Dr Sev Ozdowski OAM
Director, Equity and Diversity at the University of Western Sydney and
Hon. Professor in the Centre of Peace and Conflict Studies at Sydney University
PO Box A959, Sydney South NSW 1235
Ph: 0413 474744 E-mail: sevozdo@gmail.com

"Racism, Equality and Civil Liberties in a Multicultural Australia."

Paper delivered at the 5th International Conference on Human Rights Education, "*Advancing UNiversal Human Rights Culture"*, Washington DC, 4-6 December 2014

Summary

Modern Australia began as a European settlement in a land inhabited by Indigenous people. The history of settlement was not always peaceful. The clash at the frontier between the Indigenous population and European settlers was often cruel, hateful and has had long lasting consequences. Other areas of conflict developed along ethnic and religious lines including between the Protestant English and Catholic Irish. It should also be noted that the racist *"White Australia"* policy remained unchallenged wisdom, adhered to by the vast majority until the late 1950s.

Although European settlement espoused reasonably egalitarian principles (which initially did not include Indigenous Australians), the Australian Constitution was drafted without the inclusion of a bill of rights.

Following mass post-WWII migration, today's Australia is a well-functioning, multicultural society with well over 200 languages spoken at home. Chinese, Indian and Muslim settlers are amongst the largest communities. Governments are committed to multicultural policies which focus on equality and anti-racism measures, even if they are to the detriment of civil liberties such as a freedom of speech or expression.

This paper will examine the linkages between the historical background and modern culture of human rights in Australia and in particular the evolution of the egalitarian concept of a *"fair go"*. It will also ascertain the nature of contemporary human rights education in Australia and its contribution to advancing equality and civil liberties.

Keywords

Fair go culture, human rights education, multiculturalism, universality and cultural relativism.

Bio Note

Dr Sev Ozdowski OAM is the former Australian Human Rights Commissioner who conducted the ground-breaking *"National Inquiry into Children in Immigration Detention "A last resort?"* and the *National Inquiry into Mental Health Services "Not for Service".* He has worked in senior government positions for over 20 years and published widely on refugee issues, multiculturalism and human rights. Currently he works at two Australian universities and is Chair of the Australian Multicultural Council and of the Australian Council for Human Rights Education.

"Racism, Equality and Civil Liberties in a Multicultural Australia."
Dr Sev Ozdowski

1.0 Introduction: universal human rights, local culture and human rights education

The principle of universality of human rights is the cornerstone of international human rights law. This principle was first emphasized in the 1948 Universal Declaration on Human Rights and then reiterated in numerous international human rights conventions. It simply asserts that the basic values and principles underlying the concept of human rights are of a universal nature to all humanity and include such concepts as individual liberty and freedoms, the belief in democracy and political rights and the acknowledgement of social and economic right.

The post-Cold War Vienna World Conference on Human Rights of 25 June 1993 (OHCHR, 1993) reaffirmed universality of human rights. Article 1 in Part I of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action adopted at this conference declared that "*The universal nature of these rights and freedoms is beyond question"* and Article 5 that *"All human rights are universal, indivisible and interdependent and interrelated*."

This statement put an end to the debate between the former Soviet and Western block states about the relative importance of civil liberties and political rights versus economic and social rights. The Declaration also proclaimed that it is the duty of States, regardless of their political, economic and cultural systems, to promote and protect all human rights and fundamental freedoms.

By affirming the universality of human rights, the Vienna Declaration also rejected the radical cultural relativism doctrine that holds that culture, and not international law, "*is the sole source of the validity of a moral right or rule.*" (Donnelly, 1984) However, Article 5, Part I, of the Vienna Declaration acknowledged that the universality of human rights must be seen in the context of "*the significance of national and regional particularities and various historical, cultural and religious backgrounds*."[i] Thus a concession has been made that some cultural relativism may be justified in some circumstances. However, it did not go as far as accepting the view that there are "Asian", "African" or "Islamic" human rights that take precedence over the principle of universality. [ii]

The Declaration further considered human rights education to be *"essential for the promotion and achievement of stable and harmonious relations among communities and for fostering mutual understanding, tolerance and peace." (Article 78, Part II).* Considering what was said above about impact of culture and history on the principle of universalism, it could be further hypothesized that human rights education could also reflect, in some circumstances, national culture and history and most likely would differ between the countries as education will reflect different perspectives.

The purpose of this paper is to look at the universality principle in the context of Australian historical particularities. The paper will also attempt to assess if, and if so how, such local particularities impacted on the human rights education system in Australia.

2.0 The Roots of Australian Human Rights Culture

The history of modern Australia is relatively short. It began on the day Captain James Cook arrived at Botany Bay in the *HMS Endeavour* in 1770 and formally took possession of the east coast of New Holland (as it was then called) for Britain. The continent had already been inhabited at that point for tens of thousands of years by a race steeped in culture and tradition. The first colony in Australia was established in Sydney Cove in 1788 (that is 12 years after the US Declaration of Independence) when Captain Arthur Phillip's fleet of 11 ships arrived with nearly 1,500 people; half of them convicts and the rest consisting of mariners, government officials and soldiers.

Today's Australia is a modern nation with Parliamentary democracy, robust economy and of enormous diversity. Freedom from discrimination based on race, gender, sexual orientation, disability, age, religion and a range of political rights and civil liberties and freedoms are protected in Australia by an independent judiciary. This judiciary apply the Common Law, the Australian Constitution and various other laws of Australia and its states and territories, the rule of law and transparent criminal justice system and robust representative parliamentary institutions. Human rights are also protected by an independent Australian Human Rights Commission, a range of state anti-discrimination and equal opportunity bodies and a robust non-government sector.

Contemporary Australia however differs significantly from the Australia of early European settlement and its colonial times and from Australia during the period between the 1901 Federation and Second World War (WWII).[iii]

Australia's human rights culture also significantly differs when compared with other western democracies despite their common roots. Let us take a *tour de horizon* to see what these differences are and how they were formed.

2.1 Australian democracy and political rights

Despite its youthfulness, Australia is one of the oldest continuous constitutional democracies in the modern world, with political rights firmly established and observed. Australia is a federal state and adopted a Westminster system of government. The constitution and law provide citizens the right to change their parliamentary government peacefully, and citizens exercise this right through periodic, free, and fair elections based on universal suffrage and mandatory voting. Australia's democratic traditions are comparable with traditions of Great Britain, Canada, and New Zealand and to some extent the USA.

Initially Australia was established as a collection of British colonies administered by governors with autocratic powers. This order was challenged by early settlers demanding political participation. In 1835, William Wentworth established the Australian Patriotic Association which successfully argued for establishment of representative government for New South Wales. By the mid-1850s Australian colonies were ready to manage their own local affairs and soon after, each colony was given its own constitution and residents granted the right to elect their own parliaments; with voting eligibility initially restricted to males with a certain amount of wealth.

The first parliamentary elections in Australia took place in 1843 for the New South Wales Legislative Council. It was well before first elections were held in Russia (1917), China (1912), Japan (1890), Germany (1871) or even Canada (1867) or France (1848). In 1856 the NSW Parliament became bicameral with a fully elected Legislative Assembly and with a Government taking over most of the legislative powers of the Governor. Soon after, the other colonies followed suit and limited self-government was granted to South Australia (1856), Victoria (1857), Queensland (1859), Western Australia (1890) and Tasmania (1896).

In addition to being one of the oldest continuous democracies in the modern world, Australia was also a pioneer of modern electoral systems. For example, it has adopted an innovative secret ballot technique (first Victoria, Tasmania and South Australia) - later named ”Australian ballots” in the United States - based on “one man one vote” principle. This system now underpins all modern elections.

Australia is also a pioneer in women’s political rights. The franchise was initially extended to all male British subjects aged 21 years or older. This included Indigenous people (although they were not encouraged to enroll) with the exception of Queensland and Western Australia where they were specifically barred from voting.

However, in 1895, only two years after women were enfranchised in New Zealand (the first in the world), South Australian women were granted voting rights and for the first time in the world, the right to stand for Parliament. This lead to Catherine Helen Spence becoming the first female candidate for political office, unsuccessfully standing for election as a delegate to Federal Convention on Australian Federation in 1897.

The federation of the colonies in 1901 created the Commonwealth of Australia as a dominion of the British Empire.[iv] The first election for the Commonwealth Parliament in 1901 was based on the electoral laws of the six colonies at that time. In 1902, the Commonwealth Parliament passed the *Commonwealth Franchise Act 1902*, which established a uniform franchise law for the federal Parliament. The Act declared that all British subjects (including women) over the age of 21 years who had been living in Australia for at least 6 months were entitled to a vote. The Act also extended to Australian women the right to stand for election to federal Parliament. This meant that Australia was the second country, after New Zealand, to grant women's suffrage at a national level, and the first country to allow women to stand for Parliament.

However, the 1902 *Franchise Act* also disqualified Indigenous people from Australia, Asia, Africa and the Pacific Islands, with the exception of Māori, from voting, even though they were British subjects and otherwise entitled to a vote. Only in 1962 the right to vote in federal elections was granted to Australian Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders.

Currently every Australian validly enrolled citizen who is aged 18 years or more is obliged to vote in both federal and state elections, if not disqualified from voting.

2.2 Civil liberties and the absence of a bill of rights

The creation of a progressive electoral system and advancement of democratic rights did not go hand in hand with constitutional protection of civil liberties and freedoms. Australia's historical approach to protection of fundamental freedoms has been based in the notion that the rights and processes established by the *Magna Carta*, the *Bill of Rights 1689* and common law were imported to Australia by British colonists and provide sufficient protections.

So when drafting the 1901 Constitution, most civil liberties and freedoms were not included in Australia's Constitution despite the French and US examples. Australia followed instead the British model of reliance upon the common law to protect individuals against abusive interference by governments.[v] Just five individual rights were explicitly recognised in the Constitution:

- the right to vote (Section 41)
- protection against acquisition of property on unjust terms (S. 51(xxxi))
- the right to a trial by jury (S. 80)
- freedom of religion (S. 116) and
- the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of State of residency (S. 117).

