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Abstract: This paper explores Australia’s history and background of migration and refugee policies and examines the possibilities of applying the Australian solutions in the European Union. It has often been assumed that the history of Australia’s migration and refugee policies and the solutions it has applied are not relevant for the European Union (although they are sufficient, albeit controversial, in the case of Australia). In order to verify this assumption, first the origin and the current rules of Australia’s migration policy are presented and described, and then the determinants of immigration to Australia are indicated. Next, the overall state of relations between the EU, its Member States, and Australian immigration matters is explored. The main research questions posed in this text concern the key points of Australia’s immigration policies and its determinants, as well as the current state of the EU’s and its Member States’ relationship with Australia with respect to the refugee crisis and immigration. The paper ends by offering conclusions with respect to the above.
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Introduction

Today one of the most challenging issues faced by both the European Union (EU) and its Member States is the massive influx of refugees and
(often ‘economic’) immigrants seeking to reach Europe. This process, however, is taking place not only in Europe, but also in other parts of the world. For example Australia has also been facing massive immigration problems for the decade of more. Being a state with colonial origins, Australia is on the one hand developing its migration policy\(^1\) by remaining open to newcomers, while on the other hand it is trying to restrict the number of refugees and immigrants by applying solutions that are considered controversial by some in the international community. Thus at one and the same time Australia’s migration policy has caused debate and controversy in Australia itself, as well as beyond. European leaders and policy-makers have made explicit reference to Australia’s case, sometimes indicating its path toward restricting immigration as one of the possible ways to deal with the issue in the EU Member States.

The topic of the paper thus concerns the history and background of Australia’s migration and refugee policies and the potential to apply these solutions in the EU. It has often been assumed that the specific history and background of Australia’s migration and refugee policies render it not relevant for the European Union (although they are sufficient, albeit controversial, in the case of Australia). To verify this assumption, first the origin and the rules of Australia’s migration policy are described, and next the determinants of Australia’s migration policy are indicated. Subsequently, the overall state of the relations between the EU, its Member States and Australia in immigration matters is explored. The main research questions posed in this text concern the key points and determinants of Australia’s immigration, as well as the current state of the EU’s and its Member States’ relationship with Australia with respect to the refugee crisis and immigration. The paper ends by offering conclusions.

1. The origins and determinants of immigration to Australia

In the case of Australia, it is first of all necessary to briefly outline the origins of its migration policy. A brief analysis of this issue will help the reader to better understand the specificity of the solutions currently applied in Australia.

To begin with, Australia is a state built on a massive influx of European immigrants, originally from the United Kingdom (it should be borne in mind that Australia was a British colony), who were sentenced to be sent to Australia for violating British law. In the majority of cases these were

\(^1\) For the purposes of this paper, with regard to Australia the term ‘migration policy’ has been applied consistently – for instance see: Australian Government, http://www.australia.gov.au (last visited 18.12.2016).
petty crimes, such as burglaries, etc. The British historian Niall Ferguson even claims that ‘Australia literally emerged as a country of thieves’. This process dates back to the beginning of the 18th century. The main reasons that this forced emigration to Australia rapidly changed into a voluntary immigration concerned the possibilities for newcomers from the UK to quickly increase their wealth. In the first place, the original emigrants were given land after completing their sentences, which in fact transformed their punishment into a kind of prize and began to attracting people voluntarily to Australia. The second major attraction was the first gold rush, which began in the mid-19th century when the gold digger Edward Hammond Hargraves discovered rich gold mines in New South Wales in 1851. This event prompted a rapid and massive inflow of gold diggers from other parts of the world (such as China), who were hoping to find gold in Australia. Australia thus ceased to be a ‘huge prison’ for British criminals and became a desirable place to live, where one could quickly become rich.

The black pages of Australia’s history include the events of 1861, when Australian diggers, jealous of the results of and competition posed by their Chinese counterparts, attacked the Chinese gold diggers’ camp in Lambing Flat. This event eventually led to the implementation of the so-called ‘white Australia’ policy, which is usually described as an ‘anti-Asian immigration policy initiated by the new Commonwealth of Australia in 1901. It reflected a long-standing and unifying sentiment of the various Australian colonies and remained a fundamental government policy into the mid-20th century’.

