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HOST AUSTRALIAN SOCIETY ATTITUDES TOWARDS HELLENIC SETTLEMENT: THE PRE-WHITLAM YEARS.

As the preceding chapter indicated, central to Australia's immigration policy was the question of the origins of migrants. This preoccupation with origins reflected broader social attitudes towards the settlement of different ethnic groups. Until the mass migration of the post-WWII period, Australian attitudes to non-British migrants had remained largely unchallenged, for two reasons. Firstly, the British were themselves the colonisers and, secondly, until WWII there was an adequate supply of migrants from the United Kingdom. Coupled with Australia's isolation from Europe, these two factors inhibited migration by non-British Europeans and the White Australia policy ensured that non-European migration was never seriously considered. This chapter will explore how the social, economic and cultural structures that emerged from Australia's pro-British immigration policies affected Australian attitudes towards the settlement and subsequent social mobility of non-British migrants. In particular, it will trace the social mobility of Greeks in the context of the host society's formal and popular attitudes during the inter-war and post-WWII period, and indicate how social mobility was connected with the process of integration or assimilation and the economic and political participation of migrant population groups.

One of the determinants of the host Australian society's attitudes towards new settlers has been the size of the particular ethnic population group. This factor depended on the extent to which migrants were perceived to threaten the existing occupational and residential profiles, the ratio of endogamy to frequency of inter-
marriage, and the acquisition or lack of English language proficiency. According to Price (1963), none of these factors has been constant in Australia, particularly in regard to Southern Europeans, since the official attitude has mattered less than the everyday behaviour of locals at any given time. As Price observes, "in some places British-Australians were either comparatively favourably disposed or indifferent, especially where numbers were small and inter-marriage occurred. In other places feelings at times became most hostile" (1963:208).

Price's (1963) study on the social history of Southern Europeans in Australia has traced the tradition of social conflict in early incidents between British-Australians and Southern Europeans. He cites the case of two adjacent goldfield towns of Western Australia as illustrative of the friction between British-Australians and Italians, Slavs and Greeks after the discovery of gold in 1894.

[They were employed as] either miners or as timber-cutters providing wood for pit-props or furnaces; accompanied by a number of Ithaca, Kastellorizan and other Greeks of whom some mined or cut timber, but others followed a few Italians and Slavs in opening restaurants, hotels and clubs. Before long, British-Australians became incensed at alleged agreements whereby employers brought Southern Europeans to Australia under contract to work at less than standard wages. Southern Europeans were also accused of insanitary habits in the mines, aggravated by their different way of life and their carelessness with explosives in the mines as a result of their inadequate English. These events led to the appointment of two commissions to investigate the charges (Price 1963:208, 209).

Attitudes towards Southern Europeans including the Greeks fluctuated and often depended on government policy including immigration policy. At times, governments, in an attempt to avoid social unrest, bowed to popular and/or employer demand, and imposed regulations permitting only those with some knowledge of English to work in the mines, and forbidding the contract system of
working for lower wages. Social and political pressure was often so intense that it resulted in a proposition for a Bill, aimed at compelling mining employers to limit the number of their alien employees to ten per cent of their workforce. This position was an attempt to force the aliens to assimilate, and so "cease evading the provision concerning the learning of English and taking up duties of full citizenship". The Bill was passed at all stages in the lower house, but was rejected by the Legislative Council (Price 1963:208). Throughout Australia's labour and industrial history, the measurement of living standards in material terms goes a long way towards explaining the White Australia Policy. Both official and public opinion were based on the view that:

if the migrants were prepared to conform to the industrial laws of the country relating to hours, working conditions and wages, their introduction was easily tolerated by organised labour. This was the hard core of labour policy. But how far the concept of protection of economic standards was intermingled with suspicion on racial, social or other grounds was seldom, as far as the white population was concerned, put to a test (Borrie 1954:13-20).

Through their control of economic and political power, British-Australians demanded the acculturation of all immigrant groups by accepting little if any transculturation, whereby both the "donor" and the "receiver" are influenced by the other. Suspicion about non-British migrants (with the exception of early Chinese settlers) was not aroused until the arrival of increasing numbers of Southern Europeans, especially once they started forming noticeable groups by about 1910. By then, migrants, whether they were Greeks or not, had to fit into organised labour to avoid further racial and ethnic discrimination. In fact, by 1915 British-Australians had gained a significant victory when the government required all miners to join miners' unions and accept laws regarding labour and working conditions. Despite such conformity by new settlers to the industrial laws, conflict was not always prevented.
Price (1963) maintains that, in 1916, there was an outburst of xenophobia against the Dalmatians, who, though mostly anti-Hapsburg, were from Austria-Hungary, and therefore technically treated as "enemy aliens". Similarly, Greeks experienced racial hatred because, while officially the Greek Government was always on the "right side" of the allies, King Constantine had taken a pro-German stand (Price 1963:209; Tsounis 1971a; Gilchrist 1985; Vondra 1979:19).