The Constitution is silent in relation to numerous other rights that are well recognised in the constitutions of other Western democracies. For example, the Constitution makes no mention of fundamental freedoms such as the freedom of association, freedom of movement, freedom of peaceful assembly, freedom of thought, belief and opinion, and freedom from arbitrary arrest or detention. It does not guarantee the right to a fair trial or due process, nor does it ensure equality of all persons.[vi]

In fact, until today, Australia is the only democratic country in the world without a national bill of rights of some kind. This is despite the fact that on a number of occasions Australians have shown support for the establishment of an Australian Bill of Rights. For example, the 2009 National Consultations on Human Rights initiated by the federal government received 27,888 written submissions in favour of the establishment of an Australian Bill of Rights while 4,203 were opposed. (NHRCC, 2009)

However, Australia's hands-on approach to civil liberties does not lag behind the other western democracies and reflects a belief in the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights of all people as set out in the Universal Declaration. So, for example, in Australia there are no government sponsored arbitrary or unlawful killings and no politically motivated disappearances or arbitrary arrest. There are no political prisoners or detainees. The law provides for the right to a fair trial and the government respects judicial independence. Although the constitution does not explicitly provide for freedom of speech or press, the High Court has held that a right to freedom of expression is implied in the constitution. An independent press, an effective judiciary, and a functioning democratic political system combine to protect and promote the basic civil liberties.[vii] (Ozdowski, S., 2013)

In addition, Australia plays an integral role in the development of international human rights standards, is a party to six major UN human rights conventions and engages actively in UN human rights mechanisms.

Lack of protection of civil liberties and fundamental freedoms against government's infringements by a national bill of rights is further mitigated by the fact that Australians have a healthy disrespect for authority and a noticeable anti-authoritarian streak in their national character. The love of the Ned Kelly legend is often quoted as an example of it. As we know, in the late 1880s a bushranger called Ned Kelly murdered and stole and was subsequently hanged for his crimes. But contemporary Australians admire him for his courage and willingness to stand up for himself. They justify his actions by accepting that he was forced into such behavior because he was denied a *''fair go''* as both he and his family received unfair treatment from those in authority.

2.3 Equality – the Australian *"fair go"*

The modern human rights culture of Australia is firmly based in the Australian concept of *"fair go"* that has its roots in the early European settlement days.
One of Arthur Phillip's earliest decisions as governor was to distribute food equally amongst the convicts and freeman. He realized almost immediately that food was going to be an issue in the new colony and that any system that distributed it unfairly would result in civil unrest. This was not a decision that his men and officers agreed with, particularly when he had anybody who stole from the stores- convict or freeman - flogged.

Further, Governor Phillip also set up an emancipation system whereby convicts could earn their freedom and take land grants in the new colony. By 1790 there was a growing population of emancipated convicts and ex-military establishing private enterprise. By the time Governor Phillip left his commission in 1792 the colony and its social foundation were well established. Considering Phillip's focus on equal access to food for all, his focus on emancipation of convicts and little attention to class barriers, it is not without some cause that we can describe Governor Arthur Phillip as the founder of the *''fair go''* ethos in Australia.

A succession of Governors, some better than others, continued to build a society based on Phillip's foundations. Governor Lachlan Macquarie (1810 -1822), for example, much to the chagrin of the free settlers, appointed emancipated convicts to high government office. This included Francis Greenway as the colonial architect and Dr William Redfern as the colonial surgeon. He even appointed one former convict, Andrew Thompson, as a magistrate. In the old world this disregard for class barriers would simply not have been possible.

It needs to be however recognized that the initial concept of *"fair go"* included only male British subjects. In fact, in early colonial days it was a bit like the Athenian concept of democracy in around 500 BC which formally applied to all Athenian citizens, but excluded Athenian women, most likely Athenians with disabilities, *"barbarians"* – which often meant other Greeks who spoke in a different dialect or with a different accent - and slaves.

In particular, the concept *Terra Nullius* or "*no man's land*" was the antithesis of the extension of *''fair go''* to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. In fact, the clash at the frontier between the Indigenous populations and white settlers was often cruel, hateful and has had long-lasting consequences. Aboriginal resistance against the settlers was widespread, and prolonged fighting between 1788 and the 1920s led to the deaths of at least 20,000 Indigenous people and between 2,000 and 2,500 Europeans. (Grey, 2008, pp.28-40). Smallpox decimated the local Eora people and debate rages still as to whether it was deliberately introduced to them or not. One may also wonder to what extent our past brutal takeover of Australia is linked to our current prejudices and an on-going fear of alien invasion.

In time, this egalitarianism underpinned by the "*fair go*" concept has become the towering concept of Australian human rights culture, overshadowing civil liberties and freedoms. Further, I will examine how the initially limited concept of "*fair go*" has been significantly extended to include other social groups.

Finally, having acknowledged the positive impact of "fair go" concept on creation of modern Australia, perhaps one should also acknowledge that on occasions the Australian egalitarianism has a mean streak to it. For example, a *''fair go''* attitude may be particularly offended by those who secure advantage in wealth or in political status and are in front of the pack or, in other words, display the *"tall poppy"* syndrome. People who acquire major financial wealth are rarely seen as role models and perhaps attract many more dob-ins to the Australian Taxation Office. This also applies to politicians or other people who acquire political power, as the predominant attitude is: we voted *"the bastards"* in and we can vote them out. When dealing with *"tall poppies"*, ordinary Australians would justify taking effective measures to ensure that the egalitarian status of *''fair go''* is maintained. In Graham Davis' (2011) words: *"We seem to regard our self as perfectly entitled to tell anyone in authority to 'get stuffed', especially if that person is an effwit and violates our inviolable code of ''fair go''".* Is Australia the only nation in the world that does this?

Interestingly, the former Prime Minister John Howard invoked the *"fair go"* ethos against the trade unions as a way of justifying his goal, which was to deliver *"fair go"* protections to employers when he abolished what was left of the conciliation and arbitration system. Also, the unauthorized boat arrivals are seen by the majority of Australians as undermining both the controlled nature of Australia's immigration intake and the principle of "fair go", because boat people come without waiting in a queue and thus unfairly taking a place of people waiting orderly in refugee camps. A *"fair go"* can cut both ways and has throughout our history.

2.4 Economic and Social Rights

This original notion of a *''fair go''* and equality of all men established by Governor Arthur Phillip continued post federation and embraced economic and social rights. In 1907, Justice Higgins of the Court of Conciliation and Arbitration used Australia's innovative industrial relations system to bring down the landmark Harvester Decision and established a concept of the living, or basic, wage. Higgins' decision determined that an employer was obliged to pay his employees a *"fair and reasonable wage"* that guaranteed them a standard of living

that was reasonable for *"a human being in a civilized community",* whether or not the employer has the capacity to pay.[viii] Thus the concept of *''fair go''* become grounded in this interventionist approach into employment relations and Australia continues to have higher costs of labour than, for example, the USA.

This decision led the world in setting up progressive labour standards and was made a long time before the Bolshevik Revolution, establishment of the International Labour Organization in 1919 or adoption of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in 1966. Another of the Conciliation Court's early acts was to set the standard working week at 48 hours. What it meant was that employers had to factor the cost of a decent standard of living into their operating expenses. Also around the turn of the century, Australia established the Age Pension available to persons aged 65 years and over, subject only to means testing. All these measures contributed to the flat class structure that characterizes Australia today.

It is important to note, however, that the Harvester decision did not guarantee the same conditions of employment to women and Aboriginal Australians. In other words, the Harvester decision could also be described as both racist and sexist with neither women nor Aboriginal Australians enjoying the benefits of the basic wage. Only in 1965 was equal pay awarded to Aboriginal stockmen and to Australian women workers in 1969.

Australian governments are seen as the custodians of the *''fair go''* principle and the key function of governments (especially Labor) is to remove disadvantage, deliver housing, schools and hospitals and extract a fair proportion of tax from the wealthy (tall poppies).

2.5 Equality and the "White Australia" Policy

The "fair go" principle, however, did not extend initially to other races. Examination of legal history indicates that Australian laws and political institutions reflected racial prejudices and xenophobic fears.

Particularly significant was a conflict that developed between white and Chinese miners in the Gold Fields of Victoria and elsewhere during the 1850s. According to John Knott (2001): "*There were allegations that the Chinese were immoral, that their methods of mining were wasteful, that they were unwilling to prospect for new fields, that they spread disease, that they would marry white women and that their weight of numbers would eventually swamp the British character of the colony".*

What was particularity resented was that Chinese were very industrious, hardworking and were able to earn income from claims abandoned by white settlers. In other words, Chinese were accused of - amongst other things - unfair labour competition because they worked too hard. Their work practices were clearly seen by white miners as undermining what they understood to be the *"fair go"* principles. To resolve the conflict, as early as the 1860s the Australian colonies had passed restrictive legislation directed specifically at Chinese immigrants and established the foundation of the "White Australia" policy.

The Federation movement was firmly driven by our anti-Asian prejudice and fear of foreign invasion. The so-called *"race power"* section (s 51(xxvi)) was inserted into the 1901 Constitution to grant the Federal Parliament power to *"regulate the affairs of the people of coloured or inferior races who are in the Commonwealth"*.

The new Federal Parliament quickly established controls over immigration to maintain Australia's "British character". The first act of Parliament was the *Immigration Restriction Act 1901* which established the *''White Australia''* policy at a national level and the famous dictation test to be taken at the discretion of immigration officials in any European language. *The Pacific Island Labourers Bill 1901* was passed shortly after that. (Evans, R., 2001).

Two years later the Parliament legislated for *The Naturalization Act 1903* which talked about British subjects and did not mention Australian citizenship per se. It also established that Asians and other non-Europeans were to be denied the right to apply for naturalization and that resident, non-European males were not allowed to bring wives to Australia. And all this took place in a context of disregarded British advice to Australian authorities that a race based immigration policy would run "*contrary to the general conceptions of equality which have ever been the guiding principle of British rule throughout the Empire"*.

World War I saw the establishment of internment camps for German and Italian settlers. At its conclusion, he mandate of the League of Nations was compromised by Australia's (and other nations) refusal to include a commitment to non-discrimination on the basis of race.

Only in 1948 *The Nationality and Citizenship Act* created a new status of Australian Citizen in addition to that of British subject and, until 1984, UK citizens living in Australia were able to vote in Australian elections without acquiring Australian citizenship.

