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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Australian Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADCQ</td>
<td>Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATSI</td>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>Brisbane City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALD</td>
<td>Culturally and Linguistically Diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERD</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPC</td>
<td>Centre for Multicultural Pastoral Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIAC</td>
<td>Department of Immigration and Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMCRX</td>
<td>European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HREOC</td>
<td>Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMP</td>
<td>Local Area Multicultural Partnership Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAQ</td>
<td>Local Government Association Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE</td>
<td>Language Other Than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAQ</td>
<td>Multicultural Affairs Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESB</td>
<td>Non English Speaking Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>Racial Discrimination Act 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Confronting Racism in Communities project was designed to identify and address the variety of racisms experienced by Queenslanders from CALD backgrounds. The project arose in response to state and Commonwealth anti-discrimination agencies (ADCQ and HREOC) awareness of under-reporting of racist incidents. The project therefore attempted to encourage reporting of a more representative range of incidents and to develop appropriate training to support those working with people who have experienced racisms.

A training needs survey of workers was conducted and, along with a literature review, formed the basis for design of a reporting instrument and training for seventy selected people (Data Collection Points) who assisted those who have experienced racism to complete the questionnaire. Data collection was undertaken from January 1 2006 to December 31 2007, resulting in a total of 398 reports of incidents occurring in the last five years that were perceived as racism by those who experienced them.

Reported incidents involved a wide range of ethnic backgrounds and took diverse forms including physical violence, threats of physical violence, property damage, verbal, written and non-verbal harassment, social exclusion, discrimination and institutional racism. Racist incidents occurred most often in public places including the street, work, real estate agents, public transport, shops and educational institutions. Most of the reported instances involved total strangers with no prior warning. Other relationships to perpetrators included employers and work colleagues, public transport officials, real estate agents, government agencies, police and educational staff as well as neighbours. Perpetrators were reported as disproportionately male with more females involved in mixed groups rather than as single-sex offenders.

Those experiencing these incidents reported a wide range of emotions and reactions but especially reported feeling angry, upset, scared, anxious, excluded and not-belonging, sad, depressed, disappointed, a loss of confidence, physical symptoms and shame, although some reported personal growth or were sorry for the perpetrators. It is significant that some of these responses persisted for years after the event. While the responses of those who witnessed these incidents varied widely, it is significant that many were reluctant to become involved with almost thirty percent apparently indifferent to what had occurred.

Seventy percent did not formally report their experiences, with nineteen percent having reported and eleven percent not specifying. Amongst those who did report the incidents there were two-thirds who were unsatisfied or very unsatisfied with the outcome, and only twenty percent satisfied or very satisfied. Main reasons for satisfaction with reporting outcomes included a speedy response, apologies, perpetrators being confronted, and apparent measures to avoid repetition. Key factors in dissatisfaction with reporting outcomes included trivialising reports, lack of action by reporting agencies, experiences not being validated, and future incidents not being prevented. Many of those who reported incidents to the Confronting Racism in Communities project expressed their appreciation of the opportunity to have their
experiences validated and taken seriously by an external party even when they were not interested in making a formal complaint.

The main reasons for not reporting included not knowing the identity of the perpetrator, not having witnesses or other evidence, fear of further racism, fear of the consequences of reporting, not believing it would result in any useful outcome, not knowing where or how to report, negative feelings prolonged by reporting or that such events were so frequent as to be not worth bothering with.

Significant issues raised by the project include the difficulties in establishing that reported incidents constituted racism and in providing evidence. While those reporting their experiences were convinced of racist motivations, the nature of many events, especially not knowing the perpetrator, lack of witnesses, etc., makes it difficult to sustain a formal complaint. It is also extremely difficult in many cases to establish systemic or institutional forms of discrimination.

Existing government responses to racism (including the work of ADCQ, HREOC and MAQ) provide complaints mechanisms, education and community relations initiatives which have been valuable in supporting community cohesion and addressing the needs of particular communities. However, these strategies need to be supplemented by more targeted initiatives including a positive duty to minimise discrimination and unintended racism. On the basis of extensive international evidence the research suggests that interventions need to be directed at multiple levels of engagement including individual, inter-personal, institutional and societal, with appropriate coordination to ensure maximum effectiveness. Political commitment and leadership are particularly important in supporting sustainable initiatives. International evidence highlights the need for comprehensive training to support efforts by agencies and individuals to provide non-discriminatory services and organizational environments. The Confronting Racism in Communities project has developed and delivered such training to more than seventy groups of government and community workers over the life of the project.

Future directions recommended include the need to:

- develop an ongoing, evidence base for reporting racist incidents;
- examine the relationship between criminal offences and racist violence;
- use departmental Multicultural Action Plans to address systemic racism;
- provide comprehensive community education programs on anti-racism;
- develop victim-support programs and community worker training to provide assistance to those experiencing racism;
- develop guidelines for organizations wanting to implement effective anti-racism;
- identify services to work with perpetrators of racism.
INTRODUCTION

Sociologists often refer to ‘race’ as a social construction. The notion of ‘race’ has no biological base and modern science proves that the human physical differences do not constitute differences in ‘race’ (Brace 2005). Yet, human societies continue to operate as if these differences are real. Terms such as ‘race’ are used to highlight the view that reality is socially constructed, that our conceptions, and understandings are socialised and mediate between ourselves and our social environment. For many people, everyday life is seen as fixed, 'natural', many processes are invisible and taken for granted. Most of us have little time or reason to wonder why things are as they are. Our construction of reality, the 'meanings' and understandings are shared by those with whom we associate with. These are reinforced by the media, our family and social institutions. The term 'construction' refers to both these processes and their products. Thus race is one of these constructions that are often invisible, yet operate and influence human behaviour. Cashmore and Troya (1990: 26) point out the complexity of understanding ‘race relations’:

No matter how offensive we find race and how unimpressed we are by the scientific research on it, it remains a great motivating force behind peoples' thought and behaviour. It cannot be wished away.

Race is as real as people want it to be and we do not wish to deny its reality ... we are interested not in the genetic aspects of race, but in the social reality of race. In other words, the reasons why people believe in the existence of race and the ways in which their behaviour is affected by their beliefs.

The meanings of ‘race’ are dynamic and ongoing, and come to the fore of social awareness at particular social crises. In recent years instances of ‘race dynamics’ has been brought to our attention through powerful images of the September 11 attacks, the Bali bombings, and the war in Iraq have been beamed into Australian homes en masse. With these have come images of asylum seekers on over-crowded fishing vessels; of people draped in Australian flags during the so-called Cronulla Riot; and of the trial, conviction and sentencing of gang rapists in Sydney. In the wake of these events, a number of individuals and organisations have spoken of an increase in the frequency and severity of racist incidents perpetrated against people from culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) backgrounds (Browning & Jakubowicz 2003; HREOC 2004; Poynting & Noble 2004).

Racism is a global phenomenon that is shaped by various historical, social, political and economic factors. Racism changes its forms and expression in different contexts and we therefore refer to racisms in the plural. There are dozens of definitions and theories of racism (Hollinsworth 2006a). The Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission’s definition is:

Racism is an ideology that gives expression to myths about other racial and ethnic groups, that devalues and renders inferior those groups, that reflects and is perpetuated by deeply rooted historical, social, cultural and power inequalities in society (HREOC 1998).

Racism is the result of a complex interplay of individual beliefs, shared values and ideologies, and institutional practices. It is expressed in the actions of individuals and institutions and is promoted in the ideology of popular culture. We can best understand racism as a set of beliefs and behaviours that assume that ‘races’ exist in
nature and that there are fundamental and essential differences between racial groups. On the basis of these alleged inherent differences certain groups are treated less favourably and denied access to full participation and social benefits (Miles and Brown 2003). Racisms occur in many different but related forms, which are commonly referred to as:

- Individual
- Ideological or cultural, and
- Institutional or systemic (Hollinsworth 2006a).

The Confronting Racism in Communities project was developed to address the variety of racisms experienced by people from CALD backgrounds in Queensland. As such, the Confronting Racism in Communities project aimed, in the first instance, to develop a comprehensive evidence base on the nature and extent of racism in Queensland by simultaneously examining contemporary manifestations of racism and providing a barometer of the fluctuating level of racism in metropolitan and regional communities.

However, despite such anecdotal evidence, the actual number of formal complaints received by HREOC did not substantially increase during this period, nor did the number of formal complaints received by state anti-discrimination and equal opportunity agencies (Browning & Jakubowicz 2003; HREOC 2004). Furthermore, numerous authors point toward a general lack of empirical evidence on the precise nature and extent of racist incidents in Australia (Babacan 1998; Browning & Jakubowicz 2004; Dunn 2003).

Against this backdrop, the Confronting Racism in Communities project stemmed from the belief that effective data collection mechanisms and frameworks are essential if the evolving nature of racism is to be properly understood and if appropriate anti-racism strategies are to be developed. Launched in July 2005, the three-year pilot project aims to document the nature and extent of racism in Queensland and provide communities with strategies to combat racism. The project was funded by the Queensland Government and managed by the Centre for Multicultural Pastoral Care, working in partnership with other multicultural, mainstream and government agencies. The primary objectives of the project were as follows:

1. To work with communities to document the nature and extent of racism in Queensland and provide regular reporting on incidents across the state.

2. To provide support, training and resources to communities in order to combat racism.

3. To work with mainstream agencies – such as welfare organisations, unions, health professionals, hospitals and churches – in order to increase awareness of racism.

4. Develop training materials that target people who have experienced racism, people who have been responsible for racism and people who work with both groups.
5. Work closely with the Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland (ADCQ), where relevant, and support communities to utilise existing complaint mechanisms.

6. Work with appropriate agencies to inform policy and program development on issues of racism.

A project officer was employed for the first two years of the project implementation. A Reference Committee was established to provide advice on the broad direction the project.
PROJECT METHODOLOGY

The *Confronting Racism in Communities* project involved a range of methodologies and activities including:

i) Literature Review

A literature search was conducted in order to identify key themes relating to theories of racism, definitions of racism and racist incidents, other relevant research on measuring the nature and extent of racism and reporting. Key databases, government documents and academic literature were reviewed. Additionally, community-based project documentation was also examined. The findings from the literature review were used to draft questions for data collection and develop the broad frameworks of the project. The literature review was incorporated into the first project report *Confronting Racism in Communities, Racism Report Number 1* (see Moriarty et al 2007).

ii) Training

An important element of the project was the development of resources and skills for communities and agencies on issues relating to racism. Training was identified as a key component of the project. A training needs evaluation was conducted, using a survey instrument (see Appendix 1 for a copy of the Training Needs Survey). The evaluation was designed to identify what training needs existed, particularly among community workers who worked with CALD people. 50 agencies and individuals participated in this analysis across metropolitan and regional Queensland.

The survey revealed that

- 72 per cent of respondents felt issues of racism were “very relevant” to their work, while 16 per cent of respondents felt issues of racism were “somewhat relevant” to their work.

- 26 per cent of respondents reported they were “not very well equipped/skilled” to support clients who had experienced racism, while 8 per cent reported they were “not at all equipped/skilled”.

- 34 per cent of respondents said they had previously participated in anti-racism training although much of the training received was cross cultural awareness training. Very few had received specific training titled ‘anti-racism’ training (see Hollinsworth 1992a on the differences between these approaches).

- Many outlined that the agencies they worked for did not recognise the importance of anti-racism training. Only 8 per cent of respondents said their organisation had funds allocated for anti-racism training. The finding of this survey was also confirmed by comments from participants in the actual training.

Respondents were also asked about the types of training they would like to receive. Workers identified the following training options would be beneficial:
- Development of responses to racism
- Supporting people who have experienced racism
- Identifying racisms
- Racism in the workforce
- Working with the media

Based on the findings of the Training Needs Survey a training manual was developed (Available at: www.thechangeagency.org/_dbase_upl/Anti-Racism%20Training.pdf) This was a major resource that provided a foundational basis for understanding and working on issues of racism. A series of 2-day intensive workshops was developed and implemented. The participants have included community, government and private sector agencies. The training will continue until mid 2009. Participant feedback from the training has been overwhelmingly positive and professionally relevant. One participant noted that the training was “life changing” for him. A final collation of the training evaluation will be undertaken upon completion of the training.

iii) Data Collection

Data collection about the experiences of CALD communities constituted a large element of the project. A Racist Incident Reporting Form was developed in order to facilitate data collection (see Appendix 2). The form was designed to be completed by people who had experienced racism (with the assistance of trained community workers) or by workers themselves when the people who had experienced racism were not available to tell their story.

Consisting of 36 open and closed questions, the Racist Incident Reporting Form was designed to collect data on:

- The person who experienced racism
- The racist incident
- The person responsible for the racist incident
- Whether or not the incident was formally reported, and
- The impact of the incident and its aftermath.

The form also featured a short preamble that outlined the purpose of the data collection and guaranteed that all information would be kept in the strictest confidence.

Racist Incident Reporting Forms were administered by approximately 70 Data Collection Points located throughout metropolitan and regional Queensland. These Data Collection Points were identified in accordance with the following selection criteria:

- Data collection points should be located within Queensland.
- Data collection points should routinely have people from CALD backgrounds as clients.
Data collection points should be interested in addressing racism experienced by people from CALD backgrounds.

Data collection points should possess infrastructure appropriate to the administration of proposed racist incident reporting mechanisms.

Data collection points should possess the ability to access training delivered in major cities and/or regional centres.

Uniformity of data collection was secured in two ways: Use of the same research instrument across all data collection points. All data collecting officers were provided with training on how to use the instrument and fully briefed on what the questions were trying to elicit.

Collectively, Data Collection Points provide a wide range of services. Some provide settlement services to migrants and refugees, while others work in a community development capacity. Some provide mainstream legal or health services, while others are concerned with housing or employment issues. Some Data Collection Points are also located within educational institutions or local government bodies.

As a pilot project, the *Confronting Racism in Communities* project targeted a limited number of regions with high densities of people of CALD backgrounds. Racist Incident Reporting Forms were administered by Data Collection Points located within following 10 regions:

- Cairns
- Townsville
- Mackay
- Rockhampton
- Wide Bay
- Sunshine Coast
- Toowoomba
- Brisbane
- Logan
- Gold Coast

These regions were selected on the basis of demographic composition, expressed interest from regional workers and according to the suggestions of Reference Committee members.

The data collection methodology was designed to facilitate an exploration of the lived experiences and perceptions of people of CALD background. It was never intended to facilitate the investigation of specific allegations of racism.

It is important to note the stories featured in this report represent the perspectives of a number of individuals of CALD background. While these individuals sometimes used words like discrimination and vilification to describe their experiences, the events they described do not necessarily constitute unlawful discrimination or vilification as defined in state or federal legislation.
This report does not attempt to substantiate or refute such allegations. Rather, it aims to explore the variety of ways people of CALD background feel they have experienced racism in Queensland, and to use those perspectives to illustrate the various types of racist incidents, and to inform strategies to address them.

**Ethical Considerations**

Any cross cultural research is fraught with difficulties. Ethical frameworks guide the project implementation. We adopt basic principles, deriving from human rights and ethical research frameworks, which provide a framework for the execution of the project. These principles are:

- maintenance of the integrity of each individual;
- belief that the stories recounted are genuine;
- transparency in the processes of the research;
- recognition that participants are as much a stakeholder in this research as the researcher;
- integrity of the research is maintained;
- confidentiality is maintained;
- there is informed consent to participation;
- all participation is voluntary;
- cultural sensitivity is shown in all situations; and
- researchers are respectful and sensitive to issues of culture, language, religion, gender, power, and class.

Although culture is an important factor that must be considered, extra caution was taken to not further reproduce cultural stereotyping or create assumptions of homogeneity among ethnic groups.

**Limitations of Research**

**Absence of Indigenous Experiences:** The Queensland Government commissioned the project team to document the variety of racisms experienced by CALD people only, as distinct from the racisms experienced by Indigenous Australians. Thus the focus of the Project has been on racism affecting people from CALD backgrounds as distinct from the racisms experienced by Indigenous Australians. However, the project team strongly acknowledges Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (ATSI) peoples’ status as Australia’s First Peoples, and the variety of racisms Indigenous Australians have experienced – both historically and in the present day. The 2002 National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey found 18 per cent of respondents considered racism to have been a problem for themselves or someone close to them in the past twelve months (ABS 2002, p. 39). Furthermore, a subsequent report into the health and welfare of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples found those who had been subjected to racism in the past six months were more than twice as likely to be at high risk of emotional and behavioral difficulties as those who had not experienced racism (ABS 2005, p. 85). In light of such findings, the project team has undertaken to formally refer to the Department of Communities any Indigenous policy issues that emerge throughout the course of the Confronting Racism in Communities project.
Reluctance to Reveal Racism: Feedback from Data Collection Points indicated some people of CALD background were reluctant to disclose experiences of racism for the purposes of this project even after confidentiality was emphasised. This reinforced the hidden nature of racism and the difficulties related to uncovering the nature and extent of racism. Clients from regional areas were particularly concerned about the anonymity of such reports as they were sometimes the only person from their particular ethnic background in their area. As such, they were concerned other people would be able to identify them from their story, thereby putting them at risk of further victimisation. Data Collection Points indicated some clients were also reluctant to recount details of unpleasant experiences as they believed it would not benefit them personally. Some clients explained they understood the concept of systemic change, but were skeptical whether their participation in this project would really affect their everyday lived experiences. As the project participation is voluntary this data collection reports on findings from those who consented to taking part although it is noted that the extent of the problem is wider.

