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**Abstract**
This article analyses the national cultural policy, *Creative Australia*, in terms of its constructions of multiculturalism. These constructions encompass traditional welfarist agendas, a cosmopolitan creative economy, a reiteration of artistic standards of 'excellence', and a complex politics of nationhood and citizenship. Contrary to claims about multiculturalism’s decline the policy reveals the persistence of multiculturalism, and a dispersal of its meanings and functions. Read in the context of a number of other recent multicultural policy statements the document exemplifies a contradictory set of objectives: to create the conditions for a successful creative economy, but also to mitigate against the post-national modes of identity and interrelation such economies imply. These disparate agendas are difficult to reduce into a singular narrative and instead highlight multiculturalism as a heterogeneous and unstable policy formation.
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This article reflects on the recently released national cultural policy, *Creative Australia*, and its relationship with discourses of multiculturalism. The policy is read in the context of other recent Australian policy statements on multiculturalism and cultural diversity in order to examine the meanings and status of multiculturalism today, particularly given the crisis in confidence surrounding the term from both the left and right of politics. Given current anxieties over multiculturalism, both within official and popular discourses, it is worth considering what recent articulations of multiculturalism are used to do. The article begins by looking at statements of ‘multiculturalism’ in the *Creative Australia* policy and finds that there has been an apparent decoupling of multiculturalism from broader narratives of national identity. Such a reading is consistent with accounts of the decreased visibility of the term multiculturalism in public policy. However, a closer reading suggests that the policy extends the discourse of multiculturalism in ways which complicate the narratives of multiculturalism that were evident in the Keating government’s *Creative Nation* policy of the 1990s. In the more recent policy, ‘multiculturalism’ has been largely displaced by the broader category of ‘diversity’, dispersing the meanings and functions of multicultural discourse. The term ‘diversity’ is used to describe the cultural composition of the Australian population – both specifically in terms of ethnicity and also in terms of other forms of cultural difference. It is also used to describe the range of arts practices at the centre of the policy, as well as the cultural economies these art forms circulate within. Finally, ‘diversity’ and multiculturalism are linked to the discourse of citizenship – both a narrow notion of citizenship framed by obligations to the state, and a less bounded, broader notion of citizenship as belonging via cultural expression.

This dispersal of multiculturalism is reflected in a number of other policy statements from the last few years and is especially apparent when the somewhat disparate cultural policies of federal, state and local government are read alongside each other. While this article undertakes only a partial reading of these other policies, what is clear is that multiculturalism does not refer to a singular ideology. Multiculturalism is a heterogeneous and unstable policy formation that is used to frame a range of political agendas. Multiculturalism persists in policy in ways that we may not recognise or that may be contrary to early visions of multiculturalism. The shifts and multiplications that have taken place under the banner of multiculturalism at once seek to create the conditions which can support creative economies, but also react against the post-national modes of identity and interrelation such economies imply. These articulations of multiculturalism also suggest a blurring of policy terrains, where government policies are oriented to global, regional and local spaces in ways which do not necessarily correspond to their traditional constituencies. Ultimately, this messiness of contemporary multicultural policy discourse is difficult to incorporate into a singular narrative of multiculturalism, including a narrative asserting the rise and subsequent decline of multiculturalism in Australian policy (Papastergiadis, 2012).

The competing discourses underpinning the constructions of multiculturalism might be usefully understood as an example of what Foucault describes as ‘governmentality’ – a heterogeneous assemblage of ‘institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections’, which comprises both formal and informal rationalities of power (Foucault, 1991: 102). In this Foucauldian analysis government operates across disparate sites for often indeterminate or incongruous ends. This perspective allows us to question the ‘self-
‘evidence’ of multiculturalism by identifying a ‘multiplication or pluralisation of causes’ which define the category (Foucault, 1981: 76). Conceived this way, the Creative Australia policy might be understood as the intersection of various rationalities and agendas; it is an example of the complex and uneven process of policy making rather than an expression of a singular ideology of multiculturalism. Such an understanding problematises characterisations of multiculturalism as static, singular or in decline, and opens up possibilities for what multiculturalism might be used to do.