3.0 Contemporary Human Rights Culture in Australia

During the XIX century, despite developing its own robust democracy and strong economy, Australia was isolationist and relied on Britain for migrants, security and trade and investment. Australians wanted to keep their "*Little Britain*" in Australia and as a result of this, the egalitarian "*fair go*" applied only to white males of British heritage. Australia was also out of touch with its neighbors in the region. (Crump, T., 2007)

Everything changed when WWII came to Australia and the Japanese flattened Darwin and attacked Sydney. The old alliance with Britain was challenged when Australia had to repatriate, despite Churchill's protest, two Australian divisions from Egypt to Asia Pacific war theatre. A new alliance was formed when the US military entered the war in the Pacific and then strengthened when the USA decided to continue their significant military and economic presence in the region. Despite its continued dependence on her great and powerful friend, Australia had to embrace greater independence and, over time, grow from a parochial, isolationist, colonial past to become a modern cosmopolitan society with solid standing in its region. (Driscoll, W.P. & Elphick, E.S., 1982)

3.1 Expansion of the egalitarian ethos

Australia's strengthening relations with its own region would not have been possible without the extension of egalitarianism and the *''fair go''* principle to arriving non-British migrants or "New Australians" as they were then called, and to other social groups. Let us examine now how this extension impacted on Australian society; although I do not propose to do it in any order of importance or chronology.

First, it need to be acknowledged, that the *''fair go''* principle now includes Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. The long campaigns for the rights of Indigenous Australians resulted first in the extension of social welfare and electoral rights and culminated in the 1967 Referendum in which some 90 percent of Australians voted to amend the Australian Constitution to include all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians in the national census and to allow the Federal parliament to legislate on their behalf.

In 1971 Neville Bonner of the Liberal Party of Australia became the first Aboriginal member of the Federal Parliament. In 1976 the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1976* was passed. In 1992 the High Court of Australia handed down its decision in the *Mabo* case declaring the previous legal concept of *terra nullius* to be invalid and in 1992, too, Prime Minister Keating gave his famous Redfern speech calling on Australians to address the historical wrongs done to the first Australians. In 2008, Prime Minister Kevin Rudd issued a public apology to members of the Stolen Generations on behalf of the Australian Government. And recently government is considering the recommendation made on 19 January 2012 by the Expert Panel on Constitutional Recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples to recognize the role and importance of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the Constitution.

Although much is yet to be achieved - in particular in advancing living standards and opening employment opportunities - one could conclude that in contemporary Australia the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are the key focus of national aspirations to deliver justice and opportunities for all.

Second, the "*fair go''* principle was extended to women. As mentioned earlier, Australia had led the world in bringing women's suffrage rights in the late 19th century. However it was only after WWII women joined the legislatures with Edith Cowan being the first woman elected to the West Australian Legislative Assembly in 1921 and Dame Enid Lyons, being the first woman to hold a Cabinet post in 1949. To date, it is only South Australia that has not had a female Premier, Julia Gillard was Australia's first female Prime Minister (2010-2013), and Quentin Bryce was Australia's first female Governor General (2008-2014).

The principle of *''fair go''* had also been extended to women seeking employment and education opportunities. The first breakthrough came between 1939 and 1944, when Australia created a significant female workforce engaged in direct war production. The number of women working in factories rose from 171,000 to 286,000 during WWII. However a major advancement was achieved in 1974 when the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration granted women the full adult wage. The gender pay equity gap between 15-17percent is regarded at present as a key outstanding equity issue for Australian women.

Another group of people who were beneficiaries of the expanding notion of *''fair go''* are people with disabilities. I will not offer here a historical analysis of how Australia's treatment of people with disabilities has changed over time, except to mention that by now Australia has one of the best systems to deal with disability discrimination. It is based on the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* and associated *Disability Standards*. In July 2013 Australia has adopted a *National Disability Insurance Scheme* (NDIS) which provides individualized support for eligible people with permanent and significant disability, their families and carers.

Most recently the "*fair go*" principle has been extended to gender diverse people known as LGBTIQ. (Willett, G., 2001) This acronym includes lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans/transgender, intersex and queer people. The majority of laws discriminating against LGBTIQ people were repealed in 2008. Earlier this year, the Sex Discrimination Act (1984) was also amended to prohibit discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity or intersex status, although there is an ongoing debate around the right of same-sex couples to marry. The Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras which began its famous life in 1978 is well known world-wide.

Perhaps the most important extension of the *''fair go''* principle in Australia to affect the greatest number of people occurred after WWII when Australia gradually moved from the British oriented *"White Australia"* policy to a policy of non-discrimination in immigration intake, and then in early 1970s moved away from the policy of assimilation to embrace multiculturalism. (Ozdowski, 2012).

3.2 Non-discriminatory immigration

In 1945, Minister for Immigration, Arthur Calwell (1945, pp.4911-4915) wrote: "*If the experience of the Pacific War has taught us one thing, it surely is that seven million Australians cannot hold three million square miles of this earth's surface indefinitely."* The old cry "*populate or perish"* won new currency with all major parties and mass migration started. (Ozdowski, S., 1985) Some 7.5 million immigrants have settled between 1945 and 2013 and Australia's population has increased from about seven million in 1945 to almost twenty four million in 2014.

Post WWII migration started with a preference for "ten pound Poms" British immigrants who were brought to Australia by ship for the grand sum of ten pounds. But the numbers of British migrants fell short of what was expected. The authorities turned their attention for the first time to potential non-British European settlers - to the hundreds of thousands of people, mainly Central European displaced by the War, and then to Southern Europeans. In mid-1970s this then changed to global intake based on skills. The predicted Net Overseas Migration for 2014 intake is around 250,000 with largest groups of migrants coming from India, China and the UK.

This mass migration required changes to immigration and related laws. As many new arrivals were not British subjects, Australian citizenship was created by the *Nationality and Citizenship Act 1948*. In May 1958, the Menzies Government replaced the arbitrarily applied

dictation test with an entry permit system that reflected economic and skills criteria. Further changes in the 1960s and 1970s effectively ended the *"White Australia"* policy.

The globalized intake of migrants resulted in Australia being a multiethnic nation in the demographic sense of this word. Now over a quarter (27.7%) of Australia's population was born overseas and a further one fifth (20%) has at least one overseas-born parent. Although historically the majority of migration had come from Europe, there are increasingly more Australians who were born in Asia and other parts of the world. (Markus. A., 2009) When we look at cultural heritage, over 300 ancestries were separately identified in the 2011 Census. The most commonly reported were English (36%) and Australian (35%). A further six of the leading ten ancestries reflected the European heritage in Australia with the two remaining ancestries being Chinese (4%) and Indian (2%).

Today Australians speak more than 250 languages – this includes some 40 Aboriginal languages. Apart from English the most commonly used are Chinese (largely Mandarin and Cantonese), Italian, Greek, Arabic and Vietnamese languages. There is also enormous religious diversity with some 61% reporting affiliation to Christianity in the 2011 Census and 7.2% reporting an affiliation to non-Christian religions[ix], and 22% reporting *"No Religion"*. (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012)

Australia's ethnic diversity is especially visible in large cities. For example, in Sydney nearly 40 per cent speak a non-English language at home. Arabic, which dominates the western suburbs, is the most widely spoken non-English language. Mandarin and Cantonese are the next most common languages. In the Western Sydney suburb Cabramatta West, 40.1% of residents speak Vietnamese, in Old Guildford 46.6% speak Arabic and in Hurstville 50% speak either Cantonese or Mandarin. (Ting, 2014)

3.3 From Assimilation to Multicultural Australia

With such a large and diverse intake, the pre WWII ideal of mono-cultural Australia soon became obsolete. Further, the dominant expectation in the 1950s that non-British immigrants would assimilate as fast as possible into the Australian lifestyle, abandoning their past national allegiances and cultural *"baggage"*, was no longer realistic. Non-British migrants did not meld easily into the Anglo-Celtic melting pot; instead they established their own lively communities with churches, sporting and cultural clubs, associations, schools and welfare. They established them to maintain their culture and to help themselves in the process of settlement. "New Australians" also grew in wealth and political influence.

To manage this diversity a new policy of multiculturalism was initiated by immigration minister Al Grassby during the Whitlam government in the early seventies. Multiculturalism is based on a cultural ideal about how a diverse society should be organized to deliver cohesion. It is grounded in values of equality and liberty and delivers strong upward mobility for newcomers. It assumes that culture is enriched by diversity rather than polluted by it and that the diverse cultural elements can co-exist within a broader cultural envelope that creates its own common ground. Australian multiculturalism aims to remove entrenched structures of privilege and/or racial or religious divisions and to extend liberty and equality.

A commitment to Australian core values and equality of status and opportunity of different ethno-cultural grouping are the two main pillars of this policy.

Although migrants are expected to master the English language and develop an overriding and unifying commitment to Australia and its basic structures and laws, the policy values and allows for the preservation and transfer to the next generation of minority cultural and linguistic heritage that does not conflict with the Australian core values. It follows that all Australians have the right to express and share their cultural heritage as well as a reciprocal responsibility to accept the heritage of others. It is expected however, that newcomers upon arrival in Australia will give up their foreign loyalties and in particular, involvement with the country of origin's conflicts and ethnic or religious hatreds.

This policy aims to achieve integration with a *"human face"* and with dignity. In other words, contemporary Australian multiculturalism must be seen as a social compact, or two-way street between the established Australian society and newcomers which requires both give and take. The policy also recognizes the right of all Australians to equality of treatment and opportunity as well as an equal right to participate in all aspects of the nation's life. Contribution of migrants to the nation's economy and the linkages they bring to the globalized economy, or so called "*productive diversity"* (Cope & Kalantzis, 1997), are also highly valued. In a practical sense, the policy of multiculturalism involves a complex set of normative and structural systems as well as policy, budgetary and program responses put in place to manage diversity. The policy acknowledges the political standing of ethnic leaders and involves a range of consultative bodies and a liaison mechanism between the government and ethnic community leaders. These play an especially important role in handling occasional social conflicts associated with the nature of diversity. Community leaders are expected to assist the government in particular with the management of the impact on foreign loyalties and religious hatreds.

Australian multiculturalism also aims to ameliorate the impact of racial and religious divisions and to moderate Australia's cultural nationalist impulse by focusing on inclusion of new-comers into broader society. In other words, contemporary Australian multiculturalism is a social compact, a two-way street between established and new communities. Cultural and religious leaders are expected to play their role by helping governments handle the occasional social conflicts, in particular by helping manage the impact of foreign loyalties and religious hatreds.

