Jock Collins · Branka Krivokapic-Skoko · Kirrily Jordan · Hurriyet Babacan · Narayan Gopalkrishnan

Cosmopolitan Place Making in Australia

Immigrant Minorities and the Built Environment in Cities, Regional and Rural Areas

palgrave macmillan

Cosmopolitan Place Making in Australia

Jock Collins · Branka Krivokapic-Skoko ·
Kirrily Jordan · Hurriyet Babacan ·
Narayan Gopalkrishnan

Cosmopolitan Place Making in Australia

Immigrant Minorities and the Built Environment in Cities, Regional and Rural Areas

palgrave
macmillan

Jock Collins
University of Technology Sydney
Broadway, NSW, Australia

Kirrily Jordan
Australian National University
Galston, NSW, Australia

Narayan Gopalkrishnan
Social Work and Human Services
James Cook University
Cairns, QLD, Australia

Branka Krivokapic-Skoko
Charles Sturt University
Bathurst, NSW, Australia

Hurriyet Babacan
James Cook University
Townsville, QLD, Australia

ISBN 978-981-15-8040-6 ISBN 978-981-15-8041-3 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-8041-3

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.
The registered company address is: 152 Beach Road, #21-01/04 Gateway East, Singapore 189721, Singapore

Preface

This book investigates cosmopolitan place making, the historical and contemporary impact of minority ethnic communities on the built and social environment in Australian cities, rural and regional areas. Australia is one of the great countries of settler immigration, with more immigrants than most other nations: indeed, only Switzerland and Luxembourg have a higher immigrant share of the population among Western nations. Most research about immigration looks at the impact of immigrants on the economy (jobs, growth, productivity) and society (crime, conflict, social cohesion). This book presents another take on immigration by looking at how immigrants from minority backgrounds have transformed the built environment of the suburbs, towns and neighbourhoods where they settle, changing the way that Australian cities, suburbs and towns look and feel while at the same time changing the social landscape of Australian society. Immigrants are transformed by the experience of settling in a new society and, in turn, transform the places that become their new homes, particularly evident in the places and spaces created by immigrant communities for private or community use. The overall objective of this book is to record the impact of ethnic minorities on the built environment in Australian cities and rural and regional areas, and to investigate the (changing) social uses of this ethnic heritage. Here, the focus is on minority immigrant communities. By this, we mean those immigrants who do not come from English-speaking Western societies, particularly

the British and Irish colonial immigrants—Anglo-Celtic immigrants—who have dominated Australian immigration intakes, until recent decades, for over two centuries, and still arrive in Australia in large numbers. While the concept of minority immigrant communities is not without problems—many immigrants born in the United Kingdom, for example, may have Asian or West Indian or other ethnic and cultural heritage, and be Muslim, Hindu or from other non-Christian religious backgrounds—this approach permits the gaze of our study to focus on a relatively overlooked and increasingly important domain of immigrant place making. But at the same time the society into which new immigrants settle is a post-colonial society, with a long history of Indigenous settlement prior to subsequent waves of immigration. The cosmopolitan perspective adopted for this book means that we situate the minority migrant presence within the Indigenous and Anglo-Celtic immigrant communities of all Australian places and spaces.

In the cities, we investigate what we call ethnic precincts such as Chinatown as a clustered suburban form of Australia's minority immigrant community heritage. While most immigrants settle in Australia's large cities, we also wanted to look at the places and spaces they create in Australia's rural and regional areas. However, place making is more than constructing or converting buildings for private or community use by new immigrant communities. It is much more than architecture or heritage. It is also about the social interactions that occur within these places. In both the Australian cities and the 'bush' (an Australian colloquial term for non-metropolitan dwellers), we wanted to investigate how the places built or developed by minority ethnic communities become an integral part of the lives of peoples of diverse Indigenous and ethnic backgrounds of Australian cities, and rural and regional areas.

