

commentator on education,²⁷⁴ this contributed to Smolicz's approach remaining on the margins of the cultural pluralist stream.

In the meantime Lippmann and Jayasuriya were working on a statement of cultural pluralist ideology to include in the *Final Report* of the Committee on Community Relations, in order to recommend to the Government that it accepts it as the basis of migrant settlement, welfare and community relations policy. Their efforts had been assisted by the dismemberment of the Department of Immigration, which resulted in changes to the Departmental representatives attached to the Committee. Watson, their assimilationist opponent, was replaced by Ted Charles, who was also an assimilationist but less forceful with his views.²⁷⁵ George Kiddle, an integrationist, was also appointed but he saw his role as a Departmental representative as involving less intervention in the Committee's deliberations.²⁷⁶ Jayasuriya believed these personnel changes swung the balance in the Committee in their favour: 'It was easier for us; that is why we won'.²⁷⁷

Lippmann had the opportunity to achieve his long sought after objective, an articulation of cultural pluralism under the auspices of the government. Jayasuriya drafted the report, including the significant ideological section 'A Philosophy of Community Relations', a statement of cultural pluralism.²⁷⁸ Jayasuriya and Lippmann believed that cultural pluralism stood a greater chance of being accepted by the Australian public if it was clearly distinguished from other forms of multiculturalism. Jayasuriya recalled that this strategic thinking influenced the drafting of the ideological section and the *Final Report* in general:

That is what is very significant. We took a very middle of the road position on this. We went for cultural pluralism and we drew the fine line between structural and cultural pluralism . . . we wanted to get a point of view through consensus and that was the consensus position.²⁷⁹

This distinction was clearly stated in the 'Introduction' of the *Final Report*:

The Committee further wishes to re-affirm the value it placed on the role of ethnic groups. It recognised the contributions that ethnic groups have made in providing many of the services to migrants. It

believed that ethnic groups had a further part to play in the context of an integrated community structure based on cultural pluralism. At the same time, it noted the distinction between cultural pluralism and structural pluralism, and recognised that structural pluralism if taken too far could become divisive.²⁸⁰

The fundamental framework for this model of cultural pluralism, presented in 'A Philosophy of Community Relations', was provided by a marriage of Milton Gordon's sociology and Robert Dahl's political science,²⁸¹ as was the case with Martin's ethnic structural pluralism. Additional overseas sources Jayasuriya drew on included Gordon Allport's *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954), and Michael Banton's *Race Relations* (1967) that presented a survey of relevant sociological literature and case studies of the nature of ethnic diversity in various countries. Jayasuriya also used statements on ethnic and cultural diversity by the British parliamentarian Roy Jenkins and multiculturalist ideas expressed by Canadian academics. The Australian sources he drew on included works by Zubrzycki, Martin, Cox, Smolicz, Alan Richardson, Gillian Bottomley, and Storer and Faulkner's *Recommendations for a Multi-Cultural Australia* (1973). He also used sociological data from Borrie's *National Population Inquiry* (1974) and Price's *Southern Europeans in Australia* (1963). Jayasuriya used this diverse range of sources to fashion a comprehensive, consistent and concise model of cultural pluralism that seemed to reflect and be supported by a broad cross-section of scholarly opinion.

Jayasuriya established a case for the adoption of cultural pluralism by asserting that contemporary Australia, as a result of post-war mass immigration, was ethnically and culturally heterogeneous.²⁸² He defined assimilationism as Anglo-conformism because it sought a homogeneous society, and classified integrationism as a form of assimilationism.²⁸³ He then characterised assimilationism in negative terms according to Martin's critical analysis in 'Migrants: Equality and Ideology' (1972), and rejected it as no longer relevant.²⁸⁴

Jayasuriya recommended the displacement of assimilationism in favour of cultural pluralism, which he argued was a more viable and relevant model considering the composition of Australian society.²⁸⁵ He argued that cultural pluralism would remove the pressures exerted by the host society and its institutions on the

Mark Lopez (2000)
Re Origins of Multiculturalism,
MUP - Melbourne University Press

migrant to assimilate, widening his degree of choice in the nature, place and degree of his adjustment, in the belief that this offered the migrant a greater sense of personal worth and dignity.²⁸⁶

The term 'integration' had been favoured by both integrationists and multiculturalists to describe the preferred pattern of migrant settlement or relationship of the migrant to the host society. Jayasuriya made a step towards reducing the potential for confusion, arising from the use of the same term by distinct ideologies, by adopting the term 'pluralistic integration' to describe migrant settlement into a multicultural society.²⁸⁷ In a cultural pluralist system, ethnic groups and their organisations are considered the ideal means to achieve the pluralistic integration of migrants and provide migrant welfare services.²⁸⁸

Jayasuriya characterised the cultural pluralist society as involving a common realm of 'political rights' and 'social valuations' as well as 'separate spheres of community living'.²⁸⁹ He asserted the significance of ethnicity as a source of identity and as a sociological concept defining the cultural diversity in cultural pluralism; and he took issue with Marxist scholarship when he argued that ethnicity should not be subsumed into class analysis:

Class and racial or ethnic factors may overlap by virtue of such factors as the low class status position afforded to some ethnic minority groups. It is nevertheless true that 'ethnicity' remains an independent factor which overrides other structural factors such as those pertaining to class and socio-economic standing.²⁹⁰

Jayasuriya restated the concept of 'unity in diversity', arguing that cultural pluralism involved the acceptance and encouragement of 'some degree' of cultural and social diversity 'within an overall context of national unity'.²⁹¹ He also discussed the notion of 'core values', arguing that over time a 'consensus' between migrants and hosts would emerge on 'certain universalistic values that involve a commitment to the receiving society as a political unit'.²⁹² Jayasuriya placed an emphasis on the values of equal opportunity, social justice and tolerance as part of a cultural pluralist society, and consequently argued that it was therefore not an ideology concerned with the preservation of the socio-economic status quo.²⁹³ Jayasuriya conceded that the complete eradication of ethnic conflicts and tensions

was an unobtainable ideal. He suggested that it was necessary to 'recognise certain conflicts and tensions in society as inevitable', but by taking steps to ensure equal opportunity and access to community institutions and services, it was possible to minimise the opportunity for prejudices to be expressed in a harmful manner.²⁹⁴

Jayasuriya called for the modification of all Australian institutions to reflect the diversity of Australian society.²⁹⁵ He also argued that cultural pluralism placed limits on the degree of cultural and ethnic diversity compatible with a viable multicultural society. This was discussed in terms of his efforts to draw a distinction between cultural pluralism and structural pluralism, where structural pluralism was characterised as potentially damaging to society:

Separatism and segregation become characteristic of such a situation which allows a society to develop 'plural structural units' and enhances the potentiality of conflict and tension between these units. Institutional differences will inevitably prevent common sharing and participation in a universalistic value system and sharing in key social institutions such as educational, legal and political institutions. However, the viewpoint of 'cultural pluralism', as advocated by the Com-mittee, does enable ethnic groups, if they so desire, to establish their own structures and institutions usually of a cultural and social nature, for example, the media, clubs, restaurants, shops and community organisations.

The existence of such ethnic structures serves to reinforce and sustain the fact of separate identity and distinctiveness but need not compete with the more universalistic structures of the wider society.²⁹⁶

The possibility of ethnic groups and organisations acting with 'self interest' was noted as an inherent danger of structural pluralism rather than cultural pluralism. Jayasuriya argued that this danger can be avoided if there is an interaction between all groups that would be facilitated if ethnic groups and organisations are able to participate in the mainstream structures of the wider society.²⁹⁷

Jayasuriya described cultural pluralism as a means to ensure that Australian institutions reflect the 'reality of this cultural diversity', but also stated that 'radical change' is required if cultural pluralism is to 'become a reality'.²⁹⁸ He therefore claimed cultural pluralism was intended to reflect existing social realities in response to existing

trends but at the same time claimed it sought to transform social realities by encouraging particular trends. There was an apparent contradiction between the desires to reflect or transform society, between the moderate and the radical approach. This was partly the outcome of seeking to present cultural pluralism as the moderate version of multiculturalism when it actually sought a more radical transformation of Australian society than the cultural pluralists were usually prepared to articulate in public forums. It was less radical than the ethnic rights position, in that it did not advocate social transformation through working-class militancy, but it did seek a transformation of Australian society through an ethnically and culturally diverse immigration program. This role for the immigration program was not explicitly stated by Jayasuriya, as it had been by Zubrzycki in the IAC Committee on Social Patterns *Final Report* (1973),²⁹⁹ but was implied by his criticism of the report of Borrie's National Population Inquiry that had called for a return to migration from the traditional sources of Britain and Northern Europe.³⁰⁰ If cultural pluralism was simply about reflecting social reality its stance would be neutral on the content of the immigration program, but cultural pluralism was not neutral on this issue. Cultural pluralism was about increasing Australia's social diversification through immigration to transform social reality while simultaneously demanding that Australia's institutions change to reflect this reality.

Jayasuriya had drawn a distinction between cultural pluralism and structural pluralism to enhance the appeal of cultural pluralism as the moderate version of multiculturalism. This enabled him to attribute what could be considered the undesirable possible consequences of the migrant presence, such as ethnic separatist behaviour, to structural pluralism. Like other cultural pluralists, he had a great deal to say about the value and virtues of ethnic groups and organisations but had comparatively almost nothing to say about how ethnic groups that strayed into separatist behaviour could be regulated, and precisely what constituted undesirable ethnic behaviour. The ethnic rights activists and ethnic structural pluralists did not incorporate such limitations on ethnic group behaviour into their ideologies, and were therefore not faced with the same burden of explanation as the cultural pluralists in this regard.