Although Australia's multicultural policies and programs have seen some major fine-tuning and refinements, all governments since 1973 have supported their existence. (Ozdowski, S., 2013a) Under the prime ministership of Malcolm Fraser (1975-83), multiculturalism emerged as an ideal based on social cohesion, equality of opportunity and cultural identity. The first advisory body was established, as was the Special Broadcasting Service (both radio and TV, the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs and a range of settlement services. (Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs, 1982) The Hawke and Keating governments (1983-96) established the Office of Multicultural Affairs, mainstreamed settlement services, refined consultation processes (Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, 1986) and defined multicultural policies in the National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia. (Office of Multicultural Affairs, 1989) Prime Minister John Howard (1996-2007), after initial hesitation,

because of populist, right wing backlash to multicultural policies lead by Pauline Hanson, member of federal parliament from Queensland and the leader of One Nation Party,, created in 1999 a *"New agenda for multicultural Australia"* that shifted the focus to unity and social cohesion and took measures to advance the value of Australian citizenship. (Australian Government, 2003) After the first Rudd government (2007-10) inaction, the Gillard government (2010-13) in 2011 re-discovered *"the miracle"* of multiculturalism and focused on anti-racism strategies. In December 2014 the Abbott government requested the Australian Multicultural Council to *"advise the government on ways to sustain and support socially cohesive communities, to ensure that all Australians have the opportunity to participate, engage and contribute to Australian life".*

Australia's high level of inter-ethnic marriage is one of indicators that highlight how multiculturalism has served Australia well. According to the 2006 Australian Census, a majority of Indigenous Australians partnered with non-indigenous Australians, and a majority of third generation Australians of non-English-speaking background had partnered with persons of a different ethnic origin (the majority partnered with persons of Australian or Anglo-Celtic background). There is also enormous economic upward mobility amongst the new settlers, suggesting, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, that in Australia "*Achievement has no colour".*

The effectiveness of Australia's multicultural policies was demonstrated, for example, during the 16 December 2014 Martin Place siege, where an alleged terrorist forced his captives to raise a black Islamist flag during a police standoff. In response to the siege, Muslim leaders condemned the attack and offered authorities their assistance. More broadly, Australians have shown that the correct response is not blind retaliation against people on the basis of a real or presumed religious identity. The Muslim community has not been held responsible for the attack, as it is well accepted that the extremism and terrorism is the common enemy of us all. In the end, the violence committed by Man Haron Monis did not inspire communal hatred, but rather brought Australians together.

The policy of multiculturalism has the support of the majority of Australians. This was confirmed recently by the October 2014 Scanlon Foundation survey reaffirming that there is the highly positive findings on attitudes to immigration and multiculturalism with 85% of Australians in support of multiculturalism. (Markus, 2014) What is also important is that it is supported both by the established communities and by recent arrivals (Markus, 2011, pp.89-100). A recent Mind & Mood (Megalogenis, 2012) report on New Australians, based on extensive interviews with Chinese, Indian, Vietnamese and Somali migrants indicated that they see Australia as a peaceful and a fair nation and were more optimistic about their future in the '*lucky country'* than the local-born middle class. The University of Western Sydney-led *Challenging Racism Project*[x] reported that "*About 87 per cent of Australians say that they see cultural diversity as a good thing for society*." Thus, in words of Elsa Koleth (2010) "*Multiculturalism has served a variety of goals over the years, including, the pursuit of social justice, the recognition of identities and appreciation of diversity, the integration of migrants, nation building, and attempts to achieve and maintain social cohesion."*

The Australian experience suggests that only "fair go" societies where citizens are free and equal in opportunities can develop a common sense of belonging. Equal participation in a

broader society and open upward mobility channels that work regardless of cultural, linguistic and religious backgrounds empower migrants, maximize their economic contribution and remove the need for ethnic ghettos or separateness from the community at large. Surely only such societies can remain cohesive and engaged in nation building projects.

If this is the case, then equality in rights and status, non-discrimination and access to upward mobility must be viewed as all important and universal foundation stones for the management of multi-ethnic societies. In fact, nobody would use the word multiculturalism to describe a diverse society without these characteristics.

3.4 Combating racial discrimination

Racism is one of the biggest threats to development and good functioning of a multi-ethnic society and its cohesion. This is because democratic participation and freedoms can only be enjoyed where people enjoy the basic right of freedom from discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion or culture. The definition of racism includes not only conscious discrimination at the personal level, but also unwitting systemic discrimination which occurs when racial or cultural assumptions become embodied in society's established institutions and processes.

Considering the historical overhang of past racism and of the "*White Australia"'* policy, it is a time to ask the following questions: How is the contemporary Australian society equipped to deal with any discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion or culture? What is the actual level of racism in Australia now? How do we compare with other countries?

Let us start with looking at the contemporary Australian legal system. In fact, a host of important legal changes were made both to immigration laws and to laws impacting on racial equality post WWII. First, immigration laws underwent major changes initiated by the Menzies government's *Migration Act 1958*, which abolished the "*dictation test*", and then by the Holt government's watershed 1966 announcement that effectively dismantled the *"White Australia*" policy.

The path-breaking 1966 *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination* was ratified by Australia on 30 September, 1975. The convention implemented an important idea, once simply expressed by Muhammad Ali, that "*Hating people because of their colour is wrong. And it doesn't matter which colour does the hating. It's just plain wrong".* The convention committed Australia in international law to the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination and to promoting understanding among different racial, ethnic and religious groupings. Australia was also required to criminalize the incitement of racial hatred, to ensure judicial remedies for acts of racial discrimination, and to engage in public education to promote understanding and tolerance.

The Australian Parliament passed soon after the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* (RDA) to implement the convention domestically. The passing of RDA was a crowning moment of a long process to dismantle the racist policies of the past. The Act made racial discrimination unlawful in Australia and overrode inconsistent States and Territory legislation. In addition,

the Office of Community Relations was created and Al Grassby, the former Whitlam Immigration Minister, was appointed as the first federal Commissioner for Community Relations.

Article 1 of the Convention defines racial discrimination as*:" ...any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life."*

A very similar definition of racial discrimination can be found in RDA. According to RDA, discrimination occurs when someone is treated less fairly than someone else in a similar situation because of their race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin. Racial discrimination can also occur when a policy or rule appears to treat everyone in the same way but actually has an unfair effect on more people of a particular race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin than others. RDA outlawed racial discrimination in the public sphere and in particular in areas such as employment, housing or accommodation, provision of goods and services, access to places and facilities for use by the public, advertising and joining a trade union. In addition, in October 1995, Australia introduced the *Racial Hatred Act* to prohibit offensive behavior based on racial vilification.

The State and Territory governments' laws have followed suit and established their own laws to combat race discrimination and prejudice.[xi] As a result, Australia now has an effective legal infrastructure to welcome and empower newcomers including those from minority racial, cultural or religious backgrounds.

The broad community support for Australian racial discrimination law is well illustrated by the fate of the recent government proposal to change Australia's racial vilification laws. In general, government sought to change section 18C of the *Racial Discrimination Act* in order to restore what it saw to be a better balance between freedom of expression and protection from racial vilification. (Commonwealth of Australia, 2013) Section 18C of RDA makes it unlawful to: *"offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate another person or a group of people because of their race or ethnicity*". The proposed law would have removed protections against offending, insulting or humiliating someone and the draft bill released for consultations proposed a new section that would make it: *"unlawful for a person to do an act ... that is reasonably likely to vilify another person or a group of persons or intimidate another person or group of persons".* The proposal has met with robust opposition from ethnic community leaders and was unpopular with the wider public. More than 76 per cent of 4100 submissions opposed the proposal and only three per cent called for a complete repeal of all racial discrimination protections. As a result, the government had to abandon the proposed changes.

Thus looking at its legal system, Australia today is a very different country from the Australia of the 1900s. It is free of legislative vestiges of *"White Australia"* policy, perhaps with the exception of *"Australian obsession with border control".* (Markus, 2012)

Australia now is also a very different society from that of the 1900s. It is now a vibrant, tolerant, multiethnic society with a relatively high degree of cohesion. Nevertheless, there have been contemporary incidents of racism in Australia that took many different forms—from abusive language or discriminatory treatment to violence, simply on the basis of someone's *"race"*. For example, Pauline Hanson was widely accused of racism after she stated that Australia was in danger of being *"swamped by Asians",* and that these immigrants *"have their own culture and religion, form ghettos and do not assimilate".* She fast lost her foothold in Australian politics.
In 2005 there were a series of racially motivated confrontations between white and Lebanese youths that started around a beachfront suburb, Cronulla, and continued in the following nights as retaliatory violent assaults and large gatherings of protesters in several other Sydney suburbs. This led to an unprecedented police lock-down of Sydney beaches. In 2009 protests were conducted in Melbourne by Indian students and wide scale media coverage in India alleged that a series of robberies and assaults against Indian students should be ascribed to racism in Australia[xii]. In the aftermath of these attacks, other investigations alleged racist elements in the Victorian police force.

So the question needs to be asked: What is the actual level of racism in Australia now?

There is no agreement amongst academia and public commentators on how to respond to the above question. The responses appear to depend upon who you are. People associated with the political left and those Australians who represent powerless communities are more likely to claim that Australia continues to be a racist society, indeed full of racial discrimination and prejudice. For example, Aboriginal Reverend Aunty Alex Gater is of the view that, "*We all know that racism is alive and well*." The same view was expressed by Colin Markham, former NSW parliamentary Secretary for Indigenous affairs who also said, "*We all know that racism is alive and well*." Also Lozano (2014) in paper presented to the 5th International Human Rights Education Conference claims that *"Racism is prevalent in everyday Australia…"* and provides a range of references in support of her point of view.

Other people, especially those who belong to majority groupings and/or hold positions of wealth and/or power would be more likely to argue that there is no significant level of racism in contemporary Australia. For example, former Prime Ministers of Australia have stated that *"I do not accept that there is underlying racism in this country"* (John Howard) and that "*I do not believe that racism is at work in Australia" (*Kevin Rudd). Ozdowski (2012a) acknowledges the existence of pockets of racist behaviour and attitudes in Australia but stops short from characterising racism as being prevalent characteristics of contemporary Australian society.

A recent national data survey from the Challenging Racism Project[xiii] reported the following findings:

- around 85% of respondents believe that racism is a current issue in Australia
- around 20% of respondents had experienced forms of race-hate talk (verbal abuse, name-calling, racial slurs, offensive gestures etc.)
- around 11% of respondents identified as having experienced race-based exclusion from their workplaces and/or social activities

- 7% of respondents identified as having experienced unfair treatment based on their race
- 6% of respondents reported that they had experienced physical attacks based on their race.