Because Australian immigration is perhaps Australia's most contentious area of public policy, the immigrant presence in Australian metropolitan and regional cities and rural towns is also often contentious. This is probably most evident in the protests to proposals by Australia's Islamic communities—many of them new immigrants from a minority background—to build new Mosques in suburbs and regional towns. Indeed, most opposition to the place making of immigrant minorities

relates to buildings used for religious purposes. The focus on the impact of minority ethnic communities on the built environment is partly because it is contested but also because non-Anglo-Celtic immigration is more visibly different to that of British and Irish immigration. Australia has a long history of formal and informal racism that shapes both immigration policy and the reception of immigrant minority communities. This racism is similar but different to ways that the initial waves of British and Irish immigrants reacted to the Indigenous communities who were living here. Often the community and private buildings constructed by new immigrants provide a safe place where immigrant communities can live and socialise, but over time often become places and spaces for social interaction of people in the neighbourhood from very diverse cultural backgrounds.

In order to study the impact of minority ethnic communities on the built environment, we focus our attention on three Australia states—New South Wales, Western Australia and Queensland—and take as case studies suburban, regional and rural sites in each state. We then investigate how the (changing) immigrant presence led to changes in the built environment in the form of new buildings or the repurposing of existing buildings. There are a number of questions to investigate here: How and why were each of the sites developed? What changes have there been in the social uses of these buildings, spaces and places over time? What was the resulting interaction with local and national regulatory regimes and the responses by other communities in the neighbourhood? The case studies offer numerous examples in which places built and used by non-Anglo-Celtic immigrants and their descendants have become sites of informalised inter-ethnic exchange and interaction. In reflecting on each site's history, social use and role in intercultural exchange, we show the extent to which non-Anglo-Celtic immigrant minorities have literally changed the face of Australian neighbourhoods—both physically and socially. As such, the places and spaces built by or transformed by these immigrants challenge narratives of 'Australianness' that represent multicultural place making as a foreign incursion into an otherwise Anglo-Celtic landscape. They are physical embodiments of the complex, embedded and sometimes long-standing and contradictory relationships of immigrant minorities within

their local communities, in neighbourhoods that were also transformed by the immigrant arrivals that displaced Indigenous peoples living there centuries earlier. We hope to better understand the historical and contemporary aspects of cosmopolitan place making in Australia's rural and urban social landscape.

Broadway, Australia — Jock Collins
Bathurst, Australia — Branka Krivokapic-Skoko
Galston, Australia — Kirrily Jordan
Townsville, Australia — Hurriyet Babacan
Smithfield, Australia — Narayan Gopalkrishnan

Acknowledgements

The research for this book was financed by a four-year Australian Research Council Linkage Grant. We also had funding and support from the National Trust of Australia (WA), the Community Relations Commission for Multicultural Australia, the National Trust of Australia (NSW) and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Qld. There are numerous individuals who gave their time, energy and knowledge to assist with the research over the years; we are very grateful for their support. In particular, we would like to acknowledge the support of: Mr. Enzo Sirna, of the National Trust of Australia (WA), whose enthusiasm and tireless support for the project were critical to its successful completion; Mr. Tom Perrigo, also of the National Trust of Australia (WA), who was the first person to recognise the importance of this research and to pledge funding and support for it; and Mr. Warren MacMillan—formerly of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Queensland, for invaluable support with the Queensland fieldwork. Katherine Watson provided her excellent editing skills to this manuscript, though we take responsibility for whatever faults and errors remain. Jan Rath provided invaluable networking opportunities for discussion of theoretical and policy insights into the relationships between immigrant communities and public and private space in the metropolises of the world.