Jayasuriya concluded with a call for bipartisanship on multiculturalism: 'the urgent need is for a clearer endorsement of cultural

pluralism as a matter of bi-partisan public policy. Such a philosophy of community relations needs to be de-politicised and accepted by all major parties.'³⁰¹ Bipartisanship on cultural pluralism was considered by Jayasuriya and Lippmann to be crucial to its success, Jayasuriya recalled that they feared that bipolar parliamentary debate and competition could 'tear it apart' in its nascent stages:

I have always maintained that and Walter [Lippmann] agreed with me. Because it was the only way in which it could have ever got accepted in this society because it was such a radical idea . . . And that was really the success, we were able to maintain the middle ground.³⁰²

The submission of the *Final Report*, of the Committee on Community Relations, on 30 October 1975 marked the culmination of the initial developmental period of the ideology of multiculturalism that occurred between 1966 and 1975. By October 1975 all four streams of multicultural thought had formulated and published comprehensive ideological manifestos. There have been significant clarifications and modifications of multicultural ideology since this period but it was between 1966 and 1975 that the fundamental elements of multiculturalism were established.

Except for the academics, activists, interest group leaders, public servants and politicians directly involved in the development and progress of multiculturalism, it is likely that the increased use of the term 'multiculturalism' from 1975 did not correspond with a widespread understanding of multiculturalist ideology. Multiculturalism tended to be widely understood and appreciated as a normative or ethical term, referring to people or policies positively disposed towards the migrant presence. In this regard, the term multiculturalism acquired an ethical quality that distinguished it from most contemporary political terms. This widespread acceptance of multiculturalism as an ethical term has probably distracted attention from it as an ideology and blurred significant distinctions between the forms of multiculturalism and other distinct historical phenomena, such as ALP immigration policy from 1971 to 1975.

Because multiculturalism became largely appreciated as an ethical term, assimilationism, and to a lesser extent integrationism, have also tended to have been understood as being negatively disposed towards the migrant presence, even though contemporary

assimilationists and integrationists did not perceive themselves or their ideologies in this way. Multiculturalism had already acquired the moral high ground by 1975; the assumption that the rival ideologies were by definition anti-migrant greatly enhanced multiculturalism in debates against its competitors.

Trade unions

At the beginning of 1975, the ethnic rights activists' campaign, to achieve a place for multicultural ideas and policies within the union movement, was their least successful campaign. By this time the Migrant Workers' Conference Committee, which formed the vanguard of the campaign, had been expanded to include many leading ethnic rights activists: Zangalis as chairman, Des Storer, Alan Matheson, Ignacio Salemi, Maria Pozos, June Hearn, plus other members of FILLEF and several unionists recruited from the delegates at the first Migrant Workers' Conference.³⁰³

During the first half of 1975, the Committee met intermittently³⁰⁴ because its members were involved in other more successful ethnic rights campaigns and projects, such as the establishment of 3ZZ and the research project into migrant women workers. From the middle of 1975, they met more frequently after they decided to organise a second Migrant Workers' Conference to further their campaign in the union movement and establish a Migrant Workers' Centre in Trades Hall.

Sgro recalled that the ethnic rights activists had decided to modify their tactics, changing their demand for migrants' rights to equal rights, and consequently they achieved greater support from the hierarchy of the union movement:

Our demands were at the time we wanted equal rights not migrant rights. I mean we changed the words from migrant rights, as a separate identity, to equal rights. And once we put in those words 'equal', a lot of people at the Union said, well, that is all right. If you want equal rights we support you.³⁰⁵

In addition, the circular they sent to union officials outlining the aims of the conference stated that the goal was achieving greater participation of migrant workers in the union movement,³⁰⁶ an objective that was compatible with the interests of the union movement.

This approach resulted in Jack Sparks, the president of the Trades Hall Council, and Mr Mead, a representative of the Department of Labour and Immigration, attending the August meeting of the Migrant Workers' Conference Committee and offering to support the conference.³⁰⁷

The conference was publicised in the ethnic press and union journals, on 3ZZ and 3EA, and through leaflets, with the Department of Labour and Immigration providing the necessary resources.³⁰⁸ The proposal for the conference would also be brought before the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) Congress later that year. Zangalis was aware that a positive appraisal by the executive of the ACTU would break down much opposition within the union movement. He lobbied the ACTU executive to support the conference and appreciate ethnic rights ideas;³⁰⁹ because the executive was concerned about the growing numbers of non-union workers he achieved a significant breakthrough. At the ACTU Congress in October 1975, the ACTU executive made a recommendation on the topic of increasing the proportion of unionists in the workforce, which mentioned organising migrants and the union movement's responsibility to migrant workers.³¹⁰ This did not amount to an endorsement of the ethnic rights position, but it was sufficient to encourage the Victorian Trades Hall Council to move from unofficial to official support for the conference as a forum for the expression of migrant workers' opinions, and assist in the arrangement of factory meetings to elect the delegates to the conference.³¹¹

The Second Migrant Workers' Conference was held at Trades Hall on 7–8 November 1975, and conducted in six languages. It was larger than the first conference, attended by four hundred delegates, and it included among those speaking the Minister for Labour and Immigration, Senator Jim McClelland. The organisers had learned from their mistakes with the first conference, this one was better organised and more successful but, as Storer recalled, there were some drawbacks:

Again it got a bit tied up with the elections [constitutional crisis] on at the time and people focused on that. There was a greater focus on migrant women workers' issues at the Conference because of the women workers project. It was larger; it became very diverse; it wasn't as focused as the 1973 one.³¹²