Challenges of Inclusion: Cultural Diversity, Citizenship and Engagement

Babacan H*

University of the Sunshine Coast, Sippy Downs, Queensland, Australia

Abstract

The debates about globalisation have pointed to the movements of people across the world — both wanted and unwanted migration. There is more than ever a greater interconnectivity across people with movements of finance, ideas, technologies and media very rapidly across the world. The new world order is one which is fast, shrinking spatially and culturally diverse.

However, this diversity is not understood or incorporated into social structuring. Social exclusion of minorities of culturally diverse backgrounds still occurs in all elements of public life. Conceptual discussion of social exclusion and inclusion relates these terms to disadvantage and participation in society. Since the 1990s these terms have attracted much academic, government and community attention all over the world. In a broad sense it refers to dimensions of deprivation, lack of access and barriers to social participation.

The measures traditionally used to define social exclusion or inclusion have included economic aspects such as poverty, income or unemployment or wealth, while other non-monetary factors have been spatial, geography or sense of place, health and education. Although these debates have been accompanied by a rhetoric of participation, community and belonging, its focus has been too narrow and has largely been argued from a monocultural framework.

There are significant challenges which face countries such as Australia including challenges of equality, challenges of inclusion, challenges of economic growth and challenges of building community capacity and social capital. In the context of a globalised world these challenges pose difficult questions for the nation state and strongly test the basic frameworks which underpin our current institutional processes and systems. These frameworks include the role of the nation state (particularly the welfare state), human rights and citizenship rights. To be able to effectively address issues of engagement of government with communities, particularly marginalised minorities, it is important to bring to the fore considerations of citizenship rights, human rights and social inclusion.

This paper examines the challenges of inclusion for engagement with culturally diverse communities in the context of the nation state and globalisation. It draws on examples from

Australia, a highly multicultural country, and critiques the current application of citizenship rights and democratic processes. Focussing on Australia, I put forward the argument that a different notion of 'active citizenship' is needed which incorporates cultural diversity. It is the contention of this paper that unless conceptualisation of citizenship, inclusion and human rights applications change, then genuine engagement cannot take place. The paper explores options for ways forward for overcoming social exclusion, building community capacity and differentiated citizenship rights to ensure that culturally diverse minorities can effectively engage with government and participate in decision making in all elements public and civic life.

Introduction

Movements of people have always been a part of history and today images of people traversing the globe as tourists, migrants, and refugees are familiar to us. People move for different reasons and the changes in these trends are determined by shifts in global capital, production, technologies and the policies of the nation states (Beck 2000; Bretell and Hollifield 2000; Nash 2000). These movements promote diversity through a variety of cultures, languages, religions, arts, technologies and ways of doing and knowing, and offer a richness to be celebrated. They are likely to increase as the world becomes a more interconnected place. However, this diversity is often not celebrated or welcomed, particularly in Western, post-industrial and predominantly white societies. Diversity poses challenges for democratic management of society and the politics of representation, participation, human rights, social justice and social development (Castles 2000; Jayasuriya 1997; Papastergiadis, 2000).

In the year 2000, the International Office of Migration identified 175 million people as international migrants, that is people who are in another country outside their place of birth, increasing from 79 million in 1960 to 175 million in 2000 (International Office of Migration 2003). The United Nations High Commission for Refugees estimates around 40 million refugees in the world. The reasons for the movement, processes of settlement and adjustment and their reception in the host countries show great variability. Migration experiences alter the understanding of society and shift interactions between people, political bodies and other institutions. While no government has ever set out to build an ethnically diverse society through immigration, labour recruitment policies often lead to the formation of ethnic minorities with far reaching consequences for social relations, public policies and international relations. (Freeman and Jupp 1992; Zolberg 1989).

This paper puts forward the idea that in the 21st century the movements of people occur more frequently and will lead to greater levels of cultural diversity and cultural interaction across the world. In the current world climate there are significant issues and challenges for social inclusion of minorities. This paper examines the challenges for inclusion within culturally diverse societies

within the nation state, drawing from experiences in Australia. After an initial exploration of the issues relating to migration and globalisation, the implications of the movements of people within the nation state are examined. It is argued that the processes of migration and settlement result in loss of human and social capital, thus limiting the capacity for social engagement and ability to exercise citizenship rights by ethnic minorities. Thus for effective engagement for minorities within the nation state there needs to be a lot more attention paid to 'differential citizenship' to enable active citizenship.