**From Creative Nation to Creative Australia**

The last fifteen years have seen a rise in anxiety surrounding official discourses of multiculturalism, evident both in public debates surrounding the issue, as well as a decrease in the use of the language of multiculturalism itself. Since the late 1990s, Australia has witnessed the diminishing currency of multiculturalism as a national policy priority, largely because of the ascendancy of a conservative politics of Anglo nationalism on the political right (Papastergiadis, 2012). In the popular imagination, the ‘war on terror’ and the politicisation of asylum seekers and refugees have emphasised the divisive nature of cultural difference. Governmental policies have responded by securing the nation’s social and geographic borders in the form of citizenship tests, an emphasis on migrants’ responsibilities to the state and the off-shore processing of refugees. The Federal Government’s renaming of the Department of Immigration, Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs to the Department of Immigration and Citizenship in 2007, and then to the Department of Immigration and Border Protection in 2013 reflects these shifts, and makes explicit the perceived dangers associated with migration and cultural diversity.

To a large extent this waning of governmental articulations of multiculturalism is a response to criticisms of multiculturalism that have been taking place both on the left and right of politics. Proclamations of multiculturalism’s ‘failure’ have accused multiculturalism of being a separatist strategy, responsible for urban ‘ghettoisation’ and inter-ethnic tension (Mirza, 2006). Responses to this perceived ‘failure’ from the right have involved a renewed emphasis on anti-immigration and assimilationist cultural policies, and the sorts of rhetorical shifts described above. Efforts to counter these conservative nationalist agendas, in both policy and scholarly discussions of ethnic difference, have taken the form of a ‘post-multiculturalist’ discourse which seeks out new languages and models for managing difference (Ang, 2011; Jakubowicz, 2011; National Multicultural Advisory Council, 1999). The rise in currency of the term ‘interculturalism’, for example, privileges expressions of cultural difference which promote exchange between different cultural minorities in an effort to avoid what is regarded as the dangerous relativism of multiculturalism (Meer and Modood, 2012: 177). ‘Interculturalism’ is posited as a way of addressing the limits of multiculturalism, but such thinking tends to simplify the range of interrelations, attachments and forms of exchange that are encompassed by multiculturalism. This strategy does not respond to critiques of multiculturalism by defending the category, or arguing for its usefulness, but by eschewing it in favour of a new policy language which is perceived to do things that multiculturalism could not.

To understand the impact of these discursive shifts on Australian policy it is worth going back to what might be regarded as something of a zenith in Australian multiculturalism in the early 1990s. In 1994, the Keating government launched the Creative Nation policy. Heralded as a watershed in Australian cultural policy, the document sought to elevate the arts and culture to national prominence, and reframed the arts as ‘cultural industries’. It described itself as both a cultural policy and ‘also an economic policy’ (Australian Government, 1994: 7). The document also foregrounded multiculturalism as part of an overarching narrative of national identity, and highlighted the importance of the arts and culture in contributing to this narrative. Attention has been drawn to the largely economic agenda informing this emphasis on multiculturalism – particularly as Creative Nation represented the cultural dimension of a broader governmental strategy of engagement with Asia. The latter represented a vast new market for Australian cultural products, and culture was to serve a diplomatic role,
building and sustaining relationships between Australia and its neighbours in the Asia-Pacific. Notwithstanding these economic imperatives, however, the multiculturalism that was celebrated in this document was not purely instrumental but also rhetorical: ‘Multicultural Australia – a society which is both diverse and tolerant of diversity, which actively encourages diversity – is one of our great national achievements’ (Australian Government, 1994: 6). In this way, the multiculturalism of Creative Nation was explicitly tied to a vision of contemporary nationhood.

In 2013, after a lengthy process of public consultation, the then Federal Labor Government released its national cultural policy, Creative Australia. In many ways, the policy testifies to the enduring relevance of the Creative Nation agenda in both the significance and function it ascribes to culture in contemporary Australia. Like Creative Nation, Creative Australia conceives of the arts and culture in economic terms as ‘the cultural sector’ and considers this sector as integral to shaping national identity and contributing to the economy. The latter policy also continues its predecessor’s agenda of positioning Australia culturally, politically and economically in ‘the Asian Century,’ a phrase that has gained some currency in recent years and formally entered Australian policy rhetoric with the release of the 2012 white paper Australia in the Asian Century.

The Creative Australia policy is directed by five main goals:

1) Recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures as central to Australian identity.
2) Reflecting the diversity of all Australian citizens including cultural background, location and social circumstance.
3) Supporting excellence and the special role of the artist.
4) Expanding the capacity of the cultural sector to contribute to all aspects of national life, the community, wellbeing and the economy.
5) Supporting innovation in the digitally enabled 21st century through the development of new creative content, knowledge and creative industries.