Difficulties in Identifying Racism: While the project adopted a working definition of racism there are many complexities of identifying racism due to its covert nature, intersectionality with other social problems and the changing manifestations of it. Data Collection Points reported that many clients did not identify racist incidents as ‘racism’ when it occurred. The difficulties in identifying and in naming racism are discussed below.

Resource Limitations: The project’s data collection methodology relies heavily on the capacity of individual Data Collection Points to identify and document racist incidents in their local areas. In many instances, Data Collection Points chose to actively promote available reporting frameworks and mechanisms within their local communities. Activities such as these are clearly time and resource intensive. As such, some Data Collection Points have expressed – while they were happy to participate in the project – they do not have the capacity to promote the project very widely or over the long term, and, as such, the data they collect will be limited. The access to Data Collection Points in regional areas was particularly noted as a major issue. Such constraints may of course result in limited awareness of available reporting frameworks and mechanisms and, resultantly, limited data collection within some regions.
The data collection was undertaken from 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2007. The methodology described above was utilized and data was collected through the Data Collection Points. A total of 398 separate perceived racist incidents were reported from across the ten identified regions in Queensland. These were incidents of racism experienced by victims in the last five years.

The project findings are presented in two sections: 1) Participant Profile and 2) Racist Incidents

i) PARTICIPANT PROFILE

This section covers the demographic and personal profiles of respondents in this study including ethnic background, language proficiency, religion, age, gender and periods of residence in Australia.

Ethnic Background: Racist incidents were reported by people from 73 different ethnic backgrounds. Although people from a wide variety of ethnic backgrounds identified as experiencing racist incidents the majority of incidents were experienced by people from visible minority groups. The following table provides a summary of the ethnic breakdown of respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Community</th>
<th>Number of Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian (India, Fiji and South Africa)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese (China, Hong Kong, Taiwan)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanese (Sudan)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other African (Somalia, Eritrea, Sierra Leone, Burundi, Liberia, Ethiopia, Congo, Rwanda, South Africa, Kenya, Nigeria)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic Speaking (Lebanon, Iraq, Egypt, Oman)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander (Samoa, Tonga, Maori, New Zealand*, Tokelau and Tuvalu, Cook Islands, Fiji, Niue Island)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian (Japan, Indonesia, Thailand, Philippines, Malaysia, Vietnam, Burma, Laos, Korea, Cambodia, PNG)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Middle/Near East (Iran, Turkey, Afghanistan, Kurdish, Assyrian)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European (Greek, Malta, Italy, France, Germany, Bosnia, Croatia, Spain, Hungary, Poland, Russia, Jewish, Albania, Holland, Portugal)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American (Colombia, El Salvador, Chile, Uruguay, Brazil)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sub Continental (Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Australian (Anglo Buddhist, Muslim or other)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous**</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Country of Origin/Ethnic Background

*Not further defined
** Although the project did not focus on Indigenous experiences, a number were reported

The highest numbers of racist incidents were reported by those who identified as Indian (15 per cent), then Chinese (13 per cent), Sudanese (9.8 per cent), other
African (11 per cent), Arabic speaking (7.8 per cent) and Pacific Islanders (6 per cent). Those from Africa collectively were the largest group of people to have reported incidents of racism (approximately 21 per cent). It is not certain that these proportions reflect the actual numbers of incidents as it is also related to the distribution and capacity of the Data Collection Points, as the clients of more active Data Collection Points will be represented more significantly.

**Length of Time in Australia:** Majority of the respondents have been in Australia over 5 years. The following figure demonstrates the length of time in Australia.

![Figure 1: Length of time in Australia of persons who experienced racism](image)

Using the figures represented in Figure 1, approximately 8 per cent of respondents were in Australia 0-12 months, 25 per cent 1-5 years, 9.5 per cent 6-10 years, 26 per cent more than 10 years, 24 per cent born in Australia and 7.5 per cent did not specify length of time in Australia. Approximately 33 per cent of total respondents were in Australia 5 years or less while nearly 60 per cent of respondents were in Australia 6 years or greater.

**Gender:** Data analysis indicated women reported greater instances of racism than men; 59 percent of reported incidents were experienced by women while only 39 per cent of incidents were experienced by men. Two per cent did not identify their gender. Care must be taken when attempting to draw inferences from this data, as it is unclear whether the data reflects higher victimisation rates among women or whether it reflects a greater propensity of women to report racist incidents to Data Collection Points.

**Age:** The age breakdown of respondents indicates that people of all age levels experienced racist incidents. Figure 2 demonstrates the age breakdown of respondents.
The data collection did not target children; this is reflected in a small percentage of people younger than 10 years of age (1 per cent). Fifteen per cent of respondents were aged 10-19 years; 24 per cent were 20-29 years; 21 per cent were 30-39 years; 13 per cent were 40-49 years; 11 per cent were 50-59 years; 7 per cent were older than 59 years and 8 per cent did not specify their age. Thus, 61 per cent of respondents were under 40 years old.

**Religion:** The majority of the racist incidents were experienced by people who identified as Christian (37 per cent). A breakdown of the religious affiliation of respondents is presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Dreaming</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahai</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikhism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Religion of Persons Who Experienced Racism*

**Languages Spoken At Home and Level of English:** Approximately 63 languages, other than English (LOTE), were identified as spoken at home. The key languages identified included Hindi, Mandarin, Cantonese, Arabic and Dinka. Approximately
69 per cent of respondents also identified ‘English’ being spoken at home as either in addition to language other than English (LOTE) or as the main language spoken at home.

Respondents were also asked about their level of written and spoken English. Based on their own assessment, 71 per cent of respondents described their level of spoken English as either “good” or “very good”, while 62 per cent described their level of written English in this way. Approximately 7 per cent of respondents described their level of spoken English as “poor” or “very poor”, while 12 per cent described their level of written English in the same way. Approximately 12 per cent of respondents described their spoken English as “fair” while 16 per cent described their written English in this way.

Levels of written and spoken English can often suggest a positive correlation between a person’s level of English proficiency and their propensity to report racist incidents. However, it is important to note that respondents were asked to describe their own levels of English proficiency and the results are likely to be subjective. Furthermore, reporting and disclosing behaviour of incidents is much more complex and proficiency in English is one of many more factors that influence reporting.

**Completion of Data Collection Form:** The Racist Incident Reporting Form was designed to be completed by people who had experienced racism (with the assistance of trained community workers). The form may also be completed by friends, relatives and other acquaintances of the person who experienced racism.

Accordingly, 65 percent of racist incidents were reported by the person who directly experienced the racism, while 35 per cent of incidents were reported by someone other than that person. The persons who reported the incident, other than the person who directly experienced racism, included friend, teacher/lecturer, community worker, priest, work colleague, neighbour, community member, parent, lawyer and other (unspecified).

**ii) RACIST INCIDENTS**

This subsection of this report relates to the nature of incidents experienced, geographic location and responses to the incidents.

**Single/Multiple Incidences:** The Racist Incident Reporting Form was designed in such a way that respondents could report either a single incident or a series of related incidents. It is, however, important to note that some respondents reported multiple unrelated incidents on the same form. For the purposes of data analysis, these incidents have been counted as single incidents. Seventy-six per cent reported single incidents while 24 per cent reported multiple incidents over the five years.
When reporting single racist incidents, most respondents seemed unable to recall the exact date on which the incident occurred. Many specified only the month or the year in which the incident took place, and some provided no information at all. Data collected in relation to the frequency of multiple incidents was even more ambiguous. As a result, this report categorises single incidents only by the year in which they occurred.

The reporting period for experiences of racist incidents were defined as those that occurred within the past five years. Table 3 provides a breakdown of the year of incidents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Dates of Reported Incidents

The vast majority of single incidents were said to have occurred within the last three calendar years. Sixty-three per cent of incidents were reported to have happened between 2005-2008. However care must be taken when attempting to draw inferences from these data as it is unclear whether these data suggest an increase in the frequency of racist incidents or whether it simply suggests a propensity for people to report incidents that occurred within the last couple of years.

**Geographical Locations**: The majority of racist incidents were reported to have occurred within South East Queensland. Figure 4 provides a breakdown of the spatial location as reported by respondents.
Thirty-seven per cent of incidents were reported as occurring in Brisbane, 15 per cent in Logan, 13 per cent on the Gold Coast, 11 per cent on the Sunshine Coast, 7 per cent in Toowoomba, 5 per cent in Cairns, 4 per cent in Townsville, 3.5 per cent in Mackay and 2 per cent in Rockhampton and Wide Bay.

We note that these data do not reflect the true extent of the regional distribution of racist incidents across Queensland. Indeed, anecdotal evidence from local agencies and community members attests to this fact. The number of reports received reflects the demographic composition of these regions, as well as the predilection of people within those regions to identify and report racist incidents. Additionally, it also reflects the number of Data Collection Points within each region and the extent to which Data Collection Points have promoted available reporting processes. The access to Data Collection Points has been identified as a problem during the research and noted as one of the limitations of the project.

**Types of Racist Incidents:** Respondents described a range of incidents involving racially and religiously motivated violence, destruction of personal property, verbal harassment and other forms of offensive speech and behavior, institutional racism and broader social exclusion.

The incidents described were frequently complex in nature and involved more than one type of abuse and some participants identified multiple dimensions of the same incident. For example, an incident can involve both physical violence and verbal harassment. The racist incidents were sorted into 12 distinct categories (see Figure 5).
Physical Violence: Approximately 17 per cent of respondents identified being subjected to physical racist violence. Eleven per cent (of the 17 per cent) of those subjected to physical violence were women. Respondents described how they were spat on, beaten, or had small rocks, rubbish, eggs, tomatoes and other matter thrown at them while undertaking everyday activities such as shopping, catching public transport or simply walking along a footpath. These incidents were usually perpetrated by complete strangers and were – for the most part – completely unprovoked. Some examples reported are:

— The victim was a woman who was walking in the Brisbane inner city area on the main road when a car approached her, slowed down and a handful of pebble-like rocks were thrown at her (2006). Racial abuse was yelled at the same time. She was lightly scratched on the arm. She did not know who the perpetrators were. (Woman of Indian background)

— The victim was a woman living in regional area whose neighbour threw eggs on her or her family every time she saw them in the garden, accompanied by racial abuse (Woman of Sudanese background)

— The victim was a man walking in regional area when a group of three men approached him and started hitting him while yelling racial abuse. The victim did not know them or why they were hitting him (Samoan man)

Threat of Physical Violence: Approximately 6 per cent received racially or religiously motivated threats of physical violence. These threats were frequently communicated in face-to-face situations, while some were delivered in letters and phone calls. Some examples reported are:

— A Muslim family continued to receive a “death to Muslims” flyer in their letterbox for several weeks (in outer Metropolitan area)

— In a dispute between neighbours racial threats to kill him were made against an Ethiopian man by his Anglo-Australian neighbour (inner metropolitan Brisbane)

Property Damage: Four and a half per cent of racist incidents involved assaults against personal property. Such incidents generally occurred at home and involved either neighbours or casual acquaintances. Some examples reported are:
— Neighbours complained that the family was too noisy. One day when they took their bin out onto their driveway one of the neighbours reversed their car and knocked the bin over. They kept reversing and left the driveway full of rubbish and the rubbish bin was damaged. (Man from Sudanese background)

— A fight erupted outside a Brisbane school between a group of young boys. A group of boys, of mixed cultural backgrounds, ‘ganged’ up on the boy from Congo and grabbed his bag and tore it to pieces, including all his books and homework while they yelled verbal abuse (reported by mother, a Congolese woman).

**Verbal Harassment:** Forty-nine per cent of reported incidents involved some form of racially or religiously motivated verbal harassment. Respondents frequently described being assailed by strangers as they walked down the street and being told to “go home” despite having been born – or spent much of their lives – in Australia. Respondents described situations in which they received verbal harassment on the basis of accent, appearance and culture. Some examples include:

— A Muslim woman in a shopping centre was yelled to take that ‘f…n scarf off as you are now in Australia’ (Woman of Egyptian Muslim background)

— A man was yelled at in the street to go home and to stop taking our jobs (Man of Indian background)

— A Chinese student’s accent is mocked and derogatory comments said in front of her by others in class (Woman of Chinese background)

**Non-verbal harassment:** Ten per cent of racist incidents reportedly involved some form of non-verbal harassment. These include rude and mocking gestures, or shooting and noose signs. Some reported non-action as a form of harassment such as not being sat next to on the bus. Some examples include:

— Muslim student with hijab describes how no-one sits next to her in class even though there are no spare seats in the room and students are standing up (Woman of Lebanese background)

— Rude gestures made to woman as car passed her, coupled with racial abuse (Woman of Somali background)

— A motorist make a shooting gesture with hand to victim as he stops at the traffic light (Man of Pakistani background)

**Written harassment:** Three per cent reported incidents involved some kind of written harassment. Most of these incidents were reported by people who received anonymous letters containing disparaging comments about their ethnic or religious background. Some of these messages also contained threats against the recipient’s life or demands that they change their religion. Examples include:

— A man receives a “White Power” flyer on his desk at work while he is at lunch. No one else has received it and no one has seen who put it there (Man of Ethiopian background).

— An anonymous email is sent on the work email opposing immigration as ‘Asians and Indians are taking our jobs’ (Man of Indian background)
Racist Graffiti: 5.5 per cent reported racist graffiti. Most of the graffiti was found on private property and was therefore presumably directed at specific individuals from CALD backgrounds.

- Graffiti on wall – “Go home – you’re not welcome”. Second graffiti – “You’re f**ken pigs”. (Woman of Indian background)
- Writing on fence with insults against the person, including name (Woman from Sudanese background)
- Stop Asian Immigration graffiti was painted on shop wall (man of Vietnamese background).

Offensive Media Content: Three and a half per cent of respondents reported offensive media content in either the print or broadcast media. Generally speaking, these reports made three different types of allegations – firstly, that individual media personalities made disparaging comments about particular ethnic or religious groups; secondly, that certain advertisers utilised racist stereotypes in the promotion of their products; and thirdly, that some media organisations demonstrated a racially motivated bias when deciding which current events were worthy of their attention. These are views held by participants (whether in individual capacity or linked with their work or voluntary organisations) from their contacts with the media. There other studies about the media over the last decade in Australia which support these perceptions including Jakubowicz 2007, Manning 2004, Poynting et al 2004, Anti-Discrimination Board of NSW 2003.

Social Exclusion: Nine per cent of respondents identified social exclusion in work, school or social events. There were reports that they were ignored or avoided because of the colour of their skin or because of their ethnic, cultural or religious background. These reports frequently contained allegations of poor customer service, with several respondents describing situations where they had been overlooked by wait staff or sales assistants.

- The victim was constantly overlooked while ordering takeaway food although she was at the front of the queue (Woman of PNG background)
- The victim noted that a particular bank officer was always rude to her (Woman of Indonesian background)
- A woman stopped going to play group due to the way the other mothers were treating her, looking down at her, ignoring her (Woman of Chilean background)

Discrimination: Thirty-nine per cent of respondents reported unfair treatment. Respondents described a variety of situations where they felt they had been discriminated against because of the colour of their skin, or because of their ethnic, cultural or religious background. Some of the examples included:

- Woman not promoted to higher duties since the manager felt the other staff will not take her seriously due to her ‘background’ (Woman from Sri Lankan background)
- The victim is a newly arrived refugee. He was denied accommodation. The real estate agent said the two-bedroom house was too small for his family. The victim believed that he was discriminated against as he has two children and the previous tenant also had two children. The real estate agent was making jokes about Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan when he found out that the victim was from Afghanistan (Man of Afghani background)
— Woman who travels frequently complained of being picked out for checking at the domestic airport (Woman of Muslim background, ethnicity unspecified)

**Institutional Racism:** Twenty per cent of respondents identified experiencing racism within institutions. These were both public sector and private sector agencies. Respondents identified a number of examples which they describe as institutional racism:

— Community worker with refugees frequently encounters prejudice and stereotypical views of particular groups by real estate agents and a reluctance to rent accommodation (Community Worker, Logan)

— A person in a senior position, often acting as head of section, denied promotion as unit head when the unit head departs. The person believes this is due to him wearing a turban and is a form of institutional racism (Man of Indian Sikh background)

— A doctor in public hospital is refused by patient as he is seen to be ‘less qualified’ (Man of Indian background)

— A resident of a nursing home refuses the service of nurse (in medication) as she claims that she is not qualified and is likely to kill her (Nurse of Filipino background)

— Bus driver yells abusive comments at person trying to board the bus and drives off without appropriate time to get on the bus (Man of Chinese background)

— Young person unduly picked on by police and suspected for ‘no reason’ (Man of Pacific Islander background)

— Community services fails to call interpreter for a victim of domestic violence and communicates in broken English and sign language serious legal matters (Woman of Thai background)

**Locations of Incidents:** Respondents described experiencing racist incidents that occurred in a range of locations including on the street, at work, at home, at school and in supermarkets and shops. A significant number of people also claimed to have experienced racism while traveling on public transport and while looking for employment and rental accommodation.
The highest number of incidents took place on the street (16 per cent). Respondents described incidents of:

- Verbal abuse
- Spitting
- Eggs and other objects being thrown at them
- Rude gestures
- Physical violence

These incidents occurred while undertaking everyday activities such as shopping, jogging or spending time with friends and family. These incidents were generally perpetrated by complete strangers and were completely unprovoked. Some respondents described feeling ‘unsafe’ while in public spaces.