Migration in a globalised world

International migration is never a simple individual action in which a person decides to move. The movement of people does not occur in a vacuum. Migration requires infrastructures and institutions of transport, communication and regulation. Contemporary travel involves strict regulation and control. Nation states seek to maximise the opportunities from transnational corporations and yet close their doors to the different forms of movement of people. Contemporary travel takes place in a world in which international law impacts on domestic legislation and international organisations monitor and intervene in migratory processes. Migration processes intersect with and are constitutive of networks of political, military and cultural relations that lie with nation states, transnational corporations or international bodies. (Held et al. 1999; Castles and Miller 1998).

Developing countries have moved to liberalise their trade policies and to integrate themselves more closely with the world economy. These nations have relatively larger supplies of unskilled labour than industrial countries and can establish themselves in those industries that make use of their abundant resource, namely unskilled workers. However, changes in technology require a more skilled workforce, leaving little demand for unskilled workers. Those immigrants who migrated as unskilled labourers in the last four decades of the 20th century are finding their positions redundant in the labour market as manufacturing shifts to the developing countries. The shift is now towards *skilled immigrants* who are able to demonstrate competency in the developing industries of business and information technology. These people are often young, professional and highly mobile elites of the societies they belong to (Papastergiadis 2000; Brettell and Hollifield 2000).

The changing geo-political map of the globe now means that the core-periphery patterns of immigration are no longer applicable. Current global population growth patterns indicate that the industrialised nations will grow from 1.2 billion people in 1990 to 1.35 billion in 2025 while the corresponding growth for less developed countries will be from 4 billion in 1990 to 7.15 billion in 2025 (Brettell and Hollifield 2000). The disparities in social, economic and demographic

conditions will create enormous pressures in the world in terms of work, land and other resources (Zolberg 1989). The difference in new migrations is that it is no longer the very impoverished who migrate. Rather, immigration requires finances and social capital. Migration is based on existing or past social and economic links, international trade or knowledge of employment opportunities.

Additionally, migration is no longer from less developed countries to more industrialised ones. New types of migration correspond to the restructuring of the economies and labour markets of both developing and developed countries. Numerous countries, especially in Asia and the Middle East, have become immigrant-taking countries. This is largely also due to the investment by multinationals in countries in the South and the establishment of new manufacturing or industrial bases. In a globalised world, the patterns of immigrant movement are complex, multidirectional and changing. The proliferation in the directions of movements, the restrictions in settlement and the diversification of the identity of migrants have made the patterns of migration very complex. New forms of migration include contract labour, trade in 'sex slaves', illegal immigration to many parts of the world, 'bi-local' business immigrants from Asia and the feminisation of the migrant labour force. These patterns contradict earlier patterns of migration and make it difficult to represent it in simple terms (Papastergiadis 2000; Castles and Miller 1998).

The nation state and cultural diversity

Within the context of a globalised world, there are numerous debates about what is happening to the nation state. Castles et al. (1988) identify that the nation state is "an ideology of social unity, 'imagined community' … which describes a so-called people who live within the boundaries of a nation state … Nationalism is the organisation of human groups into large, centrally educated, culturally homogenous units, coterminous within the nation state" (p.103). Many writers point out that in a shrinking world the impact of states is lessening with a diminishing role for the state (Beck 2000; Castles 2000). In an attempt to be relevant to its citizens and to maintain loyalty, it is argued that the state will shift to appease populist views. Often these are connected with taking policy positions against minorities. Furthermore, the nation states have become more involved in the control and regulation of wanted and unwanted citizens. Citizenship, in both the legal and more normative sense, is about determining who can access social, civil and political rights and curtailment of those who do not have access to rights. Thus there is a stronger move away from universal rights to more targeted rights creating different classes of citizens (Babacan 2003; Westwood and Phizacklea 2000).

In the face of increasing movements of people and a loss of control by the state, a number of factors are emerging. The first is the question of *control*, which is the role of the nation state in establishing rules of entry and exit. A key focus of discussion has become to what extent nation

states can and do control their borders as governments intensity effort to increase border control, deportation of asylum seekers and tightening of regulations and rules of entry (Brochmann and Hammar 1999). The second element is the relationship between sovereignty and *security* of the nation state. The state has become engaged in management of unwanted immigrants. There are clear links between international relations and domestic foreign policy, and immigration policies of nation states. This was evident in the arrival of the boat people and the Federal elections in Australia. The emphasis is now shifting to the possibilities of controlling or managing immigration on an international level rather than domestic (Ghosh 2000). The third issue relates to *incorporation* of immigrants in host countries including what citizenship rights are to be given, provision of welfare support and legal entitlements (Brubaker 1992).