This broad set of objectives makes it difficult to discern a clear and coherent agenda informing the policy. Rather, these goals indicate the range of constituencies the policy seeks to address, and the different forms of value these constituencies attribute to the arts and culture.

Significantly, the policy demonstrates that conservative responses to multiculturalism that have taken place in the last fifteen years have not been accompanied by a complete disavowal of multicultural policy. While there are fewer explicit references to ‘multiculturalism’, there has been a multiplication and dispersal of uses of multiculturalism. In the Creative Australia policy, multicultural objectives are dissipated, via the language of ‘diversity’, into a range of economic, social and cultural governmental agendas. These objectives are heterogeneous – some contradictory, some a continuation of agendas from the past, and others a reaction against these agendas.

There are, for example, appearances of a pre-Creative Nation welfarist agenda which defined the multiculturalism of the 1970s and 1980s. Within the policy, multiculturalism and the arts are connected because the arts are seen to have a place ‘at the core of a just, inclusive, vibrant, prosperous and resilient society’ (Australian Government, 2013: 102). Here, multiculturalism is equated with ‘community’, access and social inclusion, and mentioned alongside disability, youth, regional arts, and other forms of perceived social ‘disadvantage’. Communities are the site where multiculturalism happens:

They are the hub of multiculturalism, linking and unifying people from different backgrounds and circumstances, fostering understanding and building a common sense of purpose (Australian Government, 2013: 102).

This is part of an enduring tradition of multicultural arts policy, whereby the importance of artistic production is seen to lie in its role in celebrating and ‘maintaining’ minority cultures. As has been argued elsewhere, this is a rather narrow understanding of the
relationship between multiculturalism and the arts – one which privileges traditional or folkloric art, where art is understood to emerge organically from the wellspring of traditional culture or community (Hawkins, 1993: xix). Such understandings overlook the complexity of identity in favour of bounded categories of ethnic identity. This perspective has long been regarded as problematic for artists and organisations seeking to promote more hybrid and multi-dimensional forms of expression without necessarily being burdened by a responsibility to ‘represent’ ethnic identity and ‘community’ (Gunew, 1994: 4; Routoulas, 1991: 32).

Drawing multicultural policy back into an instrumentalist, welfarist agenda that is also targeted at ‘community’ has the effect of decentring it from narratives of the nation state. This displacement means that the language of ‘multiculturalism’ no longer carries the same symbolic status it did in Creative Nation, where it was explicitly incorporated into a vision of contemporary Australian identity. While multiculturalism still has a place within governmental programs of the ‘social’, it is no longer a descriptor of a cosmopolitan national identity. This is reiterated by the persistence of ‘multicultural’ programs and initiatives at the level of state and local government, at the same time as there has been a decline in the use of the language of multiculturalism at a federal level.

Despite this apparent reorientation of multiculturalism, the term ‘diversity’ is incorporated in a significant way into the Creative Australia policy's vision of national identity. In the 'story' of Australian national identity narrated by the policy, we are told that Creative Australia reflects the diversity of modern Australia (Australian Government, 2013: 6), and that:

Culture is … the embodiment of the distinctive values, traditions and beliefs that make being Australian in the 21st century unique – democratic, diverse, adaptive and grounded in one of the world’s oldest living civilisations (Australian Government, 2013: 8).

The policy is replete with similar statements about the diversity of cultures that make up contemporary Australian society. It is the role of ‘culture’ to reflect and negotiate this diversity, to ‘strengthen the forces that unite us, build community and bear witness to the diversity of lives and experiences’ (Australian Government, 2013: 36). This construction of Australia as a plural society made up of discrete cultural groups that are united by an overarching commitment to the nation state continues the narrative of Creative Nation, albeit without explicit reference to multiculturalism.