Contents

Abbreviations

ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
ANM	Australian National Movement
ASIO	Australian Security Intelligence Organisation
BCC	Brisbane City Council
BHP	Hill Propriety Company Ltd
BigN	Business Improvement Group of Northbridge
BME	Bacchus Marsh Express
CALD	Culturally and Linguistically Diverse
CARM	Caboolture and Redcliffe Multicultural
CBD	Central Business District
CCA	Cathay Community Association
CCTV	Closed-Circuit Television
CCQ	Chinese Club of Queensland
CNN	Cable News Network
CSC	Caboolture Shire Council
CWA	Chung Wah Association
CYL	Chinese Youth League
DIA	Department of Indigenous Affairs
DIEA	Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs
DPC	Department of Premier and Cabinet
EPRA	East Perth Redevelopment Authority
FECCA	Federation of Ethnic Community Councils of Australia
FFMT	Fremantle Fishermen's Memorial Trust
FYROM	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
HCWA	Heritage Council of Western Australia
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites

IMRO	Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization
KMT	Kuomintang
LAP	Local Action Plan
MAQ	Multicultural Affairs Queensland
MWA of NSW	Macedonian Welfare Association of New South Wales
NBHP	Northbridge History Project
NSW	New South Wales
NSW DECC	New South Wales Department of Environment and Climate Change
NZ	New Zealand
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
Qld	Queensland
RSL	Returned and Services League
SHFA	Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority
TAB	Totalisator Agency Board
TAFE	Technical and Further Education
TNSW	Tourism New South Wales
UK	United Kingdom
WA	Western Australia
WAMMCO	WA Meat Marketing Co-operative Limited
WAPC	Western Australian Planning Commission
WUFC	Wollongong United Football Club

List of Figures

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1

Place Making, Migration and the Built Environment: An Introduction

Places reflect the people who live there, their history and their experiences. The built environment of the neighbourhood in the city, suburb or town provides the physical setting by which and in which we live our lives. There are emotional, physical and community interactions in this space which determine our well-being, our identity and civic participation. The built environment is strongly influenced by the social, political and economic influences of the time and often reflects issues of power, resources, ideas and values.

Immigration and immigrant experiences constitute an important element of the way places and spaces are conceived, imagined, constructed and transformed. Memory, nostalgia, estrangement, isolation, participation, dislocation and hope are elements that influence place making. Therefore, in the post-migration period, places are constructed from the contradictory forces of the familiar and unfamiliar, resulting in culturally hybrid places where individuals, community, state and national identities are negotiated and change. The place making of immigrant minorities is even more contradictory and challenging than when immigrants come from the dominant cultural backgrounds, such as British immigrants in Australia. In one sense, the contribution of immigrant minorities to the built environment can be viewed as an attempt at social participation and inclusion through control of, access to and use of public spaces (Babacan 2006).

J. Collins et al., *Cosmopolitan Place Making in Australia*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-8041-3_1

The expression of ethnic and cultural difference in the landscape—what Dunn (1999, p. 15) called the 'spatialisation' of multiculturalism—is evident in Australia in many ways. Although it is rarely recognised in research on Australia's built heritage, prior to European arrival Indigenous Australians developed the built environment over millennia—some 60,000 years—constructing shelters out of natural materials and building elaborate stone fish traps and ceremonial sites. The British colonial myth of terra nullius—empty land—denied the many thousands of years of Indigenous place making across the continent and their care and management of the Australian landscape (Babacan and Gopalkrishnan 2017; Gammage 2012; Pascoe 2018). While industrial development, urbanisation and natural weathering have seen the disappearance of much of this heritage, many of the stone structures remain intact today. Nonetheless, colonisation has meant that the most dominant influence on the Australian built environment has undoubtedly been the architectural styles and forms originating from the United Kingdom and Western Europe. Perhaps unsurprisingly, it is the styles of British colonial architecture, in particular, that are most commonly recognised as Australia's built heritage.