In western democracies, the universality of *approach* is adopted which assumes a common set of values, processes and strategies. Boyd (1996) notes that this perspective respects the notion that values are always matters of interpretation, of meaning, to individuals and groups adhering to them. However, to allow for the possibility of shared meaning and commitment, 'the search for universals' posits that there are some basic interpretations that do not vary across cultures because they are, in some way, built into the structure of the universe. The universality principle, while a uniting factor, does not recognise diversity. Furthermore, what may be considered universally applicable may not be equally accessible if they were uniformly designed and delivered, because the clientele may not be uniform.

While not advocating a cultural relativist point of view, Stokes (1997) cautions that unless Australians construct a unity that allows for genuine embracing of diversity, they are collectively at the mercy of living in an undemocratic nation state. Studies indicate that immigrants and refugees face barriers to accessing services and resources throughout the settlement stages: cultural, physical, language, psychological and geographical access issues become serious.While there is considerable variability across and within immigrant groups, there is general consensus that immigrants with high levels of social capital face disadvantage upon immigration (Wooden et al. 1994; Adelman et al. 1994).

'Whiteness' is a concept which points to the dominant status and privileges of being white (Gabriel 1998). Although whiteness is a problematic concept in itself and not all whites are privileged, Gabriel (1998) suggests that racialisation occurs and that globalisation has brought 'whiteness' into sharper focus. The notion of 'core values' in national identity has not and is currently not being negotiated by dominant elements in society**.** The debates about national identity, in the Australian context, are not about how Australians genuinely represent themselves as a truly multicultural nation with a wide range of ethnic and indigenous cultures, but rather

about how much does the 'white core' tolerate diversity without losing a sense of unity as a nation and a loss of Anglo-Saxon identity. A further question that arises is how this racialisation is reflected in the social institutions of society.

The political and institutional approach by the state towards culture, language, identity and history are crucial elements in the discourse and reproduction of national identities (Guttmann 2003). The approaches by the state determine the discourse on national identity through what events are celebrated, what the national days are, what religious practices are permitted and what symbols are used to represent cultures.

Pettman argues that the issues of racism lie within institutional contexts and determine how individuals are treated. She states:

> "Institutions validate rules, roles and certain understandings about entitlements which are often seen as fair or universal, but which actually reflect and protect dominant social interests — through, for example, understandings about who is a good parent, a reliable tenant or borrower, or the best for the job. They are activated by bureaucrats, social workers, receptionists and so on, whose own perceptions, priorities and values are fused with cultural meaning that speak of their own personal histories and social location. Within particular constraints and in their own ways, they do their job" (Pettman 1992, pp. 57-8).

The global conditions (that is, economic decline, contracting out of the state or 'de-stating', international events of terrorism and expansion of global markets) have provided an impetus for the rise of national identity in a fundamentalist manner that has prompted a re-assertion of western, liberal values (Hage 2003; Stratton 1998) and has served to reinforce institutional racism within certain arenas of the welfare state. In Australia a key area this impacts on is the rights of new residents and refugees where the state is embroiled in the regulation of citizenship rights. For example there are now strict criteria for eligibility for welfare payments and strict contractual arrangements for universal services such as medicare (health). There are also people with little or no rights such as those in detention centres or those released on temporary protection visas (McMaster 2001). Vandenberg (2000) points out that the routes to citizenship entitlements are becoming weaker and less reliable as guarantees for resource allocation, recognition and participation.

In multicultural societies such as Australia, discourses on race and culture have formed the basis of nation building and have determined who is included and who is considered the "other" (Stokes 1997; Vasta and Castles 1996). Castles et al. (1988) point out that Australian national identity has been forged on a process of exclusion and racism towards indigenous and ethnic minorities.

6

Policies of multiculturalism in the 1970s and 1980s were an attempt to use cultural difference as a way to gain leverage for state recognition for minorities, resource allocation and equality. The new liberal forms of multiculturalism that have emerged in the 1990s and the 2000s question the validity of such claims and separate out issues of social justice and equality from that of cultural difference. The dilemma of diversity lurks in the background without a full public consideration of the implications of cultural pluralism for exclusion. Furthermore, Boyd (1996) points out that this may be characterised as one of the major sites of repression and that the problem gets hidden behind safe platitudes talked around in obfuscatory terms such as one nation, community relations and harmony.

Migration, settlement and loss of human and social capital

When people arrive in a new society there is a stage in which they adjust and settle. The term settlement refers to the period following an immigrant's arrival in a new country.

