed between the bureaucratic process and the political process as a hindrance to effective settlement service delivery because in many cases, both discourses appeared combined. It was evident from the research, especially in government organisations, that different levels of hierarchy, functional divisions and organisational structures presented major challenges to the effective delivery of settlement services. Patricia, a SGP worker with extensive experience in the sector made the following observations:

*There are many people who understand the activities of target communities within a government state office, however, as it moves up to the National Office in Canberra, key decisions are made by those who have less exposure to target communities. The Minister for the Department of Immigration and Citizenship can have a different view from the rest of the Canberra office. Therefore, what he chooses to do is subject to a higher political power and budgetary approval. The policy is a top-down approach. Grant consultants have little power to make a difference. Their influence is limited to a specific grant they monitor. The new SGP application is one example where significant changes were made, causing it to be very confusing. It is obvious that both the Canberra office and state office do not know what they have done. It is a change made for the sake of change. The Canberra office, which has no contact with grassroots, is responding to its new parliament secretary. It is a juggling act where the Canberra office is caught in the middle. Due to the need to include of the inputs made through the state office, as well as meet the needs of the minister when developing its strategy. The state office, which has better contact with the community, is constantly under pressure. Even the minister is limited if the government and caucus policy is to keep asylum seekers out. At service provider forums, it has been repeatedly expressed that rigid bureaucracy and a lack of flexibility of the DIAC implement policy concerning payment procurement has caused small organisations financial restrictions when starting a new funding period.*
The above statement indicated that there was a compromise somewhere in the system between genuine needs of target communities and policy decisions made based purely on the political climate of the time. Power is excised from top to bottom and it is difficult to prove the failure of adopted policies when the responsibilities of an individual as a self reliant new citizen is so highly emphasised.

The NSW Auditor General’s report ‘Settling Humanitarian Entrants in NSW’ (2012) criticised CRC’s inability to play any role in the planning and coordination of NSW services for humanitarian entrants. The report contained a response from CRC that denied the majority of responsibilities of such a role stating immigration is the Commonwealth government’s constitutional responsibility.

According to the report;

*New South Wales does not have an overall plan to respond to the settlement needs of current or expected humanitarian entrants. New South Wales does not currently collect or contribute any information to the Commonwealth. In 2005, the NSW GISP (Government Immigration and Settlement Planning Committee) was established to support the NSW Government’s commitment to a coordinated approach to settlement planning. The NSW GISP has not developed a plan that includes the settlement of humanitarian entrants in New South Wales.*

(NSW Auditor General, 2012)

From the report it was revealed that although there was a government’s Immigration and Settlement Planning Committee, whose role was to coordinate federal government and state government’s services, the committee remained largely ineffectual.

Bureaucracy affected small organisations at local levels too. Many small groups had greater dealings with local governments in the area of grants and in accessing local facilities for group activities. The local government employees interviewed in this study revealed that there was a serious mixture of bureaucracy and political favouritism existing at local councils.

*People do not have confidence in councils and how they respond when the small groups raise issues or request support. It appears that they become so frustrated and choose a path via councillors they have associations with.*  

(Angela, 14/02/2011)
According to Angela who was a community development worker in a local government in Western Sydney, bureaucracy and political favouritism created inequality amongst interest groups in the local government area. Decisions were made not according to needs but based on which group made the ‘loudest noise’ and issues were only temporarily addressed at the cost of other groups. According to the findings in this research, the extent to which bureaucracy affected the operation of small groups varied from council to council. Although small in number some local governments discussed during the interviews were found to provide strong support to small groups.

Angela elaborated on bureaucracy at local governments.

Most local governments have a multicultural advisory committee (MAC) which is formed to deal with any matters related to multiculturalism. It is chaired by a councillor and key local stakeholders and ethnic communities are supposed to be represented. It is a main decision making body and usually council has a multicultural officer or community development worker within community service department who sits in the committee meeting and implement decisions. The council agrees on its work program every year and this work program carries significant importance as a measurement of council’s performance and achievement in local multicultural affairs. There is a mandate for a council to apply principles of access and equity and for council’s community services it presents pressure. Due to the low level of staff and resource, it is not feasible for MACs to function as real tool to address the emerging issues other than being symbolic and self congratulatory. Further with council’s influence, it becomes an agenda for the whole network.  

(Angela, 14/02/2011)

Lisa from MRC provided the following insight.

Every funding body has its own policy frames. Interactions with funded organisations are meant to occur within the realm of this framework. Funded organisations cannot say much about the policy framework. They are only allowed to say things that matter to the operation within the framework. Let’s say skilled migrants, the department sets the policy that we cannot assist the skilled migrant then that’s it. The funded organisation cannot change that.

(Lisa, 11/03/2011)
Lisa’s comment above suggests that a funded organisation could not change the policy framework of funding bodies, which is indicative of the reality that the power is unequal between the funded organisations and funding bodies. It illustrates that the relationship is not based on mutual respect and genuine partnership, as described in the policy, but is a hierarchical relationship where funded organisations are subject to funding organisations’ control.

From the research conducted in this study it was evident that, despite the most influential role governments play in the provision of settlement services, through the bureaucratic process the government lacked responsiveness to emerging needs and issues of the target communities. The inability to deal with diverse cases and situations at the coalface of target communities was undermining the effectiveness of the services. Alternatively monitoring and evaluation mechanisms of the government’s performance in running programs through funded organisations were minimal, which will be further discussed in this chapter. Technologies of government are exercised through bureaucracies. The typical characteristics of bureaucracy such as the lack of a timely response, multiple layers of decision making processes and unclear jurisdictions, are useful elements of technologies of government.

**Limited advocacy**

The investigation into the extent that advocacy could occur in the settlement service context was inconclusive. About a half of the service providers believed that there was a structure that did not allow substantial advocacy within the sector, whereas a number of service providers displayed faith in the system and pointed out the lack of effective strategies. The key argument arising from the interviews was that through the funding mechanism, the settlement service sector, as it stands today, functions like a branch of government. They deliver government services with government funds; therefore, it is a naive assumption that a degree of autonomy would be warranted. James Burke was a community development worker with extensive experience both in government and the community sector. He believed “the distinction between the government and community is almost nonexistent”. He further observed:
“Over the last 30 years our sector has become an industry. We provide not only settlement service but jobs for settlement service providers. We do not inherit traditions of social movement anymore. We work on behalf of government. We implement their policies. We are an extension of government or a partner. The implication of this is everyone plays safe. There is no room for being radical and innovative. Because everyone plays safe. We apply for the things that governments identify as priority. Governments are not interested in exploring new ideas but they are rather interested in spending budget well. We are the new class now and we are industrial workers. In Illawarra for example 30 per cent of residents is in the community service sector. At the end of the day the welfare state is still there but now it is transformed. Its function has been transferred to NGO sectors. Now we are a part of system. Real advocacy is very low in priority.” (James Burke, 03/03/11)

Community organisations could maintain autonomy as organisations, but not for the settlement project they deliver on behalf of the government. It was consistent with observations made by interviewees that inter-agencies and networks affiliated with large religious charities are more effective in advocacy. Richard, a senior policy officer in a state government department commented:

I doubt the effectiveness of these forums. There are a lot of discussions. There are a lot of repetitions, maybe because the issues don’t go away. I still hear the same issues I heard five years ago. The networks affiliated with smaller sized organisations do not run steadily. The sector has high turnover of workers. Governments do not fund infrastructure and long term projects. They are outsourcing settlement service to frontline organisations. Strong networks are ones that stay under the umbrella of large organisations. As a result in many occasions networks start from scratch over and over again reinventing wheels every time.

(Richard, 21/03/2011)

The respondents from the service providers group stated that not enough time and resources were available for immediate effective advocacy. However, it was reported that there was a time when not a single word of advocacy was allowed in the work program. ‘Representation’ was used instead which meant being able to inform what the issues were without advocating. According to SGP workers interviewed, currently ‘service advocacy’ is an acceptable term used in the work program. Defining acceptable language in the sector was found to be an
important strategy in terms of constructing a dominant discourse. Denying advocacy was an important technology of government used to monitor the community sector.

Many service providers and community organisations that were represented in this study were NGOs or civil groups that make up civil society in Australia. Barry, Osborne and Rose (1996, p.9) observed that civil society is potentially alignable with political aspirations, contrary to common belief that civil society is somewhat advanced mode of modern democracy. The advocacy role of NGOs was weakened under the Howard government by a process of de-funding and silencing of advocacy from service organisations (Staple, 2006).

Political technologies of government require various institutions to come in and play their parts. As Burchell states:

> It requires expertise to meet the natural social demand for order. It requires for mechanisms to integrate individuals into appropriate schemes of behaviour. The expertise needs to be licensed by the state but formally independent of it (1991, p.142).

According to Burchell the relationship between government and civil society has elements of interdependency. They complement each other. Settlement service workers consisting of social workers and community workers were considered to possess expertise for the target groups, in this case African refugees and humanitarian entrants. They had cultural and linguistic competency to engage with the target communities. Under the current funding system most government funds were applied and assessed based on funding bodies’ perceived needs for target groups. Every applicant had to prove, after eligibility, that there were needs in the target communities. Therefore the needs analysis of the application was considered to be the most important component. As revealed in the interviews the evidence the service providers presented to the funding bodies in order to convince them of the needs of target communities was in most cases anecdotal or based on informal surveys.

