



Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane Australia

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted/accepted for publication in the following source:

[Burnett, Bruce M. & McArdle, Felicity A.](#) (2011) Multiculturalism, education for sustainable development (ESD) and the shifting discursive landscape of social inclusion. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 32(1), pp. 43-56.

This file was downloaded from: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/46402/>

© Copyright 2011 Taylor & Francis

Notice: *Changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published source:*

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2011.537070>

Multiculturalism, education for sustainable development (ESD) and the shifting discursive landscape of social inclusion

Bruce Burnett and Felicity McArdle*

Queensland University of Technology, Australia

Australia has a long and sometimes turbulent relationship with the migrant Other. This paper examines a component of this relationship via the window of contemporary multicultural policy. The paper begins with an analysis of the political and social conditions that enabled a national and bipartisan policy of multiculturalism to emerge as formalised federal policy during the late 1960s and early 1970s. The paper re-problematizes the influences that helped shape Australia's articulation of race and ethnicity and argues that multiculturalism, within a post-September 11 environment, can no longer be framed solely within its traditional framework of social justice. The paper positions ESD (Education for Sustainable Development) as an emerging discursive field that provides educators with an alternative road map for critiquing Australia's fluid relationship with the migrant Other. By linking the tenets of multiculturalism with ESD, this paper suggests pre-service teacher educators are presented with a productive, and at the same time politically palatable, means for regaining pedagogical traction for a semi-dormant agenda of social inclusion.

Keywords: education for sustainable development, pre-service teacher education, multiculturalism, social inclusion

Introduction

Fertile ground for rethinking multiculturalism as a social ideal emerges as the post-September 11 geopolitical landscape is superimposed on a rising responsiveness to notions of sustainability. The tensions inherent within this emerging discursive space produce novel windows of opportunity for interpretation, and can introduce multiple political perspectives on this 'dangerous new world'. This shift in collective psyche – shared, perilous, and under siege – has generated intense debate concerning personal and national security, while at the same time highlighting anxiety concerning the sustainability of current social, economic and agricultural practices. Such shifts are particularly evident when they converge upon singular focal points such as the un-integrated Islamic Other and 'its' potential threat to the essence of the Western nation state. From the 2005 riots in Paris to uprisings that same year on the

* Corresponding author: Bruce Burnett, Faculty of Education, Queensland University of Technology, Victoria Park Road, Kelvin Grove, Queensland, 4059. Email: b.burnett@qut.edu.au

southern beaches of Sydney, there is every indication that this is a global phenomenon that has a real and tangible impact across a range of policy areas, particularly as nations scramble to ‘shore-up’ domestic and international border-security. While military and intelligence sectors have anticipated and received unprecedented injections of funds, other initiatives not as patently reactive, longer term and complex, such as the promotion of social inclusion, are losers in this new order. Multiculturalism – already under attack from neo-liberal economic models that drive radically alternative agendas to social justice – is likely to be further eroded by nationwide cultures of fear transfixed upon notions of the un-integrated Islamic Other.

With the election of a new Labour government in Australia in 2007, and a Democrat President in the US White House in 2008, subtle shifts in government rhetoric have already given cause for some optimism for those who are committed to principles of social justice, equity and inclusion. Nevertheless, there is every indication that Australian multiculturalism as a cornerstone of a federal policy agenda is well into its final stages of collapse as the remnants of Australian multicultural policy are already aligned more squarely with economic rather than social ends. It is clear that the gloss has been lost from the very term ‘multiculturalism’, for it is increasingly expunged from government documents along with expressions such as ‘race’ being softened to ‘culture’. While ‘social justice’ has provided a useful discursive node for organising the social and cultural foundations of multiculturalism within a variety of educational settings, the challenge now is to rethink the vocabularies and discursive spaces through which to engage educators with issues dealing with social inclusion. This paper maps the antecedents of this challenge by tracking the management of Australian ethnicity, migration and its relationship to the Other. In doing so, the paper analyses the emergence of multicultural policy, indicating how certain practices have enabled the state to exercise sovereignty over an increasingly diverse population — and how the state has manipulated the rationalities and sensitivities that produce notions of cultural and ethnic ‘Whiteness’ and ‘difference’. This paper suggests that advocates of multiculturalism would be wise to reposition the principles of cultural pluralism within the emerging and more politically palatable policy domain of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD). ESD provides new discursive possibilities, particularly for teacher educators who still have ‘fire in the belly’ as they seek to regain political/pedagogical traction for a semi-dormant agenda of social inclusion.