The National Population Council (1988) defined *settlement* as:

> "The process by which an immigrant establishes economic viability and social networks following immigration in order to contribute to, and make full use of, opportunities generally available in the receiving society" (cited in DIMIA 2002, p. 1).

Cox (1996) points out that "it is the period during which immigrants need, depending on each person's situation, to find housing and a source of income, to develop or find an adequate means of communicating with existing residents, and to begin building a satisfactory personal and social life in their new environment" (Cox 1996, p. 1) However, the process of adjustment to a new society is dependent on many factors and it is an ongoing process. Settlement is a dynamic process and involves the interface of the social, psychological and political dimensions of the person/group entering Australia and the prevailing attitudes and social institutions in the society that receives them. Success or otherwise of settlement cannot be uni-dimensional and solely dependent upon the person/group immigrating.

Often personal characteristics of migrants are considered in determining the success of settlement. The greater the differences between country of origin and Australia, the greater the difficulties in integration and settlement. The ability to handle culture shock, emotional coping skills, level of education, the personality of the immigrant and the ability to form relationships can impact on settlement. These factors vary from person to person. The impression created by initial settlement experiences has a lasting impact on the settlement process. The impressions are formed by what services are available, what attitudes exist towards the newly arrived and what government policies are in place. The settlement phase is greatly affected by the host society's

(i.e. Australia's) reaction to newly arrived. The situation will determine the new class stratification, political system, power relations and the economic reality of newly arrived migrants. The level of resources, the presence of family and the existence of supportive networks are also important in determining successful settlement. The presence of the ethnic group in Australia, the support of ethno-specific as well as mainstream structures and services is seen as fundamental in successful settlement (Wooden et.al 1994; Cox 1996; Jupp 1991).

There is considerable research on the effects of migration on ethnic communities. This body of research has identified numerous settlement factors such as lack of recognition of prior learning, skills, qualifications, lack of English proficiency or barriers to communication (e.g. accents), difficulties in accessing basic services such as health, education and housing, cultural adjustment problems, torture and trauma (particularly for refugees), financial difficulties and inter generational problems (Adelman et al. 1994; Babacan 1995; Cox 1996; Lukomskyj 1994; Wooden et al. 1994). These are both social and community problems and impact directly on the ability to participate in society. In summary the processes of migration impacts on both individuals and communities through:

- Loss of human capital
- Loss of social networks and resulting isolation
- Impacts on family relationships
- Impact on gender roles
- Impacts on belonging and identity
- Impacts on social participation
- Impacts on opportunities.

These factors are fundamental prerequisites for citizen participation, community engagement and active citizenship and are important to the continuation of a robust, well functioning representative democracy.

Culture, social exclusion and citizenship rights

The corner stone of the democratic nation-state is the establishment of rights: political, social and civil. Membership in a nation-state denotes both civic belonging in the political community and cultural belonging in a national community. In the political community all citizens are seen as equal. The national community, on the other hand, is based on shared possession of supposedly unique national characteristics. The formation of the nation is often based on the incorporation and assimilation of other ethnic groups (Castles and Davidson 2000).

Ideas of citizenship rights in a global era, begin by disengaging 'belonging' from 'nationality'. The coincidence of citizenship rights with the boundaries of the nation-state has resulted in an ambiguity in civic belonging and unique identification simultaneously with cultural belonging to one national identity. International migration poses many problems to the nation-state. Cultural homogenisation does not work and the principle that each person should belong politically and culturally to just one nation-state is problematic. Migrants move with their cultures and histories. How this is incorporated into national cultures has proved difficult in countries that claim to have 'multicultural policies'. Policies of many countries have targeted migrants as a group for social exclusion. These include denial of political citizenship (e.g. guest workers in Europe), restrictions on welfare eligibility and other social rights. Social exclusion is increasingly taking on new forms, although it is still predominantly based on socially constructed markers of biology and culture. Underlying struggles and conflict over multiculturalism is the conflict over the relationship between democracy, citizenship rights and culture on the one hand and identity and the politics of representation on the other. (Du Gay et al. 2000; Giroux 1993).