> In many cases settlement service workers are assumed to have knowledge about the target group and their needs. This is because in many instances community organisations cannot afford well designed, well thought out surveys with target groups. Questions remain from the interviews that whether those who can answer the survey are truly representative of the target community (Lisa, 17/01/2011)
The government’s decision to fund a proposed project or not was largely determined by this defined ‘need’ along with the organisational capacity of the applying organisations. Such a needs based approach raised two issues. Firstly as elaborated later, the research found that there was no direct communication between the target group and most government funding bodies. The service providers were delegated a role of presenting needs on the target community’s behalf. However, it was unclear what process was involved to legitimise this delegation of needs other than assumptions that settlement service workers accurately know about the community and their issues. It operated under the assumption that service providers would represent the target groups and raise issues on their behalf. There was barely any consideration given to possible conflict of interest between the funded organisations and the target groups, which in fact had significant implication in terms of advocacy capacity of the sector. It is through this process of a grassroots link that civil society had established, that the government could reach out to individuals and “subjectify” them. Settlement service providers passively participated in the subjectification process by providing smooth passage into the target group and desensitised the funding bodies’ agenda. Secondly the approach reinforced the construction of a negative discourse by encouraging a ‘deficit model’ of the target communities. The data from interviews showed that under the funding system the applicant had to prove that the target groups were in need of government intervention. Mr Wong, a young SGP worker revealed his observations about the sector.

*The target group must be described constantly by the expertise of settlement service workers as ‘in need’ and prove their ‘deviation’ from dominant social norm in order to be successful in any government funding. There is little funding awarded based on the strength of a target community. In order to attract resources the target communities need to be presented as ‘at risk’ or in great need of some kinds of intervention.*  
(Wong, 10/12/2010)

As a result the discourse was constructed in a way that African refugees were always takers and Australian society was always a giver and it was continuously required that African refugees maintain such a social identity. Even within the settlement service sector, to the workers who are assumed to have expert knowledge on African refugees, the target communities’ strength was largely irrelevant to the service. The service was built around negativity or problematisation of the service target. This was an important precondition to the current governmentality of settlement policy.
Theme 3: The relationships between ethno-specific organisations and generalist organisations

Governmentality is a process in which the individual and the state seek each other out through ‘technologies of self’ and ‘technologies of domination’ that leads to the legitimisation of institutionalising discourse as power (Lemke, 2000). The inter-relationships between African refugee communities and funding bodies, which are governments, and the funded services in between has emerged as a key context for the interviews in this study. Reciprocity between each organisation formed a basis for ‘technologoies’, through which governmentality existed.

The relationship between ethno-specific organisations and generalist organisations illustrated how the Foucauldian concept of technologies of government could be applied to settlement services through ‘technologies of self’, which requires involvement of ethno-specific organisations and ‘technologies of domination’, and in turn the involvement of generalist organisations. The prescribed aim of the settlement service, which was to empower target communities so that they could be independent and self-reliable, is undermined by government policy that opted for larger established generalist services for the delivery of services. A number of technologies of government were identified, which legitimised dominance of government through funded organisations and subjugation of the target communities to the funded organisations. This trend had accelerated over the years, the most recent SGP funding round in 2011 encouraged more larger organisations to take up projects for ethno specific organisations while creating barriers for smaller organisations to apply successfully remain difficult (DIAC 2011).

Lisa, a SGP worker pointed out:

*MRCs are generalist service providers and not mainstream organisations. There is a significantly lesser number of MRCs now. That is because many MRCs have changed their names due to the Public Benevolence Institution (PBI) status. (Lisa, 17/01/2011)*

It was evident that it was harder to get PBI status with the MRC in name because the name implied migrant services only whereas with PBI, applicants had to prove to be beneficial for the wider general public. Names such as “multicultural service” or “diversity service” were used instead. This reflected urgency for services to diversify funding sources to stabilise their finances. MRCs and similar services appeared to be a bridge between ethno-specific
organisations and mainstream organisations. This was based on the perception that most of MRC services were designed to assist new migrants and refugees to access mainstream services. In their role, MRCs delivered much of the services that ethno-specific organisations were supposed to deliver. The research revealed that many ethno-specific organisations were small and did not have the capacity to do what it was required. Some mainstream human service organisations delivered settlement services as well, such as Anglicare, Red Cross or The Smith Family. In this research, however, MRCs are classified as generalist organisations as the size of the organisation is important in the discussion of the relationships between ethno specific organisations and generalist organisations and MRCs are distinctly different from small ethno specific organisations in that regard, particularly small and emerging African community organisations.

**Role of ethno specific organisations**

The majority of service providers stated in the study that if ethno-specific organisations had more capacity, they would serve ethnic communities better. There was one respondent in the service provider’s cohort who dismissed the possible contribution of the ethno-specific organisations on the basis that they had inherited a number of characteristics which made it impossible for them to run democratically. Other than that, there was shared understanding about the important role that ethno-specific organisations could potentially play. An observation was made by Mr Ram who served his community for over 30 years, including 10 years as a management committee member of a local MRC. He asserted that:

> *The government must weigh up the advantages and disadvantages of engaging with small ethno-specific organisations. When running a government campaign or project, ethno-specific groups have presented more efficient and cost effective solutions, for example, in the area of information dissemination involving relative low risk activities. Given adequate training, working with ethno-specific organisations will become effective because networks can communicate information more extensively and effectively.*

(Mr Khan, 09/10/2010)

Toby, a client service worker at a generalist service who has face to face interactions with migrant and refugee clients said with confidence:

> *Clients of course feel more welcomed and appreciate more when served by people from the same cultural background. Let’s take an example of mental*
health which is a huge issue in the community now. There is a massive barrier for CALD communities to access mental health service. This sort of issue can only be appropriately addressed by ethno specific organisations. I get phone calls from people every day when the specific worker clients look for is not available so if I suggest someone else then they are not interested.

(Toby, 17/01/2011)

It was recognised that ethno-specific organisations served their own communities only, however, there was also a need for an organisation to carry out collective advocacy on behalf of all ethnic communities. Nevertheless, the ability of an ethno-specific organisation to organise such collective advocacy was limited. Also, it is an assumption to believe that everyone in ethno-specific communities wants to be served by ethno-specific organisations. Tony added that although small in numbers there were people who prefer a support worker from a different language or cultural background mainly due to the fear that people in the community would find out about the client’s case and gossip.

Department policy

Recent statistics about SGP grants recipients strongly indicate that the government is ‘phasing out’ ethno-specific organisations (DIAC, 2012). By examining the current discourse of DIAC, it can be understood that this was a result of a policy that has been adopted by the Department of Immigration. It was therefore evident that less and less ethno specific organisations are funded every year. The average funding duration for ethno-specific organisations has been reduced to one year whereas the average funding duration for large generalist organisations, in most cases, was increased to three years. The Community Relations Commission for Multicultural NSW has a funding program called, the ‘Community Development Program’, which was designed specifically to assist community groups with community development. CRC focused more on ethno-specific organisations therefore the grant presented a perfect opportunity to them. However the grant has a set maximum amount of around $17500 for most ethno-specific organisations. The majority of groups received less than that. Some of them received as little as $3000-$4000 per year. The number of recipients was also small. These amounts were by no means sufficient to contribute towards creating community infrastructure. The change was attributed to the poor governance and accountability standard of small ethno-specific organisations. During the interviews
community leaders from the small ethno-specific organisations were somewhat diplomatic as they carefully acknowledged the benefit they had had from their relationships with large generalist organisations. Nevertheless Abduali from an African community in Lakemba protested about the unfairness that:

*There are small organisations that are being well managed and there are cases where large generalist organisations have had poor financial management too. Everyone starts from a small organisation.*

(Abdulai, 07/03/2011)

It was generally agreed by the service providers that many small and emerging ethno-specific organisations did have issues with transparency and accountability in financial management whereas more established ethno-specific organisations with a longer history of managing government funding display a higher level of understanding of the importance of financial management capacity and practice, even with the private funding they receive. It appeared that an effective management committee consisted of community members from a wide spectrum, including accountants and bookkeepers who were essential to ensuring a high level of accountability. However, for small organisations with committee members in the process of settling into Australia, unemployed and inexperienced with community service, it was common that these organisations lacked appropriate governance structures. The majority of groups represented by leaders in the research usually had a structure consisting of a couple of key leaders who had become informal office bearers. There were several active members who had taken up the role of management committee members. Members with higher literacy skills usually ended with taking on a role of secretary or treasurer.

There was concern expressed by the leaders in the interview that the stability of small organisations would be challenged and that the ability to provide consistent service and plan for long-term projects would be severely constrained. An example was given that previously, a small organisation was closed down as a result of financial mismanagement by a larger mentoring organisation. The interview participants from both leaders and service providers agreed that mentorship between small and large organisations would certainly enable many small organisations to work more effectively. Therefore, guidance and support were encouraged in the sector, working at odds with the technologies of government through funding that clearly resulted in reducing actual support in small and emerging communities.
Competition over resources

The relationship between ethno-specific and generalist organisations was found to be complex. There were varying degrees of trust by ethno-specific organisations towards generalist organisations, depending on factors such as ethnicity, gender and the number of years in operation. The levels of dependency and development phases also affected the perception of generalist services. For instance, newly established groups tended to depend heavily on the support of generalist organisations, whereas there was more tension and complex dynamics existing between established organisations and generalist services. Some of the organisations, that had started as ethno-specific organisations, such as Co as It (Italian community) and CASS (Chinese community), had become large and run many programs, particularly in aged care. These services used non ethno specific names in order to run programs targeting other ethnic communities as encouraged by government policy. A similar pattern was displayed between ethno-specific organisations and other mainstream service providers, such as local councils. The interviewees in the community leader’s cohort indicated that larger and independently established community groups perceive MRCs positively or neutrally. The analysis into the current funding policy allowed an understanding of the delicate nature of the interdependent relationship between the two parties. Some relationships had grown to partnerships and some had not. When an attempt to form a partnership did not go smoothly, dissatisfaction was expressed. In recent years, some African groups raised concern that they were the reason that generalist and mainstream services were granted funding. Group leaders did not believe they were not getting the service they want. In the interviews some African community leaders expressed the view that their agenda has been taken over by service providers after consultation. In some cases, their discontent and frustration toward the MRC and multicultural services were expressed by discontinuing the relationship and ‘boycotting’ the service. It was evident amongst settlement service providers that both tension and collaboration existed between MRCs and ethno-specific organisations – and it was intensifying. The DIAC’s statistics on SGP funded organisations illustrated a trend that suggested that ethno-specific organisations were losing out.