The legal act that formed the basis for the new immigration policy was the Immigration Restriction Act of 1901 – one of the first acts introduced by the new Commonwealth of Australia, which was formed earlier that year. Its full title read as follows: ‘To place certain restrictions on Immigration and to provide for the removal from the Commonwealth of prohibited Immigrants’. Its basic premise concerned the prohibition of immigration to Australia of those the Act referred to as ‘prohibited immigrants’. The potential immigrants were asked first of all to write a dic-

---

2 N. Ferguson, Imperium: jak Wielka Brytania zbudowała nowoczesny świat (Empire: How Britain Made the Modern World), Kraków 2013, p. 138.
5 According to the Act, a ‘prohibited immigrant’ was: ‘(a) Any person who when asked to do so by an officer fails to write out at dictation and sign in the presence of the
tation in a European language, which at that time shattered the hopes of most non-Europeans of being accepted in Australian territory. The adoption of this law had a significant impact on the Australian migration policy during the following years by stopping virtually all non-European immigration (mainly from Asia), thus leading to the formation of a racially insulated society.

Despite the restrictions on immigration contained in the Immigration Restriction Act of 1901, Australia was still receiving new immigrants searching for a better life. During the following years, Australian authorities remained eager to accept newcomers (mainly from Europe) to build the country and enhance its growing economy. This statement is supported by following numbers: at the end of the 17th century the Aboriginal population in Australia was about 400,000⁶ while nowadays there are approximately 23,000,000 people – not only descendants of former immigrants but also new ones (see Chart 1). Obviously, the most numerous ethnic group is the English (25.9 per cent), while the Chinese account for about 3 per cent of today’s Australian population.⁷

While the nature of immigration to Australia changed over time, it is still possible to distinguish the main determinants of the process that encouraged immigrants to come to Australia (pull factors).

The first of these determinants is intrinsically connected to the historical background of Australia, its geographical location, and poor living conditions (dry, red soil, natural hazards, etc.). Being a colony of the United Kingdom, a continent far away from Europe, and not being suitable for agriculture, Australia was recognised as an good place to send

---


all the ‘redundant’ citizens of the UK, namely criminals. The second determinant is linked to Australia’s natural resources: Australia is rich in, among other things, gold. During the gold rush of the mid-19th century, which began after the discovery of the gold mines in New South Wales, thousands of people from different parts of the world, including China, decided to come to Australia to improve their living standard.

The third determinant is related to the previous one, as well as to the current political and economic situation in Australia. Despite the fact that the ‘white Australia’ policy remained in place until the beginning of the 1970s, today approximately two-fifths of all new immigrants to Australia are of Asian origin. Furthermore, Australia’s migration policy changed considerably after World War II, when the Australian authorities came to understand that if they wanted their state to develop, they needed to accept more immigrants to boost the economy (for example, many Italians decided to immigrate to Australia following World War II\(^8\)). Nowadays,

\(^{8}\) On a side note, it seems relevant to mention the results of the censuses of the Italian population conducted in Australia in 1933, 1947 and 1991. For comparison purposes the number of Poles is included as well:
China seems to be Australia’s main partner – in 2012 the Australian government adopted a White Paper with the telling title: ‘Australia in the Asian Century’,9 which emphasized the political and strategic implications of cooperation between Australia and Asia. As regards social ties, Australia tries hard to attract thousands of Chinese students to Australian universities. At the same time, programmes in Australian Studies are run in China (for instance, at the Australian Studies Centre at Peking University), which may attract Chinese immigrants to Australia in the future.10

Obviously, the list of the determinants of immigration to Australia presented above is not exhaustive. Our aim was only to point out those determinants which have had considerable influence on Australia’s migration policy.

2. The cornerstones of Australia’s current migration policy

The recent developments in the international political situation, the massive influx of refugees to other states and, also, the flow of not only authorized, but also unauthorized immigrants, have prompted actions of the Australian government that have been widely criticized. A recent and well-known example of a strict migration policy is the so-called Pacific Solution programme, implemented in 2001 by the government of Prime Minister John Howard. Since the number of unauthorized boats arriving to Australia had been increasing rapidly, Howard’s government decided to transfer them to offshore centres established on the Nauru and Manus Island (Australia signed an Administrative Agreement with Nauru in 2001 in order to attain this aim). In 2008 the government of Prime Minister Kevin Rudd dismantled the Pacific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nationality of immigrants</th>
<th>Number of Italians / Poles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Italian/Polish</td>
<td>17,658 / 1,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,172 / 1,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991*</td>
<td></td>
<td>409,464 / 64,899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) Data according to the language spoken at home


Solution, but in 2012 it was recommended to re-establish the offshore processing facilities.\textsuperscript{11}