However, since the earliest decades of colonisation, non-Anglo-Celtic immigrants and their descendants have also left their mark on Australia's built environment. We refer to these non-Anglo-Celtic immigrants as immigrant minorities. Their impact in transforming Australia's built environment is the central focus of this book. For example, despite recent protests against the development of mosques and Islamic schools in Australia, they are hardly a new feature. Temporary mosques were built across the Australian outback soon after the arrival of 'Afghan' cameleers in the mid- to late-nineteenth century, and the first permanent mosque was opened as early as 1899 (Dunn 1999, p. 233). Today, arguably the most obvious of the places built by ethnic and religious minorities are the grand places of worship, such as the Auburn Gallipoli Mosque in Sydney's West, or the Guru Nanak Gurdwara in Woolgoolga on the north coast of New South Wales. But immigrant minorities have also built less immediately striking facilities including cultural centres, social clubs, schools and aged care facilities, restaurants and shops. Together, these sites can be understood as 'multicultural monuments' (Dunn 1999, p. 2)—records of Australia's cultural diversity in its built environment. Non-Anglo-Celtic immigrants have also brought unique architectural and landscaping styles to Australia's residential centres (see Armstrong 1998;

Pascoe 1987, pp. 178–181; Sandercock and Kliger 1998) and even to suburban backyards (Graham and Connell 2006; see also Morgan et al. 2005; Pascoe 1987, pp. 180–181).

Australian architect and academic Susan Stewart and colleagues have also noted the 'invisible' impacts of non-Anglo-Celtic immigrants on the built environment. For example, while some sites may be 'visually unremarkable' and show no obvious signs of Australia's cultural diversity, they are 'culturally heterogenous in their production and habitation', having been designed through a process of cross-cultural negotiation (Stewart et al. 2003, p. 240). For planning researcher Leonie Sandercock, all of these patterns of spatial diversity are signs of a 'mongrelization', a new condition of cities 'in which difference, otherness, fragmentation, splintering, multiplicity, heterogeneity, diversity, plurality prevail' (Sandercock 2003, p. 1). They are also a reflection of the super-diversity of contemporary Australian life and of Australian society (Vertovec 2007).

While this book focuses on sites built by non-Anglo-Celtic ethnic groups, there is a complex overlap between ethnic and religious diversity. Hence, many of the sites examined are places of worship built and used by non-hegemonic ethnic groups who also have non-hegemonic religious affiliations. In this sense, multicultural monuments may also be monuments to religious diversity, with expressions of both ethnic and religious difference in the built environment being a testament to Australia's immigration history.

The spatial impacts of Australian multiculturalism had received little public or academic attention. Tamara Winikoff (1992, p. 140) has suggested that in research on the Australian built environment there has been 'an obvious bias in favour of British influence', with the 'material evidence of ethnic minority settlement… rarely celebrated'. Walter Lalich (2003), too, has argued that while inadequate academic attention has been paid to ethnic community organisations in Australia, even less attention has been given to the buildings and physical infrastructure they have created. Lalich argues that this reflects the cultural hegemony of Anglo-Celtic Australians and an Anglo-centric approach to research.

Similar critiques exist in the heritage realm. Renowned geographer David Lowenthal dubbed it a 'heritage crusade' (1998, p. ix). Interest groups have regularly lobbied to have buildings, towns or natural spaces listed on the numerous 'heritage' registers that now exist at local, national and even international levels. According to Lowenthal, such listings may recognise and validate peoples' attachments to place, enshrining symbols

of shared identity and allowing the consolation of tradition in difficult times (Lowenthal 1998, p. 1).

Heritage listings may also have significant practical implications. They may confer status on heritage sites—particularly important in the context of heritage tourism—as well as attracting privilege in resource allocation and political influence in development decisions. However, just as the spatial aspects of multiculturalism have been under-researched in the social sciences, the places built by non-Anglo-Celtic Australians have been largely ignored by heritage professionals. As the Australian Heritage Commission found in 1994: 'the history of many minority groups is relatively invisible in registers of significant places as though the history of such groups is not seen as being of broad public interest and importance' (Johnston in Lalich 2003, p. 9).