In an interview, Bruce Chan, an operations manager from an established ethno-specific organisation explained how ethno-specific organisations were losing out under the funding structure, not only with DIAC, but with most government funding bodies.
Mainstream service providers have advantages such as a well built network or proven record of financial management capability. Ethno-specific organisations from small and emerging communities were unlikely to receive the DIAC SGP fund. Only established ethno-specific organisations that represent early settled communities will succeed in receiving SGP funding. (Bruce Chan, 01/04/2011)

Bruce made a point that SGP funding is targeting new settlers who have stayed in Australia for less than five years while the funding was granted to established ethno-specific organisations with a longer history.2 This indicated that small and emerging communities would not be able to deliver SGP services. They could only be clients. DIAC had clearly defined its project target, which is to achieve self reliance within five years of settlement. As earlier settled communities grow older, they faced emerging issues such as aged care. DIAC did not recognise aged care as a relevant service under SGP except for providing service information and referrals. Most SGPs targeted young migrants and refugees. The responsibility of aged care related services was being shifted to state governments and DIAC urged ethno specific organisations to diversify their funding sources to meet the diversifying needs of the community. According to Bruce, the state government had adopted a policy that discouraged the provision of aged care services by small ethno specific organisations, preferring the service to be provided by large mainstream organisations or a number of ethno-specific communities through a consortium arrangement. The justification from the funding body was that this model promotes multiculturalism and enables selection of reliable service providers that could deliver efficient services with minimum risk.

When a consortium arrangement is negotiated, often small communities are only used to strengthen the application, but when funding is received, the small ethno-specific group’s share is insignificant compared to the administrative costs the organisation has to bear.

(Bruce Chan, 01/04/2011)

Bruce expressed a strong dissatisfaction with the process. The disparity within ethno-specific organisations had also been documented in other interviews. For example leaders from small organisations stated that even within the same ethno-specific organisation, the support to larger ethno-specific organisations was disproportionate to what smaller ones received. Bruce

---

2 In 2012 several established communities including Chinese, Indonesia and Korean community organisations also lost SGP funds.
believed it was their political power that matters in the process, not necessarily the needs. Despite the complex relationships detailed above, most respondents agreed MRCs are well placed to help small organisations. The contribution made by MRCs in terms of providing a ‘hands on’ service was well recognised and respected by all respondents.

**Accountability and transparency**

In today’s climate, most government funding bodies place a greater emphasis on accountability of funded projects and financial management (Houlbrook, 2011). A lack of accountability was the most common cause for defunding or unsuccessful applications to government funds. Accountability has been an issue not only confined to small organisations, but has affected many large organisations as well, according to the Review of Settlement Services (2003). Nevertheless, the recent development of Department of Immigration and Citizenship policy to support large organisations over small ethnic organisations indicated that small ethno-specific organisations would be further disadvantaged when competing with mainstream or generalist service providers. As a result, their organisational growth has been hindered. The widespread issue of accountability among small organisations was well known in the community service sector. Malpractice takes various forms, ranging from an absence of bookkeeping records to embezzlement. From the interviews it was revealed that most small community leaders understand the importance of accountability and the emphasis that funding bodies place on it. However, interviews with some community leaders and service providers revealed a number of reasons why they could not have good accountability practices in place. Firstly, records of expenditure made with the project fund must be kept. Bintu was a leader in one of the African women’s groups. The group ran many activities for its members such as a sewing class and a literacy class. Bintu in her interview revealed that:

> When we organise an event, everyone is involved and roles are assigned to members. For example, when catering for a community function, people are required to buy the ingredients, cook the food, transport the food to the venue and serve it up. Often community members buy ingredients at a small local grocery shop in our community where the giving of a receipt is not standard practice. When a bookkeeper requests all the receipts after the event, the participating members realise that some are missing. (Bintu, 20/12/2010)

Secondly, most small organisations had a basic financial accounting system for internal use among members. However, in order to meet government requirements and to be eligible for
additional government funding, community groups required proper financial reporting, which generally needed to be certified by a CPA. New organisations, in particular women’s organisations, lacked networks and found this requirement difficult and resource intensive. Thirdly, information on legal and financial requirements for incorporated associations was difficult to comprehend for most small organisations and their members. Even professional community workers found it difficult to understand what was required with GST, BAS and other financial reporting requirements used for different thresholds. Every time they received mail from the Australian Taxation Office or Office of Fair Trading, they became frustrated. Fourthly, producing and publishing annual reports was a task beyond the scope of expertise of a small organisation. Annual reports are standardised legal requirements requested by the government and most funding bodies, however, as Bintu’s comments indicate, small organisations with a limited relationship between stakeholders and potential funding bodies did not feel the need for annual reports because they felt that everyone in the community and its members already knew what had been achieved throughout the year. Documenting and submitting the activities in an annual report was a difficult task for community groups because the majority of its members were not confident in the written English language, and even illiterate in many women’s groups. Also under the SGP, there is some provision for training community leaders and management committee members on accountability and transparency. This type of training was also offered by the NSW Office of Fair Trading. The efficacy of these courses is in doubt because it does not take into account the varied skill levels of target groups. They take the form of an information seminar lasting approximately two hours where presenters disseminate the relevant information. An information seminar does not assist target groups because their main reason for not producing reports is that they do not possess the knowledge nor do they have the resources to produce the report. Therefore, it would be more beneficial for community groups to be provided assistance in writing reports and desktop publishing, that is, pasting photos and layout. Under the current SGP scope, with limited resources and time allocation, it is not possible to provide that service. The NSW Office of Fair Trading collects and disseminates information but does not recognise community capacity building as part of its role, despite many requests from the communities. Lastly, although governments and funding bodies place an increasing emphasis on accountability and transparency, when a problem occurred within the community, their role was passive. According to participants in this study, when a dispute erupted within organisations, there was no mechanism in place to resolve it other than costly legal litigation, which was not a realistic option for members of small community organisations.
Mentorship and fostering

One of the most serious concerns raised during the interviews centred on the systematic failure to provide an environment where ethno-specific organisations could acquire skills and resources to become fully independent. The community leaders cohort came from a highly varied background, ranging from newly-established African women’s organisations to a well-established ethno-specific organisation with 30 years of history. Despite shared understanding of the well placed position of some of the generalist services including MRCs, most research participants believed that the services perform poorly in the areas of transferring skills and providing mentorship. One African women’s group described a high level of dependency, relying heavily on assistance from a community development worker at the local MRC because they cannot manage themselves. However, the group members were not certain whether there is a transfer of skills taking place. Community groups in the study expressed desire and enthusiasm in building their own capacity and employing community workers from the same linguistic and cultural backgrounds. However it was indicated that they had little knowledge about how to reach that stage. Mr. Khan questioned the efficacy of departmental policy in fostering ethno specific organisations.

I am aware that from the department’s point of view the standard of small ethno specific groups varies significantly whereas larger organisations present safer options, but it is also true that there is a discrepancy among mainstream organisations too. I think it is important to understand not everything in the projects requires professional staff. Despite poor accountability and transparency of small ethno specific organisations, they need to be given roles with acknowledgement that firstly there are less complex issues and projects that small ethno specific organisations can do as well as mainstream organisations, secondly they need to be given opportunities to run projects and gain experiences. It may be a lot more cost effective. (Khan, 09/10/2010)

Data in this study revealed that small organisations’ networks did not go beyond local MRCs and councils, therefore, indicating limited support available to them. Not all ethno-specific groups had links with mainstream or generalist service providers. It was found that some groups had been operating in isolation from the service networks for a long time. The Office of Fair Trading was the first contact point for many community groups in NSW. When
organisations registered, little information was made available to them, apart from a copy of a sample constitution, according to a community leader who has been linked to a local migrant resource centre after his own centre operated for over five years. It was not clear how new groups and the existing service network established connections, however, it was not uncommon that organisations that had operated for five or six years had not heard about local service networks available to them. The community leader described the feeling of swimming in the ocean alone, indicating a serious lack of information and support available to him as a leader. Many service providers were not optimistic about achieving self-reliance as small ethno-specific organisations unless a strong culture of support and mentorship was in place. A service provider raised concerns about a lack of responsiveness and participation in community projects intended to train managers and leaders, and to raise awareness about the organisational capacity causing a failure of effective mentorship and fostering.