Creative Australia also incorporates this vision of a diverse Australia into economic strategies. The policy continues Creative Nation’s efforts to mobilise an outward-looking cosmopolitan multiculturalism in order to align Australia with Asia in the service of an economic agenda. The policy promotes arts initiatives which involve international engagement, and which ‘will result in Australia having a world renowned reputation as a sophisticated, innovative, creative and culturally diverse nation producing internationally acclaimed artists and creators’ (Australian Government, 2013: 24). These economic rationales for multiculturalism continue to hold currency not just within federal-level policies, but in the programs and policies of state governments. The commodification of ethnic difference, and the consumption practices which surround it, have been the focus of a range of governmental programs and extend far beyond support for narrow categories of cultural practice such as ‘multicultural art’. The Victorian Office of Multicultural Affairs and Citizenship, for example, administers the Cultural Precincts funding program – an initiative that involves the enhancement of streetscapes and public places to preserve and showcase the ethnic identity of various precincts across metropolitan Melbourne, including Chinatown and Greek and Italian precincts in the inner city. Despite the program’s concern with developing cultural heritage and expressions of ethnic diversity, these precincts are equally mobilised as ‘product’ – to maximise touristic opportunities, drive further investment and to enhance Melbourne’s reputation as a cosmopolitan city of ‘world class’ standing (Ratio Consultants, 2007: 3, 5). The primary function of these enhanced precincts is to serve as distinctly branded spaces of consumption and in this way, tie strategies for supporting culturally diverse
expression with those of urban placemaking and economic development. Such programs arguably form part of a discourse of ‘cosmopolitan multiculturalism’ which privileges a globalised, middle-class consuming subject at the expense of the cultural interests and priorities of migrant communities themselves (Hage, 2003; Ang et al, 2008).

This commodification of ethnicity highlights the way in which a neoliberal, transnational imaginary has come to inform contemporary (multi)cultural policy. That is, such policymaking seems to demonstrate an awareness of the hybrid identities and modes of belonging engendered through changing migration patterns and diaspora cultures, and the global flow of mediated images, media scapes and economies. Such an imaginary, however, necessitates a more hybrid vision of nationhood – a problematic shift for conservative policy makers and one which heightens the need to justify support for multiculturalism on economic grounds.

These pressures and fissures within multicultural policy making – the privileging of economic rationalisations, as well as a more complicated relationship between ethnicity, identity, community and art – have implications for multicultural cultural production. Works by artists from diverse backgrounds and organisations that do not necessarily label themselves as ‘multicultural’ can claim cultural and economic capital by speaking to these discourses of cosmopolitan value, without having to rely on an identification as ‘multicultural’. The work of organisations such as Footscray Community Arts Centre and Casula Powerhouse, whose constituencies are decidedly ‘multicultural’, can be rebranded as ‘contemporary’, ‘innovative’ or ‘experimental’. At the same time, however, there has been a recentring of the rhetoric of artistic ‘excellence’. ‘Excellence’ has long been a key criteria for Australia Council-funded work, and the focus of accusations of cultural elitism (Rowse 1985; Hawkins 1993). In recent years, Multicultural Arts Victoria – a multicultural arts advocacy organisation which began as a grassroots cultural festival over 30 years ago – has redefined its work using the language of ‘excellence’, and in some respects embraces the hierarchy of artistic value the term implies. This organisation has taken on a deliberate and strategic move to produce work that reflects cultural diversity but which also seeks to meet this criteria of artistic ‘excellence’. So it is by engaging with this transnational imaginary, and the forms of economic value it implies, that such organisations can accumulate cultural capital and participate in circuits of artistic distribution and reception they were previously marginalised from (Khan, 2010).

Dispersing multiculturalism: diversity, citizenship and new policy terrains

The dispersal of multiculturalism becomes even more evident when we consider Creative Australia in the context of other recent policy articulations of multiculturalism. While the Creative Australia policy alludes to a neoliberal transnationalism, other recent policies reiterate a bounded vision of the nation, and can be read as a defensive response against this globalised cultural imaginary. In 2012 the Victorian state government released a document entitled The Government’s Vision for Citizenship in a Multicultural Victoria. The statement was developed by the Office of Multicultural Affairs and Citizenship and relies on a narrative about the contribution of multiculturalism (and migrants) to a national project. While the document, like many official statements on Australian multiculturalism, highlights cultural diversity as one of the state’s key ‘strengths’, the document also emphasises migrants’ attachments and obligations to the state (Office of Multicultural Affairs and Citizenship, 2012: 3). The ‘vision for citizenship’ that the document advocates is a narrow one. The ‘promotion of citizenship and civics to new migrants’ and the requirement for ‘full and equal democratic participation’ are highlighted (Office of Multicultural Affairs and Citizenship, 2012: 4, 7). While such participation apparently includes what might be described as ‘rights’ – ‘experiencing a sense of belonging’, accessing services, and artistic and cultural expression – it also emphasises responsibilities to the state – ‘contributing to society by volunteering’, and ‘being gainfully employed’ (Office of Multicultural Affairs and Citizenship, 2012: 7). In doing so, the document constructs an ideal, ‘responsible’ multicultural citizen – one who may have various attachments beyond the state, but whose primary responsibility lies
to the state. These responsibilities are to be enacted by way of participation in civic life. Here, the value of multiculturalism lies in a narrow understanding of its productive value and contribution to the state – a reactionary discourse which could be understood as a response against celebratory and cosmopolitan visions of multiculturalism.