In 2013 Kevin Rudd announced: ‘As of today, asylum seekers who come here by boat without a visa will never be settled in Australia’.\textsuperscript{12} This, among other things, led to the flagship social campaign of 2014 aimed at discouraging newcomers coming to Australia illegally by boat. Its famous slogan is: ‘No way – you will not make Australia home.’ One of the best-known elements of the campaign is a short video in which the current Chief of Army, Lieutenant General Angus Campbell, presented against the background of the campaign’s poster featuring a turbulent sea, informs all potential immigrants that they will not be given entry into the country if they come there by boat without a visa.\textsuperscript{13} This is only one example of a variety of actions the government has undertaken in the last couple of years in order to restrict illegal immigration. In addition, in 2013 the Australian government launched the military-led border security operation known as Operation Sovereign Borders (OSB), which involves the military controlling asylum operations. According to the official Internet website of the Australian government devoted to the OSB, ‘Australia remains committed to ending the criminal activity of people smuggling. Anyone who tries to come to Australia by boat without a visa will be turned back to their country of departure’.\textsuperscript{14}

Recently, Australia’s policy of restricting immigration has been applied by the government led by current Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull, who announced in November 2016 that a law prohibiting refugees and asylum seekers on Manus Island and Nauru from coming to Australia would (soon) be passed. The solution used by the government of Australia, namely keeping unauthorised arrivals out of Australian territory, was made possible by the Migration Act, which was adopted in 1958 and later amended several times, most recently in 2016. The long title of the law is ‘An Act relating to the entry into, and presence in, Australia of aliens, and


the departure or deportation from Australia of aliens and certain other persons’, a title which accurately reflects its nature. This law replaced the above-mentioned 1901 Immigration Restriction Act.

Particular attention should be drawn to the catalogue of objectives included in the Migration Act, namely ‘[…] to regulate, in the national interest, the coming into, and presence in, Australia of non citizens. […] visas permitting non citizens to enter or remain in Australia and the Parliament intends that this Act be the only source of the right of non citizens to so enter or remain. […] This Act provides for non citizens and citizens to be required to provide personal identifiers for the purposes of this Act or the regulations. […] This Act provides for the removal or deportation from Australia of non citizens whose presence in Australia is not permitted by this Act. (5) To advance its object, this Act provides for the taking of unauthorised maritime arrivals from Australia to a regional processing country’.15

It is thus safe to say that in the Australian authorities’ view, a restrictive migration policy is a part of Australia’s national interest. It might be noted, however, that the act was significantly amended in 1966 by the cabinet of Prime Minister Harold Holt: the restrictions were relaxed, and more immigrants were able to come to Australia easier.16

As mentioned above, Australia has adopted the policy of preventing unauthorized arrivals from coming to the country by relocating them to extraordinary camps outside its territory (on Manus Island in Papua New Guinea and on Nauru Island). In 2016 the government of Australia and the US administration agreed that some asylum seekers – a total of 1,200 people, mainly representatives of the most vulnerable groups – would be resettled to the United States.17 The future will show if the administration of the new US President will support this solution.

3. The European Union, its Member States and Australia’s migration and refugee experiences

As mentioned above, in the mid-1970s Australia became more open to newcomers, including asylum seekers. One of the main factors that prompted


this change was the Vietnam War and, in consequence, the inflow of Vietnamese refugees to Australia. This phenomenon forced Australia’s authorities to adopt refugee policy rules in 1977. Following slight modifications, these rules still underpin Australia’s refugee policy (Table 2).

Table 2. The principles of Australia’s refugee policy (1977)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Australia fully recognises its humanitarian commitment and responsibility to admit refugees for resettlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The decision to accept refugees must always remain with the Government of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Special assistance will often need to be provided for the movement of refugees in designated situations or for their resettlement in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>It may not be in the interest of some refugees to settle in Australia. Their interests may be better served by resettlement elsewhere. The Australian Government makes an annual contribution to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) which is the main body associated with such resettlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As a result, since the mid-1970s Australia has received more refugees and immigrants. Not everybody is accepted, however, and boats with unauthorised immigrants are turned back. This is the reason why Australia’s government is criticized by the international community, institutions such as UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees), and the media. For instance, in 2015 “The New York Times” published an editorial under the telling title: ‘Australia’s Brutal Treatment of Migrants’, where Australia’s policy was called inhumane. Moreover, the article emphasized that some European states could be attracted by the tough solution towards illegal immigration adopted by Australia.¹⁸

In recent years, European Union Member States have experienced a massive inflow of refugees and immigrants, some of whom were not authorized to come to the EU. While the refugees are coming mainly from Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan, and the ‘economic’ immigrants from sub-Saharan Africa and the Balkans, both groups are trying to reach Europe either by boat or using inland pathways.¹⁹ Obviously the political leaders

---


of European states, mostly of those states that have already faced a ‘maritime’ influx of refugees or immigrants, have been searching for the most workable solution to implement it into their own immigration policies. Some of the EU Member States, namely those of the Mediterranean Basin, which have received refugees and immigrants coming mainly by boat (as happens in the case of Australia), were even advised by Australian politicians to follow Australia’s example.