Part of the explanation for this lack of attention lies in definitions of heritage that have privileged the age of structures over their significance to local communities. For example, Helen Armstrong argued that the dominant understanding of heritage in Australia in the mid-1990s 'derived from the ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) model where antiquity, excellence and rigorous evaluation criteria' prevailed (Armstrong 1994a, p. 480). Heritage assessments based on this model emphasised 'historic, scientific and archaeological value… rather than social value' while the 'concept of social heritage significance [or] what is valued by the community' was inadequately understood (Armstrong 1994a, p. 480; see also Sandercock and Kliger 1998). Researchers in other Western nations have reached similar conclusions. In the United States and New Zealand (NZ), Dolores Hayden (1995) and Michael Hartfield (2001), respectively, have argued that official definitions of heritage have prioritised 'elite' or 'western' heritage at the expense of the heritage places of socially marginalised groups. Babacan and Gopalkrishnan (2017) point out that political struggles over heritage and space play out through structures of difference, discrimination, power and inequality.

Since the 1990s there have been increasing calls among both social scientists and heritage professionals to recognise and examine the social, cultural and political significance of places built by ethnic minorities. In the heritage realm, Hartfield (2001) has argued strongly for the expansion of definitions of heritage away from the age of structures to include places that are identified as significant by local communities, particularly

focusing on the inclusion of non-hegemonic ethnic groups (see also Hartfield and Kindon 2003). This approach recognises that what constitutes 'heritage' is socially constructed and gives equal value to both places deemed significant by heritage 'experts' and those felt to be heritage by local communities.

Official definitions of heritage in Australia have begun to recognise these concerns. For example, in 1999 the Burra Charter, the document developed by Australia ICOMOS—the peak body for heritage professionals in Australia—to guide in the management of places of cultural significance, was updated to recognise the cultural significance not only 'embodied in the place itself' but also in its 'fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects' (Australia ICOMOS 1999). The Burra Charter recognised that cultural heritage is living and always changing (Australia ICOMOS 1999).

In practice, the operationalisation of notions of heritage by heritage agencies and professionals increasingly recognises the cultural context of built sites, incorporating the social use of sites and even the prevailing legislative climate as aspects of a place's heritage (see, for example, National Trust of Australia [NSW] 2007). Some local governments and state heritage agencies began to commission studies of multicultural sites. For example, the Heritage Branch of the New South Wales Department of Planning commissioned studies into the thematic histories of Greek, Italian and Chinese immigrants in New South Wales (NSW), with the studies including research on significant buildings (see Pesman and Kevin 1998; Turnbull and Valiotis 2001; Williams 1999).

In the social sciences, several geographers and urban researchers both in Australia and overseas focused their attention on places built and used by ethnic and religious minorities. For example, Kevin Dunn (1999) examined the politics of mosque development in several Sydney suburbs (see also Dunn 2001a, b, 2003, 2004). Helen Armstrong has explored questions of immigrants' sense of place (1994b, c, 1997, 2002), while other researchers examined the history and politics of buildings such as Muslim schools (Rath et al. 2001), Hindu mandirs (Naylor and Ryan 2003) and Buddhist temples (Beynon 2007) in predominantly Christian countries. Lalich (2003) researched the emergence of community facilities as a result of the collective action of non-Anglo-Celtic ethnic groups in Sydney. He referred to the clubs, schools, places of worship and childcare that immigrant minorities funded and built as ethnic community capital, a

subset of ethnic social capital. Lalich documented the financing, management and the social usage of these places and spaces, including the extent to which bridging and bonding social capital occurred in them. Babacan and Gopalkrishnan (2011, 2017) have explored the spatial elements of a sense of belonging, identity and fear. Babacan and Babacan (2012) focused attention on the link between citizenship, equal valued status and place for ethnic minorities in Australia. Law et al. (2011) examined culturally diverse groups' impact on natural environments, agricultural land use, natural resource management and rural landscapes in Far North Queensland ethnic communities. Gopalkrishnan and Babacan point to the complexity of place and space nationally and internationally and the impact it has on relationships. The authors explore the impacts of place on marriage arrangements in the Indian community in Australia (Babacan and Gopalkrishnan 2012; Gopalkrishnan and Babacan 2007).