While this construction of multiculturalism emphasises the instrumental benefits and contribution of cultural diversity to the (otherwise homogenous) nation state, we contend that this is part of a broader dispersal of multicultural objectives that has taken place in recent years. ‘Multicultural’ policy initiatives are being channelled into welfarist agendas, incorporated into economic strategies, or redirected into a range of other agendas via the language of ‘diversity’ and the more loosely defined set of uses and meanings this carries. Creative Australia is one of a number of policy statements that illustrate these tendencies, and the displacement of ‘multiculturalism’ with the language of ‘diversity’.

The term ‘diversity’ in the Creative Australia policy is pervasive. ‘Diversity’ is mobilised as a less-prescriptive category, and one that can be instrumentalised towards a wider range of outcomes, than ‘multiculturalism’. Despite few mentions of the ‘multicultural’ character of Australian identity in Creative Australia, Australian life and its arts and cultural economy are frequently described as ‘diverse’. At times the policy elides the ‘diversity’ of culture with a ‘diversity’ of arts and cultural products, and ultimately with the diversity of the cultural economy: in this way the rhetoric of ‘diversity’ enables support for cultural difference to be absorbed into an economic strategy. There is also much reference in Creative Australia to the range of actors involved in the arts and cultural sector – that is, the diversity of artists, organisations, artworkers and other creative practitioners – and the related need to modernise the funding structures that support this. The description of this cultural economy as an ‘ecosystem’ is an effort to reflect this diversity (Australian Government, 2013: 37). It is the diversification of the arts sector, its producers, audiences, forms and media, and the spaces in which production and consumption take place, that has also been used to explain the 2012 review of the Australia Council and the ongoing effort to shift responsibility for arts and cultural funding away from traditional sources.

Diversity also enables the Creative Australia policy to speak to different forms of cultural difference, rather than the categories of ethnic difference that are the specific focus of multiculturalism. In celebrating cultural diversity, the policy makes a strong connection between this diversity and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander culture. The policy’s ‘respect for this unique foundation of our identity [ATSI culture] should both precede and inform the broader cultural diversity that has become a defining characteristic of 21st century Australia’ (Australian Government, 2013: 124). In this sense, traditional policy objectives relating to cultural access, recognition and representation are reiterated in this policy.

These objectives are also linked to a more general aim to enable belonging through cultural expression. This has been described by some as ‘cultural citizenship’, where legal, formal obligations to the state are less significant than informal and implicit modes of belonging (Couldry, 2006; Karim, 2005; Mercer, 2005; Murray, 2005; Rosaldo, 1997). Modood, for example, describes citizenship as ‘the right to make a claim on the national identity in which negative difference is challenged and supplanted by positive difference’ (2007: 150). This sentiment is reflected in one of Creative Australia’s stated ‘goals’: ‘to Ensure that government support reflects the diversity of Australia and that all citizens, wherever they live, whatever their background or circumstances, have a right to shape our cultural identity and its expression’ (Australian Government, 2013: 6). This understanding of the rights of citizenship complicates the kind of citizenship imagined in the Victorian State Government’s Vision for Citizenship policy, which is stated in terms of migrants’ responsibilities to a pre-defined national culture rather than the right to shape this culture. The forms of belonging promoted in the scholarly discourse on cultural citizenship encompass more fluid attachments both to and beyond the state.
This globalised sense of cultural citizenship is alluded to in Creative Australia’s reference to transnational cultural policy documents. The policy cites the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of Diversity of Cultural Expression, which aims to ‘ensure that citizens have opportunities to express their cultural identity’ (Australian Government, 2013: 29). There are other references to international cultural policy instruments and the forms of cultural value envisioned by these documents, such as the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. In these articulations of the role of the arts and culture in expressing difference, the value of diversity is not reduced to an economic or nation-building agenda. Rather, these statements and reconstructions of cultural citizenship point to something beyond the nation state.