The second highest numbers of incidents were reported in the workplace. Fourteen per cent of respondents reported racist incidents taking place at work or while seeking work. Respondents described incidents of:

- Harassment by supervisors, bosses and other superiors based on religious and cultural factors;
- Excluded in workplace teams;
- Exclusion from social events at work;
- Lack of promotion based on appearance, accent and other factors
- Belittling and racist jokes;
- Underemployment although highly qualified to do the work based on assumptions that their experience and qualifications are not relevant or less;
- Discrimination when applying for jobs (accents at interviews, ethnic names, lack of recognition of past experience);
- Stereotypical views of particular ethnic communities (e.g. lazy)
- Incorrect assumptions about workplace fit
- General unfair treatment at work
- Unfavourable treatment (e.g. comments) by customers or clients of the workplace

Twelve per cent of reported incidents occurred while renting or applying for rental accommodation. Respondents described incidents with real estate agents involving:

- Denial of rental accommodation although the property was advertised as being on the market;
- Offensive and intrusive questions;
- Rude and offensive comments;
- Offensive judgments relating to size of house and family size;
- Offensive comments relating to lifestyle of particular groups;
- Assumptions about income and ability to pay rent and default on rent for particular groups;
- Rudeness in carrying out inspection and blame families for prior damage in property;
In instances of denial of accommodation, respondents felt they had been discriminated against, but were not able to substantiate these claims as real estate agents rarely explained why their applications had been unsuccessful. Many alleged that real estate agents had been culturally insensitive and racist but they were not able to substantiate it.

Eleven per cent of reported incidents occurred on public transport, while catching buses, trains and ferries. This makes public transport the equal fourth most common venue for racist incidents. Incidents described by respondents included:

- Racist comments by bus drivers;
- Racist comments and unfair treatment by ticketing officers;
- Buses not picking up passengers;
- Not recognizing valid passes or concession cards;
- Offensive comments and behaviour by passengers;
- Verbal abuse while waiting at stations;
- Physical abuse by other passengers.

Many described feelings of insecurity while catching public transport and a sense of fear and lack of safety on trains, buses and while waiting for transport.

Eleven per cent of racist incidents were described as occurring in supermarkets and shops, also equal fourth most common venue for racist incidents. Incidents described included:

- Intentional overlooking while being served (although at front of queue)
- Impolite or discourteous service;
- Refusal of service;
- Offensive comments by shop staff;
- Additional scrutiny not applied to other customers (checking bags, security officer monitoring)
- Verbal abuse by other customers;
- Physical abuse by other customers (in shopping centres)

Six per cent of respondents reported racist incidents in social venues (4 per cent) and other places of leisure (2 per cent). The reported incidents occurred in social venues such as cafes, restaurants, pubs, nightclubs, movie cinemas, sports grounds, parks and other places of leisure. Respondents claimed to have been treated improperly or refused service because of the colour of their skin or because of their ethnic, cultural or religious background. Incidents reported included:

- Refusal of entry to social venues or clubs (often based on excuses such as dress. Respondents pointed to friends of Anglo-appearance being allowed in with similar sandals or sports shoes);
- Denial of service;
- Offensive comments in parks and sports grounds;
- Rude comments made about ability to afford the service by staff (e.g. cinema);
- Comments from other customers or users (e.g. not allowing children to play together in public park);
- Unfair treatment by security officers, bouncers and police in social venues and places of leisure;
- Verbal harassment (e.g. in sports grounds);
- Physical harassment or threat of physical violence by security officers or other customers.

Four per cent of racist incidents were experienced at home. Some of these involved disputes with neighbours and in other cases it did not. The types of incidents described include:

- Avoidance and unfriendly manner;
- Not allowing children to interact in the neighbourhood;
- Bullying;
- Yelling insults and verbal abuse based on culture, ethnicity, religion or skin colour;
- Damaging property (e.g. fences, walls, bins, cars, house);
- Threat of violence;
- Physical violence;
- Threatening mail in the letterbox.

In a small number of instances police were called due to the level of violence.

Two per cent of respondents identified instances involving a private vehicle and car parks. Instances described include:

- Rude gestures by people in cars;
- Verbal abuse of a racist nature;
- Throwing of objects such as eggs, bottles and rocks from cars;
- Tailgating;
- Intimidation and being followed home;
- Cars not stopping at a pedestrian crossing or lights (sometimes coupled with verbal abuse).

Three per cent of racist incidents related to offensive letters, emails and phone calls. The people behind these letters and phone calls typically wished to remain anonymous. The content of these offensive mail or call were threatening and related to:

- Anti-immigrant sentiment;
- Stopping immigration intake;
- Calling on particular groups to ‘go home’;
- Not taking jobs;
- September 11 and Muslims being seen as terrorist;
- White power;
- Threats of violence to the person.

Approximately 3 per cent of reported incidents were said to have taken place in either the print or broadcast media. The offensive content related to:
- Disparaging comments made about particular ethnic or religious groups by media personalities;
- Media utilisation of racist stereotypes in comedy, advertising and films;
- Media organisations demonstrating a racially motivated bias when deciding which current events were worthy of their attention;
- Generally negative portrayal of different groups.

Nine per cent of respondents identified other locations of racist incidents. These were government departments (5 per cent); private corporations (2 per cent) and community service organisations (2 per cent). These locations clearly intersect with other areas described above such as shops and clubs. The nature of incidents described include:

- Refusal of service;
- Impolite service;
- Refusal to use interpreters;
- Attitudes of staff towards CALD staff or clients;
- Verbal harassment from other clients;
- Systems being used to cover racism;
- Seeking employment;
- Denial of promotion;
- Assumptions of assimilation and lack of sensitivity to cultural issues.

**IMPACT OF RACIST INCIDENTS**

Racist incidents impact on the victim, the perpetrator and society as a whole.

Since racist incidents affect a group as well as an individual, they are experienced as attacks on the values, loyalties and commitments central to a person’s identity and self-worth – their family honour, friends, cultural heritage, religion, community and history. Racist, cultural and religious abuse is accordingly more hurtful than any or most of other kinds of abuse (Bristol City Council 2004).

Paradies et al (2008: 9), writing in the context of the impacts of racism on Indigenous health, note a number of impacts of racism including:

- Reduced and unequal access to societal resources;
- Increased exposure to risk factors associated with ill health;
- Physical injury;
- Stress and negative emotional reaction;
- Negative responses such as smoking or alcohol use

The respondents felt a range of emotions at the incidents. Table 4 presents the reactions to racist incidents by the respondents. Please note that some respondents felt complex and multiple emotions thus, the table records greater than the actual number of responses.
Responses/Reactions to Racism  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipation</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious or distressed</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of exclusion, not belonging</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth, resilience</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed or depressed</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointment</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of confidence, Helpless/Victimised</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical reaction (e.g. headache)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural change</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorry for perpetrator</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Responses or Reactions to Racist Incidents

WITNESESS REPONSES TO INCIDENTS

Many of the incidents reported in this study took place in public places. Approximately 41 per cent of respondents identified that there were witnesses to the racist incidents. Majority of these (32 per cent) were unknown to the person who experienced the incident. Nine per cent were family, friends or colleagues. Thirty-eight per cent stated that there were no witnesses and 21 per cent said they were unsure if the incident was witnessed by a third party.

Witnesses reacted to the racist incidents in different ways. Table 5 provides a breakdown of witness responses to racist incidents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distressed by Incident</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent to incident</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided Support to Victim</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panicked</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confronted perpetrator</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advised Victim to Ignore event</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported the incident</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Witness Responses to Racist Incidents

Witness responses differ; while many appear to be distressed or anxious about the situation, there appears to be a reluctance to be involved. Overall, approximately one third (30 per cent) of witnesses supported the victim, confronted the perpetrator or reported the incident. Almost one third were indifferent to the incidents they witnessed.
PERPETRATORS OF RACISM

The working definition of racism adopted by the *Confronting Racism in Communities* project acknowledges racism may be expressed by individuals, by groups of people or by institutional structures and processes. The boundaries between individuals and institutions are not always clear cut. It is individuals within social structures that implement systems, processes and procedures. They bring into the situation their own history, knowledge and perceptions. The view presented here are those of the respondents, as they perceive the perpetrators.

Fifty-eight per cent of racist incidents were reported to be committed by individuals, while 23 per cent of incidents were carried out by groups of people. Nineteen per cent were carried out by staff of institutions. Sixty-four per cent of respondents stated they *did not* know the people responsible for acts of racism while 36 per cent of respondents said they *did* know the person or persons responsible. Figure 7 provides a breakdown of the relationship between the perpetrator and the person who experienced racism:

![Figure 7: Relationship of perpetrator to persons who experienced racism](image)

As can be seen from Figure 7, the relationship of perpetrator to person experiencing the incident varied. Total strangers that could not be associated with any organisation made up 26 per cent of perpetrators; neighbours 4 per cent; a friend or acquaintance 2 per cent; classmates 3 per cent; teacher or lecturer 5 per cent; work colleague 9 per cent; employer 11 per cent; client or customer 3 per cent; real estate agent 10 per cent, police officer 4 percent; public transport official 11 per cent; family member 1 per cent; government or community agency 6 per cent; media 2 per cent; and not specified 2 per cent. Although 58 per cent of respondents identified individuals as perpetrators, when the breakdown of this relationship is analysed, the majority of the
perpetrators are in organisational relationships such as school, work, real estate, government or media, comprising 62 per cent.

Racist Incident Reporting Forms asked respondents to describe the ethnic background of the person or persons responsible for the racism they experienced. However, it is important to acknowledge there are numerous difficulties associated with identifying another person’s ethnic background, especially when they are strangers.

Having said this, racist incidents seem to have been perpetrated by people from a variety of ethnic backgrounds. However, 90 per cent of respondents who answered this question said their assailants were from Anglo-Australian backgrounds. Respondents described their assailants’ perceived “whiteness” in the following ways:

- Australian
- Average Australian
- Christian Australian
- White Australian
- Aussie
- Anglo
- Anglo-Australian
- Anglo-Saxon
- Anglo Saxon Australian
- English Australian
- English
- White
- Caucasian

9 per cent of incidents were reported as being carried out by people from the following ethnic backgrounds:

- Asian
- Islander
- Indigenous
- Dark/brown skin
- Indian
- Maori
- Italian
- European
- Dutch
- German

According to respondents, males were responsible for three times as many racist incidents as females. Males were allegedly responsible for 57 per cent of reported incidents, while females were allegedly responsible for 19 per cent. 24 per cent of reported incidents were allegedly perpetrated by groups containing both males and females, which indicates women were more likely to exhibit racist behaviors when in the company of men.

Racist Incident Reporting Forms asked respondents to estimate the age of the persons responsible for the racist incidents they experienced. Such persons were frequently unknown to respondents. As such, 26 per cent of respondents did not specify the age of their assailant and others probably took educated guesses. The racist incidents seemed to have been perpetrated by people of all ages, although 56 per cent of
respondents who answered this question stated their assailants were either in the age group 20-29 and 30-39.

REPORTING OF RACIST INCIDENTS

Respondents were asked whether racist incidents were reported to any authorities. Only 19 per cent had reported the incident, 11 per cent did not specify whether they reported it or not. A significant 70 per cent did not report the incident. Figure 8 provides a diagrammatic illustration of the reporting of racist incidents:

![Figure 8: Whether racist incidents were formally reported](image)

The racist incidents were reported to a number of agencies including:
- Police (3%)
- Community Worker (3%)
- Teacher (3%)
- Employer (2%)
- Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland (ADCQ) (3%)
- Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) (1%)
- Community leader/elder (2%)
- Government department (1%)
- Legal Service (1%)

Data analysis indicated a relatively low degree of respondent satisfaction with reporting outcomes. Approximately 20 per cent of respondents (15 people) who formally referred racist incidents to other agencies stated they were either “satisfied” (16 %) or “very satisfied” (4 %) with reporting outcomes. On the other hand, 66 per cent of the respondents stated they were either “unsatisfied” (45%) or “very unsatisfied” (21%) with reporting outcomes (see Figure 9). Eight per cent of respondent stated they were “neutral” about the outcome and 6 per cent of respondents elected not to answer this question.
Respondents collectively identified seven key factors that contributed to their satisfaction with reporting outcomes:

- Their assailant was confronted
- The situation was remedied quickly
- The perpetrator was confronted and measures were taken not to repeat the incident
- They received support or their experience was validated
- They received an apology
- They felt good about having spoken out
- Felt safer once the issues were in the public domain

Respondents collectively identified nine key factors that contributed to their dissatisfaction with reporting outcomes:

- The report was not acted upon
- Nothing was done to rectify the situation
- Complaint not taken seriously, or minimized
- The perpetrator was not reprimanded
- Their experience was not validated
- They did not receive an apology
- Future incidents were not prevented
- The victim was forced to modify their behavior
- The ‘evidence’ required was not possible to obtain

Approximately 70% (279 people) did not report the incident to any authorities for a number of reasons:

- Did not know who the perpetrator was
- Did not have enough evidence
- Fear of further racism or discrimination
- Fear of consequences of reporting e.g. loss of job
- Afraid of being labeled a trouble maker
- Did not believe it will do any good
- Did not trust authorities to do anything
- Did not know where to report
- Did not have confidence to report
- Did not speak enough English to report
- Unaware of processes of reporting, lack of knowledge
- Event seemed trivial to report
- Event too frequent which is faced everyday, reporting too exhausting and time consuming, choose to endure
- Too much negative emotions with reporting.
DISCUSSION & ANALYSIS

This report identified that people of diverse ethnic backgrounds, physical appearance, age and gender across Queensland have been subjected to racism, indicating the breadth of occurrences and experiences. A range of incidents involving racially and religiously motivated violence, destruction of personal property, verbal harassment and other forms of offensive speech and behavior, institutional racism and broader social exclusion were identified. The incidents described were frequently complex in nature and involved more than one type of abuse. Some participants identified multiple dimensions of incidents, and recurring patterns.

The underlying causes of racist events can in part be traced to structural problems related to ‘new racisms’ including narrow popular understandings of Australian national identity and particular types of patriotism espoused by politicians and the media, curtailment of citizenship rights and ongoing disaffection among marginalised ethnic groups, Islamophobia and continued widespread negative stereotyping of ethnic groups (Babacan & Gopalkrishnan in press; Jayasuriya, 2002 & 2005).

Experiences of racism are interconnected and multiple. As this study documented over the research period, one quarter of respondents reported multiple incidents. This indicates that experiences of racism are not ‘one off’ events that can be dismissed as coincidence or unfortunate circumstance. It constitutes part of ‘everyday racism’ (Essed 2002) - of lived reality in the lives of people. Everyday racism examines individuals’ lived experiences and knowledge of racism, and connects structural forces of racism with routine situations in everyday life. It links ideological dimensions of racism with daily attitudes and interprets the reproduction of racism in terms of the experience of it in everyday life (Essed 2002: 177).

All respondents identified instances of unprovoked racism in the course of their daily lives- in locations such as the street, shopping centres, work, public transport and at home. Although the term ‘everyday life’ is synonymous with the idea of being ordinary it is by no means insignificant (Gouldner 1975). It is important to note that 28 per cent reported physical violence, threat of physical violence and/or property damage. The conclusion is that approximately 112 people experienced a form of racialized physical violence, threat of violence or property damage in Queensland in the last five years. It is often believed that violent behaviour in incidents of racism is extreme and undertaken by small proportion of the population. While that may be the case, 112 people living with the spectre of racial violence is not an insignificant statistic for matters which are not only linked with racism but also are criminal offences covered under laws of the State.

The Report of the National Inquiry into Racist Violence undertaken by HREOC in 1991 identified the serious nature of racist violence across Australia. Since that time, there has been no comprehensive study examining racist violence. What the findings of this study indicate is that there is a need to undertake further work in this area within Queensland.
One fifth of respondents pointed to racism in the institutions of society, in government, non-government and private sector agencies. While this kind of structural racism is difficult to identify, the study revealed that, despite existing policies and systems, indirect systemic racism remains a powerful and common experience in practice. Consequently there is a need to pay closer attention to actual operational, implementation and administration processes in relation to systemic or institutional racism.