In 2015, the former Foreign Minister of Australia, Alexander Downer, claimed: ‘You have, in the Mediterranean, three choices’, by which he meant three possible options that might be applied in Europe in order to deal with the refugee crisis.20 The first is to continue the present policy, but in Downer’s view it would mean that newcomers, who come mainly by boat, will still drown. The second choice is to become more open to those who are coming to Europe, but this means that Europe would need to provide better and safer shipping for them. Finally, the third option is to turn back unauthorized boats in order to stop the drowning. Moreover, Downer claimed that Europe could establish refugee processing centres in northern Africa, and there decide who could be resettled to Europe.21

However, despite the obvious similarity that in both cases asylum seekers are coming (to Australia and the Mediterranean region) by boat, there are numerous differences between the situation of Australia and the EU Member States. In the first place the political situation and the scale of influx of refugees and immigrants are different. Australia is a single state, while the EU consists of 28 sovereign states. Second, the geographical conditions should be taken into consideration: Australia has only sea borders, while the EU Member States also have land borders. Third, one should bear in mind that due to factors such as the ‘[…] number of inhabitants, population density, and history, modelling immigration and asylum policy after Australia, even if welcomed, would be hard to fully implement in Europe’.22 Also, the Stratfor agency noted that while some European politicians have claimed that the European Union should follow Australia’s example and establish offshore centres to process unauthorized arrivals, the differences between the EU’s and Australia’s conditions seem to be too numerous to follow this proposal.23

---

21 See: ibidem.
23 See: The Refugee Crisis, op.cit.
On the other hand, with respect to the relationship between Australia and the European Union, the state of the overall relationship between Australia and the EU appears to be very good, mainly in the economic sphere, since the mid-1990s. In 1995 Australia’s Prime Minister Paul Keating proposed to the European Commission to conclude a framework agreement in order to enhance mutual economic and social ties. Currently, bilateral relations are governed by the 2008 European Union – Australia Partnership Framework. Some provisions of the agreement concern border security matters, migration, and refugee policies. For instance, a Senior Officials’ Dialogue on Migration, Asylum and Diversity Issues is mentioned among the sectors for bilateral talks and closer cooperation in the field of border security, and immigration management is mentioned among security-related objectives.

In recent years a new agreement has been negotiated, which was supposed to be signed in 2016. This process started in 2015 with the conclusion of the Joint Declaration of the EU’s High Representative for Foreign and Security Policy/Vice President of the Commission and Australia’s Foreign Minister. The aim was to get Australia and the EU to enhance their cooperation in areas such as security policy, development, and also in migration and asylum matters. The mutual will to cooperate more closely was then expressed by the President of the European Commission Jean-Claude Juncker, the President of the European Council Donald Tusk, and the Prime Minister of Australia Malcolm Turnbull in their common statement given after the terrorist attacks in Paris in 2015. As regards the refugee crisis, the politicians stated: ‘The displacement and mass movement of refugees and migrants is a global concern. We agreed that international protection must be granted to those entitled to it, in line with international law. Effective management of borders and fighting against migrant smuggling networks remain essential, as well as tackling...

---

the root causes of the current migration and refugee crisis’. These words mean that both Australia and the EU are aware of the need for bilateral as well as international cooperation in order to manage the refugee and migration crisis.

Conclusions

The refugee and migration crisis has forced both the European and the Australian leaders to search for new solutions for dealing with it. While some European politicians consider the Australian model attractive, they also should be aware of the fact that the situations of Australia and the EU are significantly different in certain critical aspects.

The research conducted for the purpose of this paper led to the following final conclusions:

First, the key points of Australia’s migration and refugee policies and their determinants are strictly linked with the history of this state. Unlike European countries, Australia was founded on immigration, initially from Europe (at the beginning from the UK), and later from other parts of the world, mainly from Asia. Australia’s geographical location, political system, close ties with the UK and with the United States after World War II, growing economy, welfare system – these are only a few factors that have influenced Australia’s migration policy. It is necessary to underscore that Australia has only sea borders, so its immigration solutions are aimed at illegal immigration by boat.

Secondly, with regard to the current state of the EU’s and its Member States’ relationship with Australia concerning the refugee and migration crisis, one should keep in mind that the number of newcomers in Europe is far greater than in Australia (a quantitative dimension). What is more, Europe receives mainly asylum seekers, while Australia also has immigrants from its Asian neighbourhood (a qualitative dimension).

The above differences lead to the conclusion that the history and solutions implemented in Australia’s migration and refugee policies are not fitted to the European Union. Thus, the assumption made at the beginning of this article has been confirmed.

---
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