In the global arena, identities are contested and struggles are represented by conflicting national identities, often with disastrous consequences. Often identities are portrayed in terms of conflicting, incompatible and often polarized positions. At a more personal level, new forms of identities are emerging. The question of 'who am I?' has become the key element of post-modern societies and goes to the heart of social resistance and public contestation about citizenship rights. Therefore, identity matters in terms of social and political concerns within the contemporary world and as a way of offering explanations of social and cultural change (Isin and Wood 1999; Woodward 1997). However, identities emerge within the play of specific modalities of power in each society and are the product of marking difference and exclusion (Hall and du Gay 1996; Isin and Wood 1999). Pugliese (1995) confirms this by stating that:

> "minority groups are themselves internally stratified and differentiated by hierarchies of gender, ethnicity, class, sexualities, age and so on. It is invariably the desire of the dominant groups in a culture to promote the notion that a minority group is a type of undifferentiated singularity that is not marked by all the factors listed" (Pugliese 1995, pp. 195-6).

Giroux (1993) notes that while identity politics was central to challenging the cultural homogeneity of the 1950s and provided space for marginal groups to assert the legacy and importance of their respective voices and experiences, it often failed to move beyond a notion of difference structured in polarising binaries. The imagined communities continue to be reconstituted in the contemporary world with Western cultures often producing the 'other'. The 'other' is those who are excluded from the in-group within society and who hold an inferior position (Isin and Wood

1999).The 'other' is often seen as a source of danger and threat. (Said 1978; Massey and Jess 1995). Current constructions of the other have focused in more recent times on demonising Islam as the new threat to western, liberal traditions (Hage 2002).

Writings on social exclusion have focussed on exclusion from the labour market, economic exclusion (including poverty), exclusion based on social isolation, geographic or spatial exclusion and exclusion based on institutional processes and systems (Young 1999; Levitas 1998). Key indicators used to measure or examine social exclusion include poverty, income levels, access to education, access to the labour market, family size, crime rates, community facilities and resources (primary and secondary) weight at birth of babies, literacy rates, overcrowded housing and owner occupied housing/rented accommodation/homeless, levels of community involvement, volunteering and rates of suicide (Rodgers et al. 1995). In the debates and discussion on social exclusion/inclusion very little attention has been paid to the exclusion based on culture, ethnicity and other diversity signifiers (Babacan 2003).

The discussions on multiculturalism in the early 1970s and 1980s related more to social exclusion based distributional elements such as access to social resources, access to the labour market and financial support. Some attention was given to culture, language, ethnicity and racism as a basis for material exclusion (Babacan 2003). Contemporary thinking on this is not only focussing on distribution to but to relational dimensions of stratification and disadvantage and the nature of relationships between communities, government and others. Therefore, more attention is needed on issues such as recognition of identity, racism and ethnic social capital.

The ways in which minorities can participate in society are shaped by power relations, social structures and social institutions (Barry and Hallet 1998). Social exclusion takes place based on socially constructed markers of biology, race and culture. There is still a privileging of white or Anglo-Saxon norms in the Australian context over the others (Mac an Ghaill 1999; Babacan 2003). There is ample evidence to show that racism impacts on life chances and social inclusion outcomes. Studies indicate that life chances of racialised minorities are adversely affected (Li 1998; Hollinsworth 1998; Bonnet 2000; Eberhardt and Fiske 1998; Mac an Ghaill 1999). Social signification based on 'race and culture' facilitates social exclusion and hinders inclusion. The findings of studies confirm that the life chances are impacted in the areas of occupational status and earning; educational achievement, housing and social integration.

'Race and racism' are value-laden notions that carry with them a set of assumptions about power relations in society. Although racism appears contrary to democratic societal values, it can still be articulated without denouncing democratic principles and, through transformation into more

palatable concerns, becomes a legitimate concern (Henry et al. 2000). Furthermore, coded societal messages are perpetuated through public discourses on immigration, multiculturalism, refugees and citizenship. However, in measuring and looking at interventions to such problems, the traditional social exclusion indicators are considered in isolation to culture, race and ethnicity.

Putting culture in social inclusion on the agenda of community engagement

Social inclusion is about a new qualitative approach to ensure that people do not feel 'shut out'. It involves entry points for vulnerable communities and establishment of human relationships. Key issues of note in inclusion are the participation of marginalised members of the community in economic, cultural, political, social and interpersonal domains with equal 'valued status' (Cushing 2003). Social inclusion is very much concerned with participation in social affairs, taking part in decision-making processes of society and a sense of belonging to community. It is about recognition that inclusion is concerned with addressing all types of exclusion and not creating a hierarchy of diversities (Phillipson et al. 2003; Levitas 1998). Crawford (2003) notes that social inclusion is about people wanting to participate as valued, appreciated equals in the social, economic, political and cultural life of the community (i.e. in valued societal situations) and to be involved in mutually trusting, appreciative and respectful interpersonal relationships at the family, peer and community levels.