Experiences of racism are regionally varied as revealed by the findings. Not only experiences but also the reporting of racist incidents is determined by spatial considerations and the study noted that factors that limit the reporting of racist incidents in rural and regional settings. Racist attitudes and behaviour are expressed in different regions in the study in specific ways. The study did not have the scope to delve further into detailed case studies of each area. Forrest and Dunn (2006b) point out the importance of place and context in understanding racisms. They further argue that the distribution of socio-economic and cultural variables do not of themselves account for variations in racism. That is, place (context) is an important consideration and that racism is both socially and spatially constructed. The implication of the regional variation of racisms is that further work needs to be undertaken in developing context-sensitive anti-racism strategies.

The exposure to racism can have significant impacts. It is noted that racial stressors have multifarious effects on the health and well being of racialized subjects. Being treated as inferior in everyday life can have profound effect on those who experience it and as Fanon (1967: 11) notes it can lead to “the internalisation or the epidermalisation of this inferiority”. The everyday racialization of individuals and communities affects their social and psychological functioning, limits their life chances, and the economic-social opportunities available to them. The respondents in this study felt a range of emotions at the incidents including anger, sadness, despondency, fear and anxiety. The life chances and health impacts of racism have been well documented (Paradies et al 2008, Li 1998).

The study also indicated that acts of racism were perpetrated in public places and nearly half of the incidents had witnesses who acted in various degrees of social responsibility. Approximately one third of witnesses supported the victim, confronted the perpetrator or reported the incident. Almost one third were reported as being indifferent to the incidents they witnessed. This raises issues of whose responsibility is it to tackle racism and why witnesses do not want to become involved. The issue of responsibility is a complex one and often it is seen as the responsibility or problem of the victim. The reasons for indifference and reluctance to be involved vary with individuals and can be for many reasons. As many of the witnesses were unknown to victims we are not in a position to provide further analysis.

There are many psychological studies as to why people behave in a racist manner (beyond attitudes). Fifty-eight per cent of racist incidents were reported to be committed by individuals, while 23 per cent of incidents were carried out by groups of people. Nineteen per cent were carried out by staff of institutions. Sixty-four per cent of respondents stated they did not know the people responsible for acts of racism.
while 36 per cent of respondents said they did know the person or persons responsible. There are different psychological theories which attempt to explain the causes of individual racist behaviour, often linked with either intergroup relations or on an interpersonal basis (such as early childhood development, identity formation and human character. It is not possible, in the scope of this paper, to go into a discussion of this topic. For greater detail on this topic refer to The Australian Psychological Society Position Paper on Racism and Prejudice (1997).

However, Moore (2000:148) provides a summarized approach when she states that the psychology of racism and prejudice is a “a state or feeling or mental attitude, felt and/or expressed as an antipathy based upon an erroneous inflexible generalization of the other”. Moore aptly point outs, however, that racism is much more than just attitude but is an overt and covert establishment and maintenance of power by one social group over another. Moore further posits that there are certain behaviours and thinking which are characteristic of unequal relationships, as a way of explaining the coercive behaviour of dominant groups. Kovel (1984) outlines that there are three types of racists: i) domineering who act out their bigotry; ii) aversive, those who exhibit aversive behaviours and iii) unconscious, those who do not reveal their racist tendencies except in unconscious ways as part of broader social tendencies. He argues that these three types of racist tendencies are an instrument to stabilize dominance. Moore, reinforces this and argues that the type of behaviours towards those considered subordinant are usually ‘destructive’ and range from prescribing acceptable roles including work roles, submissiveness, passivity, dependency, and inability to act or make decisions. By assuming a dominant position, certain myths are created encompassing overall cultural outlook, philosophy, morality, social theory, science and economics which rationalize and legitimize the unequal relationship. The ‘normal’ is that of the dominant group and is the model for behaviour. It is expected that dominant and subordinant groups will share the same interests.

Pheterson (1990) in a study of internalized oppression and domination identified feelings in both the perpetuator and victim as reactions to oppression or domination. Anger, guilt, confusion, fear, seeking reassurance and approval, and powerlessness were feelings identified by those who acted in domination. Although noting that the political and social consequences of oppression are different from domination, Pheterson noted that the psychological reactions of victims were surprisingly similar to those who were perpetrators and included anger, fear, confusion, powerlessness, guilt and insecurity.

The official reporting of racist incidents was very low with only 19 per cent having reported the incident. There are multiple reasons for the lack of reporting as noted above. There are major institutional barriers to reporting through formal channels including rigorous requirement for evidence which is often difficult to produce. This contributes to the consensus that experiences of racism are rare events in Australia rather than everyday experiences. The construction of what is normal through systems, processes, language and discourses make the identification of racism difficult for those who experience it. Without an appropriate evidence base, it is difficult to generate the political will to combat racism, or to develop context specific interventions.
The tasks ahead in anti-racism in Queensland are complex. The first step is to acknowledge its presence, legitimize it as a social and policy issue and then to build an evidence base for it. As the French philosopher, Michel Foucault, states:

*the real political task in a society is to criticize the working of institutions which appear to be both neutral and independent: to criticize them in such a manner that the political violence which has always exercised itself obscurely through them will be unmasked, so that one can fight them* (cited in Rabinow, 1984: 28).
HOW TO IDENTIFY RACISM FROM INCIDENTS

As we have noted, there are many competing definitions of racism and related concepts including racial harassment, racial vilification, discrimination and social exclusion on racial or religious grounds (Hollinsworth 2006). Agencies charged with the responsibility of identifying, monitoring and countering racism struggle with such definitional and operational criteria. There are layers of meaning and interpretation that shape the experience of allegedly racist incidents and their reporting and management through the available anti-discrimination mechanisms. At each point in these processes there are influences that encourage the identification of incidents as racist and there are powerful factors that deny or challenge that interpretation. This report is inevitably enmeshed in these debates and the Project team accepts that there will be ongoing debates about these questions.

As a federal system race discrimination and racial hatred legislation operates at both State and Commonwealth jurisdictions. Since 1986 the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) have administered Federal anti-discrimination laws, with the Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland (ADCQ) administering state laws (see their websites at http://www.humanrights.gov.au and http://www.adcq.qld.gov.au/index.html). Complainants must choose to use either state or federal law but not both jurisdictions (HREOC, 2005). Increasingly institutions, such as corporations and universities, have their own anti-discrimination policies that operate as specific mechanisms derived from national and state laws.

Australian anti-discrimination legislation is largely drafted within an international framework, underpinned by the International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD) passed by the United Nations in 1965 (O’Neill et al, 2004: 480). The CERD Article 5 details many civil and political rights that are replicated in Australian law. Articles 1.4 and 2.2 permit ‘special measures’ to temporarily advance or protect particular racial or ethnic groups to overcome past injustices (HREOC, 2008: 43). This so-called ‘race power’ makes constitutional specific laws and programs to benefit indigenous Australians enacted after the 1967 referendum and is incorporated in the 1975 Racial Discrimination Act (RDA). Without this power specific programs for indigenous people would be vulnerable to challenge as discriminating against non-indigenous Australians (O’Neill et al, 2004: 478).

The Commonwealth Racial Discrimination Act (1975)
The main aim of anti-discrimination legislation is to promote formal equality before the law, and to make unlawful acts that harm, exclude or deny citizens equal access and enjoyment in economic, political, social and administrative fields on the basis of ‘race’. Judges have taken the view that ‘race’ in anti-discrimination legislation is used in the popular sense regardless of academic arguments that the concept is biologically meaningless (Hollinsworth, 2006).

The basic provisions of the RDA deal with the problem of defining race or racial, by listing many similar concepts of group identity that could motivate discriminatory behaviour. Section 9.1 of the RDA states:
It is unlawful for a person to do any act involving a distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of any human right or fundamental freedom in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life.

This broad definition of the grounds on which direct discrimination is prohibited reproduces serious issues of terminological inexactitude (HREOC, 2005). Of particular concern, given the rise in racism directed at groups on religious grounds, is the failure of the RDA to prohibit discrimination or vilification based on religion (HREOC, 2004).

Definitional complexity is inherent in the debate. All distinct cultural groups would meet the definition of an ethnicity but in common usage ‘ethnic’ means NESB or CALD minority, through an assumption of ‘other’ or foreign. Are Anglo-Australians or UK-born Anglos an ethnic group within the meaning of the act? For example, many people born in England are ‘black’, while some born in India or China are of European descent. Is anti-Semitism religious or racial hatred? The RDA would cover discrimination against people because they are Arab or “of middle eastern appearance” but not because they wear a headscarf or attend a mosque. Courts have found that Jews and Sikhs are an ethnic group, but that Muslims are not (HREOC, 2005).

In certain circumstances, people who do not themselves belong to the racial or ethnic group which is regarded as inferior or other can be protected by anti-discrimination legislation as a ‘relative or associate’ of such a person. Racist violence is often directed at those whose political activism brings them to the attention of racist groups (HREOC, 1991: 181-208). Discrimination, as with racism in general, needs to be considered in context to determine its meanings and consequences, rather than seen as absolute or immutable.

Australians have multiple complex and dynamic identities including how others see them, and when they experience discrimination and/or vilification. Anti-discrimination legislation has evolved around specific ‘grounds’ (race, age, disability, gender, marital status, sexuality and so on) and in specific proscribed areas of activity (O’Neill et al, 2004: 476-515). This particularity of anti-discrimination legislation tends to hide the intersectionality, or interconnected nature, of much discrimination and abusive behaviour.

The idea of “intersectionality” seeks to capture the structural and dynamic consequences of the interaction between two or more forms of discrimination or systems of subordination. It specifically addresses the manner in which racism, patriarchy, economic disadvantage and other discriminatory systems contribute to create layers of inequality that structure the relative positions of women and men, races and other groups. Moreover, it addresses the way that specific acts and policies create burdens that flow between these intersecting axes contributing effectively to create a dynamic of disempowerment (HREOC, 2001: 1).

Such intersectionality means that comprehensive strategies are essential to address the complex, often mutually reinforcing, nature of discrimination. Specific legislation and interventions around a single axis of discrimination can fail to engage with the
lived experiences of most people. It can also be very difficult, for example, to establish whether an act of violence or discrimination was based on ‘race’ related categories or on sexuality or on some individual behaviour or appearance or frequently a combination of all these factors.

A further complicating issue is the intent or motivation of the alleged perpetrator. As noted above, the RDA refers to “any act … which has the purpose or effect of nullifying …” (emphasis added). Despite this dual approach, the issue of intent remains contentious and often critical to the outcome of a complaint. Persons accused of racial discrimination usually deny either that any unfair or prohibited act occurred or was intended or that it was not based on racial grounds. It can be next to impossible to definitively establish why an individual was passed over for promotion or not selected for a position. As familiarity with anti-discrimination legislation increases, the likelihood of overt and documentable incidents declines (Gaze, 2005).

The RDA covers both direct and indirect discrimination where indirect discrimination refers to situations when people are apparently treated equally but the requirements or criteria exclude or penalize one group more than others (HREOC, 2008: 31-38; HREOC, 2005: 11-21). Some acts are not covered by the RDA and therefore cannot be dealt with by the HREOC. Indirect discrimination is very important given that today much racial inequality and discrimination occurs when institutions formally treat people the same but in fact, the requirements are such that particular groups and individuals are unable to meet their criteria. For example, workplaces that prohibit taking of breaks are impossible for Muslims expected to pray five times per day. In contrast to the Sex Discrimination and Disability Discrimination Acts, little use has been made of the indirect discrimination powers of the RDA to prevent structural discrimination, given legalistic difficulties and an over-emphasis on individual complaints (HREOC, 2005). This systemic racism is, by its nature, more difficult to identify except in its unequal outcomes and is often denied by those who regard entrenched practices as ‘fair’ and objective (O’Neill et al, 2004: 523-540). This greater difficulty in identifying and establishing indirect discrimination was reflected in the reporting of incidents captured by the Confronting Racism in Communities Project (Moriarty et al, 2006: 36).

The challenges in establishing facts and circumstances are typically significant when alleged incidents of racism are not witnessed or independently documented. For a graphic example of the great difficulty in unpacking conflicting accounts of such events even when there are many witnesses, see Margaret Simons’ article “A Cry in The Night” (2008). Given the enormous challenges of proving “beyond reasonable doubt” the facts in alleged racial discrimination and violence, agencies such as HREOC and the ADCQ increasingly use conciliation rather than formal judicial processes (On the Briginshaw principle of the standard of proof required, see Gaze, 2005; HREOC, 2005: 253-257).

In 2006-07, HREOC received 250 complaints under the Racial Discrimination Act. The majority of these complaints related to employment (42%), the provision of goods and services (26%) and racial hatred (15%). The Complaint Handling Service finalized 269 complaints under the RDA, with 70% terminated or administratively closed, 15% withdrawn, and 21% conciliated (HREOC, 2006-7, chapter 4). Conciliation consists of a confidential process where the victim and the perpetrator
met together with a mediator to discuss the complaint. Currently conciliation generally is sought on the basis of “no admission of liability” by the respondent.

This negotiated approach allows for recognition of differing interpretations and sidesteps the complex issues of the onus of proof (Gaze, 2005). Often the perpetrator denies intent but apologizes and undertakes to stop future discrimination. Sometimes the victim is compensated or reinstated to their job. Occasionally parties agree to change practices or to introduce training programs or grievance procedures to prevent further occurrences (O’Neill et al, 2004: 558-562).

**How the Confronting Racism in Communities project addressed these issues**

The project was initiated as a response to the contradiction that despite an apparent dramatic increase in racist incidents including physical and verbal abuse following the September 11 and Bali bombings and the second war in Iraq, actual complaints received by HREOC and ADCQ had not substantially increased (Browning and Jakubowicz, 2003; HREOC, 2004; Poynting, 2002; Poynting and Mason 2006 and 2007).

After considerable research and debate the Project team adopted the following working definition of racism:

*Racism is a form of discrimination that occurs when a person or a group of people are treated less favourably because of their skin colour or perceived membership of a particular ethnic, cultural or religious group.*

In the 1991 National Inquiry into Racist Violence in Australia, HREOC defined racist violence as “a specific act of violence, intimidation or harassment carried out against an individual, group or organization (or their property) on the basis of race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin; and/or support for non-racist policies” (HREOC, 1991: 14).

The *Queensland Police Service Crime Recording Information System for Police (CRSIP) Aide Memoir – 04/06* defined a racist incident as:

*A event that is caused wholly or partly by the direct or indirect expression of an individual’s or a group’s prejudiced beliefs and/or their participation in discriminatory activities towards others because of their race.*

These definitions face the same challenges identified above in relation to causation, intent and the burden of proof.

A significant departure in defining a racist incident emerged during the *Macpherson Inquiry into the Death of Stephen Lawrence* (1999). In order to more accurately reflect the experiences of vulnerable groups to racism, Macpherson defined a racist incident as “any incident which is perceived to be racist by the victim or any other person” (1999: Chapter 4, para 1). The definition removes the authority to define an incidence of violence as racist from the traditional state agents (police, judges and magistrates) in favour of the victim’s perspective. This definition has been subsequently adopted by the criminal justice systems of England, Wales and Scotland (EMCRX, 2005; PAIH, 2008).

This re-definition has resulted in significant increases in the recording of racist incidents in the UK compared to the rest of the European Union (Goodey, 2007). While there have been some objections to the adoption of a victim-centred approach, it is consistent with a wide-spread focus on victim involvement in the justice system.
especially in relation to sentencing and restorative justice (Clark, 2003; Goodey, 2005; Walklate, 2007). International initiatives such as the UK Victim’s Charter have been followed by Victim’s Charters in most Australian states (CJS, 1996). Some jurisdictions have recognized that victims of crime (including racial harassment and violence) from CALD communities face particular barriers in accessing victim’s services and the criminal justice system (Ozdemir and Dew 2007: 7).

The Race Relations Act 1976 (UK) was recently amended in s54A(2) to provide that “once facts are proved from which, in the absence of explanation, it could be inferred that racial discrimination occurred, the onus is on the respondent to prove that race was not the ground” (Gaze 2005: 15; original emphasis). While no such onus or standard of proof exists in relation to the RDA, an example from Australian anti-discrimination practice might be where a shopkeeper served several other customers who arrived after an Indigenous complainant. Yet in the vast majority of cases the less favourable treatment is much harder to demonstrate and it remains unclear how a complainant can ‘prove’ the connection with ‘race’ without an admission by the respondent (for the EU parallel, see Goodey 2007: 575).

While the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EMCRX) endorses Macpherson’s victim-centred definition, key questions remain, for instance:

• Is the onus on the victim to prove racial motivation?
• Is the onus on the offender to disprove racial motivation when a victim or a third party alleges it?
• Can the police, or other criminal justice agencies responsible for the investigation of crime, decide themselves whether a crime is ‘racially motivated’? If so, are they issued with instructions about how to determine whether crime is racially motivated?