The first section of the paper explicitly positions the historical context of Australian immigration as constituting a non-normative political technology that masks a unique domestic articulation of race, ethnicity and the migrant Other. A large part of this section is devoted to the foregrounding of practices of the newly federated Australian State engaged in a contradictory mode of governance in relation to social diversity that simply ignored Indigenous issues as a national priority. First, we demonstrate how conservative constrictive immigration regulation (enshrined in the infamous ‘White Australia’ policy) was sanctioned at the same time that government ministers were heralding the liberal foundations of a newly formed constitution. The paper moves on to analyse the political and social conditions that enabled a national and bipartisan policy of multiculturalism to emerge during the late 1960s and early 1970s. The paper draws attention to the parallel narrative at work in schools and universities as they first grappled with, and later came to embrace, this evolving social experiment. This section of the paper highlights how progressive education sat comfortably within the discourse of social justice using this to frame and articulate what was to become a national multicultural education program. The final section of the paper addresses the post-September 11 environment and suggests multiculturalism is no longer able to provide an equivalent matrix for educators promoting notions of social justice. The paper turns its focus towards the emerging field of ESD and suggests this new diverse conceptual template allows educators to restate, reposition and recreate the traditional tenets of multiculturalism.

Migration and an evolving relationship to the Other

Any discussion of multicultural policy in Australia must locate its analysis of how notions of race, ethnicity and the migrant ‘Other’ have been constituted over time. Accounts of Australian migrant history are disputed, with considerable contestation over Indigenous history and, in particular, how the period of white colonisation should be represented (see, for example, Macintyre & Clark, 2003). The following discussion takes as its starting point the story of white migration to a country already home to Indigenous peoples — of many social and cultural identities and practices, including around 660 language groups. Predating notions of ‘White Australia’ as a national ideal are the multiple waves of migration that began in 1788 with the use of Australia as a penal colony and the mass clearing of British gaols that eventually saw over 160,000 convicts transported to the colonies. The initial arrival of small numbers of free-immigrants in 1790 was followed by several spikes of migration that coincided with the Irish famine in the 1840s (see O’Farrell, 1987), the gold rushes during the 1850s and 1860s, and ethno-specific migration during the 1800s and 1890s that included Chinese, Japanese and Afghan workers (see Kabar, 2006, and Markus, 1994). Despite such diverse sources of migration, when the colonies united in 1901 to form the Australian nation at Federation, the dominant cultural group controlling positions of power remained predominately an Anglo-Celtic ruling elite with UK migrants numbering 679,200 from a total of 852,400 overseas born migrants (ABS, 2009).

This formation of a newly federated Australia brought with it an undercurrent of sentiment that explicitly set out to ensure Australia would remain under the control of British descendants. The apparatus used to enact this nationally became the *Immigration Restriction Act of 1901* which, notably, was the first piece of legislation the new Australian Parliament enacted after Federation. The legislation, subsequently known as the *White Australia Policy*, became a guiding principle of Australian migration for the next 60 years and served as an effective administrative mechanism to enhance and maintain power over the production of knowledge structures related to race. The White Australia Policy was critical in articulating for the first time an emerging fear that not only could the ‘uncivilised other’ take over the country via military invasion, but also ‘that through the pressure of sheer numbers, the uncivilised others slowly end up penetrating the place and their different cultural forms and norms slowly end up “polluting” colonial society and identity’ (Hage, 2003, p. 52). The historical, political and cultural legacy of this policy cannot be understated for ‘White Australia provided the very basis upon which national unity was articulated and national identity experienced’ (Carter, 2006, p. 318).

In its most simplistic form, the Immigration Restriction Act of 1901 sought to ensure that migrants to Australia were European and preferably of British heritage stating:

The immigration into the Commonwealth of the persons described in any of the following paragraphs of this section (hereinafter called ‘prohibited immigrants’) is prohibited, namely:—

(a) Any person who when asked to do so by an officer fails to write out at dictation and sign in the presence of the officer a passage of fifty words in length in an European language directed by the officer. (*The Immigration Restriction Act 1901*, copy cited ABC, 2006)

The effect of the policy meant that it was all but impossible for non-Europeans to immigrate to Australia due to the ‘dictation test’ that enabled a Migration Officer to use any number of European languages to ensure ‘unsuitable’ applicants were unsuccessful in their attempt to enter the country. It is important to note that the policy had overwhelming domestic support with pockets of resistance emerging mainly from foreign governments – most notably that of

Great Britain. The British resistance, however, was pragmatic rather than ideological, for they were attempting to avoid disrupting ongoing trade negotiations with China and Japan and also worried about unrest within the ethnically diverse Commonwealth of Nations (Zelinka, 1996). The fact this policy remained on the statute book until 1958 stands as testament to the fact that while the White Australia Policy produced in Althusser's (1971) terms 'subjection' via 'ideological state apparatuses' (p. 136), it importantly also 'worked to ingrain – in a population already predisposed to believe it – the racial causal logic that links White racial identity with high civilised standards of living' (Hage, 2003, p.54). The levels of support for the Immigration Restriction Act were clearly linked to the emergence of an overarching notion of Australian 'Whiteness' that has been secured and reproduced as both normative and invisible with implicit institutional support. The powerful labour movement maintained the policy was needed to exclude cheaper Asian labour from competing for wages in the manufacturing industry (see, for example, Hollinsworth, 1998, and Markus, 1994).