The above data are in line with the Newspoll survey findings published in The Australian newspaper on 17 July 2014 concluded that *"One in five people agrees the word 'racist' describes Australians 'a lot', while two thirds agree that describes them 'a little'. Only 12 percent of people believe Australians are not at all racist."*

Generally speaking, racist hotspots are reported to be in areas of economic hardship, recent immigration and below-average education levels. The most often reported location of discrimination was the neighborhood (58 per cent), followed by shopping centers (42.8 per cent) and at work (39 per cent).[xiv]

Research also indicated that experiences of racism vary considerably amongst different ethnic groups. For example Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people report much higher rates of racism, in particular in relation to contact with police, when accessing primary health care or seeking housing.

Also people born overseas report higher rates of racism than those born in Australia, and are twice as likely to experience racism in the workplace, although the Scanlon Foundation surveys also indicated that "settled" immigrants tend to experience lower levels of racist attitudes than more recent arrivals to Australia.[xv] (Dunn, K., *et all*, 2009) Currently anti-Muslim feelings become more visible with the Scanlon Foundation surveys indicating that the attitude towards those of the Muslim faith remains relatively high (Markus, 2014).

The above data can be interpreted in a number of different ways. According to federal Race Discrimination Commissioner Tim Soutphommasane: *"These findings remind us that racism occurs in everyday places, to everyday people. Casual racism appears to be the new face of prejudice and discrimination. The public response to recent incidents of racial vilification shows that the majority of Australians reject hate and division. But we can't be complacent about stopping racism wherever it occurs."* (Soutphommasane, 2014)

In my opinion, the surveys demonstrate a very high level of awareness of racism amongst the Australian public, and possibly moral condemnation and dis-approval of it. This could explain the recent by-stander reactions by majority members to deal with racists outbursts on public transport. The surveys also demonstrate that direct individual experience of racist behavior is relatively low – from 6-7% who have experienced direct physical attacks or unfair treatment to some 20% who have experienced racial slurs and offensive gestures. In other words, the studies clearly indicate that there exist pockets of racist behaviour and attitudes in Australia.
The fact that between 6-20 % of Australians report experiencing racist attitudes and actions is a major challenge to social cohesion. In particular, negative attitudes towards those of the Muslim faith are of key concern as they seem to be embedded into populist culture and contribute to settlement difficulties being experienced by some elements of the Muslim community But discrimination against the latest group of arrivals is nothing new in Australia

and elsewhere – the earlier arrivals such as Greeks or post WWII refugees and displaced persons experienced initially negative attitudes during their early settlement, too. In case of Muslim migrants, the negative attitudes towards them are being more profound possibly because of cultural and in particular religious differences and by concerns about Islamist radicalization.

Clearly further educational effort is needed to ameliorate the existing pockets of racism in order to maintain sustainability of Australia's egalitarian dream. In fact, multicultural policies are about good intercommunal relations, inclusion and above all about equality for all of us to advance social cohesion. To link challenges to social cohesion with multicultural policies is plainly wrong and as Geoffrey Braham Levey (2012) pointed, the alternative is much worse: "*Abolish Australian Multiculturalism and the strong cultural nationalist impulse in this country would go unchecked. Liberty and equality in Australia would be the first casualties".*

To conclude, despite the clear existence of pockets of racism in Australian society, it is the egalitarian streak in Australia's national character, and not the past racism and xenophobia, that has provided an effective foundation for the establishment of contemporary Australia. The multicultural policies provide the best response to challenges posed to social cohesion by contemporary racism as they extended liberty, equality and economic wealth to migrants and offer them a sense of belonging, unparalleled opportunities and integration into democratic institutions. In my view, the supremacy of the Australian egalitarian dream will win the day.

Allow me to finish with a quotation from Nelson Mandela: "*No one is born hating another person because of the colour of his skin, or his background, or his religion. People must learn to hate, and if they can learn to hate, they can be taught to love, for love comes more naturally to the human heart than it's opposite."*

4.0 Human Rights Education

This brings us to human rights education. Human rights education is a high priority for the United Nations (UN) and many governments world-wide. It is based on a premise that human rights are universal and indivisible and it aims to build an understanding and appreciation for learning about rights and learning through rights. The UN Decade on Human Rights Education (1995–2004) provided a global human rights education implementation framework through its Plan of Action. It was followed by the 2004 UN World Human Rights Education Programme. The 1st Phase (2005–2009) of the Programme emphasized the primary and secondary school curricula and formal education, while the 2nd Phase (2010–2014) focused on those who further mentor tomorrow's citizens and leaders, e.g. higher education institutions, government officials, the military. The 3rd Phase (2015–2019) is currently being developed with initial focus on media professionals and journalists, and will have an emphasis on education and training in equality and non-discrimination.

One important result of this emphasis on human rights education was the formulation of the UN Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training which was adopted by the UN General Assembly in December 2011. The Declaration asserts that everyone has the right to

know, seek and receive information about their human rights and fundamental freedoms and recognizes that human rights education and training is a lifelong process that includes all parts of society. (Tibbitts, F. & Fernekes, W.R., 2011)

This non-binding Declaration also defines human rights education and training as comprising "*all education, training, information, awareness-raising and learning activities aimed at promoting universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms*" and calls on all to intensify efforts to promote the universal respect and understanding of human rights education and training. (United Nations General Assembly Resolution, A/RES/66/137, 19 December 2011).

4.1 What do Australians Know about Human Rights?

Australians, on the whole, have a poor knowledge of their human rights according to various research. (Civics Expert Group, 1994, NHRCC Report 2009). This was well illustrated when I undertook a yearlong project "*Rights of Passage – A Dialogue with Young Australians about Human Rights*" (HREOC, 2005) in 2005.

During my meetings with high school students (which I continue under the ACHRE "Citizen for Humanity" program) most students were not sure if Australia has a constitution or a national bill of rights or were unable to name any of the key international human rights instruments, perhaps with the exception of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

This is further supported by the Report of the 2009 National Consultations on Human Rights chaired by the well-known lawyer and Jesuit priest, Fr. Frank Brennan. Fr Brennan found human rights education to be wanting and recommended a range of measures to improve the situation. Critically, Recommendations 1 and 2 named education about human rights as the highest priority for cultivating a human rights culture and ultimately improving the human rights situation in Australia. The government responded by adopting the Human Rights Action Plan. (Commonwealth of Australia, 2012).

The poor knowledge does not however indicate lack of an interest in or opinions about human rights issues. It was interesting to find that many young Australians regarded human rights very highly and aspired to high human rights ideals. It was also interesting to find that although they had almost no formal knowledge of human rights applicable in Australia, they were most willing to comment on possible human rights violations or social justice issues often quoting various rights well established in the USA and assuming that they were referring to Australian laws. For example, the Miranda rule[xvi] or Fifth Amendment were quoted as applying to Australia. This certainly may attest to the popularity of USA movies in Australia but regrettably does not suggest much local knowledge!

I Interest in human rights issues was also shown at the 2009 National Consultations which attracted thousands of people willing to talk about the importance of human rights. The consultations consisted of sixty-six community round tables, three days of public hearings and received some 35,000 submissions in addition to commissioned research and a phone survey.

This begs a question: Why do Australians have such limited factual information about human rights laws? This requires a review of the sources of knowledge acquisition; so let us start with schools.

4.2 Teaching Human Rights at Schools

The issue of human rights education at primary and secondary school level has been debated in Australia for decades. There is even a national agreement that human rights education in school is an effective way to assist children to incorporate human rights values into their attitudes and behaviors. In December 2008, federal and state ministers for education released "*the Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians"* which aimed to provide a direction for Australian schooling for the next ten years. This declaration followed "*the Adelaide Declaration"* of 1999 and was developed in collaboration with the Catholic and independent school sectors.

The Melbourne Declaration stated that active and informed citizens:

- act with moral and ethical integrity
- appreciate Australia's social, cultural, linguistic and religious diversity, and have an understanding of Australia's system of government, history and culture
- understand and acknowledge the value of Indigenous cultures and possess the knowledge, skills and understanding to contribute to, and benefit from, reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians
- are committed to national values of democracy, equality and justice, and participate in Australia's civic life
- are able to relate and communicate across cultures, especially the cultures and countries of Asia
- work for the common good, in particular sustaining and improving natural and social environments, and
- are responsible global and local citizens.

The follow up "*Statements of Learning"*, agreed to by all Australian education ministers, recognized that civics and citizenship aspects of school curricula will seek to provide students with, *inter alia*, *"an appreciation of the local, state, national, regional and global rights and responsibilities of citizenship and civic life.*"

Research into teaching of human rights at schools, however, suggests that Australia has still not achieved a systematic and integrated approach to human rights education. To put it simply, despite high level declarations, there is very little done in practice to deliver an effective human rights education at Australian schools as no human rights learning has been solidly embedded in the school curriculum. In addition, the issue of children's rights remains contentious.

A report of a national study of the place of human rights in the Australian school curriculum undertaken recently by Nina Burridge and researchers from the Cosmopolitan Civil Societies Research Centre, at the University of Technology, Sydney (Burridge *et al.*, 2013) was launched in November 2013. The study, *Human Rights Education in the School Curriculum*, reviewed of curriculum documents in each Australian State and Territory, as well as the new

national curriculum which is currently being developed and implemented. Roundtable discussions were also held with key stakeholders in each state and territory.[xvii]

The Report found that current opportunities to learn about human rights issues are fragmented and that the implementation of human rights education initiatives is largely dependent on the interest of individual teachers. Its authors noted that *"[S]tudents are missing out on the opportunity to discuss what having the right to vote or the right to freedom of speech means and understand that we all have the right to live with dignity in our community."*

The research confirmed that the obvious humanities-based subjects of History, Geography and Legal Studies in the senior secondary years and Civics-based subjects in the lower secondary years have explicit references to human rights in the curriculum. However, for many other subjects, including important subjects such as English, while there is the perception that human rights exists explicitly within the curriculum, more often this is not the case. There is an implicit assumption that "*it would fit in the section on…"* but this is not backed up by explicit directions or descriptions in the syllabus content. (Burridge, N. & Chodkiewicz, A., 2010).

Also the multicultural education policies and anti-racism programs at schools contain explicit references to human rights. A recent study, however, found that also in this area "*There is still a degree of confusion and varied understandings among teachers around key terms in multicultural discourse, such as multiculturalism, culture, intercultural understanding and social cohesion."* (Watkins *et al.*, 2013)

In the absence of an effective integration of human rights education into the new national curriculum, Australian schools are likely to continue to find it difficult to prioritize human rights issues to the extent necessary to have a sustained impact on student learning.[xviii]
A recent review of the Australian School curriculum initiated by the Minister for Education is unlikely to further advance inclusion of human rights into the core of Australian education curricula. Thus, the transformative potential of human rights education to challenge existing systems and pedagogical practices remains largely untapped in the school environment of Australia.