These questions and others are, at present, variously responded to or neglected in different Member States. As such there is no homogeneous legal definition of ‘racist violence’, ‘racist crime’ or ‘racism’ in Europe, nor are there common working practices about how a crime can be determined to be ‘racist’ (EMCRX 2005: 39).

In seeking to more adequately measure and respond to racist violence across the European Union, the EMCRX argues that racist violence should be understood as both part of a continuum of racisms, and as repeat victimisation:

Racist violence is not experienced in isolation to other racist incidents. Like women’s experiences of harassment and sexual assault, racist victimisation is best understood as part of a ‘lived reality’ that encompasses anything from name-calling through to violent assault.

Most victims of racist violence experience it in the context of broader racist discrimination – from housing to employment. Racist victimisation and violence need to be contextualised against these other discriminatory experiences that, together, amount to a personal history of racist discrimination and victimisation. In turn, the individual’s impressions of racist discrimination/racist violence are influenced by the experiences of others. In sum: Lifelong and varied experiences of racist violence/victimisation/discrimination can be described and understood as part of a ‘continuum’ of racisms. ….

In contrast to the reality that much of racist violence is on-going repeat victimisation, the criminal law is only able to approach racist violence as single incidents. The criminal justice system is set up to respond to individual acts that break the law. Because of this, victims’ on-going experiences of victimisation cannot be accommodated within the framework of criminal law (EMCRX 2005: 62-63).
These insights provide significant assistance in interpreting the reports of racist incidents obtained by the Confronting Racism in Communities’ Data Collection Points. The majority (77%) of incidents are reported singly (Moriarty et al 2006: 33) yet their meanings for the victim and victims’ reactions are heavily influenced by their previous experiences (including of family and friends). This background not only includes previous incidents of abuse or threat but also includes what action (if any) they took and the responses they received.

For example, did they complain? Who to? Were they listened to? Were they believed? Were they asked to provide evidence to a standard they thought was unreasonable? Was the incident, to their mind, trivialized? Was naming the incident as ‘racist’ rejected, or were other ‘innocent’ explanations suggested?

These and other factors, often unknown to those responsible for handling complaints, have profound impacts on the responses of victims especially in relation to whether a formal complaint is made. Of the 145 incidents reported in the first collection period, only 33 (23%) were reported to authorities. This background can also affect how the complainant reacts during and after reporting the incident. Of those 33 who complained, only 21% were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with reporting outcomes, while 51% were ‘unsatisfied’ or ‘very unsatisfied’ (Moriarty et al 2006: 67). Among reasons given for this dissatisfaction were apparent failure to act on the complaint, failure to reprimand the perpetrator apparently because the behaviour was regarded as acceptable, and not having their experiences validated (Moriarty et al, 2006: 70-71). These reports also showed how in some cases the agency reported to could not have obtained the hoped-for outcome, for example, an apology from an unidentified assailant (Moriarty et al 2006: 71).

The concept of a continuum reminds us that that there are various grades of abuse or harm, some of which constitute a criminal offence, some of which are covered by civil proceedings, and some of which are beyond the current law. Clearly in criminal matters the burden of proof is usually higher, but if the purpose of a reporting practice is to assess the extent of the problem then a much broader approach is justified (Imtoual 2006; Goodey 2007). A related problem concerns the exclusion of discrimination or attacks based on religion where, for example, Sikhs or Muslims are racialised on the basis of their faith (Dunn et al 2007). For this reason it is usually preferable to refer to racist incidents rather racial crimes or hate crimes (EMCRX 2005; Goodey 2007).

The core of this dilemma of identifying and validating racist incidents relates to the primary purpose intended. Government and other anti-discrimination agencies may aim to provide an accessible, affordable and deliberative complaints process that can establish proof to an exacting legal standard. Local government may want to monitor the number of incidents and where they occur but not require formal certification as this information is for planning purposes. Service providers and employers may wish to resolve conflict between workers and between workers and clients to ensure productivity and service standards. A community worker may wish to encourage community engagement and to provide counseling for harm and distress. An academic may wish to know the extent of racial incidents and their complex forms and responses without wishing to respond to victims and provide any assistance or redress.
In each case there will be differing definitions of racism and racist incidents. There will be differing reporting and complaints processes with different onus and standard of proof. In some situations it is probably unethical, or at least unhelpful, to ask for information if you won’t be able to provide appropriate support. The Confronting Racism in Communities’ Project Officer was impressed by several informants saying that, while they did not wish to make a formal complaint, they greatly appreciated being able to tell their story in a non-adversarial context (pers. comm. June 2007). In some cases the incident being recorded occurred years before (Moriarty et al 2006: 34). Significantly community workers acting as Data Collection Points noted that in some cases they were providing counseling and strategic advice while receiving the incident report. Officers of the ADCQ however, are prohibited from providing counseling or advice (see the website). In this context, the aim of the Confronting Racism in Communities Project required a broad definition of racism and racist incidents and an accessible and non-judgmental recording process.
EXISTING GOVERNMENTAL RESPONSES TO RACISM

As part of promoting a multicultural society, different levels of government in Australia undertake a range of policy and program initiatives to promote a socially cohesive society. Some of the programs relate to promotion of the benefits of multiculturalism while others aim to eliminate negative attitudes and racism. Government agencies have promoted positive images of cultural diversity as a way to engage the broader society and a strategy for education and awareness. Festivals, community multicultural events and other forms of cultural knowledge development have been valued as one key strategy of promoting a society that is more accepting (Bonnet 2000). As evaluation of anti-racism measures is a difficult task the effectiveness of different approaches is much debated. For example, Vertovec (1996:50) points out that most multicultural programs in government have tended to avoid anti-racism, focusing instead on celebrations and festivals. Some have criticized this as not paying attention to substantive issues which go to the heart of critical multiculturalism (Vertovec 1996, Ho & Dreher 2006).

The list below provides a snapshot of existing responses by Government in Queensland. It does not purport to be a comprehensive summary of all responses but aims to provide a brief overview of the key initiatives relevant to Queensland.

The Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland (ADCQ) is an independent statutory authority which administers the Queensland Anti-Discrimination Act 1991. It works to promote equality of opportunity and to protect people from unlawful discrimination, sexual harassment and public vilification. The Act in Queensland covers racial and religious vilification in addition to discrimination.

The following presents the complaints lodged with the ADQC in 2006-07 and 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ground Number</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impairment</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimisation</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family responsibilities</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary info</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial vilification</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union activity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious belief or activity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship status</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality vilification</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental status</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging contravention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawful sexual activity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breastfeeding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity vilification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political belief or activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious vilification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminatory advertising</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: ADCQ Accepted complaints (by ground)

As can be seen from the above table race or religious based discrimination complaints make up approximately 9 per cent of total complaints. Since 2005-06 the complaints on the basis of race has declined from approximately 12 per cent to 9 per cent.

The ADCQ provides information in community languages about the Act and complaints procedures. The Commission provides a range of information and training programs across Queensland about discrimination and making complaints under the Act.

**The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC)** is the organisation charged with the administration of federal anti-discrimination laws including the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975 (RDA)*. The Commission’s goal is to foster greater understanding and protection of human rights in Australia and to address the human rights concerns of a broad range of individuals and groups. It undertakes a range of activities including:

- education and public awareness
- discrimination and human rights complaints
- human rights compliance
- policy and legislative development.

HREOC provides information on the complaints processes in 14 community languages. HREOC received 1779 complaints nationally in 2006-07 across all grounds of discrimination. They received 1725 enquiries based on ‘Race’ and 587 based on ‘Racial Hatred’. Additionally they received 102 enquiries relating to categories of ‘Immigration – detention centres’ and 207 relating to ‘Immigration – visas’. The total complaints lodged under the *Racial Discrimination Act* was 250, indicating that 9.5 per cent of enquiries were lodged as actual complaints with HREOC. Furthermore, 60 per cent of complainants under the RDA were born overseas. HREOC point out that in 2006-07 complaints regarding employment constituted: 42 percent of complaints under the *Racial Discrimination Act*; 81 percent of complaints under the *Sex Discrimination Act*; 46 percent of complaints under the *Disability Discrimination Act*; and 68 percent of complaints under the *Age Discrimination Act* (HREOC Annual Report 2007, http://www.hreoc.gov.au/about/publications/annual_reports/2006_2007/word/4.doc)

**Multicultural Affairs Queensland (MAQ)** is a Queensland Government agency that implementing the Queensland Multicultural Policy: The *Queensland Government Multicultural Policy – making a world of difference* recognises the need for enhanced understanding of cultural diversity and community harmony, commits to building a cohesive society that accepts and respects cultural diversity, and also commits to developing a whole-of-government strategy that enhances individual Queenslanders to overcome social exclusion; establish a greater sense of belonging; and attain greater awareness of the value of cultural diversity. MAQ funds numerous projects within the community to promote cultural diversity, strong community relations and anti-racism.

**Multicultural Highlights** showcased the achievements arising from the Queensland Government’s annual Multicultural Action Plans by its departments. In the 2006-07
Report, the Parliamentary Secretary states that “Most departments have taken further steps to ensure that, in undertaking their core business, they also take into account and respond appropriately to Queensland’s increasingly rich cultural and linguistic diversity”. The report lists a number of initiatives of the Queensland Government agencies, far too many to list here. The initiatives are categorized under four headings as linked to the Queensland Multicultural Policy:

- Community relations and anti-racism strategy – strengthening the sense of belonging Queenslanders have in their local environment and in the global community
- Supporting communities strategy – funding and investing in Queensland’s communities to further multiculturalism through research, policy development, advocacy, community awareness, festivals, services, projects and networks
- Strengthening multiculturalism in the Queensland public sector – changing how activities of Queensland Government agencies are planned and delivered to ensure that all Queenslanders have access to services
- Productive diversity economic strategy – strengthening our Smart State standing as a place that values and wishes to attract intellectual capital, overseas investment and secure further gains through harnessing cultural diversity in key areas such as trade, skilled migration, educational industry onshore, tourism and science/technology regardless of cultural and linguistic background,


The Queensland Community Relations Plan was endorsed in September 1999. The Plan is a coordinated government strategy that promotes and fosters a positive community relations environment in Queensland. Specifically targeted anti-racism strategies were developed as part of the Community Relations Plan to limit the impact of expressions of racism in the community.

- Queensland Roars Against Racism

The Queensland Roars Against Racism campaign is a partnership between Multicultural Affairs Queensland and the Queensland Roar Football Club, our State representative in the National Hyundai A-League football competition, designed to deliver an anti-racism campaign using a variety of special events to promote community harmony. Through this partnership, the campaign sends positive messages in support of harmony and social cohesion and makes it clear that there is no room for racism in Queensland. More broadly, the campaign aims for all Queenslanders to recognise themselves as part of a rich and diverse community (research shows that increasing the level of interaction among people from different cultural backgrounds increases mutual understanding and reduces prejudice).

- Supporting Cultural Competence

MAQ has developed and is implementing the Smart State Cultural Competence Strategy, to support cultural competence with a focus on Queensland state and local government agencies. The overall aim is to ensure that state and local government agencies are confident and skilled in meeting the challenges of servicing an increasing cultural and linguistically diverse community.
Addressing particular needs of minority communities

The Queensland Government’s multicultural policy works across the whole community in Queensland. However, in some cases it is necessary that particular needs and support mechanisms are addressed through a targeted response. Cabinet also endorsed three priority areas to be addressed within existing resources through relevant Multicultural Action Plans from 2008-09. The areas are:

- refugee issues, particularly among African refugees;
- Pacific Islander communities’ issues; and
- responsiveness and accessibility of services delivered by Queensland Government-funded non-government organisations

There are four communities, or groups of communities, for whom specific initiatives have been developed to address their particular needs:

- The Australian South Sea Islander community which comprises the descendants of indentured labourers brought to Queensland to work in agricultural industries in the 19th century and who have suffered exclusion and deprivation.
- The Muslim communities whose experience of discrimination and racism has been heightened over recent years since the terrorist attacks and other international events.
- The Pacific Islander communities who, with some exceptions, receive no settlement support from the Australian Government and face particular issues and challenges. Queensland has the largest Pacific Islander community in the country and the communities are growing rapidly.
- The refugee African communities who have experienced severe disadvantage in their home countries and refugee camps and are facing settlement challenges of the highest order. The growth in African communities in Queensland, as with the rest of Australia, has been dramatic. Queensland also has the largest African population outside a capital city in Toowoomba.

Local Area Multicultural Partnership Program (LAMP) program was first established in 1998. It is a partnership between the State Government of Queensland, 14 Councils (since amalgamation in April 2008) and the Local Government Association of Queensland. LAMP aims to

- Broaden the inclusion of diverse cultural and linguistic groups in community building strategies;
- Increase the levels of understanding and appreciation of cultural diversity in local government and community life; and
- Facilitate more fully integrated approaches to the ongoing management of community relations
Participating Councils currently include Brisbane, Logan, Gold Coast, Ipswich, Toowoomba, Caboolture, Sunshine Coast, Fraser Coast, Gladstone, Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville, Cassowary Coast and Cairns. LAMP workers and Councils undertake a wide range of activities, some of which directly target building better community relations and anti-racism. For further details of LAMP program activities, see:

http://www.lgaq.asn.au/portal/lgaq/general/community/CulturalDiversity/what_is_lamp.html

**Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC):** is a Federal Government agency with statutory responsibility for Immigration and Citizenship and in Policy and Program responsibility for immigrant settlement and multiculturalism. They state that “The purpose of the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC) is to ‘enrich Australia through the well managed entry and settlement of people’ (www.immi.gov.au). The policy framework which governs multiculturalism is the *New Agenda for a Multicultural Australia*. The key principles noted in this policy are “civic duty, cultural respect, social equity and productive diversity” (Commonwealth of Australia 1999: 6). These principles are based on a social justice perspective and highlight a number of rights and obligations. This policy is being reviewed at the time of writing this report due to change of Government. DIAC funds a large number of settlement services including community workers, refugee support services and migrant resource centres.

The main program which targets community relations is the ‘Living in Harmony’ (LIH) which is an annual funding program. The *Living in Harmony* program seeks to promote social cohesion and address issues of racial, religious and cultural intolerance. In 2007, 41 projects were awarded from almost 400 applications, totalling some $1.5 million. Six projects were funded in Queensland:

- Dalby Town Council, *Welcoming Community Project*
- Multicultural Community Centre Ltd, *Harmony Through School Cultural Exchange*
- Refugee & Immigration Legal Service Inc, *Promoting Peace in Refugee Families*
- Spiral Community Hub Ltd, *Growing Together in Inner South Brisbane*
- Sunnybank State Primary School, *Building Strength With Diversity - The Values We Share*
- Woodridge North State School, *Wonders of Woodridge Multicultural Magazine*

The *Living in Harmony* program has been criticised for moving away from its original aim of tackling racism to promoting harmony and tolerance. Ho and Dreher (2006:3) note that: “By 2003, the concept of ‘harmony’ had moved to the foreground, and ‘racism’ to the background”. Ho & Dreher argue that this approach moves towards a more liberal pluralist model, with its assumption that racism is a product of individual prejudice and misunderstanding that can be addressed through dialogue. In so doing, they point out that the politics of ‘harmony’, with its deliberate sidelong of the concept of racism, individualises social relations and prevents us from looking at structural issues of power, for example, how racism is institutionalised within society.
DIAC holds Harmony Day events across the nation on 21 March as a way to create awareness and appreciation of cultural diversity. Currently re-badged as Community Relations Funding the objectives of the program are:

- The importance of all Australians respecting one another regardless of cultural, racial or religious difference the fair treatment of all Australians,
- Encouraging people to recognise that our interactions should be accepting of and responsive to people’s backgrounds, circumstances, needs and preferences,
- Opportunities for people to participate in Australian society and to understand the rights and responsibilities that we share as part of that society,
- A sense of belonging for everyone by helping communities work towards a peaceful, progressive and prosperous future, and
- Understanding and acceptance by the broader community of Australia’s changing demographics.
GAPS IN STRATEGIES

Anti-discrimination legislation in Australia needs review and amendment. The RDA needs to be amended to include discrimination and vilification on grounds of religion (HREOC 2004). The RDA allows a person or trade union representing the affected person to make a complaint to HREOC but only the affected person has standing to bring an action before the court. An amendment to allow third party litigation would strengthen the capacity of community groups to support their members and would raise awareness throughout society. More resources and political support is needed to allow HREOC and the ADCQ to mount test cases especially in relation to systemic racism. Consideration should be given to making racial motivation a specific criminal offence and/or an aggravating factor when sentencing existing offences. There is also an argument to reduce the burden of proof in discrimination cases (HREOC 2008: 79-96).