Although the 1930s depression saw migration from Britain slow, the end of Second World War marked a radical shift in the sourcing of migration growth and one which continued unabated until the second half of the 1960s. Given impetus by the massive number of European displaced war refugees, this period is commonly referred to as one of *Assimilation* (Jayasuriya, 2003), where 'immigrant cultures were devalued and ignored and immigrants were dispersed both geographically and throughout existing institutions in the community' (Muetzelfeldt, 1992, p. 308). Importantly, in terms of education, adult and child immigrants were required to abandon their culture and language and 'assimilate' as quickly as possible into the dominant Anglo-Celtic culture. Within schools, there developed a prevailing deficit model centred on the issue of linguistic deprivation of migrant children, and education in general devalued cultural and linguistic links to the child's homeland (Hollinsworth, 1998). In the face of such a large influx of cultural and linguistic diversity, education was soon positioned as a defensive tool that could ensure Australia remained a homogeneous English speaking country with strong links to British heritage (Hollinsworth, 1998).

Pressure to reform the White Australia Policy further intensified as the flow of migrants from Britain and northern Europe decreased and the government was forced to accept migrants from southern Mediterranean countries such as Greece and Italy (Jayasuriya, 2003). In addition, the UN began to target the apartheid policies of South Africa resulting in more attention being drawn to Australian immigration policies and thus causing escalating international embarrassment. By the 1960s, the vocal and radical student movement added to the pressure by calling for an end to existing racist immigration policies. Importantly, this period witnessed the abolition of the infamous dictation test in 1958, and by 1965, there were strong sentiments within both major political parties pushing to abolish the increasingly ideologically unacceptable White Australia Policy (Markus, 1994).

Throughout this period, education played a major role in promoting the dominant Anglo Celtic culture through interpreting the provision of additional services to migrants as problematic in that they were both superfluous and divisive (Jayasuriya, 2003). Migrant children – despite in many cases not speaking any English – had been forced to rapidly integrate into mainstream schools with little or no additional support provided. By 1965, sentiment had shifted to the point where progressivism and child-centred educational philosophy began to sway many teachers into insisting changes be made to migrant education (see, for example, the arguments used by Karmel, 1973). In 1967, the Victorian state government recognized the issue by taking the radical decision to introduce the first withdrawal English as a Second Language (ESL) classes. The *Karmel Report: Schooling in Australia* (1973) followed and added to the debate by arguing assimilationist policies not only disadvantaged immigrants, but also were wasteful in preventing the immense pool of

potential migrant talent from contributing to society. In this context, education was increasingly positioned as a critical element in allowing Australia to successfully move from the existing policy of 'assimilation' to one of 'integration'; where non-dominant cultures could participate on more equal terms and 'integrate' into the mainstream. In 1970, the *Child Migrant Education Program* (CMEP) emulated the Victorian example by providing nationwide funding to schools that allowed migrant children to withdraw from class and receive specialist ESL lessons (Department of Education: Victoria, 1997). In addition, the CMEP provided funding for in-service training to raise awareness amongst teachers and to provide resources and guidance of migrant related issues. At this point we pause to acknowledge the invisibility of Indigenous Australians in this discussion. The omission reflects the landscape of policy and practices under discussion, and requires a parallel analysis not attempted in this paper.

Education and the emergence of multicultural Australia

Although the actual date that multiculturalism became national policy is still contested, it is clear that 1973 was critical. The new Labour government made a series of concrete decisions that laid the foundation for the multicultural roadmap that followed. It was in 1973, for example, that Al Grassby, the Labour Minister for Immigration, released the critical reference paper entitled *A multi-cultural society for the future*. At this time the government also made the critical decision to remove race as a factor in immigration policy by:

- legislating that all migrants, of whatever origin, be eligible to obtain citizenship after three years of permanent residence
- issue policy instructions to overseas posts to totally disregard race as a factor in the selection of migrants and
- ratify all international agreements relating to immigration and race. (DIC, 2010a)

With the White Australia Policy now officially obsolete, broader ideological and legal trends began to focus policy makers' attention on equality and access across the whole educational sector. Schools began to focus their attention on new culturally-derived notions of equality and, for the first time, positioned ethnicity as an identifiable marker of disadvantage within their student cohort. With multiculturalism promoted as the best way to address the 'life-chances' of minority ethnic groups, it is possible to observe the move from ideology to tangible practice in the form of large injections of funding targeting 'access' within government schools and universities (Jayasuriya, 2003). Significantly, in 1974 the *Committee on Teaching Migrant Languages in Schools* was established and federal funding was directed to the area of promoting community languages as a means of enhancing tolerance (SRNSW, 2009).