Abdulai commented that:

_Every large charity and community organisation started out as small, therefore, it would be very unfair to favour larger organisations without giving smaller groups a chance._ (Abdulai, 07/03/2011)

If any small organisation was funded and simply carried out tasks contracted by the funding bodies without fostering larger organisational capacity, it appeared that they were falling behind. The fund could cease anytime. Adhering to job descriptions and meeting all contractual requirements did not necessarily mean that the funded organisation would develop capacity. This is a direct technology of government exercised by the bureaucracy.

**Community consultations**

‘Community consultation’ is a heavily laden discourse of participation in defining the relationship between ethno-specific organisations and mainstream or generalist organisations. Community consultations are often the first step in the identification of community needs. Under the needs based approach, community consultations legitimised the necessity of projects and provided the justification of expenditure in high need areas. It had been commonly practised in the sector and widely used by various service agencies and research groups. In some instances, conducting community consultations alone qualified as a single activity within a work program. Despite its popularity, it was not an easy task to recruit
participants for consultations to suit the purpose of the consultations. In an interview an experienced IHSS worker pointed out that given the low responsiveness of target communities to community initiatives, he believed the consultations and needs assessment relied on only a small number of samples that did not fully represent the diverse views existing within the community. At the same time, only a few service providers had direct links to target groups. Participants were usually recruited from existing networks or groups, and as a result, the small number of selected samples represents a broad cohort for a variety of purposes. For community leaders, this provided an opportunity to raise issues affecting their communities. The weakness of this process led to community leaders seeing no changes, they felt that their opinions had been ignored. In a worst case scenario, they felt that they had been used. This then adds to a construction of the African refugee discourse, that does not capture actual needs and again affects small emerging African communities without a real voice.

Patricia, a senior SGP worker commented about consultation fatigue:

*African leaders come to me and say “We have been consulted to death and nothing changes”*. (Patricia, 02/02/2011)

It was evident in the interview that the community leaders experienced frustration, partially due to the lack of understanding about the process of consultation and different expectations about how soon their input will be reflected. Without fully understanding the nature of the information and referral service, clients often expect MRCs to become direct providers of goods or expedite access to goods or services, for example, providing affordable housing rather than referring them to other housing service providers (Report of the Review of Settlement Services for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants, 1993, DIAC).

Nevertheless, it appeared to be the case that participants were not given any feedback after consultation. According to Patricia, consultations were held needlessly without any serious consideration about how the input would be channelled. Sometimes, input was compiled into the form of a report and launched, however, it was rare that consultation participants are able read the report and establish a link about how it improved their lives. She added uncertainty about whether the consultations or support groups she ran were for the African communities or service providers.
Yasmine is a MRC staff, from a African refugee background herself, stated:

*The consultation participants believe that when they hear that change is forthcoming, they will be offered assistance. When change does not eventuate or nothing is communicated about what is happening, they lose their trust for MRCs and other service providers. Of course it does not happen at the first instant. Usually those who were invited to consultation are very excited. They genuinely believe they are making difference to their community and feel somewhat honoured. But it doesn’t take long until they realise nothing changes and their life is always same. From that point on it is more of the case that they participate for the consultation organisers whom the people often they get other assistance from.* (Yasmine, 19/03/2011)

Karim, a leader from an African woman’s group who worked with the state government health agency expressed strong distrust towards the health agency they partnered with:

*Sometimes they are not happy to help. I don’t know the reasons. Sometimes we don’t know what to do. We were not born in this country. We don’t know everything. We don’t know the rules. We need someone to tell us what we have to do. But we found they were hiding something. We don’t know why they are hiding knowledge. It is very hard to share opinions and things* (Karim, 16/11/2010)

Views of participants included the belief that community consultations are used by mainstream service providers as a means to impose mainstream values on them. The community leaders revealed that the mainstream sector appears to lack sincerity and cultural sensitivity to take alternative approaches to ensure that target groups feel there is a room for real understanding. Child protection is one example. Child protection was raised as an example, as it has been a contentious area, where many African communities felt resentment about the incompatibility of the system. Jok Martin, a Sudanese youth group leader commented about how community consultation is a one way process.

*We come along much excited and appreciative but eventually it is same everywhere we get to hear “sorry mate! That is just the way it is in Australia. You will just have to learn how things are here. You have to integrate into the Australian society”.*

(Jok Martin, 12/12/2010)
Despite widely expressed consultation fatigue, it is ironic that one African youth leader suggested that more consultations were needed. If governments and service providers are genuinely committed to learning the African way, he asserted that youth leaders and community elders could come together and teach people about the African way. Ambivalence was witnessed in terms of how service providers were perceived by community leaders. Certainly, there was a sense of trust and appreciation towards what service providers did for African communities, as well as a belief that service providers would bring benefits. Community leaders generally agreed that if they did not raise their issues strongly to service providers, service providers would simply strengthen their position within the system.

**Theme 4: Inter-governmental relationships**

**Relationships within Settlement Service Sector**

From this research, it has been found that within small ethno-specific organisations, a number of issues exist that have significant implications, such as community leadership, tribal rivalry, undemocratic decision-making and industrial relationships. These factors can be seen to contribute to inefficiency and excessive bureaucracy within the community. Such issues provide government with arguments for its policy, which supports service delivery by larger organisations. Established communities and general and mainstream service providers regularly practise instruments such as consultations, consortiums, interagency meetings and funding applications in order to strengthen and sustain the sector and in effect exclude small and emerging African community organisations.

**Priority Setting**

The interviews and the focus group revealed how certain issues in the target communities become prioritised following the widespread community consultation processes. There are diverse needs existing within the community with its limited resource, thus it seems inevitable that those issues are competing with each other in order to be a priority. Nevertheless, a great deal of discrepancy emerged in the data.

Mr Win, a community leader from a small and emerging community admitted:
I get ridiculed by my community members. No one has a job and we don’t have a place to live in, but the only projects we succeed in getting funded seem to be for community harmony funding. So I get out there and say to my people, let’s organise a function to promote community harmony in Lakemba, they come up to me and ask what is wrong with me. But the harmony fund seems to be the only fund we can get. (Mr Win, 11/10/2010)

He added that there appears to be a perception that small ethno-specific communities are capable of minor projects only. Funding bodies assign minor roles, such as participating in community harmony projects or refugee week celebrations. CRC and Refugee Council of Australia have a funding round for Refugee week celebration which provides up to $500. The exact mechanism to determine how one becomes a priority within competing priorities is unclear. The government’s priority is based on aggregated statistical information that the government relies heavily on. According to the interviews it is often based on the needs presented by service providers and the government collects them at interagency meetings and through submissions. Every year the Department of Immigration and Citizenship conducts a ‘needs planning’ campaign, for which they circulate needs assessment forms. Service providers are being asked to choose the activities for their work programs from websites without being reflective on particular local needs. Respondents from more established communities reported that more of their community needs are being reflected. From a government perspective, it is important for the needs to be weighed against the available budget. Amal, a SGP worker commented.

Governments go through ‘selection’ process because they cannot consider every recommendation made. It is only the ones they select that become priorities, whereas there is always someone in the community whose life is affected by the issue that did not make it as a government priority. If a service responds in order to meet the winning need, this results in an access and equity issue. There are always people out in the communities who are affected more by the needs that did not get selected. The government is always under pressure to ensure that money is being spent wisely to receive the most benefit. This is why the government is concerned about the duplication of services. As far as
priority setting is concerned, there is little opportunity for small organisations to raise their concerns and difficulties. (Amal, 30/01/2011)

According to the interview data small organisations did not receive up-to-date information. Also English language skills of the small organisation’s representatives was identified as another barrier to getting their messages communicated.

One senior settlement service worker in the African refugee community pointed out that considering differences in priorities do exist between service providers and communities, the selection process is not entirely negative. For instance, in recent years, in many forums including Refugee Council’s annual community consultation, it has been repeatedly expressed by the African communities that political stability and security back in their home countries is increasingly a matter of importance. Many African refugee communities maintain political affiliations with political parties in Africa and therefore express a desire that the Australia government assist in political stabilisation in their home countries. It is well known that African refugees settling in Australia have concerns over the wellbeing of their families and relatives left in Africa (African Thinktank, 2007). They make a great deal of effort to reunite with them or assist them financially by sending them money. Recent research, including CRC and ‘African Thinktank’ identifying that many refugees settling in Australia suffer from worry, anxiety, feelings guilt and financial pressure.

Jok Martin, a youth leader expressed his frustration over a lack of understanding by the government of their issues:

When the Australian government cannot help us, and when the overall Australian law cannot help us, the more we follow government directions, the more disasters we will have. Let me use this term disasters. If we don’t educate our children properly in our way, then our children will not grow properly. So we opt to go our own way. (Jok Martin, 12/12/2010)

Jok’s comment illustrated a serious distrust of the target communities towards the Australian government. It demonstrates a clash between target communities’ real needs versus the government’s perceived needs for the target communities.
Translation

From the data it was evident that there is a process of ‘translation’, which can be defined as a tactic used by service providers in relation to stakeholders, particularly funding bodies, to describe target groups in a way that suits the funding criteria. It is to satisfy the funding body’s funding priorities, however, during the course of project implementation, often deviation occurs in order to meet the target community’s real need. Funding bodies sometimes lack adequate monitoring procedures or there is a tendency to not question further as long as a financial acquittal is made in accordance with the contract. ‘Translation’ is an act that occurs as a result of accepting the dominant discourse on refugees for the purpose of further resourcing them. By accepting and using the discourse, it further enhances the construction of such a discourse.