The International Comparison of the RDA Background Paper outlined examples where nation states accepted a duty to positively promote racial tolerance and equality, rather than just prohibit discrimination and racial vilification (HREOC 2008: 67-78). As noted in the section How to Identify Racisms from Incidents above, a major driver was the report by Macpherson in response to the failed police investigation of the racially motivated murder of Stephen Lawrence. This led to the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 (UK) that extended the reach of anti-discrimination prohibitions but also imposed on public authorities a positive duty to “eliminate unlawful racial discrimination” and “to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different racial groups” when carrying out their public functions (HREOC 2008: 67).

This requirement is the major driver for current policy and practice in the UK and has established the requirement for Racial Equality (often now termed Community Cohesion) Plans and enforcement mechanisms (Tamkin 2002; NACAB & CRE 2002). As noted elsewhere in this report, vigilance is required to ensure that the original intention of policies and strategies are sustained especially in times of political crisis. By 2008 the emphasis within Community Cohesion planning in Britain was on monitoring tension to avoid civil unrest and to counter terrorism (DCLG 2008). A similar slide into jingoism and racial profiling in the name of counter-terrorism has been documented in the final years of the Howard government (Hocking 2007).

As noted above the Queensland and Australian governments fund a variety of programs to celebrate diversity and promote community harmony. These programs support a range of festivals, welcoming and citizenship ceremonies, arts and cultural events and informational services. Such events showcase the contribution of CALD communities and encourage civic participation and social cohesion (Markus 2008). The 2008 Local Government Association Queensland report, “What Makes a Welcome?” notes the value of such local activities in supporting skilled migration to rural and regional areas. In some local government areas, workers in the LAMP program undertake a wide range of activities, some of which include anti-racism and community cohesion.
There is a need for programs to supplement these “building harmony” initiatives, for example, in providing training to engage more effectively with the media and the political process. Projects that are explicitly anti-racist are often not supported and seen as overly political or confrontational (Ho & Dreher 2006; Arber 2008; 82-87). Such reticence is unhelpful and effectively minimizes the extent of entrenched racism and discrimination. The aforementioned “positive duty” notion could assist government agencies in exercising the necessary courage to extend anti-racism efforts. These can work in partnership with community campaigns such as “Close the Gap” (a campaign, by over 40 Indigenous and non-Indigenous organisations, that calls on governments to commit to closing the 17 year life expectancy gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians within a generation).

It should be better understood that official calls for ‘ordinary Australians’ to be more tolerant often reinforce taken-for-granted assumptions about who is able to tolerate, and who is to be magnanimously tolerated despite their ‘difference’ (Hage 2002 & 1998). Campaigns for tolerance and harmony can function to reassure most of ‘us’ about ‘our’ fundamental fairness while leaving open a range of possible grounds on which to withhold that tolerance including allegations of unacceptable values and customs, lack of patriotic fervour, and divided loyalties (Due 2007). The language, assumptions and approaches that reflect a belief in minority rights, cultural pluralism and equity underpin a radically different set of strategies and programs than those relying on notions of (conditional) tolerance, assimilation and core values (Forrest & Dunn 2006a; Schech & Haggis 2001). Efforts to combat racism must name and engage with issues of power and unacknowledged privilege to begin to seriously dismantle long-held racial beliefs and assumptions and the structures and processes that maintain and enact them. In the next section we examine Australian and international literature to identify good practice and the many challenges facing those planning and implementing effective anti-racism strategies and programs.
The work of anti-racism remains poorly developed and prone to unfulfilled hopes and imprecise theorizing (Babacan 2007; Anthias and Lloyd 2002; Bravani 2001; Bonnett 2000). Much of this imprecision derives from inadequate understandings of the fluid and complex nature of racisms, especially in more structural or systemic forms. As Michael Keith argues:

*An understanding of contemporary racism depends on the development of an interpretive framework that is sensitive to the ‘historicity’ and ‘spatiality’ of racial conflict. Anti-racist practice needs to confront simultaneously the representational practices which normalize bigoted understandings of cultures as well as the institutional forms and economic forces which draw on and amplify processes of criminalization and racialised deprivation (1995: 551).*

A further complication is the different discourses and slogans that are used to represent the ‘problem’ and the ‘solution’. In past decades a key debate concerned multiculturalism versus anti-racism, especially in education (Ladson-Billings and Gillborn 2004; May 1999; Sleeter and McLaren 1995; Cohen 1992). A related debate involved criticisms of cultural awareness training and racism awareness training (Hollinsworth 1992a). Many well-intended programs to combat racial prejudice homogenize very different experiences and identities within rigid and overly deterministic cultural categories that disguise the plasticity of these categories and the social and political processes by which they are constructed, challenged, expanded and resisted.

One important critique is of culturalism or an abstract and essentialised notion of: ‘culture’ that implies a consensus often about unspecified or loosely identified attributes which deny the structural influences of class and gender. It presumes a totalized view of cultural groups representing a universal system of meaning devoid, for example, of political factions. It romanticizes and reifies the past. It locates social inequality within the domain of ‘culture clash’ and social conflict. It ignores the complexity of intersections between the dominant and subordinate groups except as examples of domination and oppression, giving rise to simplistic views of racism as prejudice and discrimination. It thus denies the possibility of past and future intersection, or commonalities, with other groups’ experience of oppression (Rizvi and Crowley 1993: 161).

These weaknesses cause specific problems when applied to educational programs or community strategies, including reinforcing stereotypic understandings of CALD groups as “other”, and exaggerating difference while ignoring commonalities. Culturalist approaches ignore diversity within CALD groups and important issues about who can and should represent those groups (Yasmeen 2007; Meekosha and Pettman 1991). They also reproduce prevailing structures of representation in that non-Anglo groups are seen as “having” culture while the dominant group is seen as “just Australians”, the core against which all others are measured (Zevallos 2005). Yet such static and naive notions are immensely attractive to many, including governments wanting to appear inclusive as well as those wishing to consume exotic otherness as a mark of their sophistication or non-racism (Hage 1998).

These challenges of thinking through and acting effectively to counter racisms are significant although there are many useful programs and initiatives in Australia and overseas. More concentrated effort is required to both identify and address racism in all its myriad forms and to document and analyse those programs. The following
Most anti-racism approaches target the majority population as those people in need of re-education and behaviour change. This ignores the considerable issues between those different community groups who would be seen as socially excluded or marginalized on the basis of their ‘race’ or ethnicity (Meekosha 1994). This weakness in part follows from the previously noted failure to recognize different interests and schisms within CALD communities, and also a reluctance to criticize those seen as oppressed. As a consequence of this, efforts to enhance resilience and equip those subjected to racism and exclusion to more effectively respond have been relatively unexplored.

Paradies refers to “Arm(or)ing Against Racism” and identifies some effective strategies that reinforce a strong racial identity, a worldview resonant with one’s racial/cultural group, and the solidarity that comes from being securely within a strong community (2005: 6). He notes that for many subjected to chronic racial oppression, racism can be poorly understood and its messages of inferiority can become internalized. Providing appropriate tools to identify and understand racism and on how to respond can be very effective for those targeted by racism.

Implementing these strategies can be difficult and it should be noted that some forms of highly racialized identities can be dangerously combative or can encourage disengagement rather than more effective self-determination. These approaches also often ignore the mutability and hybridity of contemporary Australian identities where there are high levels of intermarriage and frequent interaction between people of different ethnicities (Khoo 2004; Noble et al 1999). A key component of an effective identity might be the capacity to switch fluidly between cultural domains and codes and to resist being forced into any essentialised identity (Hollinsworth 1992b).

Efforts to enhance minority community resilience, sometimes called community capacity building, can offer great potential to support those who experience racism. Many of these community projects (and some key research) have used art, especially storytelling in text, theatre, video and film making, and music to good effect (Dreher 2006). A critical factor is the provision of a ‘safe space’ where people’s experiences are validated and their capacity to survive, deflect and appropriate those experiences is celebrated. One of the most debilitating impacts of racist incidents is their denial or trivialization by those in authority and others in the community. As noted the listening by the Confronting Racism in Community Data Collection Points to those who reported racist incidents was found to be very positive even when no other assistance was offered.

Working with the Assyrian Australian community in western Sydney, Greg Gow has defined community capacity building as:

… about enabling people to develop their individual and collective potential as contributing members of society. The verb ‘building’ highlights that it is a process which involves training, resourcing and supporting people. The aim is to develop the skills and capabilities of community members so they are better able to identify, and help meet, their needs. Ideally, service providers play the roles of facilitators and catalysts, who support community-driven efforts to build capacity. In this way community capacity building is about multi-layered and integrated partnerships (cited in Dreher 2006: 21).
Stories that record events, their impacts, and ways to deal with them, not only build community capacity, they can provide valuable material for educating organizations such as police or local government.

Most anti-racism initiatives involve reducing prejudice and racist behaviours. Duckitt (2001) identifies four levels of intervention in countering prejudice and racism:

- Cognitive
- Individual
- Interpersonal, and
- Societal.

We would add a further level between interpersonal and societal that could be termed institutional or organizational.

This model has been widely used, especially within psychology based paradigms, for example, Paradies (2005) and Pedersen et al (2005). Research findings on the cognitive level are plagued with methodological issues (Augustinos et al 2006; Duckitt 2001) and will not be covered in this report. This aligns with our view that changing attitudes (and rigorously establishing those changes and their causes) is extremely difficult. Pedersen et al found that:

> attitudes have only a tenuous relationship with behaviours, and attempts to change behaviours by inducing prior changes in attitudes are ineffective and inefficient. Thus, it may be more useful to focus on changing of racist behaviours directly (2005: 28).

It appears more effective to focus on modifying behaviour, given that behavioural changes have been shown to in turn affect attitudes and beliefs (Abell et al 1997: 15-18).

At the individual level various approaches have been used to counter established prejudices of majority or mainstream participants in regard to minority groups. These efforts can be characterised under three main strategies:

- Addressing false beliefs by providing specific information about racial or cultural issues
- Creating dissonance about holding inconsistent values, for example, espousing egalitarian values such as fairness and equal opportunity while being hostile and disparaging towards certain groups, and
- Invoking empathy for groups previously regarded as ‘other’ or outside of the community (Pedersen et al 2005b).

One of the most common approaches is to provide ‘accurate’ information about different cultures or groups in order to counter or correct prejudices. This strategy derives from Allport’s original description of prejudice as antipathy based on false or inaccurate beliefs (Adams 2008; Dovidio et al 2005). Excellent examples of such educational resources include HREOC’s *Face the Facts*


However, the presentation of correct information does not simply “drive out” the bad (Cohen 1992). Prejudicial and negative beliefs and attitudes are deeply entrenched and “scaffolded” with other beliefs that shape and define our identities. They provide strong affective and emotional reactions as well as cognitive resources and structures. People are loath to replace or substitute these beliefs that accumulate, often unconsciously, from birth (Dovidio et al 2000). Obviously the resilience of ‘false
beliefs’ doesn’t negate the need for sound educational programs but they must recognize the social, political and emotional interests and investments involved. This point will be further examined in relation to interpersonal programs of anti-racist education below.

Efforts to produce dissonance and guilt, or to encourage empathy have been used to combat prejudice. For example, the issue of Aboriginal child removals (the “stolen generations”) has been fiercely debated but support for the 2008 national apology by PM Rudd was won by appeals for non-Indigenous Australians to “imagine if this had been done to us” (Hollinsworth in press). While lack of empathy and collective guilt have been identified as key factors in the production and maintenance of negative attitudes, it remains unclear how effective efforts to influence individual prejudices can be, and under what circumstances (Halloran 2007; Pedersen et al 2004). Part of the difficulty in assessing this research lies in the popular distinction between ‘old’ and ‘new’ racism. For much of the twentieth century, racism was expressed and justified in terms of biological hierarchies and pseudo-scientific social Darwinism (Hollinsworth 2006: 32-38 & 79-84). In recent decades such crude notions of non-white inferiority and biological incapacity have become largely unacceptable. To some extent, they have been supplanted by explanations based on inherent cultural differences and more subtle codes expressed in terms of values, or an Australian way of life (Due 2007; Dunn 2003).

Such modern ideologies have proved more resilient and capable of deflecting or denying their racist nature. Indeed, there is strong support for a shared sense of being disadvantaged or disparaged among many who would normally be identified as members of the dominant group (Brett 1997). A significant number of complaints to anti-discrimination agencies are now coming from such sources. Twinned with this sense of loss and resentment are notions that minority groups, especially Indigenous Australians, receive “special treatment” and unwarranted government assistance (Pedersen et al 2006; Mickler 1998). While it is crucial that such assertions are examined and where appropriate rebutted as the myths they are, an important consequence of such strong beliefs is to blunt normal educational programs and to deflect efforts to invoke empathy and exploit guilt (Pedersen et al 2004). There is ample evidence that education is correlated with lower measures of prejudice but this finding is complicated by concerns as to what extent underlying beliefs remain but are constrained by an awareness of socially acceptable sentiments (Paradies 2005).

The most productive level according to prevailing research appears to be the interpersonal. Strategies can be grouped under those that attempt to change socially endorsed beliefs and those that attempt to create positive inter-group interaction. Efforts to change social influence include:

- Mass persuasion campaigns
- Promoting positive media representations, and
- Anti-racist education (Paradies 2005).

Mass persuasion campaigns have been found to be largely ineffective presumably because of the complex interconnectedness of the explanatory and affective systems involved. They can even increase hostility, especially amongst highly racist individuals (Duckitt 2001). This makes sense if people believe that governments and other powerful agencies favour minority interests, then arguments that they need
special support or that aggression towards them is wrong will simply reinforce the conspiracy theories on which such beliefs are based. It is crucial to take seriously such resentments while systematically demolishing them. This point will be revisited in the concluding section on societal interventions.

More effective are community-based campaigns such as those run by Australians for Native Title and Reconciliation (ANTaR), Reconciliation Australia and A Just Australia. All three organizations have excellent websites and can mobilize mass lobbying campaigns around key issues while providing quality information about Indigenous affairs, reconciliation and refugees respectively. Probably the most spectacular Internet community campaigns are run by GetUp, which has more than 280,000 members. GetUp played a key role in recent climate change, refugee and other campaigns, and in winning support for the Apology. Other key community resources are email lists that distribute media monitoring services in indigenous, refugee, inter-faith and related issues. While it is unclear how much these organizations change, or merely reinforce, attitudes, they do provide very easy and well supported opportunities for participation and agenda setting.

Less pedantic and pedagogic efforts can be very powerful. Films, music videos, soap operas and comedy programs have been found to very effective in disrupting and for some, transforming, attitudes towards out-groups. Recent anti-racist programs such as Oxfam’s Close the Gap (http://www.closethegap.org.au) and ANTaR’s Racism Makes Me Sick campaign (http://www.antar.org.au/racism) have made effective use of celebrities such as Cathy Freeman and Ian Thorpe and empathetic imagery, but we continue to confront the problem of confirming existing beliefs rather than changing them. Such campaigns highlight the role of the media in both promoting racist representations and potentially in anti-racism (Jakubowicz 2007; Manning 2004; ADB 2003). This area is extremely complex and requires further research (but see the work of Gail Phillips in the Reporting Diversity Project, available at: http://reportingdiversity.murdoch.edu.au/media.html). This extremely powerful impact of the media operates in particular for the many Australians for whom direct contact with minority CALD and Indigenous groups is minimal or non-existent (Hollinsworth 2006). As well as efforts to re-educate media workers and use complaint mechanisms, efforts to enhance the media skills of minority group members are required (Pearson 2007; HREOC 2004; ADB 2003; National NGO Coalition Against Racism 2000).

Anti-racism and multicultural education programs for children and young people often focus on “celebrating diversity” rather than countering racism (Hollinsworth 2006). These are often valuable first steps towards creating an appreciation of cultural diversity. Whole school approaches that embed anti-oppressive and respectful values and practices are more effective than (often reactive) interventions designed to protect or cater to a specific victimized group (Ofsted 2005; Citizenship Foundation 2003; Dadzie 2000; May 1999). In a similar fashion general policies against bullying can be preferred to specific polices against racial harassment (see www.bullyingnoway.com.au).
In summary available research has found that programs are more effective if they:

- Avoid culturalism and stereotyping including so-called ‘positive images’
- Emphasise commonalities and parallels rather than seek to explain or celebrate uniqueness and differences
- Use specific social and historical (‘situational’) rather than ahistorical and essentialist (‘dispositional’) explanations
- Integrate across the whole curriculum rather than within a discrete (often elective) module
- Start early and continue throughout an age relevant sequence
- Delivered by competent and confident teachers, and
- Use self-directed and cooperative learning.