4.3 Key Sources of Learning about Human Rights

So how do people in Australia learn about human rights? In short, I would suggest that most learning comes from first-hand experience. It may also be a process of osmosis, imbibing information provided by a range of government and non-government bodies, employers, and the media and through the arts industry highlighting topical human rights issues.

Let us start with the Australian legal system *per se*. It does not lend itself easily to human rights education purposes. The lack of a national Bill of Rights in Australia is particularly relevant in light of evidence showing that the introduction of a Bill of Rights in the United Kingdom (UK) resulted in huge gains in human rights education, especially within the UK civil service.[xix] As Cherie Blair QC, civil rights campaigner and wife of the former British Prime Minister noted when in Australia: "*The most significant impact of the Human Rights Act has*

been the way in which the language of human rights has begun to permeate the consciousness of individuals and organizations, and thereby to inform the policies and practices of governmental and non-governmental bodies alike".

Second, Australian human rights education is strongly anchored in the international human rights system.[xx] The Universal Declaration of Human Rights continues to be a key plank for education in schools and elsewhere with other key conventions (namely the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention on the Rights of the Child) playing some role.

In fact, a significant part of federal educational activities are associated with international human rights treaty obligations and with government implementing them through domestic legislation such as the *Age Discrimination Act 2004, Disability Discrimination Act 1992*[xxi], *Equal Employment Opportunity (Commonwealth Authorities) Act 1987, Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Act 1999, Racial Discrimination Act 1975, Racial Hatred Act 1995 and Sex Discrimination Act 1984.*

For example, when lodging with the United Nations Australia's combined 6th and 7th Report on the implementation of the *UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women* (CEDAW) in December 2008, the government launched an education pack entitled: *Women's Human Rights*. The pack provided information on human rights treaties, CEDAW and the Optional Protocol and was publicly available through the Office of Status of Women website. Another example would be the formulation of disability standards by the Federal Attorney General under the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992*. The standards regulate access by people with disabilities to premises, public transport and education and are well known across Australia. To implement the World Programme for Human Rights Education, federal Department of Education introduced human rights themes into "*Civics and Citizenship"* and "*Values*" educational programs.

Third, the Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC) is a prominent player in the human rights education field. AHRC is a statutory authority created by the Federal Parliament. One of its responsibilities is to provide human rights education, and in fact, the AHRC engages in various education projects to target a range of contemporary issues. The AHRC website contains a range of educational resources targeting school teachers, but it is also available to the wider public.

The AHRC also conducts public inquiries into topical human rights issues and the media publicity associated with these inquiries provide one of the best human rights education vehicles in Australia. For example, such inquiries as the 1997 "*Bringing them home"* Report, known as the Report of the "*National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families"*; the 1993 "*The National Inquiry on Human Rights of People with Mental Illness",* and the 2005 follow up report *"Not For Service - Experiences of Injustice and Despair in Mental Health Care in Australia" h*ave had a major impact on public opinion and brought major human rights issues into the public domain, enabling major government reform and the allocation of resources to address the problems they identified. (Ozdowski S., 2007).

A particularly good example of the human rights education value of these inquiries was the national inquiry into the children in immigration detention that was conducted between 2002 and 2004. It resulted in a detailed report entitled *"A last resort?"* (HREOC, 2004) that was tabled in Parliament and found that the mandatory immigration detention of children was fundamentally inconsistent with Australia's international human rights obligations and that detention for long periods created a high risk of serious mental harm.[xxii]

This inquiry took over two years. Its methodology was very comprehensive and included visits to all immigration detention centers, written and oral submissions, public hearings, subpoenas of Department of Immigration, Multiculturalism and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA) documents, and focus group discussions. What is of particular importance is that it was conducted in the public domain to alert Australians to the fate of children in long-term detention, to win their hearts and minds and secure the children's release. With the explanation of the extent of the mental health damage suffered by children in immigration detention, Australians changed their minds and stopped supporting government policy of indefinite mandatory detention of children. In fact, public opinion shifted dramatically during the inquiry from about 65 percent of Australians supporting government mandatory detention policies to 65 percent opposing children being kept in immigration detention because of human rights violations. Following the tabling of the report, the Howard Government released the approximately one hundred children who were still being detained in June 2004.[xxiii]

Fourth, most human rights learning is associated with being in employment. Employers, both public and private, are responsible for the implementation of a range of anti-discrimination provisions in places of employment. Players in the human rights education field involve both the public and private sector employers who are subject to Federal and state anti-discrimination laws that prohibit discrimination and harassment in employment, education and service delivery based on an extensive list of grounds such as race, colour, descent, national or ethnic origin, ethno-religious background, sex, marital status and pregnancy.

For example, the federal Public Service Commission has the responsibility of maintaining *"[T]he principles of good public administration, [that] …lie at the heart of the democratic process and the confidence the public has in the way public servants exercise authority when meeting government objectives."*[xxiv] In 2012, it implemented the Australian Human Rights Network for Australian Public Service (APS) staff and produced resources for public servants such as *Human Rights at your Fingertips* (2012).[xxv]

In fact, most of larger employers will ensure that the workers know of their rights and that the workplaces have culture of respect and inclusion. The occasional breaches in employment of anti-discrimination or occupational health and safety provisions result in court cases, significant payouts and associated publicity that contributes to public knowledge about human rights. Furthermore, increasingly, good corporate governance is seen as an important aspect of a large private corporation's social responsibility. For example, some large mining companies such as BHP Billiton, Iron Ore or Rio Tinto Alcan

Weipa have indigenous mining and employment agreements and offer indigenous traineeship programs.[xxvi]

In particular, the universities are model employers when it comes to upholding human rights laws and equal opportunity laws. Social justice principles are an integral part of a university's charters. Most universities have offices dedicated to ensuring compliance with equity and diversity principles and support programs and that promote social justice, inclusion and respect. These units provide specialist advice and support to all areas of the university on diversity policy development, program implementation and equity-related grievance resolution (Burridge & Walker, 2010). In addition, many universities provide specialist programs, scholarships, affirmative action strategies and assistance for women, minorities and socially disadvantaged groups in the community. For example, scholarship assistance or special entry provisions are provided to certain university faculties for students from rural and remote communities. Similarly, many universities have designated policies following Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Agency (EOWA)[xxvii] principles and are the employers of choice for women. (EOWA: https://www.wgea.gov.au/)

Many universities have also academic units within their faculties of law or social sciences, for example the Centre for Human Rights Education at Curtin University or the Centre of Peace and Conflict Studies (CPACS) at the University of Sydney that teach human rights.

Finally, it should be remembered that Australia has a well-established civil society with a large number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) involved in human rights. Many, such as Amnesty International and Save the Children, have well-developed human rights education programs, and many church-based organizations have social justice or human rights groups like Caritas Australia. There are asylum seeker resource centers and migrant organizations, law societies, disability organizations, gender and sexuality NGOs, trade unions and employee organizations concerned with unlawful workplace discrimination, bullying, work conditions and charities to name only a few.

For example, the Australian Council for Human Rights Education (ACHRE) established in 1999 actively promotes human rights education in Australia and internationally. Despite its limited budget as a small independent NGO, the ACHRE has undertaken a range of important activities to promote human rights education in academia, in primary and secondary schools, and in the wider community. For example, in 2003 it was an important player in establishing the Centre for Human Rights Education at Curtin University, Western Australia, with the generous donation by a Japanese philanthropist, Dr Haruhisa Handa. In 2007, ACHRE established the National Centre for Human Rights Education at RMIT University in Melbourne. In addition, ACHRE participates in international human rights education initiatives such as provision of human rights training in developing countries and participation in international forums and conferences.

Most importantly, ACHRE has initiated and co-sponsored a range of national and international conferences and workshops to promote human rights. For example, it has been the leading organizer of a series of International Conferences on Human Rights Education (ICHRE) held so far in Sydney, Australia (2010),[xxviii] Durban, South Africa (2011), Cracow, Poland (2012),[xxix] Taipei, Taiwan (2013)[xxx] and in Washington DC (2014).

4.4 What Australians learn about human rights?

Education systems in many western countries deliver information about the history of human rights and the evolution of democratic systems; about what constitute civil rights and freedoms for the ordinary citizens about concepts of equality, non-discrimination and justice; and about what needs to be done when human rights violations occur either domestically or internationally.

The focus of human rights education, however, can differ between different countries. For example, the European Union is particularly focused on advancing democratic citizenship education. For example in 2010, all the Member States of the European Union adopted the Council of Europe's *Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education* (European Commission, 2012; Council of Europe, 2010) and now individual states are implementing it with vigor.

The USA, because of its Bill of Rights, is particularly focused on advancing ideas about civil liberties and freedoms as they are seen as adding to innovation, eliminating costly mistakes and giving modern societies their competitive edge. USA also has a range of innovative programs to advance racial equality.

Australia, not surprisingly, has a human rights culture focusing on social justice, equity and access, and economic rights.

Starting with schools, the focus on social justice, equity and respect provides a lion's share of student education. (Evans, C., 2005) The Burridge Report, "*Human Rights Education in the School Curriculum"*, found the overwhelming evidence that "*there is a relatively narrow base of subjects in the curriculum spectrum across Australia that specifically offer rights and freedoms based learning opportunities for students and that there exist opportunities for students to have related learning experiences in a more generalized sense about fairness and respect, but these are not couched in terms of rights issues and they are often localized to the individual committed teacher."*

An examination of websites and published human rights education and training materials developed by the Australian Human Rights Commission, a range of government agencies, private employers and universities have clearly indicated that the vast majority of them deal comprehensibly with a range of equality issues, especially in the context of employment and service provision and with a range of anti-discrimination measures and in particular on measures aiming to prevent race, disability and sex discrimination as well as bullying and sexual harassment. Democratic rights and citizenship also get an occasional mention, but civil liberties and freedoms are rarely covered. In fact, elsewhere I have criticized the Australian Human Rights Commission for pursuing a highly selective and ideological agenda as far as civil liberties are concerned (Ozdowski, S., 2014).