Following the pioneering work of Kay Anderson (1990, 1991), several researchers have studied the representation of ethnicity in ethnic precincts (Dunn 1998; Ip 2005; Mak 2003), while ethnic precincts' complex economic, social and political environments have become a growing area of research (Chang 2000; Conforti 1996; Fitzgerald 1997; Fong 1994; Frenkel and Walton 2000; Kinkead 1993; Lin 1998; McEvoy 2003; Zhou 1992). Several studies have also explored the potential of Chinatowns and other ethnic precincts to attract both tourist dollars and investment capital (Collins and Kunz 2005, 2006; Kunz 2005; Rath 2007; Rath et al. 2018). Korean immigrant entrepreneurs in the restaurant industry in Sydney cluster around Eastwood, Strathfield and Campsie—the suburbs with the highest concentration of Korean immigrants—and a block of a few streets in the Sydney Central Business District which has Korean language street names but little by way of other Korean iconography (Collins and Shin 2014). Much of the recent research has been influenced by the 'mixed embeddedness' approach which emphasises how different regimes of regulation in different cities and countries shape the contours of immigrant entrepreneurship (Kloosterman and Rath 2001). A recent study of the role of Chinese and Asian ethnic entrepreneurs in suburban place making in Toronto, Canada (Zhuang 2019) demonstrated how the institutional framework plays a role in shaping ethnic retail places and the spatial and physical outcomes of ethnic entrepreneurship. Other studies have investigated how neighbourhoods have been gentrified (Hackworth and Rekers 2005; Zukin et al. 2009; Bridge et al. 2011; Sakizlioglu and Uitermark 2014; Hochstenbach 2015; De Oliver

2016) and streetscapes transformed (Hagemans et al. 2015; De Koning 2015; van Eck et al. 2020) by newly arrived immigrant minorities and immigrant entrepreneurs.

These studies provide enormously useful insights into contests over space and the role of place in both economic competition and the social construction of identity and belonging. However, many focus their research on the specificities of one place or immigrant group. While this allows detailed and focused analysis, it loses the valuable insights that can be gained through comparative research. Moreover, almost all studies of multicultural place making have focused on sites in large cities, with less focus on regional cities and rural towns. This is not surprising given the urban settlement of most immigrants in most countries, leading to the inadequate attention to regional and rural immigration research (see, for example, Black et al. 2000). However, this book consciously attempts to rectify this urban bias in research on minority immigrant place making by also putting the spotlight on immigrant minorities in regional cities and rural towns. Despite the smaller numbers of regional and rural immigrants, immigration has had a significant impact on regional and rural Australia for a long period. For example, Italian (Kelley 2001) and German (Borrie 1954), Indian (de Lapervanche 1984) and Chinese immigrants (Lancashire 2000; Frost 2000) have played a significant role in the historical development of the Australian agricultural sector.

As Dunn (1999, p. 17) has previously noted, while 'the spatial dimension of Australia's ethnic diversity' has been neglected in academic research, 'a documentation of all spatial reflections would be a mammoth task'. While this book seeks to move beyond existing studies that focus on a particular site or ethnic group, it attempts to strike a balance between depth and breadth. Focusing on several sites in three Australian states, it demonstrates that places built and used by non-Anglo-Celtic immigrants and their descendants are crucial aspects of Australia's built and social landscape, with each of the sites in this study contributing to their local communities in complex and diverse ways.

The analysis of case studies in this book supports Anderson's (1990) concerns that the representation of ethnicity in public space may be racialised and shaped by a (changing) political climate of planners, regulators and politicians with their own agendas. But the key point of departure here is that immigrants are not passive victims: they transform their new neighbourhoods while they themselves are changed by them. The book highlights the agency that immigrants have in shaping their own destiny