The most common form of anti-racism education for adults is the one or two day workshop, although some forms of flexible learning through the Internet and websites are being used more often. Research as well as participant feedback has shown that overly pedagogical or ‘preachy’ approaches usually fail and can increase resentments and hostilities (Guerin 2003). The Confronting Racism in Communities project team developed anti-racist training materials in both a two-day and one-day formats based on the identified needs discussed in the Methodology section. These workshops were extremely well received and effective, but participants were self-selecting; most felt they were in great professional need of useful strategies to deal with racism. Key factors in the success of the workshops included:

- The balance between presentations, case study discussion and analysis, and sharing of participants’ experiences and concerns,
- The diverse backgrounds and work settings of participants,
- The decades of professional experience of the trainers, who have international reputations in this field, and can readily provide examples of good practice and failure as well as appropriate resources, and
- The usual critical workshop factors such as cost, food, venue etc.

A critical but fundamental research finding is that quality anti-racism education and training can produce significant improvements in both accurate information about minority groups and more positive reported attitudes in the short term. However this attitude change can disappear (although increased knowledge persisted) when measured against pre-training benchmarks in a three-month follow-up (Hill and Augoustinos 2001). This finding means that longitudinal evaluations are essential and additional inputs such as reinforcement by managers, repetition of workshops, and ways to incorporate ‘new’ attitudes into shared work practices are all critical in consolidating and embedding changes.

It is important that both school-based and adult anti-racism education and training is presented in a critical but collaborative way. It is completely counter-productive to use an authoritarian or dogmatic teaching style while urging respect and mutual cooperation between different groups (Paradies 2005; Ladson-Billings & Gillborn 2004; Guerin 2003). Effective programs provide ways of analyzing and understanding racism in its myriad forms, and suggestions for appropriate responses. Such programs will enable participants to engage effectively with challenges as they arise rather than attempt to provide particular solutions or generic guidelines.
A related model for improving inter-group relations is based on Allport’s “contact hypothesis”. The model suggests that increased contact between different groups can reduce prejudice and racism if four essential conditions are met:

1. Equal status
2. Superordinate goals
3. No competition, and
4. Institutional/authority sanctioning of the contact (Paradies 2005: 11).

It is not surprising that these conditions are rarely met, or only approximated, and a detailed analysis of the hypothesis has raised many concerns and limitations (Pettigrew & Tropp 2000). Pettigrew and Tropp conclude that efforts to systematically reduce inter-group conflict must be sustained over time, and focus on commonalities prior to addressing diversity and divergent perspectives.

However, many apparent examples do exist, including sport, community arts, and even so-called anti-social activities, and appear to demonstrate positive relationships across cultural differences. The evidence from social geography is mixed. For example, areas with the highest proportion of Aboriginal people had the lowest Yes vote in the 1967 Referendum (Attwood and Markus 1997). Recent research found that geographic areas with high cultural diversity reported lower rates of racism (Dunn & Geeraert 2003), although subsequent work has found there is no reliable correlation with local histories and issues making “everywhere different” (Forrest & Dunn 2006b). There is also considerable slippage between reported opinions and observed behaviours with respect to inter-group relations in multicultural settings.

A fourth key level of anti-racism intervention is the institutional or organizational. As we have noted it is important to recognize that racisms operate at different levels and in myriad forms within multiple discourses. A key form is institutional racism, and in particular the mundane and taken-for-granted structures and processes within key organizations that routinely reproduce inequality for minority groups. Most of us work in and for such organizations. All of us interact with these organizations on a daily basis. We need to recognize that organizations are more than just aggregations of individuals (workers, managers, clients, etc) but have their own cultures, ideologies, control mechanisms, information and communication systems. Strategies to re-engineer organizations and to initiate significant cultural changes will need to be designed specifically for those settings rather than simply applied to all those who work within them (for an excellent set of guidelines, see Appendix 3: Pettman 1991).

This need for specific, contextualized planning and evaluation reinforces the dangers of individualizing or psychologizing what are corporate structures, and of applying educational strategies that focus on cultural insensitivity rather than power, processes and organizational practices. For example, some efforts in the health services to cultivate cultural competence may encourage self-reflexivity, but have been criticised for focusing on interpersonal, cross-cultural communication rather than on power differentials and the social determinants of health and illness. For example, Culley (1996) argues that cultural competence is based on the assumption that a health professional’s cultural insensitivity can be addressed through education rather than by political processes or institutional change.

There are few well-described and evaluated reports of efforts to combat systemic racism within organizations (but see Canadian Human Rights Commission 2006;
Opper 2005; Tamkin 2002; Taylor et al 1997). Most of the approaches discussed under interpersonal are relevant to anti-racism work within organizations, although their presentation may change to meet specific challenges. It is usually necessary to provide a range of interventions in concerted and sustained fashion to obtain the outcomes anticipated for each of these approaches.

In a comprehensive study of anti-discrimination training in the United States, Bendik et al (1999) derived eight key principles or benchmarks:

1. Anti-discrimination initiatives enjoy strong, visible, consistent support from the client organization’s top management.
2. Training is closely tailored to the specific circumstances of the client organization.
3. Training is motivated by the client organization’s important operational goals.
4. Trainers have qualifications in management or organizational development.
5. Training focuses on discrimination as a general process rather than the unique issues of specific groups.
6. Training is designed to change trainee’s behaviour rather than attitudes alone.
7. Training is complemented by improvements if the client organization’s human resource management practices.
8. Training is part of broad efforts at organizational development.

These principles cover key understandings supported by research evidence but probably underestimate the inertia and denial that attempts to introduce “root and branch” reforms of organizations. Those of us who have attempted to produce and implement anti-racist policies within universities, government departments and NGOs will be familiar with ways that such pressure can be resisted or diffused for example by replacing equity and anti-racism with diversity (Ahmed 2007). Bendik et al’s first benchmark may be the determining factor in that, in the absence of “strong, visible, consistent support from the client organization’s top management”, efforts to devise and especially to implement anti-racism strategies dissipate or become “tick-a-box”, empty gestures. In part this failure derives from the taken-for-granted nature of so much cultural and social exclusion, coupled with the ‘normal’ pressures of scarce resources, risk aversion and competing priorities. One revealing aspect is the tendency to ‘dump’ the task of dealing with racism and diversity on staff from CALD backgrounds (Ahmed 2008). The Project team strongly believes that the work of anti-racism is particularly, but not exclusively, the responsibility of those privileged by prevailing racist beliefs and practices (Hollinsworth 1997).

The final level of intervention is the societal. Again key strategies such as anti-racism education, media and mass persuasion strategies, anti-discrimination legislation, training and conciliation mechanisms, and policy development are central (HREOC 2004). Inevitably the difficulties of evaluation increase with society wide anti-racism interventions. There are some factors that can be identified as improving community relations including better education overall, sustained economic prosperity, provision of community services that build community capacity, absence of international tension eg. the perceived threat of terrorism. Ironically harsh political rhetoric from the Howard government about asylum seekers led to greater acceptance of record high levels of immigration because many people felt the government was being tough on who could come to this country (Kalantzis 2005; Betts 2003).
A fundamental strategy is anti-discrimination legislation such as that administered by HREOC and ADCQ. However, as we have noted there are serious challenges in using the complaints mechanisms, especially to identify and address indirect discrimination or systemic forms of exclusion and racism, and newer media such as websites, computer games and text-messaging (HREOC 2008 & 2003; Hollinsworth 2006b). The reasons for this difficulty are complex and include the range of problems identified by many of those who reported racist incidents to the Confronting Racism in Communities Data Collections Points. Both HREOC and ADCQ are exploring ways to more effectively process complaints, including possible class actions and third party notifications. Both organizations perform important educational and training functions, especially in relation to legal requirements but also in contributing to national debates and public support for human rights. It is possible that significantly greater resources and further amendments to the legislation will be necessary to more effectively combat racial discrimination (Gaze 2005).

Notwithstanding these concerns, it is important to recognize the powerful symbolic and educational messages such legislation, and the determination to police them, provide as a clear statement of societal values as well as some deterrent and remedial effects.

Linked to legislation are policies that prohibit discrimination and promote equal opportunity. Anti-discrimination and anti-racism policies of governments and government agencies, major corporations, associations and other bodies such as universities are fundamental to shifting prevailing social values, attitudes and practices (see above under government responses). As with any policies, their impact is dependent on the political will to drive them, the resources available and the reporting and evaluation requirements. Given the many institutional barriers to non-discriminatory work practices and the considerable investment many people have in downplaying the problem, policies can be critical in assisting those who wish to act in generating interest and enlisting support. Policies also can ‘routinize’ obligations and concerns that can easily be dismissed as special pleading or the result of overly sensitive individuals. Policies also mandate the responsibilities of managers to provide a ‘safe’, equitable and non-discriminatory environment, making serious efforts to counter racism part of professional ‘risk management’ (Tamkin 2002; Bendik et al 1999). Again experience shows that broad based campaigns for social justice and community cohesion may be more effective than programs to defend or advance the interests of specific minority groups.

The apparent shift from policies and strategies aiming to combat racism or achieve social justice and equity to policies and strategies designed to foster social inclusion and community cohesion in both the United Kingdom and Australia needs further analysis. Positive aspects include the broad agenda and possibilities for coalition politics, and the emphasis on community capacity and resilience rather than pathology and dysfunction. Less helpful aspects can be the marginalizing of fundamental issues of inequality and power within a discourse of citizenship, participation and tolerance. Efforts to combat racism and build community cohesion are often damaged by short-term political opportunism, or a reluctance to risk alienating voters seen as intolerant of racial and religious differences (Canberra Times editorial, 2 June 2008 in the wake of the decision by Camden Council to reject an Islamic school on planning grounds).
Craig (2007) describes British attitudes towards ethnic minorities as ‘janus-faced’ in that extremely hostile vilification of refugees and immigrant communities as “cunning, loathsome, unprincipled” are twinned with stated policies of community cohesion. In Australia important anti-discrimination campaigns and the work of settlement services have been put at risk by intemperate and populist attacks by state and federal politicians (Poynting & Mason 2007 & 2006; Goot & Sowerbutts 2004). Internal DIAC documents found that comments by former Immigration Minister Kevin Andrews attacking the capacity of Sudanese refugees to assimilate were associated with increased racist attacks and harassment (Topsfield 2008). His criticism also led to a reduction in allocated refugee places for Africans from 70% in 2004-05 to 30% in 2007-08. As anthropologist Ghassan Hage (2003: 247) observes:

_Violent Racists are always a tiny minority. However, their breathing space is determined by the degree of ‘ordinary’ non-violent racism a government and culture will allow._

While these sources indicate serious concerns with the politicization of community relations, immigration and social cohesion, there are many positive examples of anti-racism in community work and some organizations. While the slogans and policy priorities may change, many of those working in and for CALD communities simply keep at it. Thomas (2007) investigated the shift from the language and assumptions of anti-racism towards what he terms “critical multi-culturalism” within a ‘community cohesion’ policy framework. He found that many of the youth workers he interviewed were able to generate novel, collaborative programs and activities that positively worked across differences where previous work had been reactive and ethnic-specific. One of the important benefits of the anti-racism training provided by the Confronting Racism in Communities project team has been the sharing and honouring of such innovative and committed work by the participants.

In summary anti-racism is hard work. It requires commitment, imagination, resources, high-level support, creativity, and good luck. Building community capacity and trust between different groups and organizations takes time. Mistakes will be made and hopes dashed. Pedersen et al conclude rather pessimistically that:

_Many interventions designed to reduce stereotyping, prejudice, and racism produce limited effects, if any, that do not persist across time and do not generalise across situations and groups. This renders them ineffective and inefficient (2005: 24)._

However, they do provide eight useful, evidence-based suggestions for implementing anti-racism strategies:

- Combat false beliefs by providing accurate information (especially in the form of case studies and stories rather than categorical denial of false beliefs)
- Involve the audience (through discussion, debate and recognition of contradictory positions, avoiding the judgmental and aggressive stance of Racism Awareness Training (Hollinsworth 1992a)
- Invoke empathy (but carefully)
- Emphasize commonality and diversity (recognize both similarity and difference but avoid overemphasizing otherness or exoticizing differences)
- Focus on changing behaviours as much as changing attitudes (attitudes will often realign over time with the non-racist and inclusive behaviours)
- Meet local needs (target specific situations, participants and issues)
- Evaluate properly (many anti-racism strategies aren’t evaluated well, use multi-methodological and longitudinal techniques)
- Consider the broader context (prejudice reduction efforts frequently focus on individuals and ignore structural contexts thereby nullifying hoped for outcomes; target powerful and high status rather than relatively powerless people) (Pedersen et al 2005: 27-28).

Armed with these and other guidelines and strategies we can make a difference by supporting those who experience racism and working with those responsible for non-discriminatory programs and services. As Jan Pettman concludes:

> Combating racism means contesting a whole range of political issues at national, state and local level, through the media and popular culture, in our work and play places, and at home. These issues are not restricted to those explicitly related to Aborigines or ethnic groups, but include the whole range of social policy and ways of challenging the existing unequal distribution of goods. Given the racism-social injustice nexus, almost any action for social justice will undermine racist structures and exclusionary devices. We need, too, to establish criteria for fair treatment, moving beyond both racism and reactive cultural relativism, to examine what are appropriate grounds for differential treatment, such as the overcoming of past racism or other forms of social damage. (1987:131)
CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Combating racism is a difficult challenge. Anti-racism is not simply the opposite of racism. It is complex due to the changing nature and manifestations of racism and the manner in which racism is entangled with other forms of inequality and oppression. Furthermore, different forms of exclusion are intersectional and overlap such as gender, class, or sexuality. Racisms occur in complex combinations of other factors such as poverty, disability, homelessness, linguistic and cultural differences, poor health and unemployment.

Strategies to confront racism have to be multi-dimensional and incorporate a diverse range of targets and methods (Anthias and LLoyd 2002). Cowlishaw argues that racialisation generates racial categories but:

*The categories created are not an automatic consequence of a certain genetic or cultural heritage, or indeed of any inherent characteristics. Rather the social categories are part of a cultural process of evaluation and bestowal of meaning on certain phenomena such as biological or cultural characteristics* (1988: 249).

The prevalence of racisms is formed through a ‘cultural process of evaluation’ that is linked to processes of social change. Social and cultural elements of society are dynamic and fluid. As noted above, this makes it difficult to identify racisms or to generalize about them across societies, spatial locations or situations. However we know that racisms are pervasive and continue to exist over time and across the world.

Anti-racism remains little analyzed in the social science literature, and is too often confined to a simplistic understanding of it as merely the inverse, or absence, of racism. Babacan (2007) points out the need to define what we mean by anti-racism. She asks what does anti-racism mean in a context of fluidity and contextual understandings of racism. Furthermore, we need to ask how can anti-racist discourses be developed in a climate where increasingly racist and nationalist ideas are part of the political debate and are incorporated into the political agendas of governments, media and other institutions? How do you develop anti-racist strategies when the existence of racism is denied or minimized by powerful players in society?

The difficulty of developing a politics of anti-racism is identified by a number of authors. Malik (1996) points out that we have moved from the notion of ‘right to be equal’ to the ‘right to be different’. Critiquing modern discourses Malik concludes that ‘equality’ has come to mean oppression and ‘difference’ liberation. Many attempts to build an anti-racist politics based on difference have been criticized as reifying ethnicity, culture and race (Anthias and LLoyd 2002). Furthermore, the strategies of equality involved political struggle whereas the politics of difference has resulted in a withdrawal from broad-based political struggle (Malik 1996).

Additionally, the role of the State in racism is complex and contradictory. Different arms of state instrumentalities contribute to and confront racisms at the same time. For example, the Australian legal system retains aspects of a fundamentally entrenched racism dating from the colonial use of the police as a force of dispossession and suppression (Blagg et al 2005; Cunneen 2006 & 2001: HREOC
1991). It is difficult to create anti-racist structures that span the gulf between the elements of the anti-racist movement that are outside the state and those which remain within it. Gilroy cautions us not to turn our back on the state (Gilroy 2002) and rely exclusively on anti-racist social movements within civil society.

Hollinsworth (2006) discusses anti-racism measures as
- education
- training
- public policy
- anti-discrimination legislation
- affirmative action
- general political activities at the local community and national level.

These strategies often need to be implemented in combination to produce meaningful and sustainable improvements.

The issue of whether anti-discrimination legislation is effective in addressing racism has been covered elsewhere in this report. Solomos identifies growing recognition of systemic racism rather than 'active discrimination against individuals' (1989: 83). He reminds us of the importance of indirect discrimination where universal treatment of everyone as the same had discriminatory effects on one particular group. Furthermore, Solomos points to the poor outcomes from legislation to address racism as there is overwhelming evidence of the very slight success in prosecuting or preventing discrimination even in individual cases, let alone more complex issues of institutional racism. However, the need for policies and related legislation derives partly from their educative value. That is, the government or other authorities take a position against certain behaviours or in support of social objectives such as access and equity.

The discussion on legislation and policy frameworks has focused on modifying the behaviour of individuals and more particularly on racist violence. Castles points to the difficulties of this approach which often leaves social institutions untouched:

> Community relations strategies designed to change prejudiced attitudes will therefore achieve little, because they do not affect the social structures which cause attitudes. The real solution would be measures to prevent the structural marginalisation caused by economic change. This would require changes in economic and political structures, as well as in welfare policies. But such fundamental changes are hard to achieve, take a long time, and require unity of political will and large resources. A realistic community relations strategy must look to more modest measures of institutional change, which can be achieved in a reasonably short time with limited funds. (1991: 20).