For example, the Human Rights Commission was silent when the Labor government wanted to outlaw, as discrimination, any actions or words which have made others feel offended, and proposed shifting the burden of proof in discrimination cases from the accuser to the

accused. It preferred to focus on limits of free speech rather than on free speech itself. It required former NSW chief justice James Spigelman to remind the commission in his Human Rights Day oration that *"the freedom to offend is an integral component of freedom of speech*", and that *"there is no right not to be offended*".

The Commission also failed to argue, with sufficient vigor, for the freedom of expression when the government planned to create statutory media regulation in response to the Finkelstein inquiry. The Gillard government's media inquiry, led by retired judge Ray Finkelstein QC began in 2011 after the phone-hacking scandal in the UK and in 2012 recommended establishment of a new government funded super regulator, a News Media Council, with statutory powers to police all that is said and written in the media to stop "wrongful harm" caused by "unreliable or inaccurate reporting, breach of privacy, and the failure to properly take into account the defenceless".

It was left to Liberty Victoria, the NSW Council for Civil Liberties and other non-government organizations to identify the structural and conceptual flaws in the draft legislation, and to campaign against it. What was of particular concern, in its December 2012 submission to the Senate Legal and Constitutional Committee about the draft *Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination* bill, the Commission argued for the abolition of the position of Human Rights Commissioner who has statutory responsibility for civil liberties and freedoms. This was noted by the then shadow Attorney-General George Brandis, who stated *"this government is engaged in a multi-front war against the traditional liberal conceptions of freedom of speech",* and that Australia's human rights culture is being changed to reflect Labor social justice priorities.

On the other hand, the Commission excels itself in development of measures to combat discrimination. For example, since 2012 the Race Discrimination Commissioner advanced a highly effective National Anti-Racism Strategy which focusses on public awareness, education resources and youth engagement and is underpinned by research, consultation and evaluation. The Strategy aims to promote a clear understanding in the Australian community of what racism is, and how it can be prevented and reduced. By doing this, the Commission hopes to create a culture where people are able to identify racism and have the confidence and tools to act appropriately when it does occur.

The Sex Discrimination Commissioner runs highly visible campaigns to create a more gender equal world through changes to corporate environments aiming at elimination of glass ceilings, removal of sexual harassment and bullying and through elimination of gender pay equity gap. She has also undertaken a review of the treatment of women at the Australian Defence Force Academy to improve their leadership pathways and remove bullying. There is also excellent work conducted to deliver equality to people with disabilities, LGBTIQ and others.

5.0 Conclusion

Human rights provide a secular set of internationally agreed universal standards to guide human behavior in any society. In other words, human rights are agreed minimum standards of human decency. These standards determine working relationships between individuals

and their governments, and between different groups of people. These standards entrench dignity and empower individuals. They are especially important in diverse societies when collective protection of minorities is weakened.

Different nations focus on different aspects of human rights. Some national governments hide behind specific cultural attributes to effectively undermine the universality of human rights – such governments usually do not have an exemplary human rights record. The nations that unreservedly support the concept of universality of human rights may, however, differ in the way they implement particular sets of human rights standards. In practice, often implementation of such standards reflects directly the human rights culture of any given society.

This paper has examined the implementation of universal human rights in Australia and concluded that contemporary Australians have embraced the egalitarian culture of "fair go" and worked hard to implement it. It has argued that this is in large part a result of specific historical experiences which played an important role in contributing to the constructive management of cultural diversity and provided the framework for social cohesion and on-going upward mobility.

There is however a shortage of focus on civil liberties and freedoms. This means that some of the key issues are not being discussed and tested and that "political correctness" takes the upper hand from time to time. It also means fewer challenging ideas reach the public domain and this in turn may from time to time impact on potential discoveries and economic efficiency.

In conclusion, Australia is certainly a fertile ground for human rights education but much is yet to be achieved. The Australian human rights educators should aim at restoring the balance between civil liberties and egalitarian rights.

---

[i] There are also authors arguing that human rights are not universal in their nature. For example, some suggest that human rights serve to advance western domination (Douzinas, 2000; Hopgood, 2013). Others insist that human rights to apply in Islamic societies must reflect the Sharia law.

[ii] For a good discussion of the concepts of cultural relativism and universality of human rights see: Donnelly (1984).

[iii] For discussion see: Ozdowski (2012).

[iv] It is interesting to note that although the Australian constitution was developed and voted on by the population of each of the 6 Australian states it only came into being as an act of the British Parliament and is still held in the British archives in London and not at Parliament House in Canberra.

[v] This is largely explicable by reference to Australia's mostly peaceful development towards nationhood and independence. The federation was not forged in war or revolution; non-indigenous Australians have no history of on-going military struggle against massive human rights abuses. Governments established in violence have been much more likely to entrench those hard won human rights in their constitutions. But that is not the Australian experience. This history leaves aside the violence committed in the establishment of Australian sovereignty against Aboriginal people. Aboriginal people, of course, were excluded from the constitutional debates and were not even considered part of the population for the purposes of the national census.

[vi] Some historians suggested that Australia being a predominantly white British nation on the periphery of Asia with a fear of being demographically overwhelmed by its heavily populated Asian neighbours did not want to legislate for the equality of the people of different races.
[vii] For more see: United States Department of State (2013).
[viii] Later the High Court found Higgins's decision constitutionally invalid because the legislation was essentially concerned with the regulation of employment conditions, a power not held by the Commonwealth Parliament. Despite this the Higgins judgment dominated Australian economic life for the next 60 to 80 years as Harvester decision was regarded as a benchmark in Australian labour law and applied to subsequent by the Conciliation and Arbitration Court.
[ix] The most common non-Christian religions in 2011 were Buddhism (accounting for 2.5% of the population), Islam (2.2%) and Hinduism (1.3%). Of these, Hinduism had experienced the fastest growth since 2001, increasing by 189% to 275,500, followed by Islam (increased by 69% to 476,300) and Buddhism (increased by 48% to 529,000 people).
[x] http://www.uws.edu.au/ssap/ssap/research/challenging_racism.
[xi] In addition both a range of Federal and State legislation was created to eliminate discrimination and racism, including: Commonwealth *Racial Discrimination Act (1975)*, *Commonwealth Racial Hatred Act (1995*), *Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission Act (1986*), New South Wales: *Anti-Discrimination Act (1977)*, South Australia: *Equal Opportunity Act (1984*) and *Racial Vilification Act* (1996), Western Australia: *Equal Opportunity Act (1984)*, Australian Capital Territory: *Discrimination Act (1991),* Queensland*: Anti-Discrimination Act (1991),* Northern Territory: *Anti-Discrimination Act (1992)*, Victoria: *Equal Opportunity Act (1995)* and *Racial and Religious Tolerance Act 2001*, Tasmania: *Anti-Discrimination Act (1998)*.
[xii] According to a report by the Overseas Indian Affairs Ministry, in all some 23 incidents were found to have involved "racial overtones" such as "anti-Indian remarks". The research by the Australian Institute of Criminology did not support these allegations. It has found that international students as recorded victims of crime in Australia were either "less likely" or "as likely" to be victims of physical assault and other theft, but that there was a "substantial over-representation of Indian students in retail/commercial robberies". The report found however that the proficiency of Indians in the English language and their consequent higher engagement in employment in the services sector ("including service stations, convenience stores, taxi drivers and other employment that typically involves working late night shifts alone and come with an increased risk of crime, either at the workplace or while travelling to and from work") was a more likely explanation for the crime rate differential than was any "racial motivation". For more see: http://www.creativespirits.info/aboriginalculture/people/racism.html.
[xiii] For more about the Challenging Racism Project see: http://www.uws.edu.au/social_sciences/soss/research/challenging_racism/findings_by_region (viewed 27 November 2011). The project was based on random phone interviews with 12,500 people.
[xiv] Although some concerns are being expressed from time to time about radicalization of some parts of Muslim communities and in particular about brain washing of Muslim youth. For example Professor Clive Williams, a leading anti-terrorism expert has warned that 'Australian Muslim children are at risk of being groomed in extremist anti-Western ideology by radicalized parents, posing a new challenge to national security agencies'.
[xv] The 2010 and 2011 Scanlon Foundation surveys indicated a long-term change in Australian opinion, with a large measure of acceptance of groups once stigmatized: "The level of negative feeling towards immigrants from Italy and Greece was found to be less than 3%; it was 7% towards immigrants from Vietnam and 13% from China.": Markus, A, Mapping Social Cohesion 2011: the Scanlon Foundation Survey, Monash Institute for the Study of Global Movements, Monash University, Victoria. Accessed at http://scanlonfoundation.org.au/research/surveys (viewed 1 February 2012), Executive Summary, pp.1-2.
[xvi] The *Miranda* rule was established by the United States Supreme Court in the *Miranda v. Arizona* 1966 decision. The decision requires for a warning to be given by police in the United States to criminal suspects in police custody before they are interrogated to preserve the admissibility of their statements against them in criminal proceedings. The Supreme Court held that the admission of an elicited incriminating statement by a suspect not informed of these rights violates the Fifth Amendment and the Sixth Amendment right to counsel.
[xvii] See: Burridge *et al*. (2013).This paper contains short excerpts from this report's Executive Summary.
[xviii] For a useful contribution to the development of a national school curriculum, see: Australian Human Rights Commission (2011).
[xix] Similar educational value of human rights legislation has been shown in the states and territories which legislated for their own Human Rights Act or Charter in the absence of national legislation. For example, The Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act of 2006 stipulates that all public authorities and

their employees must respect and promote the human rights set out in the Charter and educational activities were provided to implement the Charter.

[xx] Indeed, Australia was a leading protagonist in designing the 1948 United Nations Universal Declaration on Human Rights. It was steered through the United Nations (UN) General Assembly by Dr H.V. Evatt, eminent lawyer and Labor politician, as the president of the General Assembly at that time.

[xxi] For a paper dealing with access and inclusive pedagogy for students with disabilities see: Zajda, J. (2011).

[xxii] See also: Ozdowski (2009), pp. 39-72.

[xxiii] Unfortunately this cannot be said about the educational role of the 2014 AHRC National Inquiry into Children in Immigration Detention as the Inquiry was highly politicized by the AHRC President and undermined the Commission's standing in the community.

[xxiv] Australian Public Service Employment Principles and Code of Conduct, www.apsc.gov.au/aps-employment-policy-and-advice/aps-values-and-code-of-conduct.

[xxv] This pocket guide for public sector officials is available at Australian Human Rights Commission, http://www.humanrights.gov.au/human-rights-your-fingertips-2012.