During the short period from 1972 to 1975, a clear shift is evident as the schools moved from the previous integrationist policies towards policies that valued different cultural and linguistic traditions under an overarching context of unity. Despite the change to a conservative government in 1975, commitment to the promotion of multiculturalism within schools remained strong. Education during this period can be seen to play a slightly different role with a change in emphasis from the previous focus on minority rights to a new doctrine of cultural pluralism constructed on the foundations of culture and ethnicity (Jayasuriya, 2003).

The *Galbally Report* which reviewed and evaluated post-arrival programs and services for migrants was released in 1978 and positioned schools at the front line of the

successful promotion of multiculturalism within the broader the community (Galbally, 1978). The notion of using schools to campaign and disseminate the benefits of multiculturalism was strengthened in 1978 when the Commonwealth Schools Commission recommended the formation of a new federal Committee on Multicultural Education (CME). The CME became instrumental in providing funding for the subsequent Commonwealth Multicultural Education Program (MEP) which coordinated the allocation of support to state and territory education departments (Castles, Kalantzis, Cope, & Morrissey, 1988). Importantly, the MEP made it possible for education departments to develop new programs in non-English languages that targeted migrant students' learning and retention of their mother tongue. Additionally, the MEP provided funding for second language and bilingual education programs and helped develop strategies for an across the curriculum perspective of multiculturalism (Castles et al., 1988). This paper suggests, however, that the most fundamental aspect of change enabled by the Galbally Report was that education systems were simply required to place an emphasis on multicultural education policies targeting all children, rather than purely those of non-English speaking backgrounds.

The episode of multicultural evolution between 1975 and 1983 is likened by Jayasuriya (2003) to be a period of *Liberal Multiculturalism* and impacted at the level of school curriculum through the promotion of a 'whole school approach' to notions of cultural identity, equality and social cohesion. Enactments of this influence included: the emergence of school-wide celebrations of ethnicity, often in the form of festivals; more widespread provision of specialised ESL services; and the targeting of multicultural support staff to specific schools with high percentages of migrant children (Castles et al., 1988). The emphasis on languages other than English (LOTE) into the classroom was integrated into schools' mainstream curriculum and practices in a systematic way. LOTE remains a key component of contemporary attempts by schools to develop and enhance intercultural skills and awareness, and is designated as a Key Learning Area in the Primary school curriculum (see, for example, Education Queensland, 2009).

The next major shift in how schools engaged with multiculturalism occurred from 1984 to 1995, and coincided with yet another change in federal government. This period referred to by Jayasuriya (2003) as *Managerial Multiculturalism* saw the ongoing process of multicultural policy refinement continue. The *Jupp Report* (1986) reviewed migrant and multicultural programs and services, and serves as a critical marker in this new period. It delineates a fundamental shift from earlier notions of affirmative action and a move towards notions of equitable multiculturalism in the form of equality of treatment and fairness (Jupp, 1986; Jayasuriya, 2003). Inherent in this change was the underlying ideological repositioning of multiculturalism. Policy now shifted to enable the consequences of diversity to be managed in the interests of the both the individual and society (Borowski, 2000). Schools needed to realign their interpretation of multiculturalism from a philosophy of migrant settlement into a new regime that embraced contemporary notions of economic rationalism and the productive dividend generated by ethnic groups (Jayasuriya, 2003).

The final phases of multicultural evolution, beginning in 1996, continued the process of refining the underlying tenets of managerial multiculturalism (Jayasuriya, 2003). At this point, there is a subtle shift away from the overt targeting of 'access' to a more holistic attempt to combine the consequences of diversity at both the level of the individual and society as a whole. In concrete terms, the federal government moved towards four key principles that would underpin Australia's multicultural policy:

- 1) Responsibilities of all: All Australians have a civic duty to support those basic structures and principles of Australian society which guarantee us our freedom and equality and enable diversity in our society to flourish

- 2) Respect for each person: Subject to the law, all Australians have the right to express their own culture and beliefs and have a reciprocal obligation to respect the right of others to do the same
- 3) Fairness for each person: All Australians are entitled to equality of treatment and opportunity. Social equity allows us all to contribute to the social, political and economic life of Australia
- 4) Benefits for all: All Australians benefit from the significant cultural, social and economic dividends arising from the diversity of our population. Diversity works for all Australians. (DIC, 2010b)

While the rhetoric is laced with democratic sentiments that are difficult to fault — e.g. fairness and respect — the emphasis is on *all Australians*. This can be read as a response to the reactionary complaints around ‘special treatment’ and the politics of envy and resentment which saw ‘ordinary Australians’ short changed by the allocation of resources to the Other.