in the literal form of the buildings that they erect or renovate in the neighbourhoods where they live, work, eat, pray and socialise. We look at the places of worship they build, at the restaurants and shops they develop and decorate with signage and iconography, the social and sporting clubs they build for recreation purposes and the ethnic neighbourhoods that develop and emerge with their dragons, lanterns and foreign language signposts. Our analysis shows that while the emergence and development of ethnic places and spaces may entrench negative ethnic stereotypes or reinforce ideas of cultural difference for some visitors, the same sites may be interpreted by others as an opportunity to challenge Anglo-Celtic cultural exclusivity and narrow definitions of Australianness and belonging. Importantly, they may also be seen by members of the associated co-ethnic population as claiming space and asserting community pride. The findings of our book support Meethan's (2001, p. 27) analysis that symbols of ethnicity are 'multivocal, that is, they have the capacity to carry a range of different, if not ambiguous and contradictory meanings'. With the possibility for such multiple interpretations, the focus shifts to the merits of the design process itself and to the importance of a role for the state. At the same time, the authenticity of ethnic places and spaces is viewed as multivocal, as ethnic authenticity is also subject to multiple interpretations (Wang 1999; Boyle 2003; Zukin 2010). Jan Rath and his colleagues identify 'a certain "therapeutic", aestheticised notion of diversity' in recent transformation of Amsterdam's commercial streetscape (van Eck et al. 2020).

1.1 Australia's Changing Patterns of Immigrant Settlement

With the United States, Canada and New Zealand, Australia has maintained a strong settler immigration policy since the end of World War II though temporary immigrants have increased dramatically in the last decade. In 2018, there were 7.3 million migrants—29% of the Australian population—that were born overseas and are first generation immigrants (Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS] 2019). Only Luxembourg and Switzerland exceed this migrant presence among OECD countries (OECD 2019). Moreover, more than 60% of the population of Australia's largest cities—Sydney, Melbourne, Perth, Adelaide and Brisbane—are either first generation immigrants or their Australian-born children.

One of the most urbanised nations in the world, 67% of Australians live in capital cities (ABS 2020)—with immigrants more likely to live in urban areas than non-immigrants. Of the 1,379,055 international migrants Australia received between 2011 and 2016, 85.52% settled in the greater capital cities, which also attracted many internal migrants from elsewhere in Australia. Greater Sydney and Greater Melbourne, the nation's top two global cities, received more than 50% of Australia's migrants. Only 14.5% of international migrants settled outside the capital cities (Tuli 2019).

It is not only the relatively large size of the Australian immigration intake that is important in understanding the impact of immigrants on the built environment, it is also the diversity of the immigration intake. Australia has one of the most diverse and changing immigrant populations, with the Australian immigration net catching people from all corners of the globe. As a British colony, the largest source countries for Australian post-war immigrants have been the United Kingdom and Ireland which have dominated annual immigration intakes in the last seven decades. Government assistance meant that many British immigrant families could travel to Australia by ship for ten pounds: the so-called 'ten-pound Poms' (Appleyard 1988; Hammerton and Thomson 2005; Jupp 2004). New Zealand is also a key source country, a consequence of the close geography and the shared history as British colonies. The Trans-Tasman Economic relationship also means that unlike immigrants from all other countries, any New Zealanders who want to come to Australia can do so. The annual target for permanent immigrants does not include the NZ intake. In the 1950s and 1960s, immigrants from countries in Southern and Western Europe—particularly Greece, Italy and the former Yugoslavia—came in large numbers. In the 1970s and 1980s, immigrants from Asian countries—particularly Vietnam—began to feature prominently as Australia rescinded the White Australia policy. Today India and China feature at the top of the 'top ten' countries of immigrant arrival (Doherty and Evershed 2018) with the largest Australian immigrant populations born in England, China, India, New Zealand, Philippines, Vietnam, South Africa, Italy, Malaysia and Scotland (ABS 2019). However, the immigration net is cast to more than 100 countries each year.