[xxvi] See for example: the pioneering "Rio Tinto Human Rights Guidance" document published in April 2001. This document has been produced to guide operations in implementing Rio Tinto human rights policy and to show how it can be applied in complex local situations. It codifies existing human rights standards, was written in consultation with managers across the company and focuses on building good relations with local communities and company employees.

[xxvii] The Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Agency was renamed the Workplace Gender Equality Agency (WGEA) under the Workplace Gender Equality Act 2012 (WGE Act). See: http://www.wgea.gov.au/about-wgea/our-vision-values-and-functions.

[xxviii] Inaugural Conference - Sydney, Australia 2010, http://www.humanrightseducationconference2010.com.au.

[xxix] 3rd International Human Rights Conference – Krakow, Poland 2012, http://www.hre2012.uj.edu.pl.

[xxx] 4th International Human Rights Conference – Taipei, Taiwan 2013, http://www.asiapacificforum.net/news/fourth-international-conference-on-human-rights-education.

References

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2012). *Cultural Diversity in Australia. Reflecting a Nation: Stories from the 2011 Census* (June 2012) cat. no 2071.0, accessed 25 September 2012, http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2071.0main+features902012-2013.

Australian Government (2003). *Multicultural Australia: united in diversity— updating the 1999 New agenda for multicultural Australia: strategic directions for 2003–2006.* https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/01_2014/united_diversity.pdf.

Australian Council for Human Rights Education, http://humanrightseducationaustralia.com/about.php.

Australian Human Rights Commission (2011). *Human Rights Education in the National School Curriculum: Position Paper.* http://www.humanrights.gov.au/education/aps-human-rights-network, viewed 21 Feb 2014.

Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs (1982). *Evaluation of Post-Arrival Programs and Services.* May 1982.

Burridge, N. & Chodkiewicz, A. (2010). Approaches to Human Rights Education: A Study of School Education. *Learning and Teaching*, *3*, (2), 21-37.

Burridge, N., Chodkiewicz, A., Payne, A.M., Oguro, S. & Varnham, S. (2013). *Human Rights Education in the School Curriculum Report*. UTS Printing Service. Full report available at http://www.uts.edu.au/sites/default/files/HREReportFinal22July.pdf.

Burridge, N. & Walker, R. A. (2010). Teaching within diversity. In R. Cantwell & J, Scevak (Eds.), *An Academic Life: A Handbook for New Academics*. ACER Press. (pp. 97-108).

Calwell, A. (1945). *White Paper on Immigration* (pp. 4911-4915). Hansard House of Representatives, 2 August 1945.
Civics Expert Group (1994). *Whereas the People: Civics and Citizenship Education Report*. Australian Government Publishing Service.
Commonwealth of Australia (2012). *National Human Rights Action Plan*
Commonwealth of Australia (2013). *Report of the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee on the Exposure Draft of the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012*.
Cope, B. & Kalantzis, M. (1997). *Productive diversity: a new, Australian model for work and management*. Sydney: Pluto Press.
Council of Europe (2010). *Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education*, Recommendation CM/Rec (2010/7)
Crump, T. (2007). *Asia-Pacific* (pp. 19-20). London: Hambledon Continuum.
Davis, G.A. (2011). *Question of Respect* (15 March 2011) Grubsheet Feejee, accessed 23 September 2012, http://www.grubsheet.com.au/?p=21.
Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (1986). *DON'T SETTLE FOR LESS. Report of the Committee for Stage I of the Review of Migrant and Multicultural Programs and Services.* Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra August 1986.
Donnelly, J. (1984). Cultural Relativism and Universal Human Rights, *Human Rights Quarterly,* Vol. 6, No. 4 (Nov. 1984), 400-419.
Douzinas, C. (2000). *The end of human rights*. Hart Publishing: Oxford and Portland.
Driscoll, W.P. & Elphick, E.S. (1982). *Birth of a nation* (pp. 147). Adelaide: Rigby.
Dunn, K., Forrest, J., Pe-Pua, R., Hynes, M. & Maeder-Han, K. (2009). Cities of race hatred? The spheres of racism and anti-racism in contemporary Australian cities. *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies Journal*, 1, 1–14.
Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Agency (EOWA) Available online: https://www.wgea.gov.au Accessed 28th February, 2014.
Evans, R. (2001). The White Australia Policy. In Jupp, J. (ed.) *The Australian People: An Encyclopedia of the Nation, It's People and Their Origins* (pp. 44). New York; Cambridge University Press.
Evans, C. (2005). Evaluating human rights education programs. *Australian Journal of Human Rights*, 11, 2, 53-70.
European Commission (2012). *Citizenship Education in Europe*. Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency: Brussels.
Hopgood, S. (2013). *The endtimes of human rights*. Cornell University Press: Ithaca, NY and London.
Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) (2005). *Rights of Passage – A Dialogue with Young Australians about Human Rights*. https://www.humanrights.gov.au/sites/default/files/content/human_rights/rights_passage/rights_of_passage.pdf.
Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) (2004). *A last resort? Report of the National Inquiry into Children in Immigration Detention.* Sydney: HREOC. http://www.humanrights.gov.au/sites/default/files/content/human_rights/children_detention_report/report/PDF/alr_complete.pdf.

International Conference on Human Rights Education - Inaugural Conference - Sydney, Australia 2010, http://www.humanrightseducationconference2010.com.au, 3rd International Human Rights Conference – Krakow, Poland 2012, http://www.hre2012.uj.edu.pl, 4th International Human Rights Conference – Taipei, Taiwan, 2013, http://www.asiapacificforum.net/news/fourth-international-conference-on-human-rights-education.

Knott, J.W. (2001). Arrival and Settlement 1851 – 1880. In Jupp, J. (ed.) *The Australian People: An Encyclopedia of the Nation, It's People and Their Origins* (pp. 37). New York; Cambridge University Press.

Koleth, E. (2010). Multiculturalism: a review of Australian policy statements and recent debates in Australia and overseas. Research Paper No. 6 2010-11, Parliament of Australia.

Levey, G. (2012). Defending multiculturalism is in all our interests. *The Drum Opinion*, 25 September 2012 at http://www.abc.net.au/unleashed/4278128.html, 17 January 2013.

Lozano, T. (2014). Challenging racism through transformative learning: an Australian human rights education case study. University of Western Sydney, November 2014

Markus. A. (2009). Australia's Immigration Revolution.

Markus, A. (2011). *Mapping social cohesion: the Scanlon foundation surveys, summary report* (2011) (pp. 37, 44, 35), access 25 September 2012, http://scanlonfoundation.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/mapping-social-cohesion-summary-report-2011.pdf.

Markus, A. (2012). *Why Australians love to hate boat people*? Paper presented at the University of Western Sydney Open Forum on 24 May 2012.

Markus, A. (2014). Mapping Social Cohesion: The Scanlon Foundation surveys 2014. Report on "snap survey" conducted in October 2014.

Megalogenis, G. (2012). Happy to be here, say migrants. *The Australian*, 15 September 2012.

NHRCC (2009). *National Human Rights Consultation Committee Report* http://www.ag.gov.au/RightsAndProtections/HumanRights/TreatyBodyReporting/Pages/HumanRightsconsultationreport.aspx, viewed 30 January 2013.

Office of Multicultural Affairs (1989). *National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia*. Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra

OHCHR (1993). Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action.

Oxley, D. & Richards, E. (2001) The Convict Period. In Jupp, J. (ed.) *The Australian People: An Encyclopedia of the Nation, It's People and Their Origins.* New York; Cambridge University Press.

Ozdowski, S. (2014). Kids in detention: new AHRC inquiry**.** *Online Opinion*, 7 February 2014.

Ozdowski, S. (2013). Appointment of Mr Tim Wilson as Human Rights Commissioner, *Online Opinion*, 23 December 2013, http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp?article=15858.

Ozdowski, S. (2013a). Australian Multiculturalism. The Roots of its Success. In Mazur, K., Musiewicz, P., & Szlachta B. (2013), Editors, *Promoting Changes in Times of Transition and Crisis: Reflections on Human Rights Education*. Krakow: Ksiegarnia Akademicka. Available at http://www.akademicka.pl.

Ozdowski, S. (2012). Australia – Emergence of a Modern Nation Build on Diversity and "*fair go*". *Political Crossroads*, 19(1), 25-46.

Ozdowski, S. (2012a). Fighting Racism and Discrimination in Multicultural Australia. *FECCA's Mosaic,* 2012.

Ozdowski, S. (2009). An Absence of Human Rights: Children in Detention. *Political Crossroads*, 16(2), 39-72, http://sevozdowski.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/An-absence-of-human-rights-Children-in-Detention-2009.pdf.

Ozdowski S. (2007). Human Rights and Mental Health, in *New Paradigm. The Australian Journal of Psychological Rehabilitation*. Special Issue, pages 55-62, March 2007.

Ozdowski, S. (1985). The Law, Immigration and Human Rights: Changing the Australian Immigration Control System. *International Migration Review*, 19, 517-534. Fall, New York.

Rio Tinto (2001). *Human Rights Guidance. Guidance for managers on implementing the human rights policy in the way we work*. April 2001.

Soutphommasane, T. (2014). Media release of 7 November, Australian Human Rights Commission.

Tibbitts, F. & Fernekes, W.R. (2011). Human Rights Education. In S. Totten, J. E. Pedersen. Editors. *Teaching and Studying Social Issues: Major Programs and Approaches* (87-117). Information Age Publishing: Charlotte NC.

Ting, I. (2014). Diversity Cementing Cultural Connections. Talk of the Town, p.11 in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 12-13 July 2014.

Training and Research Centre for Human Rights and Democracy, http://www.etc-graz.at/typo3/index.php?id=818, viewed 11 March 2013.

United Nations General Assembly Resolution (2011). A/RES/66/137, 19 December 2011.

United States Department of State (2013). *Australia Human Rights report in US Department of State Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2013.*

Watkins, M., Lean, G., Noble, G. & Dunn, K. (2013). *Rethinking Multiculturalism. Reassessing Multicultural Education. Project Number 1. Surveying New South Wales Public School Teachers.* University of New South Wales.

Willett, G. (2001). *Living out Loud: A History of Gay and Lesbian Activism in Australia.* St Leonards; Allen & Unwin.

Zajda, J. (2011). Trends in education policy and pedagogy for students with disabilities in Australia. In Mazurek, M. & Winzer, M. (Eds.), *Special education in an international perspective.* Boston: Pearson Alyn & Bacon.