Although all states and territories currently embed multicultural aspects within their curriculum, the contemporary educational focus varies considerably from state to state. Possibly the most explicit programs are in Victoria and New South Wales. Nevertheless, many schools outside the state of Victoria make attempts to not only model appropriate practices and sponsor climates of mutual cultural respect, but also make available translations of school documents, policies, newsletters and student end of term reports in recognition of the diverse language groups in their communities (see, for example, WESS, 2009).

Linking ESD with the tenets of multiculturalism

Having arrived at the current state of multicultural education in schools, we turn now to what Foucault might term a ‘moment of arising’ (Foucault, 1984, p. 83), and a new ‘expert discourse’ of sustainability emerges as a feature in the education terrain. The origin of ESD is possibly best traced to an emerging environmental consciousness first given voice during the 1960s in popular works such as Rachel Carson’s *The Silent Spring* (1962) and Paul Erlich’s *Population Bomb* (1968). As environmental degradation increasingly became the focus of broader critique, the concept of maintaining global ecological balance was given greater legitimacy by its growing use within international forums such as the United Nations (see for example the conference *The Human Environment* in 1972). However, it was not until the UN’s commissioned *Bruntdland Report: Our Common Future* was published in 1987 that the terms ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable development’ became widely understood. The crucial role of the UN in promoting the notion of sustainability continued during the *Earth Summit* (UN Conference on *Environment and Development* held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992) and the *World Summit on Sustainable Development* (held in Johannesburg in 2002). It was at the Johannesburg Summit that a resolution was developed and later passed by the General Assembly calling for the creation of a Decade of Education for Sustainable Development lasting between 2005 and 2014. This resolution, adopted by the 57th Session of UN General Assembly, positioned education as central to ensuring global recognition that sustainability extended beyond the environment and included the economic, cultural and social interests of all present and future communities.

Notions of sustainability within Australia have been heavily influenced by a common focus on the environment. This is particularly evident in federal government discussion papers such as *Today Shapes Tomorrow: Environmental Education for a Sustainable Future* (Environment Australia, 1999) released by the Ministry for the Environment and Heritage and the *Environmental Education for a Sustainable Future: National Action Plan*

(Environment Australia, 2000). Both publications were instrumental in raising the profile of environmental education and the subsequent linking of environmental education to sustainability. Such publications also served as a policy ‘hub’ around which an ensuing series of national initiatives were scaffolded. These initiatives included the establishment of the National Environmental Education Council (NEEC), the National Environmental Education Network (NEEN), the Australian Research Institute in Education for Sustainability (ARIES), and the Environmental Education Grants Program. Thus, when the UN’s *Decade of Education for Sustainable Development* was launched, Australia already had a policy platform together with a network of environmental educators that was strongly weighted towards an ecological interpretation of ESD.

ESD and pre-service teacher education

Australia’s positioning of ESD within the domain of environmental education has clearly facilitated projects of an ecological or ‘green’ nature. At the same time, it could be said that the alignment of ESD and the environment has neglected a broader interpretation of sustainability, particularly along the lines originally proposed by UNESCO, the lead UN organisation for ESD. This paper suggests that the strong environmental focus of Australian ESD has created a solid space for this much needed component within the curriculum. However, educators’ understanding of ESD has been skewed to the point where other critical ESD themes identified by UNESCO have not been equally addressed. Gender equality, health promotion, rural development, cultural diversity, peace and human security, sustainable urbanization and sustainable consumption, are all important tenets of the sustainability agenda. A major goal of this paper is to recalibrate the focal points of Australian ESD beyond the environment, broadening the interpretation of ESD particularly in the area of cultural diversity. When a shared notion of ESD is expanded to include cultural diversity, educators are provided with a new politically sanctioned terrain that is backed at the international (UNESCO), Federal and State levels. In addition to this space being widely politically endorsed, it just as importantly offers powerful new discursive nodes around which educators can regain pedagogical traction for many of the original tenets of multiculturalism.

A radical repositioning of multicultural education that aligns with the domain of ESD is not straightforward. As the analysis of the history of multiculturalism in preceding sections of this paper has shown, multiculturalism is acutely influenced by political and social factors that are mostly beyond the control of practising educators. The area of Teacher Education is illustrative in this regard. Teacher educators have been increasingly forced to struggle with emerging ‘cultures of fear’ (Furendi, 2002) that extend from the national macro political level to the micro levels of the pre-service teacher cohort. In addition, Australian University Faculties of Education have had trouble finding, and just as importantly defending as an institutionally sanctioned space, multicultural curriculum within their pre-service courses. For some, this can be partially explained by the fact that contemporary curriculum must reflect the changing university climate of client-oriented ‘service’ where ‘clients’/students are perceived as less concerned with matters of politics and issues of social inclusion, and more interested in career pathways. Whatever the reasons, it appears that across Australian Faculties of Education, there is a pervasive reluctance to produce teacher preparatory curricula that taps into, or critiques, events such as 9/11 and the subsequent *War on Terror*, the impact of the Bali bombings in October 2002, the domestic refugee/asylum crisis (i.e., Tampa), the Cronulla riots of December 2005, or more recent attacks on Indian students and poll-driven policy targeting off-shore solutions for asylum seekers. For teacher educators