The Confronting Racism in Communities Project documented a range of racist incidents occurring across Queensland, and highlighted the often devastating impact such incidents, and inappropriate responses to them, can cause. The Project provided essential training and support to many whose work involves supporting people who are subjected to racism, and who often feel ill prepared for the task. The Project has identified those training and support tasks and to the degree possible, addressed them, although the need for ongoing support has been stressed. The Project has also identified some gaps in current government and NGO responses to racism, and suggested evidence-based ways to enhance them. In particular, we found it is
important to openly acknowledge racism and racial and religious vilification rather than downplay these as rare or the result of misunderstandings or cultural differences.

In the earlier report of this project specific recommendations were made about particular issues relating to racism such as transport. This report focuses on broader steps in the future of anti-racism work in Queensland. Some policy and program directions that needs to be addressed:

- The need to build an on-going evidence base. There is a need to achieve an easily accessed system of information collection without the heavily legalized framework, as a simple data-bank where people can ‘report’ and have their issues heard and registered;

- Greater attention to the relationship between criminal offences and racial violence;

- Identify ways under the departmental Multicultural Action Plans in which institutional or systemic racism can be addressed within the Queensland Government framework;

- Greater research about the spatial contexts of racism across Queensland;

- Victim support programs which provide assistance to people at the community level. This needs to involve training for community workers who are in the frontline of service delivery;

- Broader community education programs with a specific anti-racism focus;

- Development of a guide for organisations wanting to implement effective anti-racism;

- At least one service which works with known perpetrators of racism.

It is also important to build capacity and resilience in individuals and communities subject to racism, while at the same time working to reduce prejudice and change racist behaviours. Government agencies and community organizations need to deliver anti-racism within a continuous improvement culture change model and should be clear and consistent in what they want to change and achieve. Success in changing systemic racism and racist behaviours is strongly contextual and builds on what has happened (or not) in the past. Training and change strategies have to work from where people and structures are, but challenge them to exceed and embed real changes. This is an iterative process of planning, acting and reviewing. These iterations are likely to comprise a journey of increasing sophistication and complexity, and a growing appreciation of the benefits and challenges of implementation. It is firmly grounded in evaluation and feedback, and a willingness to do things differently.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: TRAINING NEEDS SURVEY

Organisational Details

1. Name ____________________________
2. Position ____________________________
3. Organisation ____________________________
4. Postal address ____________________________
5. Email address ____________________________
6. Phone number ____________________________
7. Nature of work ____________________________
   □ Settlement services □ Legal services
   □ Community development □ Health services
   □ Counselling □ Education (primary, secondary or tertiary)
   □ Individual advocacy □ Systemic advocacy
   □ Other (please specify) ____________________________

9. Number of employees ____________________________

Experience with Racism

10. How relevant are issues of racism to your work?
   □ Very relevant □ Not at all relevant
   □ Somewhat relevant □ Unsure
   □ Not very relevant ____________________________

11. In what ways are issues of racism relevant to your work?

12. To what extent do you feel equipped/skilled to support clients who have experienced racism?
   □ Very well equipped/skilled □ Not at all equipped/skilled
   □ Reasonably well equipped/skilled □ Unsure
   □ Not very well equipped/skilled ____________________________
13. What skills/knowledge are you able to draw on to support clients who have experienced racism?

- [ ] Active listening skills
- [ ] Counselling skills
- [ ] Legal knowledge
- [ ] Knowledge of referral points
- [ ] Other (please specify)

- [ ] Knowledge of complaints mechanisms
- [ ] Good understanding of racism
- [ ] Individual advocacy skills
- [ ] Systemic advocacy skills

14. In what ways do your organisation’s policies and procedures address issues of racism?

______________________________________________________________

Training Needs

15. Have you previously participated in training on racism?

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

If yes, who provided the training? ____________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

What topics were covered?___________________________________________

16. Does your organisation have funds allocated for anti-racism training?

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] Unsure
- [ ] No

17. Which of the following training options might you or others in your organisation find beneficial?

- [ ] Identifying racism
- [ ] Putting racism on the agenda
- [ ] Supporting people who have experienced racism
- [ ] Community development responses to racism
- [ ] Types of racism (eg. individual or institutional)
- [ ] Working with perpetrators of racism
- [ ] Racism in the workplace
- [ ] Building anti-racism organisations
- [ ] Working with policy responses to racism
- [ ] Working with the media on issues of racism
- [ ] Legislative and complaints mechanisms
- [ ] Other (please specify) _____________________________________________

18. How would you like the training to be delivered?

- [ ] One-off short workshop
- [ ] Series of short workshops
☐ Intensive training (eg. one week block)
☐ After-hours training (eg. nights or weekends)
☐ On the job training
☐ E-training
☐ Other (please specify) ____________________________________________

19. Please specify any special training needs __________________________

20. Please specify any other organisations and/or key persons who might like to participate in training on racism.

21. Do you have any other comments on racism training?
APPENDIX 2: RACIST INCIDENT REPORTING FORM

This Racist Incident Reporting Form was developed by the Centre for Multicultural Pastoral Care as part of the Confronting Racism in Communities Project.

The Confronting Racism in Communities Project aims to work with communities to document the nature and extent of racism in Queensland and provide communities with support, training and resources in order to combat racism.

This form is designed to be completed by people who have experienced racism (with the assistance of trained community workers) or by workers themselves when the people who have experienced racism are not available to tell their story.

All information will be kept in the strictest confidence and no identifying information will be forwarded to a third party without consent.

Completing this form will help us to understand the nature and extent of racism in Queensland. It will not mean that you have lodged a formal complaint. Complaints can be directed to some of the agencies listed on the final page of this form.

Thank you for sharing your experiences with us.

---

### About the person who experienced racism

1. **Name** (optional) ____________________________________________

2. **Address** (optional) ____________________________________________

3. **Telephone number** (optional) __________________________________

4. **Email address** (optional) ______________________________________

5. **Country of origin and/or ethnic background** _______________________

6. **Length of time in Australia**

   - [ ] 0–12 months
   - [ ] More than 10 years
   - [ ] 1–5 years
   - [ ] Born in Australia
   - [ ] 6–10 years
   - [ ] Unknown

7. **Gender**

   - [ ] Female
   - [ ] Male

8. **Age**

   - [ ] Younger than 10 years
   - [ ] 40–49 years
   - [ ] 10–19 years
   - [ ] 50–59 years
   - [ ] 20–29 years
   - [ ] Older than 59 years
   - [ ] 30–39 years
   - [ ] Unknown
9. Religion
☐ Christianity  ☐ Buddhism
☐ Islam  ☐ Judaism
☐ Hinduism  ☐ None
☐ Sikhism  ☐ Unknown
☐ Other (please specify) ____________________________

10. Language spoken at home ____________________________

11. Level of spoken English
☐ Very good  ☐ Poor
☐ Good  ☐ Very Poor
☐ Fair

12. Level of written English
☐ Very good  ☐ Poor
☐ Good  ☐ Very Poor
☐ Fair

13. Is the person who experienced racism the person completing this form?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

If no, who is completing this form? (Please specify your name and/or relationship to the person who experienced racism)

About the racist incident(s)

14. Would you like to report a single incident or multiple incidents?
☐ Single incident  ☐ Multiple incidents (go to question 16)

15. Date of racist incident (dd/mm/yyyy) ____________________________ (go to question 17)

16. How frequent were the racist incidents?
____ incidents per week/month/year for the past _______weeks/months/years (please circle)

17. How would you describe the incident(s)?
☐ Physical violence  ☐ Verbal harassment (eg. offensive joke or comment)
☐ Threat of physical violence  ☐ Non-verbal harassment (eg. offensive look or gesture)
☐ Property damage  ☐ Physical harassment (eg. unwelcome physical contact)
☐ Threat of property damage  ☐ Written harassment (eg. offensive letter or email)
☐ Racist graffiti  ☐ Display of offensive materials (eg. posters or t-shirts)
☐ Offensive media content  ☐ Social exclusion (eg. someone ignored you or avoided you)
☐ Discrimination
☐ Other (please specify) ____________________________________________________________

18. In which town/suburb and postcode did the incident(s) take place? ______

19. In which location(s) did the incident(s) take place?

☐ At home  ☐ In a sports ground, picnic area or other place of leisure
☐ At work  ☐ At a mosque, synagogue or other place of worship
☐ At school, technical college or university  ☐ In a letter, phone-call, text-message, fax or email
☐ In a supermarket or shop  ☐ In a newspaper, magazine or website or on television or radio
☐ In a café, restaurant, pub or nightclub  ☐ While applying for a job or course
☐ On the street  ☐ While applying for rental accommodation
☐ While travelling on public transport  ☐ While accessing government/community services
☐ While travelling in a private vehicle
☐ Other (please specify) __________________________________________________________

20. Please provide a brief description of the racist incident(s). (You may attach additional pages) ____________________________________________________________

21. How has the incident(s) affected you/the person who experienced racism? (You may attach additional pages)

__________________________________________________________________________

About the person(s) responsible for the racist incident(s)

22. Who was responsible for the racist incident(s)?

☐ An individual  ☐ An institution (go to question 27)
☐ A group of people  ☐ Unknown
23. Did you/the person who experienced racism know the person(s) responsible for the incident(s)?

☐ Yes              ☐ Unknown

☐ No

If yes, how would you describe your relationship with them?

☐ Neighbours       ☐ Work colleagues

☐ Classmates       ☐ Other ____________________________________

24. How would you describe their ethnic background? ______________________

25. What was their gender?

☐ Male             ☐ Both male and female

☐ Female          ☐ Unknown

26. How old were they?

☐ Younger than 10  ☐ 40–49 years

☐ 10–19 years      ☐ 50–59 years

☐ 20–29 years      ☐ Older than 59 years

☐ 30–39 years      ☐ Unknown

27. What do you think motivated them to commit this act? ______________________

28. Did anyone else witness the incident?

☐ Yes              ☐ Unknown

☐ No

If yes, how did they react?

About reporting the racist incident(s)

29. Was the incident(s) reported to any other agency?

☐ Yes                                           ☐ Unknown (go to question 35)

☐ No (go to question 34)

30. Who was the incident(s) reported to?

☐ Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland      ☐ Police

☐ Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission  ☐ Teacher

☐ Health Rights Commission Queensland             ☐ Employer

☐ Tenants’ Union of Queensland
☐ Other (please specify) ____________________________________________________________

31. What was the outcome? __________________________________________________________

32. How satisfied are you/the person who experienced racism with this outcome?
☐ Very satisfied  ☐ Unsatisfied
☐ Satisfied  ☐ Very unsatisfied
☐ Neutral  ☐ Unknown

33. Why are you satisfied/unsatisfied with this outcome? _________________________________

__________________________________________________________

(goto question 35)

34. Why wasn’t the incident(s) reported? _____________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

35. Would you/the person who experienced racism like the Confronting Racism in Communities Project Officer to contact you to discuss available complaints mechanisms and support services?
☐ Yes (please remember to provide your contact details on page 1 of this form)
☐ No  ☐ Unsure

For workers only

36. Did you provide any information or support to the person who experienced racism?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, what kind of information or support did you provide? ____________________________

__________________________________________________________
APPENDIX 3:


1. Work out operational definitions for racism and racist violence.

2. Put racist violence onto the agenda.

3. Develop arguments to delegitimise racism/racist violence and to support anti-racist action; contest language that offends and blames the victims; correct misinformation that encourages resentment against others.

4. Work out how racism/racist violence manifests itself in the particular institution/agency/workplace.

5. Gather information about who experiences racist violence. (In what forms? Where? Who are the perpetrators?).

6. Gather information about forms of institutional racism or discrimination which prevent people from access to employment or services, or deny them culturally appropriate services and support.

7. Learn to listen to those who experience racism/racist violence, both to learn more about the problem and to identify strategies and networks of support developed by community and anti-racist groups.

8. Identify those individuals who can speak for ‘the community’ and facilitate community participation. Find out which organisations and networks provide links to communities and to individuals and families which may not have ‘a community’ (eg. youth workers and women’s centre).

9. Recognise the problematic relationship that Aboriginal and Islanders and some non-English speaking background people may have with government agencies, especially (but not only) the police. The history of different groups’ contact with or exclusion from a particular agency or service needs to be taken into account.

10. Employ specially designated staff (eg. Aboriginal or ethnic liaison officers) or units. However, combating racism and providing culturally appropriate services has to be seen as everyone’s responsibility.

11. Recruiting more representative staff, and especially those from groups which experience racism/racist violence, means scrutinising the criteria for the job, rethinking relevant qualifications and experience, and providing effective induction and support programs for new staff. It also means dealing with the political and industrial issues that arise when some other employees feel threatened by the changes.
12. Examine how minority staff are treated within the department or agency. Do not expect them to deal with all problems to do with racism or cultural difference, or deny their expertise outside those areas.

13. Develop training programs for all employees to examine their own views, language and practices and to develop anti-racist strategies appropriate to their working areas. Work with both management and unions to make anti-racism part of everyday industrial relations. Ensure that dealing with racism/racist violence becomes part of everyday practice and is addressed in all mission statements, corporate plans, annual reports and work programs.

14. Develop a code of good practice and guidelines for anti-racist action. Racism/racist violence can be declared non-negotiable and unprofessional. Good work relations and fair delivery of services should be the norm, and managers should be asked to demonstrate what steps have been taken to eliminate racism/racist violence in their areas of responsibility.

15. Develop action or management plans, spelling out objectives, strategies, time-lines and ways of evaluating progress, and including a regular reporting process and dissemination of information to all involved.

16. Establish a racist violence/racist harassment grievance procedure. Procedures should be open, and involve victims and complainants at all stages.

17. Gather information on incidents and complaints through use of incident report sheets which record what happened, who was involved and what was done. In addition, collect ideas for dealing with common situations or arguments, and compile a file of available resources, policy documents and guidelines from other agencies.

18. Include monitoring and evaluation in any anti-racist strategy or policy, as declarations alone change nothing, and evaluation in turn provides more information for further planning and action.

19. Develop links with others working in similar areas. Effective antiracist action will often involve a number of agencies. Ensuring coherent policies across-the-board requires co-operation with other departments, agencies, community and non-government organisations. Inter-agency committees and local community relations committees are important here.
We wish to acknowledge the following organizations which acted as data collection points throughout Queensland:

Cairns
- Cairns City Council
- Flexible Learning Centre, Tropical North Queensland TAFE
- Mareeba Shire Council
- Queensland Police Service – Far Northern Region
- Tenant Advise & Advocacy Service Queensland – Atherton Tablelands
- Tenants Union of Queensland – North Queensland Office

Townsville
- Queensland Transport – Northern Region
- Townsville City Council
- Townsville Migrant Resource Centre
- Townsville Multicultural Support Group

Mackay
- Domestic Violence Resource Service (Mackay and Region)
- George Street Neighbourhood Centre
- Mackay and District Australian South Sea Islander Association
- Mackay Regional Council for Social Development

Rockhampton
- Central Queensland Multicultural Association
- Rockhampton City Council

Wide Bay
- Gondwana Multicultural Group
- Hervey Bay City Council
- Kenalwyn – Bundaberg and District Neighbourhood Centre
- Maryborough City Council
- Maryborough Multicultural Social Group
- Maryborough Neighbourhood Centre

Sunshine Coast
- Buddies Refugee Support Group
- Centre for Multicultural and Community Development, University of the Sunshine Coast
- Maroochy Neighbourhood Centre
- Maroochy Shire Council
- Nambour Community Centre
- Sunshine Coast Intensive English Unit, Nambour State High School
- Sunshine Coast Interfaith Network
Toowoomba
• Department of Employment and Training – Toowoomba
• Gatton Shire Council
• Life and Careers Centre
• Lifeline Darling Downs and South West Queensland
• Mercy Family Services – Toowoomba
• Toowoomba City Council
• Social Justice Commission, Toowoomba Catholic Diocese
• The Advocacy and Support Centre
• Toowoomba Refugee and Migrant Support Centre

Brisbane
• Always People
• Brisbane City Council
• Centre for Multicultural Pastoral Care
• Ethnic Communities Council of Queensland
• Griffith University
• Kinections
• Legal Aid Queensland
• Milperra State High School
• Multicultural Development Association
• Queensland Council of Social Services
• Queensland Police Service – Metropolitan South Region
• Queensland Program of Assistance to Survivors of Torture and Trauma
• Queensland University of Technology
• Tenants Union Queensland
• Volunteer Refugee Tutoring and Community Support Program
• Youth Affairs Network Queensland

Logan
• ACCES Services Inc
• Multilink Community Services

Gold Coast
• Career Employment Australia
• Gold Coast Multicultural Families Organisation
• Multicultural Communities Council Gold Coast
• Gold Coast City Council