At a more systemic level, social inclusion is about overcoming structural barriers and extending rights to the most vulnerable thereby strengthening processes and outcomes that lead to equality. It is a process that may manifest itself as a struggle for space in public arena and policy making. It is a contested terrain in terms of recognition as an issue, appropriate resource allocation and interventions that may involve partnerships with many stakeholders (Pierson 2001; Rodgers et al. 1995).

The key elements of social inclusion comprise access to social goods and services with appropriate resource allocation across the social contract; empowerment of communities who are skilled and have genuine participation in decision making structures of society; institutional trust and building democratic governance bodies; and building understanding and bridges between people (Lund 2002; Phillipson et al. 2003). In summary social inclusion is about psychology of inclusion (confident/hopeful individuals); sociology of inclusion (celebration of diversity); infrastructure of inclusion (access).

Achieving social inclusion is a very difficult task. Shifts are required in organisational, societal and institutional arrangements. A sense of belonging and inclusion is built by communities and individuals. Definitions of *community* are many but refer to the shared characteristic of a group of

people both social and geographic (Kenny 1999). It is important that effort is put into communities that are skilled, resourced and have the capacity to address their own issues. Building community capacity within ethnic communities becomes a key factor in the ability of communities to be included. *Community capacity* is the characteristic of communities to affect their ability to identify, mobilise and address social problems (Goodman et al. 1998).

'Active citizenship', taken broadly, can mean people's capacity to take an active role in public affairs, through formal democratic structures, the press, public debate, associations, political parties, trade unions, local clubs and societies or simply through informal networks (Chahan 2001, p. 1) This is to be differentiated from the notion of citizenship as a legal status. Most often in Australia the discussion on citizenship has been confused and lacking in focus. The nation-state has devoted resources to keeping an exclusive nation with large border protection measures and a strict control of who has eligibility for social, civil and political rights (McMaster 2001; Dauvergne 2000). Despite the broader views on citizenship with emphasis on citizen participation, membership and equality and democractic community, most of the discussion has centred on citizenship as a singular concept in the legal sense (Rubenstein 2002). Thus social inclusion needs a strong argument for the virtues of citizenship in the broader sense, that can include concepts such as group rights (Kymlicka 2001), multicultural citizenship (Jayasuriya 2003), post-national citizenship (Sosyal 2000) and global cosmopolitanism (Appadurai 1996). Although I do not have the scope to examine these concepts here, they all offer the potential to think beyond the narrow forms of belonging, community building and capacity building.

Hudson reminds us of the notion of 'differential citizenship' (2000) and invites us to consider key questions such as: Who gives citizenship? Who judges disputed cases? Who is denied citizenship? In asking these questions Hudson notes that we need to think more broadly about citizenship than we have done and think about multiple and differential citizenship which involves the following elements:
- Citizenship is different in different sites and contexts
- Different citizenships involving different capacities
- Exercise of civic capacity does not fall under single citizenship
- Citizenship that is not totalised, particularly relating citizenship to be within the nation-state boundaries (2000, p. 16).

In looking at multicultural citizenship in a global era, Kalantzis notes:
> "...the dominant group to learn the ways of so-called minorities rather than imposing an imperative to be like the dominant group. We all will need to be multilingual and multicultural citizens. The new citizen of this new state will be a person with multiple

citizenship and multiple identities. People will require a repertoire of skills to deal with a wider range of expectations and aspirations as parts of the new norm. These are the skills of negotiating diversity, locally and globally…" (2000, p. 109).

The conditions for social inclusion rest in a re-definition of citizenship by which active citizenship and engagement can take place through an ethic of constructive cultural pluralism. The state is challenged to distribute its resources in a way that can facilitate civic pluralism and build the capacity of marginalised communities. This means working towards a society that is accepting and valuing of cultural, religious, linguistic and ethnic diversity; providing opportunity, ensuring security on cultural and religious grounds, involvement in decision making processes and provision of information in appropriate languages.

At a practical level social inclusion and engagement of minorities can occur with deliberate policies and actions. Key practical steps to build inclusion are: provision of information in languages other than English (or the dominant language), flexible systems and procedures, openness to changing organisational processes, explicit valuing of diversity in organisational statements, knowledge of the diversity of client group or community, cross cultural training of staff of agencies, and provision of resources to build social capital in minority communities.