who are committed to embedding social inclusion within their curriculum and subsequently unpacking these events with their students, the cultural diversity component of ESD allows for a unique platform. An understanding of cultural capital linked to both class and location (Bourdieu, 1973), or Australia's relationship between 'Whiteness' and national belonging (Hage, 1998), constitute essential pedagogical knowledge for all teachers.

Despite schools and teacher educators historically being relatively well versed in using the discourse of social justice to rationalize and substantiate multicultural programs, the dilemma faced today remains consistent with that faced by teachers since the 1970s. Explicitly, how do educators promote social and economic gains for non-dominant ethnic groups, yet avoid the trap of trivialising ethnicity, reducing it to what McConnochie, Hollinsworth and Pettman (1988, p. 185) describe as 'the spaghetti and dance' variety? While the core dilemma remains consistent, the component parts of the problem are complex. It appears that educators are unwilling to wean themselves away from the folkloric traditions of multiculturalism possibly because these practices are heavily entrenched in the day-to-day cycles of curricula and the school calendar. ESD and its embedded component of cultural diversity does nonetheless provide opportunity for discursive practices that can work to unsettle historically and culturally shared sets of disciplinary rules — rules that generate binary oppositions between the Other and identified reference points of Australian identity. This is a deep-seated change for what it means to be a contemporary teacher, with implications that flow on to how this space is produced within teacher education programs. In line with the overall goal of producing teachers for change who will deliver high quality/high equity (Woods, Luke & Weir, 2010) outcomes and success for all students, some teacher educators such as in the Faculty of Education at Queensland University of Technology are trialling an 'embedded' approach to ESD. This process for curriculum design is structured around understandings of the holistic principles of sustainability, and the use of appropriate pedagogical approaches that will promote sustainable living authentically. The importance of highlighting this program is to stress that rather than shuffling existing units to make room for a new *Sustainability 101* unit, there is benefit in designing teacher education programs that incorporate ESD principles across individual unit content as a series of transdisciplinary themes.

Concerns over quality, in teaching and teacher education, have led to different systems for the establishment of standards and teacher accreditation across Australia. The move to unify these systems under the banner of a national accreditation body, and the underlying defining of professional standards can be seen to both enable and constrain notions of 'teacher quality'. New regimes of measures and accountability have seen in the case of Queensland, in 2006, a new set of teacher professional standards introduced and mandated, under the governance of the Queensland College of Teachers (QCT), the regulatory body that accredits teacher preparation courses in Queensland. Design of teacher preparation programs then is heavily influenced by the need to meet these requirements. Within this set of ten overall standards, there is some mention of the value of diversity (Standard Four: Design and implement learning experiences that value diversity) (QCT, 2006, p. 10). ESD can find some space in Standard Four which states 'Teachers know and understand: [...] factors such as socio-economic circumstances, location, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, culture, language, religious beliefs and individual needs and their impact on the world view of students' (QCT, 2006, p. 10). Much of the substance of standards are spelled out in wording that emphasises the technologies of teaching such as designing, planning and implementing learning experiences, with a clear and stated emphasis on literacy, numeracy and ICT. The word 'sustainability' does not appear in the 2006 document. Indigenous education and understandings are foregrounded in the overarching introductory section to the standards, but there are only a few occurrences of explicit statements about Indigenous issues

in the over one hundred indicators that purport to indicate the quality of teachers. Nonetheless, each of the ten teacher professional standards does generate space for ‘attitudes and values’, and here lies the potential to align multiculturalism with ESD.

The overall task of embedding ESD principles across the teacher preparation course is fraught with difficulties. How, for example, if social justice no longer has the political traction to pursue a multicultural agenda, do ‘culture-sensitive’ teacher education courses begin the task of fleshing out the ethical and practical implications of the non-environmental aspects of ESD — aspects that can sit uncomfortably across cultures? How do ‘culture-sensitive’ teacher education courses begin to document the marginalized unintegrated Other in ways that can subvert the prevailing culture of fear, yet not collapse difference into familiarity? Such questions have profound social, political and ethical dimensions which, in turn, have implications on the ‘how to’ of teaching. The degree to which teachers can and should purport to explain different subject positions in the complex landscape of cultural and religious identity politics must be more openly debated amongst the various stakeholders for clearly, these questions go to the core of teacher professional standards.