Lisa, a SGP worker who has much experience in government submission revealed that:

Terms such as ‘at risk’, ‘early intervention’ and ‘prevention’ have been chosen to appeal to government funding bodies whose priorities often reflect departmental or political agenda at the time. Applications are being made even when the issue seems distant from the real community need in an attempt to secure resources and sustain the organisations.

(Lisa, 17/01/2011)

This process demonstrated how discourse could be distorted or manipulated, although with good intentions for the system, showing the lack of effective communication among the funding bodies, funded organisation and target communities.

Client feedback

The data revealed that only a few service providers, including government agencies, adopted the established evaluation methods. Mechanisms, such as client feedback or client surveys, are practised in many instances for the sake of formality. For instance there are many occasions such as information sessions that client feedback is sought in order to improve similar sessions in the future. However it is not common that a service organisation seeks client feedback on its overall performance and reflects it onto its practice. Community development workers in local governments have a work program which outlines yearly tasks each worker is assigned to achieve. According to interview data, there is no system in place
In which clients can have a say about the service they are subject to. It is strictly business between the funding bodies and funded organisations. In the absence of direct feedback channels between funding bodies and target clients, it is questionable that widespread use of work programs and the quantitative and qualitative measures incorporated into the programs are truly reflective of client satisfaction. Even where the client survey form was used, service providers tended to use client survey forms developed internally and applied them to chosen clients. Often it was the case that the same staff who assisted the clients sought feedback because they were the most available people for the evaluation. If the process were impartial and made as available in many different community languages, it would be too costly for small community organisations. The survey is conducted non-systematically and carries little significance in policy formation of the funded organisations or funding bodies.

Statistics can measure the number of clients each service assists, however, according to Lisa, there needs to be an understanding that a core purpose of a settlement service is to inform public perception about refugees, aiming to break stereotypes. It was suggested that only individual service providers feel and judge the difference. There was obvious self-reflection within the community groups. According to Jok Martin, his community must improve on giving feedback and develop faith in the system, as people do not believe they can change things. As a result, new community group members hardly complain or provide negative feedback and remain passive. Jok Martin observed that it never occurs to the group members that the service is for them and they can have some level of control.

The impossibility of accurate assessment was also raised in the interview data. For instance, if a project, to teach computer skills to newly-arrived African women, has been financed and run, most participants assess and give feedback based on the idea that free computer classes are organised and they are given the opportunity to learn computers for the first time, which would have been impossible in their country of origin. However, their ability is limited in assessing the quality of the computer classes offered, regarding whether the instructor is qualified, learning goals are achieved or the appropriate level of resources were used. The experience of prior deprivation for refugees mitigates against them developing a critical or analytical discourse about education or services that they are offered. This results in a marginalised view in the African communities that ‘anything is better than nothing’.
Interagency Meetings

Interagency meetings are increasingly practised as a platform for information-sharing and collaboration of projects. Various levels of interagency meetings at the local, regional, state and national level are held in order to achieve integrated service planning and collective advocacy. Many government agencies rely on interagency meetings for their information source. It was a clearly expressed view that by regularly participating in interagency meetings, service providers strengthen their networks, find project partners and satisfy their work programs since attending interagency meetings alone is recognised activity under service planning category. A technology of government was exercised. Amal experienced IHSS worker questions:

*How often do you see representatives from small and emerging communities, target groups and ethno specific groups? You only see people from agencies. There must be a strong assumption that these people from agencies can legitimately represent target groups and provide expert advice on their behalf. For many years there seems to be agenda repeating over and over, if I attend all the meetings, I will have no time left for my clients.* (Amal, 30/01/2011)

The NSW Audit report (2012) contained heavy criticism about the consultations that Community Relations Commission convenes regularly with Settlement Service Providers, predominantly SGP funded ones, describing them as ‘mere information sharing without action’ and made a recommendation to redefine the purpose of these gatherings (p.25-27). Joanna Holly, a council staff member who chairs one local interagency meeting was also critical about its merits:

*It helps workers update their skill and knowledge through information sharing, but it has not been an effective platform for collaborative action and decision making. It lacks direction and leadership. It is always same people saying the same thing over and over again. Also if it is an interagency convened by the government agency, the purpose is then to bring the issues to the next level up in the government hierarchy, but we never know what is going on up there. They need to gather information from us. They are all good people but you don’t know what impact it has.* (Joanna, Holly, 01/04/2011)
Interagency communication is one of the key mechanisms in the refugee discourse through which it delegates power to service providers. It is an important ritual for the service providers and government agencies to share knowledge about the target communities. It is regarded as consultations where information regarding the target communities’ needs is discussed in depth. It is also regarded as a platform where a number of agencies come together in order to address the issues the target communities face. People join various working parties designed to implement the strategy identified in the interagency meetings. However the interview data revealed that there were a number of flaws in this process. Most importantly the legitimacy of the representation was seen as questionable. Although service providers who attend interagency meeting have experience and knowledge about their target communities, it is not clear that they can represent the interests of the target groups over the interest of service providers’ respective organisations. In particular as explained earlier, in an environment where both service providers and the target communities compete with each other over the same resource, conflict of interest seems to occur. However, it appeared that such a conflict of interest was not felt by the target communities since, in most cases, they were not aware that they were being represented by service providers. Some agencies recruited staff and support workers from the African communities, therefore it was agreed that they represented the target communities. In this case one must be mindful that there is a great diversity in terms of socio-economic, political or ideological position of the staff employed by the agencies and there is no guarantee that this person will put the target communities’ interest before the organisational interest the person belongs to.

There were numerous interagency meetings. Some of them focused on general issues and some of them focused on special areas such as housing or employment. Although interagency meeting were encouraged, it was not clear to whom the interagency meetings are accountable. The meeting participants can justify their time and resource in attending the meetings and taking collective action or advocacy, nevertheless the outcome of the interagency meeting is not accountable to anyone. Neither governments nor service providers were held accountable and the majority of the target communities were not even aware of the existence of such meetings. This process reflects a further
means of asserting technologies of government that maintain marginalisation of emerging communities.

**Theme 5: The Emergence of a Specific African Refugee Discourse**

Organised through key themes that emerged from the focus groups, the above sections have demonstrated how a broader refugee discourse and technologies of government have asserted a marginalised status on small emerging African community organisations. The following section argues that a specific African refugee discourse has also emerged. As is explained below this discourse is constructed outside the power of the community itself and also acts to marginalise the community rather than support it in the objectives for a positive settlement experience. An African refugee is a general term that fails to provide a representative description of the cultural and ethnic diversity of people from the African continent. African refugees find it puzzling that they are classified as African refugees with people whom they have nothing in common with. It is a shared experience by people from other origins such as Asian where East Asians do not identify themselves with South Asians. A vast range of cultural, social differences are ignored. Nevertheless, this study found that when African is mentioned in public discourse, a variety of communities who came from the African continent think it is a matter that relates to them. According to the data in this study with the African community leaders, the common sentiment was that there is negative view in the Australian public sphere about African refugees.

The view relied on events involving African communities. In the interviews African community leaders named a particular African community that they saw as responsible for this involvement but agreed that the public view was based on few events. All refugee groups who came to Australia at different times had to deal with some unwelcoming or negative discourse about their settlement. This is not a new view. It is similar to the experience of Arab Australians where the public perception about the Arab Australian was formed based on few incidents involving Arab Australians (Poyting, et al 2004). A series of domestic and international events provide backgrounds and context to the emergence of a specific refugee African discourse. As discussed in chapter 4, the refugee issue had become a popular election issue for politicians. It is reflective of a politics of ‘race’ and a new era in Australian political life (Gale 2004). The recent events also displayed a deconstruction process of multiculturalism discourse. The multicultural discourse was deconstructed and replaced by
promotion of tolerance and community harmony. After the Australian government had dropped multicultural affairs from the federal government portfolio in 2006, there appeared to be an attempt to depoliticise and maintain multiculturalism in the private domain. However, according to Brown (2006), tolerance discourse provides an ideal domain of depoliticization for dominant power in the form of discourse formation which is characterised by privatizing and lack of legality (Brown, 2006, p.11). Racial vilification for example is a private matter, if someone makes a general racial vilification targeting one particular community, there is no legal ground for punishment unless someone in the target community takes the matter up and proves how it has inflicted damage. There were several organised racial vilifications targeting African refugees in the Western Sydney in 2007-2008. Brown also noted that increased state power in a crisis can employ new tactics for subjugation of citizens (2006, p.105). Sidhu & Taylor (2007) pointed out in examination of refugee discursive formation in Australian schools that the language of redistributive justice was conspicuously absent. ‘Early intervention’, ‘a greater risk of isolation’, and ‘at risk arrivals’ are dominant language implying shift in socio-structural context of settlement to a level of the community (Sidhu & Taylor, 2007). The success of settlement had become the responsibility of refugee communities while the impact of structural disadvantage and the government’s responsibility for well resourced services are considered less significant (Sidhu & Taylor, 2007).

As the refugee intake from Africa increased significantly from the 1990s, it is natural to witness an emergence of a specific African refugee discourse in the public sphere. The key focus of the discourse has been the ability of this new group to integrate into Australian society. From a political perspective, such a discourse provides government with an opportunity to avoid responsibilities for political inaction but to create a space where politicians shift the blame by creating a social scapegoat.