Conclusion

Ethnic communities have and can make a positive contribution to our physical and social environment. This contribution is facilitated or hindered by social and economic structures. Social constructs such as culture, race and ethnicity play a significant role in rendering privilege for certain groups of people and excluding others. If we are to build a democratic and socially just society we need to acknowledge the barriers posed by such factors to inclusion. We need to emphasise facilitating factors of social inclusion such as building community capacity and community capital, fostering a sense of belonging, changing our institutional and governance frameworks and have empowered communities who can exercise their citizenship rights. The challenge in the 21st century is to develop societies and systems which are more socially just, accepting of diversity and which produce equality. In a globalised world, social inclusion of the marginalised, and embracing cultural diversity is a vital element of engagement as the 'other' is now within the nation state. Embracing of diversity will offer economic and social advantages and assist in the desire for a better society. In the meantime, with the persistence of social exclusion there is a lot at stake for us all.

References

Adelman H, Borowski A, Burstein M & Foster L 1994, *Immigration and Refugee Policy: Australia and Canada Compared*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.

Appadurai A 1996, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis/London.

Babacan H 2003, 'Patriotism: The Good, The Bad and The Ugly', *International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations*, vol. 3, pp. 363-72.

Babacan H 1995, 'Unemployment and non-English Speaking Background People — Are Government Solutions Adequate?', in R Hicks, P Creed, W Patton & J Tomlinson, *Unemployment Policy and Practice*, Australian Academic Press, Brisbane.

Barry M & Hallet C 1998, *Social Exclusion and Social Work: Issues of Theory, Policy And Practice*, Russel House Publishing Ltd, Dorset.

Beck U 2000, *What is Globalization?*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Bonnet A 2000, *Anti-Racism*, Routledge, London.

Boyd D 1996, 'Dominance Concealed Through Diversity: Implications for Inadequate Perspectives on Cultural Pluralism', *Harvard Educational Review*, Cambridge, Fall, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 609-31.

Brettell C B & Hollifield J F 2000, *Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines*, Routledge, New York.

Brochmann G & Hammar T 1999, *Mechanisms of Immigration Control: A Comparative Analysis of European Regulation Policies*, Berg, Oxford.

Brubaker R 1992, *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*, Harvard University Press, Massachusetts.

Castles S 2000, *Ethnicity and Globalization,* Sage Publications, London.

Castles S & Miller M J 1998, *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*, Macmillan Press, Houndmills.

Castles S & Davidson A 2000, *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*, Macmillan Press, Houndmills.

Castles S, Kalantzis M, Cope B & Morrisey M 1988, *Mistaken Identity:Multiculturalism and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia*, Pluto Press, Sydney.

Chanan G 2001, *Active Citizenship and Community Involvement: Getting to the Roots*, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, viewed 8 June 2005, <http://www.eurofund.eu.int/publications>.

Cox D 1996, *Understanding Australian Settlement Services*, AGPS, Canberra.

Crawford P J 2003, *Captive of the System!: Why Governments Fail to Deliver on Their Promises — and What to do About it,* Richmond Ventures, North Sydney.

Cushing P 2003, *Report on Social Inclusion and Exclusion Policies*, The Roeher Institute, Toronto.

Dauvergne C 2000, 'The Dilemma of Rights Discourses for Refugees', in *Melbourne University Law Review*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 56-74.

DIMIA 2002, 2002–2003 *Migration and Humanitarian Programs: A Discussion Paper*, Department of Immigration, Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, Canberra.

Du Gay P, Evans J & Redman P 2000, *Identity: A Reader*, Sage Publications, London.

Eberhardt J L & Fiske S T 1998, *Confronting Racism: The Problem and the Response*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, California.

Freeman G P & Jupp J 1992, *Nations of Immigrants: Australia, the United States, and International Migration*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Gabriel J 1998, *Whitewash: Racialised Politics and the Media*, Routledge, London.

Ghosh B 2000, *Managing Migration: The Need for a New International Regime*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Giroux H A 1993, 'Living Dangerously: Identity Politics and The New Cultural Racism: Towards a Critical Pedagogy of Representation', *Cultural Studies,* vol. 7, no. 1, January, pp. 1-27.

Goodman R, Speers M, McLeroy K, Fawcett S, Keegler M, Parker E, Smith S, Sterling T & Wallerstein N 1998, 'Identifying and Defining the Dimensions of Community Capacity to Provide a Basis for Measurement', *Health Education and Behaviour*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 256-78.

Gutmann A 2003*, Identity in Democracy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Hage G 2003, 'Against Paranoid Nationalism', *Searching for Hope in a Shrinking Society*, Polity Press, Annandale.

Hage G 2002, *Arab Australians Today: Citizenship and Belonging*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton South.