While the term ‘embedding’ has been overused and has hence lost much of its currency, the phrase embedding possibly best moves us closer to a ‘whole of systems’ approach that incorporates new pedagogies and new partnerships within ESD. And there are existing models for this approach to curriculum in teacher education. For example, all pre-service teachers are required to demonstrate knowledge and skills in ICT (another important theme within ESD), across the curriculum. At the completion of the program, graduates have compiled a portfolio of evidence, across all their units of study, that illustrates comprehensive expertise with ICT, and the capacity to teach ICT. Rather than thinking about program design in discrete units/semesters, a better starting point is to draw on Shulman’s original framework (1986) for the knowledges required of teachers— discipline/content knowledge, curriculum knowledge, and pedagogical knowledge. Knowledge of self and culture adds another dimension, and draws on the later work of Shulman (2000, 2007) and others such as Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2005) and Feiman-Nemser (2001). Likewise, with an embedded approach to ESD, teacher preparation programs would prepare students with: discipline/content knowledge about sustainability beliefs, discourses, principles and practices; knowledge of where and when to incorporate ESD into the curriculum; and knowledge about strategies and techniques for developing ESD knowledge in their students. Just as students have an understanding of the importance and place of ICTs in their own lives, so too they bring their own understandings of sustainability issues to their future classrooms. Embedding this across teacher preparation programs enables the positioning of ESD in an already crowded curriculum.

In short, this paper would encourage alternative attempts at recognizing, analysing and formalizing in pre-service teacher pedagogy curricula that promote a secure and durable relationship between human activities that advance economic, political and social development, and those activities that protect and preserve not only the natural world but the conditions within that world that allow for human activities aligned with a social justice agenda.

Conclusion

This paper has presented a reading of the manner in which Australia has woven its own discursive construction of race and the Other with issues of nationalism and collective identity. It has been argued that the politics of race has a long history that in part was addressed under the marker Australian multiculturalism and its relationship to education. The

paper began with a discussion of the historical context of Australian immigration and the conditions which led to Australia producing a unique policy driven, yet socially constructed, version of ethnicity and the role of the migrant Other. Education has been complicit in this process, and this paper has attempted to analyse the role of education in the move from notions of assimilation to one that actively promotes and encourages notions of racial equality and cultural diversity.

In this paper, we have tapped into the post-September 11 context and argued that it brings to bear new sets of issues connected to how students negotiate cultural borders, and in doing so, how such borders potentially inscribe and position their relationship to the dominant culture. We have proposed that educators committed to principles of social justice, equity and inclusion can begin to explore and develop new sets of analytical tools offered within the emerging area of ESD. ESD has been shown to hold the potential for teacher education faculties to incorporate a new conceptual kit that enables pre-service teachers to move beyond folkloric tradition and notions of multicultural policy driven compliance. ESD as a conceptual kit provides the means to include the role of ethics and new roles for human rights that tap rich political, philosophical and socio-cultural strata. By drawing on lines of reasoning that sit outside the traditional social justice rubric, educators are provided with the space to scrutinize unfolding social and cultural events in ways that regain political, ethical and moral traction. The paper does nonetheless recognise that merging ESD and multiculturalism constitutes working new forms of analysis into an already crowded teacher education curriculum. Although some disciplines already possess the theoretical 'territory' to engage with the emergence of contemporary cultures of fear, the challenge for all teacher educators is to position their practice within a more fluid understanding of ESD — one that includes combating social and economic dimensions that sit outside the more familiar ESD environmental framework. Hopefully, the greatest impact will be on the national stage, as graduating teachers move into schools armed with new understandings of 'Who gets to say what about whom and why?' (Tripp, 1990).

References

- ABC (Australian Broadcasting Commission). (2006). *The Immigration Restriction Act*.
http://www.abc.net.au/federation/fedstory/ep2/ep2_immigration.htm. Accessed 20 March 2009.
- ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics). (2006). *Year Book Australia, 2002*.
<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/> Accessed 22 November 2009.
- Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy*. London: Monthly Review Press.
- Borowski, A. (2000). Creating a virtuous society: Immigration and Australia's policy of multiculturalism. *Journal of Social Policy*, 29(3), 459-475.
- Bourdieu, P. (1973). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In R. Brown (Ed.) *Knowledge, education, and cultural change: Papers in the sociology of education* (pp. 71-112). London: Tavistock.
- Carson, R. (1962). *Silent spring*. Houghton Mifflin: Mariner Books.
- Carter, D. (2006). *Dispossession, dreams and diversity: Issue in Australian Studies*. Frenchs Forest: Pearson Education.
- Castles, S., Kalantzis, M., Cope, B., & Morrissey, M. (1988). *Mistaken identity: Multiculturalism and the demise of nationalism in Australia*. Sydney: Pluto Press.
- Department of Education: Victoria. (1997). *Multicultural policy for Victorian Schools: MACLOTE and ESL*. Melbourne: State of Victoria.

- Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- DIC (Department of Immigration and Citizenship). (2010a). Fact Sheet 8 - Abolition of the 'White Australia' Policy. <http://www.immi.gov.au/media/fact-sheets/08abolition.htm>. Accessed 6 February 2010.
- DIC (Department of Immigration and Citizenship). (2010b). Fact Sheet 6 - The Evolution of Australia's Multicultural Policy. <http://www.immi.gov.au/media/fact-sheets/06evolution.htm>. Accessed 6 February 2010.
- Education Queensland. (2009). *Languages other than English (LOTE)*. <http://education.qld.gov.au/curriculum/area/lotte/> Accessed 29 November 2009.
- Environment Australia. (1999). *Today shapes tomorrow: Environmental education for a sustainable future - A discussion paper*. <http://www.environment.gov.au/education/publications/discpaper/index.html> Accessed 20 March 2009.
- Environment Australia. (2000). *Environmental education for a sustainable future: National Action Plan*. <http://www.environment.gov.au/education/publications/nap/>. Accessed 20 March 2009.
- Erllich, P. (1968). *The population bomb*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1013-1055.
- Foucault, M. (1984). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 76-100). Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
- Furendi, F. (2002). *Culture of fear: Risk-taking and the morality of low expectation*, Revised Edition. London: Continuum.
- Galbally, F. (Chair) (1978). *Review of post-arrival programs and services for migrants. Migrant services and programs*. (Galbally Report, Department of Labor and Immigration). Canberra: AGPS.
- Hage, G. (1998). *White nation: Fantasies of white supremacy in a multicultural society*. Sydney: Pluto Press.
- Hage, G. (2003). *Against paranoid nationalism: Searching for hope in a shrinking society*. London: The Merlin Press.
- Hollinsworth, D. (1998). *Race and racism in Australia*. Katoomba: Social Science Press.
- Jayasuriya, L. (2003). *Australian multiculturalism: Past, present, and future*. Perth: Discipline of Social Work and Social Policy, School of Social and Cultural Studies, University of Western Australia. http://www.socialwork.arts.uwa.edu.au/_data/page/33070/diversity.pdf. Accessed 5 November 2009.
- Jupp, J. (1986). *Don't settle for less* (Jupp Report, Review of Migrant and Multicultural Programs and Services). DIEA. Canberra: AGPS.
- Kabir, N. (2006). Muslims in a 'White Australia': Colour or religion? *Immigrants and Minorities*, 6(2), 192-223.
- Karmel, P. (1973). *Schools in Australia* (Report of the Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission, May 1973). Canberra: AGPS.
- Macintyre, S. & Clark, A. (2003). *The history wars*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Publishing.
- Markus, A. (1994). *Australian race relations, 1788-1993*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin.
- McConnochie, K., Hollinsworth, D., & Pettman, J. (Eds.) (1988). *Race and racism in Australia*. Wentworth Falls: Social Science Press.
- Muetzelfeldt, M. (1992). *Society state and politics in Australia*. Leichhardt: Pluto Press.
- O'Farrell, P. (1987). *The Irish in Australia*. Sydney: NSW University Press.
- QCT (Queensland College of Teachers). (2006). *Professional standards for graduates and guidelines for preservice teacher education programs*. Toowoong: Queensland College of Teachers.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.

- Shulman, L. S. (2000). Teacher development: Roles of domain expertise and pedagogical knowledge. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 21(1), 129-135.
- Shulman, L. S. (2007). Good teaching [Box content]. In S. Loeb, C. Rouse, C., & A. Shorris, Introducing the issue. *The Future of Children*, 17(1), 3-14.
- SRNSW (State Records New South Wales). (2009). *The teaching of English to Post WWII Migrants*. <http://www.records.nsw.gov.au/state-archives/guides-and-finding-aids/migrant-education-guide/teaching-english-to-post-wwii-migrants/?searchterm=The%20teaching%20of%20English%20to%20Post%20WWII%20Migrants>. Accessed 20 November 2009.
- Tripp, D. (1990). The ideology of educational research. *Discourse*, 10(2), 51-74.
- WESS (West End State School). (2009). *Multiculturalism*. <http://www.westendss.eq.edu.au/Multicultural/index.html> Accessed 20 November 2009.
- Woods, A., Luke, A., & Weir, K. (2010). [Curriculum and syllabus design](#). In P. Peterson, E. Baker, & B. McGaw (Eds.) *International Encyclopedia of Education*. Elsevier, Oxford. (In Press)
- Zelinka, S. (1996). *Understanding racism in Australia*. Canberra: AGPS