**People with very different backgrounds**

Service providers acknowledged many of the African refugees came from very distinct backgrounds, such as a protracted stay in a refugee camp, which present a challenge. The assumption here is that the clients are likely to have missed out on education, developed trauma or other mental health issues, and disadvantaged themselves though an acculturation process in a new country. The documentation of recent news articles on African refugees in
Chapter 4 supports a view that the majority of media coverage and research focused on differences, and on challenges of integration for African refugees. It is evident from the research that such views formed the basis for a specific African refugee discourse. The majority of respondents in the service provider group marked this as a starting point of the African discourse. For example:

*It is not an overreaction but it is fair to say that they come from the very different backgrounds. It is not their Africaness but it is their different experiences that presented challenges* (Patricia, 02/02/2011).

Patricia, a senior settlement service worker reaffirmed that their stay in a refugee camp alone does not explain the differences since the protracted stay in a refugee camp is a common experience for refugees from other areas. The frontline service providers who worked closely with African communities observed that large differences exist in culture, custom, value and norms. Thomas Kim, a worker from an employment service gave a few examples.

*In Africa they say buses depart when bus is full, not according to the bus timetable. The ‘African time’ is the worst I have ever seen. People just do not turn up on time. People who are just employed by a security company do not come to the site on time. It now frequently happens that even though Africans find jobs, they do not last long. They have their employment terminated soon because they have difficulties adapting to the Australian workplace norms* (Thomas Kim, 29/03/2011).

According to an interviews with frontline support workers, the burdens of experience that African refugees came with when African communities first started to settle in the early 1990s had never been seen before. The interviews revealed that service providers and governments understood that it would be a major challenge predicting key problems. At one stage, 70 per cent of the refugee intake was from Sudan. There was a great sense of urgency and intensity. The title of the Community Relations Commissions (CRC) report on the African refugee settlement bears the word ‘investigation’ which was definitely a rare response. The CRC emphasised that the ‘investigation’ was initially and strongly requested by the service sector first. A comparison was drawn by Patricia who assisted the Eastern European refugee community in the past. According to her, the difference was stark. Even though skill levels were varied among African communities, generally men’s groups had a relatively higher level of organisational capacity or a pool of members with specialised skills, such as business or accounting compared with women’s groups. It was possible to conclude
that overall literacy levels were low, either in English or a mother language. In schools newly arrived children were usually sent to classrooms according to their age regardless of their literacy skill, causing concerns both for parents and support workers. Amal went on to say of the quote mentioned early in this thesis:

\textit{What Kevin Andrews said was very inappropriate, divisive, and even racist however there is some truth in it (Amal, 30/01/2011).}

The relevance of ‘Africaness’ in constructing a refugee discourse is overstated according to Andrew Jakubowicz (2011). He suggested that the Australian public attitude is mature enough not to pick on race any more. Nevertheless he pointed out that ‘blackness’ in Australia has very complex dimension since it is linked to aboriginal people. What was more relevant in the settlement of African refugees is the fact that a service gap was perceived when the first African refugees arrived. There was recognition that the system was not working for them. According to Jakubowicz (2011) there are not strong grounds, on which to suggest that the African refugee discourse is any different from other migrant groups settled earlier in Australia, as ‘otherness’ has been a distinct feature of Australian public discourse on refugees and migrants (Henry-Waring, 2007). Hage argued that the construction of an un-integrated ‘other’ has traditionally centred on Australia’s debate on multiculturalism (2003, pp 66-67). Although the status of ‘other’ can change (Ien Ang, 1996) but it does not disappear.

\textbf{Dominating discourse}

When the then-minister Kevin Andrews made the aforementioned comment that Sudanese refugees have difficulties integrating into the Australian society, it created different responses from the public. It would appear that the majority of the public was indifferent to the issue or even unaware of the existence of the Sudanese community’s settlement problems. Although those who knew about the comment were divided between supporting the comment and disapproving of the comment. Under neo-liberalism, subjects are increasingly required to be independent, enterprising and autonomous, as they are governed through the structuring of a possible field of action in which they govern themselves towards freedom (Rose, 1999, p.97). Rosa, a manager of large charity organisation that has a settlement service branch stated how people’s perception about Africans is different from what is expected under neo-liberalism:
People fear for someone with visible differences, general public have perception and expectation about the Africans. They are not modern, they think different, act different. People also hear about civil wars and rapes. These aspects have been polarised by the media. Nowadays no one claims to be racists but everyone generalises. If an African man wears a nice suit everyone turns around and looks at him because it doesn’t suit their images of Africans (Rosa, 11/03/2011).

An African refugee discourse also relies on a public perception associated with the settlement process. This is not a new perception. Although the public did not associate Eastern Europeans with specific images, refugees from the Middle East are easily associated with images of war and conflict (Colic-Peisker, 2005). Asian refugees were linked to the images of ‘boat people’ fleeing after the fall of Saigon during the Vietnam war. Powerful Hollywood or Broadway images also help reaffirm stereotyped images (Mok, 1998). The interview data with service providers, who observed public perceptions towards African refugees revealed that the shock from images of African Famines from the mid 1980s were too strongly registered in people’s mind. This is a major difference between earlier ‘Arab discourses’, whereas an ‘Arab discourse’ was dominantly associated with images related to ‘violence’ and ‘terrorist’, the African refugee discourse was mainly about their inability to integrate often associated with their origin in less developed countries.

The Australian public and on many occasions, authorities’ reaction to new African settlers are heavily influenced by a judgemental perspective and often results whether intended or not, in discriminatory action (Australian Human Right Commission, 2009)

Jok Martin gave an example that how they are being treated differently;

At a Sudanese social function organised to celebrate the organisation’s anniversary, we had to encounter the police riot squad for no reason other than ‘there are many Africans around’. The function venue was surrounded by the Police all through the night. Despite our request that it was merely a social function and the presence of the police would ruin the atmosphere of the day, the police refused to leave and in fact coordinated crowd control with private security hired by the venue. The members of our group felt that we were being discriminated against, embarrassed and angry. We were certain that it would not have happened if people were Anglo-Australians (Jok Martin, 12/12/2010).
Eric Kamara, a Sierra Leone youth leader provided his personal account of how he and members of his community face disadvantage on a daily basis.

*I purchased an electronic appliance. Next day I found it faulty. I went back to the shop and requested exchange or refund. My request however was immediately dismissed. I was not given any reason and when I made a claim further at the shopfront I was taken by a security guard. I felt hurt that staff at the shop did not engage in any conversation with me. It was difficult for me to think other than I was being judged strongly because I was an African* (Eric Kamara, 19/12/2010).

Numerous examples were provided during the interviews about how people’s perception affected the daily lives of African settlers. Although service providers and academics apply the term ‘discrimination’ less frequently for various reasons, the interviewees had no hesitation in using it frequently. A mother of a school girl in one interview explained how clever her young girl was, then she said her daughter was recommended to join a sewing class as an extracurricular activity by her teacher when her daughter wanted join computer class. According to the mother, her daughter always liked new technologies but she felt humiliated when her teacher, with little discussion, suggested the sewing class straight away.

In the analysis of a specific African discourse, identity politics are highly relevant. Philip is a community worker who also teaches community service at TAFE. He strongly believes that the sector inherited its tradition from identity politics.

*The discourse out there now is an assumption that African refugees are disadvantaged people. The cause of their disadvantage has been already defined in terms of their identity, their being African refugees. Their disadvantage is not defined in terms of their socio and economic status in the society where they belong. It is coming from the reaction conducted by the multicultural movement which is identity politics. This tendency is permeated in government and NGO sectors. It really is a limit of identity politics. We tend to put them in one box ‘CALD’ or ‘refugee’. There is strong assumption that they suffer more. The cause of repression is not defined by their socio economic status but by symbolic assets. This tradition is very strong in the governments* (Philip, 02/04/2011).
Along with other groups such as people with a disability, refugees often broadly defined as CALD are regarded as a disadvantaged group. Government resources in the form of grants, are also awarded to such groups by classifying them as an eligible disadvantaged group. It rarely happens in the sector that the socio-economic status of refugees is considered relevant. The underlying rule is that all black people are African refugees therefore in need of something. The discourse asserts that there cannot be a wealthy or independent African in theory. The target community or anyone in the target community must be in ‘deficit’. The needs presented by a particular ‘disadvantaged group’ makes it easier for the governments to identify what they are supposed to do and also to respond to the political power the groups present. Governments believe that an appropriate policy to meet needs can be prescribed. African refugee groups must be fit into one of the needs types that government grants redefine. In the sector there is no grant offered on the basis of a target community’s strength or ‘assets’. No government grants ever ask what the community is good at or how the government can help advance the goals of groups. From data in this study it is evident that the current needs based deficit approach does not foster grounds where target communities can become a lead agent in their own community building. Often a community’s role is defined as a participants in government funded projects within the broad government agenda such as employment or housing. The discourse is always built around needs, disallowing a chance for an alternative discourse. Further denying the specialised African refugee experience, there has been a recent trend that funding bodies attempt to shift targets from particular groups to the general population that should include the particular group. According to Phillip ‘family projects’ are one example where African families are a part of general project targets.