Hall S & du Gay P (eds) 1996' *Questions of Cultural Identity*, Sage Publications, London.

Held D, McGrew A, Goldblatt D & Perraton J 1999, *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Henry F Tator C, Mattis W & Rees T 2000, *The Colour of Democracy: Racism in Canadian Society*, Harcourt Brace and Company, Toronto.

Hollinsworth D 1998, *Race and Racism in Australia*, 2 edn, Katoomba Social Science Press.

Hudson W 2000, 'Differential Citizenship', in W Hudson and J Kane, *Rethinking Australian Citizenship*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 15-25.

International Office of Migration 2003 *World Migration — 2003*, Geneva.

Isin E F & Wood P K 1999, *Citizenship and Identity*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Jayasuriya L 2003, 'Australian Multiculturalism: Past, Present and Future,' *ManagingDiversity Conference*, Melbourne, 1-3 October.

Jayasuriya L 1997, *Immigration and Multiculturalism in Australia: Selected Essays by Laksiri Jayasuriya*, School of Social Work and Social Administration, The University of Western Australia.

Jupp J, McRobbie A & York B 1991, *Settlement Needs of Small, Newly Arrived Ethnic Groups,* AGPS, Canberra.

Kalantzis M 2000, 'Multicultural Citizenship', in W Hudson & J Kane, *Rethinking Australian Citizenship*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 99-110.

Kenny S 1999, *Developing Communities for the Future: Community Development in Australia*, Nelson ITP, South Melbourne.

Kymlicka W 2001, *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Levitas R 1998, *The Inclusive Society?: Social Inclusion and New Labour*, MacMillan, Houndsmill.

Li P 1998, 'The Market Value and Social Value of Race', in ed. V Satzewich, *Racism and Social Inequality in Canada*, Thompson Educational Publishing, Toronto, pp. 115-30.

Lukomskyj O 1994, *An Overview of Australian Government Settlement Policy 1945–1992*, AGPS, Canberra.

Lund B 2002, *Understanding State Welfare: Social Justice or Social Exclusion?*, Sage, London.

McMaster D 2001, *Asylum Seekers: Australia's Response to Refugees*, Melbourne University Press Carlton South.

Mac an Ghaill M 1999, *Contemporary Racisms and Ethnicities: Social and Cultural Transformations*, Open University Press, Buckingham.

Massey D & Jess P 1995, *A Place in the World*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Nash K 2000, *Contemporary Political Sociology: Globalization, Politics, and Power*, Blackwell Publishing, Malden.

Papastergiadis N 2000, *The Turbulence of Migration*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Pettman J 1992, *Living in the Margins: Racism, Sexism and Feminism in Australia*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards.

Pierson J 2001, *Tackling Social Exclusion*, Routledge, New York.

Phillipson C, Allen G & Morgan D 2003, *Social Networks and Social Exclusion: Sociological and Policy Perspectives*, Ashgate, Aldershot.

Pugliese S G 1995, 'The Culture of Nostalgia: Fascism in the Memory of Italian Americans,' *Italian Politics and Society*, no. 44, pp. 12-17.

Rodgers G, Gore C & Figueiredo J B 1995, *Social Exclusion: Rhetoric, Reality, Responses*, International Labour Organisation, Geneva.

Rubenstein K 2002, 'Citizenship, Sovereignty and Migration: Australia's Exclusive Approach to Membership of the Community' in *Public Law Review*, vol. 13, June, pp. 102-9.

Said E 1978, *Orientalism*, Random House, London.

Soysal Y 1994, *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Stokes, G (ed.) 1997, *The Politics of Identity in Australia,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Stratton J 1998, *Race Daze: Australia in Identity Crises*, Pluto Press, Annandale.

Vandenberg A 2000, *Citizenship and Democracy in a Global Era*, MacMillan Press Limited, London.

Vasta E & Castles S 1996, *The Teeth are Smiling; the Persistence of Racism in Multicultural Australia*, Allen and Unwin, St Leonards.

Westwood S & Phizacklea A 2000, *Trans-Nationalism and the Politics of Belonging*, Routledge, London.

Wooden M, Holton R & Sloan J 1994, *Australian Immigration: A Survey of the Issues*, AGPS, Canberra.

Woodward, K (ed.) 1997, *Culture, Media and Identities: Identity and Difference,* Sage Publications, London.

Young J 1999, *The Exclusive Society: Social Exclusion, Crime and Difference in Late Modernity*, Sage, London.

Zolberg A R 1989, 'The Next Waves: Migration Theory for a Changing World', *International Migration Review*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 403-30.