Such references to international policy documents reveal not just an expansion of policy spaces but a blurring of policy constituencies. This is evident not only in the Creative Australia policy but in state-level policies which also attempt to account for cultural diversity. The Cultural Diversity Action Plan of Arts Victoria, the Victorian state government body responsible for the arts, draws from UNESCO’s Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity and defines ‘cultural diversity’ as:

... the set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of society or a social group, and that it encompasses – in addition to art and literature – lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs (Arts Victoria, 2012: 1).

The policy also cites UNESCO’s World Report on Cultural Diversity to bring together the range of rationalisations for cultural diversity and multiculturalism this paper has examined: that cultural diversity is at once a demographic reality that cannot be ignored, that it is about the rights of everyone in society to participate in and have access to culture, that it is a unifying social force, and that it is a way of supporting economic agendas. While the Cultural Diversity Action Plan seeks to promote Arts Victoria as a centre for cultural diversity in the arts, it is also externally oriented, promoting partnerships and exchanges at regional, national and international levels, and seeking to influence broader agendas and structures. In this sense the Cultural Diversity Action Plan is driven by an understanding that cultural diversity is dispersed across institutions, communities, government programs, cities, and grassroots cultural activities. These two state-level policies, then, attest to a narrowing of multiculturalism (via conservative constructions of multicultural citizenship) on the one hand, and, on the other, a broadening out of the policy horizons and possibilities for thinking through multicultural relations.

Conclusion

The trajectory of Australian multiculturalism is sometimes characterised as an evolution from an ethno-specific, welfarist agenda into a cosmopolitan discourse but which, because of the perceived threat to nationhood such a discourse represents, is increasingly bound by economic rationales that serve the national interest (Ang et al, 2008; Colic-Peisker & Farquharson, 2011). What is lost in this narrative is a sense that multiculturalism, and the economic and cultural objectives which surround the rhetoric of ‘diversity’, do not refer to a coherent or singular policy agenda. A range of interests is invoked under the banner of multiculturalism, pointing to the messiness of multicultural policy making. The economic project which underpins Creative Australia is not necessarily compatible with the document’s emphasis on ‘community’-based arts practice, or the role of cultural minorities in shaping ‘our cultural identity and its expression’ (Australian Government, 2013: 6). Nor does it necessarily cohere with the notions of citizenship and national belonging articulated in other contemporary multicultural policy statements.

By describing the complexity of how multiculturalism is articulated in the Creative Australia policy, and the policy milieu it is situated within, this account has sought to point out the potentiality of multiculturalism. The category invokes various meanings and uses, across different levels and actors. Arguments about multiculturalism’s
irrelevance overlook this complexity and close down possibilities for what multiculturalism might be. Such arguments also disregard the complex and unstable lifeworld of policy. Policies are constructed via the priorities and interests of politicians, arts organisations, artists, multicultural ‘communities’ and funding bodies, who all participate in their own practices of cultural production, participation and advocacy. By attempting to negotiate these multiple interests and terrains, Creative Australia highlights the fluidity of multicultural policy making.

Endnotes:
i. Creative Nation does not speak explicitly of the ‘Asian Century’ but states the importance of using Australian arts and culture as a diplomatic tool in the Asian region: ‘Particularly in the Asia-Pacific … the use of leading performing arts companies and the mounting of major visual arts exhibitions offer unique opportunities to both influence perceptions of Australia and influence individuals who are important to Australia’ (Australian Government, 1994: 93).

ii. The Office of Multicultural Affairs and Citizenship (Victoria), the Office of Multicultural Interests (Western Australia), Multicultural Affairs Queensland and Multicultural SA all exemplify the continuing currency of the category of multiculturalism at a state level. ‘Multicultural officers’ in many local government authorities around Australia also attest to the persistence of this term.

iii. Our description of a transnational imaginary is distinct from accounts of a ‘neoliberal multiculturalism’ which critique the appropriation of multiculturalism by economic agendas in order to use it as a benevolent front for the ‘racialised social structure of globalisation’ (Melamed, 2006: 1; Hale, 2005).
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