**Impact of a Specific African discourse**

It is difficult to articulate how the general perception of African refugees in Australia is affecting community building in African communities. African community leaders interviewed unanimously stated that deep-rooted negative perceptions about African refugees do affect their daily lives. They provided countless examples of discrimination and prejudice they have encountered as individuals. These come from their experience in looking for employment, searching for housing and from other ordinary everyday situations. However when asked how the negative African refugee discourse affect their community in general, and the settlement services they are subject to, the community leader respondents were
unable to provide much comment. It can be assumed that experience of discrimination add up to a negative community and settlement impact, for most community leaders it was not an easy question to answer. It is suggested that this can be attributed to several factors. First, community leaders have a very limited understanding about settlement services. Although their communities use settlement services frequently the community leaders do not understand how the settlement sector works in detail nor do they have an understanding about the underlying structures of service operation. Most of the community leaders know that the program is funded by DIAC and have some general knowledge on specific programs that they use. However, knowledge about the sector and other settlement related services such as housing, employment and education was clearly limited. Second, the settlement service sector is primarily dominated by large charity groups and migrant resource centres, therefore even though the settlement service is very important to them as a client, it is irrelevant to them in a sense that they are not delivering the service for them, making the influence of African community groups in the settlement services is minimal. Currently no African specific community organisations are directly funded by the SGP program. All the funded settlement programs are delivered by migrant resource centres and large charities. No African community organisation has ever been directly funded under SGP to deliver the program. In many cases bilingual African community workers are employed by migrant resource centres and multicultural services run by large charities as specialised liaison workers. Third, the majority of community works conducted by African community organisations specifically focus on their communities only, and are delivered informally in isolation from the existing service networks. They do not realise that they are actually delivering a part of non formal settlement services too. The focus of their projects differ from government projects. Most projects initiated and run by communities prioritise community language, cultural practice, religious rituals and social functions. These types of projects are not necessarily a priority of the settlement service.

The complexity of different service delivery models and systems are not relevant to small and emerging African communities. In the absence of in depth understanding about the broad Australian society and systems, it is difficult for these community leaders to have a clear idea where their service fits and what social impact it brings about for larger society. It is worth noting that the African communities display different levels of willingness to engage due to their perceptions of government authorities and the police, formed from their past experiences. According to the data in this study African refugees have often had negative
experiences with governments and authorities in their countries. Phillip explained that in many cases they were the source of oppression and trouble which made them flee the country, however when they came to Australia, they still looked at the government with suspicion or were unfamiliar with the concept that the government was there to offer free services for its residents. Phillip added that many of them have already been exposed to international NGOs and have positive feelings towards them.

Most comments made by the African leaders on the impact of a negative refugee discourse on their settlement service came from a negative personal experiences living as someone from a refugee background. Few details were provided as to how their individual lives were affected by settlement service provision, which constantly reflects a specific African refugee discourse.

For instance, Mohamed, a Northern African community leader said that although the Australian public may think that Northern Africans are different from the Sudanese due to their light skin colour, when such comments were made, they felt that they were being put down. He added he was very concerned that children in his community may develop shyness and a feeling of inferiority as a result of such comments. He added that a lot of the work his community and he were doing was aimed at the younger generation so that they would feel proud of their existence. Therefore, how his community is perceived by the Australian public had serious implications on the work they did.

Rather than focusing on the government’s inability to provide adequate settlement services to people of high demand, which DIAC is funded to deliver, a specific African refugee discourse focuses on the target group’s apparent ability to integrate into mainstream Australian society by cleverly changing the dynamics of the discourse. The African community leaders also found a great resemblance in the way that the Muslim community has been perceived and treated in Australia. Entire Muslim communities have been generalised whenever there has been misconduct by individuals from a Muslim background.

In the process of public discourse being formed, there is a clear bias towards what information and perspectives are available to the public. Public discourse relies on several media outlets with radio talk shows, news on people smugglers, images of boat people on current affairs programs as key sources. The wider media rarely touches on other perspectives of refugee issues that Australia might be directly or indirectly responsible for. For instance, people are aware that refugees from Iraq increased after the ‘War on Terror’,
however the public are not familiar with a perspective that by participating in the War, Australia is also partly responsible for creating a refugee population from Iraq.

A specific African refugee discourse affects settlement services at every level, according to Lisa, a SGP worker at MRC;

*When the government changes, discourse changes followed by policy changes. For example, for Temporary Protection Visa (TPV) holders, it was taboo to serve TPV holders under the conservative government even though MRCs were not part of such conservative discourse. The detention centre has always been a contentious issue for a long time. As government changes, the policy becomes more flexible and MRCs can raise issues regarding TPV in a freer atmosphere. More detainees are released into communities now. A part of reason for this policy shift is because they are the issues that have generated a great deal of counter discourse against the dominant discourse. Activist, academics and students have been actively protesting the government policy, creating another frontline of conflict discourses.*

(Lisa, 17/01/2011)

It should be noted that in 2010-2011 the focus on the refugee intake has already shifted from Africa to Asia, as there are now more Nepalese, Burmese and Bhutanese who are emerging as the new settlers (Settlement Data Base, DIAC, 2011). Service providers were aware of this transition and were aiming to respond with appropriate service provision, yet it appeared that there was not the sense of urgency or intensity witnessed by African refugees.

**Conclusion**

Exploring the emergence of a specific African refugee discourse has demonstrated that what is said about African refugees the public arena is powerful and important. However, what is of more importance is the political, social and economic context in which a particular discourse about African refugees is being generated. What constitutes this context is complicated and involves multiple layers of knowledge and power that both support and subjectify all stakeholders in the settlement service sector. Despite difficulties to measure the success of the program, it has been a useful instrument in assisting newly arrived refugees and migrants. However, settlement services are not merely a service for refugees and
migrants, as it sustains multicultural service organisations providing opportunities to set up necessary support networks. It also employs people and creates employment, such as for bilingual workers from the target communities. For the government it is the key means of assisting new arrivals into the Australian community and for local government, it presents an opportunity to display ‘harmony’ and ‘diversity’ among residents.

The processes developed in each segment of the settlement service sector by key stakeholders are not necessary formed to maximise benefits of the target group, African refugees. All agencies pursue organisational interests that are necessary for efficient service delivery at the same time, pose the risk of take reducing focus on clients. The research revealed evidence and background of the surrounding the policy formation and delivery of settlement service and the construction of a refugee discourse. Exercising of power and governmentality took place in the settlement service sector in the form of various interrelationships among stakeholders and practices imposed as devices to inform the strategic positioning of each player in the sector.

One of the effects of a negative public discourse about refugees identified from the research, is that it allows governments to shift responsibilities for equality and re-distributonal justice in an increasingly neo-liberal economic environment while still emphasising the government’s limited welfare service provision. This has been achieved successfully by the involvement of NGO service providers who took a part as state technology of power. The study demonstrated how meticulously power relations have been constructed in order to sustain the settlement service sector and welfare industry. There are many service providers in the sector who possess skills and experience necessary to approach target groups and initiate a relationship. If said genuinely with good intentions to make a difference to the lives of newly-arrived Africans, the African discourse is embraced by target communities and the service sector in a positive light. However, when communicated with self-serving intention, African refugee discourse can adversely affect settlement and community building process of African communities. The construction of any politically motivated negative discourse takes away opportunities to plan for long-term settlement based on education and investment in the future of African refugees and humanitarian entrants. Drawing on the interview data, the key aim of this chapter has been to demonstrate how refugee discourses that have emerged from immigration policy history, political discourse and public perceptions has framed the settlement services and negatively affected the capacity building of small and emerging African communities.
Chapter Six:

Conclusion

By utilising a Foucauldian framework for understanding how power has been exercised in settlement services and contributed to a dominant discourse on refugees, this research has sought to explore the specific experience of African refugees (humanitarian entrants) in their attempts to utilise support services in their settlement. With two distinct sources of data, primary sources comprised of historical and current government immigration and settlement policies, reports, scholarly analysis and print media as discussed on Chapter Four, and interview data from participants who work within the settlement sector as discussed in Chapter Five, this thesis has shown that the discourses about refugees and specifically African refugees are generally negative and limiting.

For small emerging African community organisations, such discourses and the technologies of how they are exercised, present barriers to achieving the aspirations of their communities. The exercise of power by the agencies funded to deliver settlement services also works against the aspirations of small emerging African communities. Their aspirations are unsurprising, they seek to have sufficient access to information, skills and funds to exercise self-determination in their own communities, instead the group leaders presented an experience of ongoing limitation on what they could do and ongoing disappointment with what was being offered by the settlement services.

The key themes discussed in Chapter Five emerged from the engagement with focus groups early in the research and pointed to key sites of power that affected small emerging African communities. The themes included: funding; the relationships between ethno specific organisations and generalist organisations; relationships with the settlement services sector and; the emergence of a specific African refugee discourse. The interviews focused on these areas and provided data to flesh out the detailed concerns and problems faced by small emerging African community organisations.
A key concern arising from this research is that African refugee discourse, African refugees have the least input or influence in construction of the discourses about themselves. A complex system has been built to sustain the welfare sector or the settlement service sector as the main service deliverer. The sector operates diligently, however, it is a place where the role of African refugees is defined only as subjects of the government, as its tactics and devices are identified in this thesis. Most notably, communication flows one way each time from communities to funding bodies via funded organisations and from funding bodies to target communities only via funded organisations. There is no direct communication between funding bodies and target communities. The current system seems to be based on ‘mutual convenience’ between funding bodies and funded organisations, thus excluding the African voice. This system is built on the assumption that service providers will represent the interest of their target groups.