With this national diversity of the immigration intake comes linguistic, cultural, religious and ethnic diversity of newly arrived immigrant generations. There is also class diversity among Australia's immigrant arrivals. Millionaires go to the top of the queue through the visa pathway of the

Business Migration Program, generally under-subscribed. In the first post-war decades, a *chain migration* process (Price 1963) meant that young, lowly-educated male unskilled or agricultural workers from Greece, Italy and Yugoslavia would arrive in Australia as immigration pioneers. They would easily find unskilled factory jobs in Australian cities—many would hold more than one job—and save up to bring their brothers, then their cousins and parents. Over decades, whole families would move from the Greek islands, from the south of Italy or from Serbia or Croatia to settle in Australian suburbs where the next generations would be born. The Vietnamese boat people—refugees—in the 1970s and early 1980s also found factory work fairly easily, particularly in the cities of Melbourne and Sydney. As Australia entered the globalisation agenda under the guidance of the Hawke and Keating Labor Governments (1983–1996), manufacturing jobs declined, and the services sector expanded. Australian immigration policy shifted from a focus on family reunion to that of skilled migration. Increasingly the skilled migrants needed a university degree to be accepted as a permanent Australian resident. The numbers of skilled migrants from China and India increased significantly. Many of these had previously been in Australia on temporary visas—often student or working holiday maker visas—and made the eventual transition to a permanent visa. Indeed, the other key change in Australian immigration policy in the past two decades is the growth of immigrants arriving on temporary visas. In the last decade the annual number of migrants on temporary visas exceeded those on permanent visas by a factor of three to one (Collins 2014). At the same time, Australia has permitted a small number of refugees to arrive on a humanitarian visa. Today Australia accepts over 18,000 refugees each year. These refugees often arrive from the Middle East, Africa, Asia and Central America with an experience of displacement and trauma, their family networks fractured and dispersed across the globe. Refugees experience the highest rates of unemployment of any immigrant arrivals after settlement.

1.2 Racialisation of Australian Immigration Policy and Australian Immigrants

The history of Australian immigration is the history of formal and informal, individual and institutional racism. At the birth of the Australian nation at Federation in 1901, the common denominator of united disparate factions was the White Australia policy: the promise that

Australia would only take in white immigrants. This legislation was developed in response to the Chinese immigrant settlement related to the gold boom of the 1880s, when one in four adults in Victoria was Chinese (Choi 1975; Collins 2002). The number of Chinese in Australia dropped dramatically in coming decades when most of the non-Indigenous population and the majority of new immigrants were British and Irish in origin. At the beginning of the post-war immigration programme—designed to add 1% to the Australian population per year—the White Australia policy was still in operation. The first minister for Immigration—Arthur Calwell—promised that nine out of ten post-war immigrants would come from Britain. While the White Australia policy began to erode during the 1960s, it was not until the election of the Whitlam Labor Government (1972–1975) that the White Australia policy was formally and finally abandoned. However, it was not until the arrival of Vietnamese 'boat people'—refugees from the Vietnam War who were mostly ethnic Chinese and/or supporters of the South Vietnam regime—that large numbers of 'Asian' immigrants began to arrive in Australia for the first time since 1901.

Since that time the number of 'non-white' immigrants from all corners of the globe has increased. The 2016–2017 immigrant intake shows that the 'top ten' countries of new immigrant arrivals are led by India and China and include the Philippines, Iraq, Syria, New Zealand, Pakistan and Vietnam. Many immigrants from New Zealand are Maori. Regional data demonstrates clearly the global spread of the Australian immigration net. 58,232 permanent immigrants arriving in 2016–2017 came from countries in Southern and Central Asia, 37,235 came from countries in North-East Asia and 31,488 came from countries in South-East Asia. In addition, 28,525 came from North Africa and the Middle East, 25,174 from North-West Europe, 16,445 from Oceania and Antarctica, 11,369 from sub-Saharan Africa, 9687 from the Americas and 7306 from Southern and Eastern Europe (Liddy 2018).

The character of Australia's immigrant arrivals is shaped in a large part by the visa pathways that they take to get the rights to live in Australia temporarily or permanently. In turn, these pathways are largely influenced by the financial, human, social and linguistic capital these immigrants possess. The government annually sets the number of permanent immigrants it will accept—currently around 160,000 per annum—and divides this number between four streams: the skilled stream, the business stream, the family stream and the humanitarian (refugee) stream. The big change