Although it cannot be denied that service providers struggle to represent the needs of target groups, in an environment where the service provider sector is constantly pressured to meet the growing demand for service with limited resources produced through increasingly market-based government tendering system, service providers reach a ‘mutual convenience point’ where they develop an unwritten agreement with funding bodies. This is a place where assumptions and acceptances are made. For example, service providers: (i) know the real needs of the target communities; (ii) have grassroots links to target communities; (iii) deliver projects successfully as described in the funding applications; (iv) have a democratic decision-making process; (v) have a high level of accountability and transparency standard; and (vi) seek client feedback and reflect them on their policy and practice. These unverified assumptions are often accepted by the funding bodies as facts, that is, they do not attempt to contact the target communities directly for their input and feedback. Furthermore, funding bodies do not intervene with the funded organisation’s decision-making process, believing that is how they stay impartial. A funding body’s assessment of projects depends on documentation which describes the success of projects. It is very rare for any project within a settlement service to fail. Funding bodies and their staff lack the necessary skills to appreciate community projects and to analyse their impact beyond merely describing numbers on work contracts. The system has created an imagined and isolated space where all the funded projects supposedly work for intended target groups.
For target communities, this is a lost opportunity, as they first establish a relationship as welfare service clients with settlement service providers. On many occasions, target communities rely on services for financial assistance or immigration advice concerning their families and relatives in their home country, which is ironically defined as ‘service beyond the scope of SGP services’. Target communities also like to form their own associations and address issues arising in their community. Nevertheless the target communities always find themselves being passive clients despite repeated attempts to bring about community development. The perspective of settlement services requires target communities to stay as clients with constant needs. Under neo-liberal governmentality, the needs of the target communities become welfare services’ selling points. Welfare services do not invest in clients’ strength rather they constantly look for abnormalities and deficiencies for various justifications of technologies of government.

A specific African refugee discourses enables this process. This discourse provides a framework in which the tactics of government are strategically used to maintain service provider and client relationships. The discourse informs stakeholders that ‘harmony’ and learning the Australia system are priorities over developing community infrastructure. Under this circumstance, the self reliance of the target communities can hardly be substantiated.

A number of international events make the government’s tactics more appealing to the public. The economic recession on a global scale, rapid globalisation, neo liberalism and the War on Terrorism seem to provide convincing explanation for the relative sense of deprivation that many people feel nowadays. As a result the public becomes more vulnerable to technologies of government and prone to subjectifying themselves to dominant discourses. Although this can serve certain political purpose temporarily, the negative effects of such discourse and social cost incurring as a result must be realised. The research findings point to the fact that at the intersections of various relationships, settlement services are given a significant role to play. The success of a theoretical model, in which settlement services serve as a bridge between funding bodies and target communities depends on the degree of autonomy and integrity of the settlement services, which are free from material barriers that other services face at the same time. A critical stance toward settlement services in this research is not to discount the efforts and struggles made by MRCs and other services as a frontline services. Rather it calls for a realignment of interrelationships among stakeholders in order to empower
settlement services that are more responsive to the requirement of the target communities to achieve partnerships.

No matter what measures service providers come up with, what is unmeasurable in nature will remain unmeasurable. Considering the incomplete nature of evaluation methods in human services, it is more reasonable to use evaluation results only as a guide. Heavy emphasis on the use of such normative methods and the government management policy based on such evidence takes away the focus on more important aspects of the service, such as opportunities for close communication and building partnerships. At the same time there should be more study about the reverse process, which should be more appropriately called forward process, of how target communities ensure both funding bodies and funded organisations perform in terms of meeting the ‘aspirations and needs’ of target communities and assisting in community building of the target groups. An essential step would be the creation of a space where African settlers can have their voice heard as a part of discourse that affects their successful settlement.
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Dr Ruth Phillips  
School of Social Work & Policy Studies  
Faculty of Education & Social Work  
Education Building - A35  
The University of Sydney  
Email: r.phillips@edfac.usyd.edu.au

Dear Dr Phillips

I am pleased to inform you that the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) at its meeting held on 2 February 2010 approved your protocol entitled “Australian African Discourse: A study of Settlement Policy and Refugee Discourse”.

Details of the approval are as follows:

Ref No.: 02-2010/12273  
Approval Period: February 2010 to February 2011  
Authorised Personnel: Dr Ruth Phillips  
Mr Se Gun Song

The HREC is a fully constituted Ethics Committee in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans-March 2007 under Section 5.1.29.

The approval of this project is conditional upon your continuing compliance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans. We draw to your attention the requirement that a report on this research must be submitted every 12 months from the date of the approval or on completion of the project, whichever occurs first. Failure to submit reports will result in withdrawal of consent for the project to proceed.

Special Conditions of Approval
Please forward certified translations of public documents, permissions from organisations, and permission to use images.

The Committee noted permissions already received from Canterbury Bankstown Sierra Leone Women’s Network and the Somali Cultural Centre.

The Committee noted the receipt of one consent form for the use of images.

Chief Investigator / Supervisor’s responsibilities to ensure that:

(1) All serious and unexpected adverse events should be reported to the HREC as soon as possible.

(2) All unforeseen events that might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project should be reported to the HREC as soon as possible.

(3) The HREC must be notified as soon as possible of any changes to the protocol. All changes must be approved by the HREC before continuation of the research project. These include:-
   • If any of the investigators change or leave the University.
   • Any changes to the Participant Information Statement and/or Consent Form.

(4) All research participants are to be provided with a Participant Information Statement and Consent Form, unless otherwise agreed by the Committee. The Participant Information Statement and Consent Form are to be on University of Sydney letterhead and include the full title of the research project and telephone contacts for the researchers, unless otherwise agreed by the Committee and the following statement must appear on the bottom of the Participant Information Statement. Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Deputy Manager, University of Sydney, on +612 8627 8176 (Telephone); +612 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email).

(5) Copies of all signed Consent Forms must be retained and made available to the HREC on request.

(6) It is your responsibility to provide a copy of this letter to any internal/external granting agencies if requested.

(7) The HREC approval is valid for four (4) years from the Approval Period stated in this letter. Investigators are requested to submit a progress report annually.

(8) A report and a copy of any published material should be provided at the completion of the Project.

Yours sincerely,
Participant Information

This research is an examination of Australian Settlement policy and refugee discourses about refugees and humanitarian entrances from Africa and an exploration of the impact of these discourses on newly arrived African humanitarian visa settlers. The study is being conducted by Se Gun Song, research student and will form part of my thesis in a Master of Philosophy program at the University of Sydney under the supervision of Dr Ruth Phillips, senior lecturer.

I would like to invite you to participate in this research and share your experience and ideas. The following information is provided to give you an idea what this research is about and what it involves. It is important you to fully understand this information. If some of the information is not clear you may seek further clarification.

The research aims to identify the processes that influence how discourses on African refugees are formed, circulated as well as the impact of these discourse on settlement policy. For this study to be successful, it is crucial to examine various relationships your organizations may have with other
key stakeholders. Your response as a part of a local community network is essential to this research. Your input on the experience of your organization, organizational policy and current practice will make a great contribution to this research.

Being in this study is completely voluntary- you are not under any obligation to consent and – if you do consent-you can withdraw at any time without affecting your relationship with the University of Sydney. You may stop the interview at any time if you do not wish to continue, the audio recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.

The interview with you will take around 60 minutes. You will be asked questions based on set questions however you are encouraged to give additional statements or elaborate your opinions in an in-depth interview where you will be encouraged to provide various examples. Recording devices may be used to help producing accurate transcripts however if you feel uncomfortable with the devise, you may advise the researcher not to use it. I will be conducting the interview myself and if anything may discomfort you during the interview, you can let me know as I aim to maintain a comfortable interview environment.

All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants.

The study will benefit you since the research outcome informs community groups and policy makers of better provision of settlement service broadly.

You are welcome to tell other people about the study and in fact you are encouraged to refer other people to the study.

When you have read this information, Dr Ruth Phillips will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Dr Ruth Phillips, Senior Lecturer on (02) 93516899.

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Deputy Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on (02) 8627 8176 (Telephone); (02) 86278177 (Facsimile) or human.ethics@usyd.edu.au (Email).
Dr Ruth Phillips,
Senior Lecturer,
Social Work & Policy Studies,
Faculty of Education and Social Work,
Tel: 02 9351 6899, Fax: 02 9351 3783,
Email: r.phillips@edfac.usyd.edu.au, or/and
The University of Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee
The Old Teachers College Building, A22, Level 3, Room 313a.
University of Sydney
NSW, 2006
Tel: 02-93516226, Fax: 02-93512606

For research please contact

Se Gun Song
Tel: 02-98717601 or 0425215329, Fax: 02-97180236
Email: segun.song@cbmrc.org.au
Address: 2/29 Pearce St, Baulkham Hills 2153

This information sheet is for you to keep

The University of Sydney

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I, .............................................................[PRINT NAME], give consent to my participation in the research project

TITLE: A study of Settlement Policy and Refugee Discourses

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.
2. I have read the Participant Information Statement and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher/s.

3. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time, without affecting my relationship with the researcher(s) or the University of Sydney now or in the future.

4. I understand that my involvement is strictly confidential and no information about me will be used in any way that reveals my identity.

5. I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary – I am not under any obligation to consent.

6. I understand that I can stop the interview at any time if I do not wish to continue, the audio/video recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.
7. I consent to: – [PLEASE REMOVE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THAT ARE NOT APPLICABLE TO YOUR RESEARCH]

i) Audio-taping YES ☐ NO ☐

ii) Receiving Feedback YES ☐ NO ☐

If you answered YES to the “Receiving Feedback Question (iii)”, please provide your details i.e. mailing address, email address.

Feedback Option

Address: __________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

Email: __________________________________________________________

Signed: ………………………………………………………………………………………………..

Name: ………………………………………………………………………………………………..

Date: ………………………………………………………………………………………………..
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