It was during this same year of 1916 that the first Hellenic book in Australia entitled Life in Australia was published in Sydney. Tsounis (1971a) has noted that the ten thousand copies published exceeded by far the number of Greeks in Australia at the time, which was, as reported by the Commonwealth Census of the same year, between 2500 and 3000. In its opening section the book addressed both the Greek and Australian Governments and societies, and carried the message that, above all, Greeks in Australia had been "progressive, industrious, and law abiding citizens" (Cominos 1916). As noted in the introduction, Kosmas and Emanuel Andronicos, George Kentavros and John Cominos, the "oyster king" as he was known in Australia, who paid for this "expensive publication", wanted their readers to avoid political types of conflict and concentrate instead on their business operations, because Greeks were in danger, given the anti-Hellenic trend in Australia related to King Constantine's pro-German orientation. Greeks had witnessed "the smashing of Greek shops in Sydney in 1915 by Australian soldiers sensitive and hostile to a pro-German Greek king" (Tsounis 1971a:60). There were many other situations where Australian soldiers entered Greek restaurants in Sydney, ate, and left without paying. In one case they reduced a number of restaurants to "glass and nails" (Tsounis, in 90th Anniversary Album (Lefkoma), Greek Orthodox Community - GOC - 1988c:41).
This unrest motivated the Orpheus Hellenic Club of Melbourne to call a general meeting (Tsounis 1971a). Subsequently the Committee sent a telegram expressing sentiments of support to Greek Prime Minister Venizelos and to the British Government, as a declaration of loyalty to the allies. There is no evidence to show that Greek Australians were divided into pro-royalist and pro-Venizelist factions to the same extent as in Greece and America (Saloutos 1964), and it is likely that they were more concerned about reprisals on their shops than the politics of Greece. The main exception was that several Greek consuls in Australia owed their appointment to their affiliation to political parties in Greece (Tsounis 1971a:60,99,100), as did many others in the subsequent decades.

By 1916 the suspicion against foreigners led to an investigation, a Secret Census, of all Greek immigrant activities nationally (Secret Census 1916). Police were requested to collect information from Greek migrants, including their names, address, occupational practices, social practices, movements and associations, as well as political preferences for Greece's political parties. Interestingly, there were only seven royalist supporters of Greek politics to be found out of 2500 surveyed by the Secret Census. The results of the "Secret Census" enabled Australian authorities to divert attention from the Hellenic Community, instead concentrating efforts on the activities of German immigrants, whose country was at war with the Allies.

By the time the Secret Census was completed, *Life in Australia* had been published (Cominos 1916). The book identifies approximately 250 Greek owned shops out of 625 alleged as known to be owned by this ethnic population group nationally. Their distribution across the states is largely proportional to the size of Hellenic settlement in each case. There were some 300 in New South Wales (of
which 130 were in metropolitan Sydney and 20 in Newcastle); 120 in Victoria (70 in metropolitan Melbourne) 120 in Queensland (only 20 in metropolitan Brisbane); 80 in Western Australia (mainly in Fremantle, Perth and Kalgoorlie); 4 in Adelaide; and 1 in Hobart (Tsounis 1971:59). These shops were usually family businesses, while some, like the Freeleagus family shops in Brisbane, were quite large, and employed upward of 30 Hellenes, as well as offering significant employment to non-Hellenes. According to the authors of *Life in Australia*, Hellene proprietors provided employment for other Hellenes and only a few worked for British-Australian shop owners. This view is verified by the information contained in the files of the *Secret Census* of 1916.

*Illustration 8.1.* The Heads Cafe in Swanston Street Melbourne, 1917 - one of the many hundreds of such establishments owned nationally by Hellene-Australians. (Source: Raftopoulos, S.)
The prevailing socio-economic conditions, as well as the cultural ideology of Australian society including the White Australia Policy and suspicion of aliens, were major reasons which led many Greeks to shopkeeping occupations. At the same time, self-employment enabled Hellenes to continue their gregarious and homogeneous gatherings by maintaining their cultural traditions. Living within a network of friends and compatriots and sharing with them a common social and cultural life was important in a society which, although its members were the customers of the Hellenic food shops, still wanted them in servile positions by tacitly imposed segregation via an uncompromising adherence to the dominant British-Australian culture. Working in similar industries and sharing experiences was important in the face of the way unionised British-Australian labour viewed Southern Europeans, although the Greeks were careful not to upset their hosts. As Tsounis observes:
partly because of their occupations, partly because of their other conspicuous features, Greeks were not insensitive to the moods of their host society. Community leaders frequently admonished their compatriots to cultivate good public relations, reminding them that they were "guests in a hospitable land", and that any wrong behaviour would be detrimental to all Greeks and to Hellenism (Tsounis 1971a:61).

In practice, however, it took more than any one person's advocacy of the need to maintain good relations, and the xenophobia of the host society resulted in attacks on Hellenes by returning British-Australian soldiers. This hostility came to a head in August 1918, when returned soldiers, incensed at the death of a comrade during a brawl with North Italian wood-cutters and miners, demanded the deportation of all Italians from the goldfields. Trade union officials eventually halted the looting and damaging of Italian, Slav and Greek clubs, shops and hotels, but by then many Southern Europeans had already escaped to the bush (Price 1963).

Greeks were often mistaken for Italians, and the more extreme British-Australians made no effort to distinguish between them. Often, trouble with one individual was generalised to the entire ethnic population group. In some areas, hatred or discrimination against non-British was more severe. Tamis's (1988) research on Macedonian Greeks in Australia found that the Western Australian Government did not give Macedonian Greeks the legal right to purchase their own home. Pascoe and Bertola (1985) found:

The Italians and other non-British minorities entertained no hope of taking up land in the southwest, but instead took up bushworking. The expression, 'The mines or the Bush', became the catchcry of immigrant Italians in the interwar era (Pascoe & Bertola 1985:13).

The absence of housing and appropriate government organisations and lack of welfare provisions and services forced a number of Greeks and others
throughout Australia to seek refuge at Salvation Army centres. These centres offered then food, protection and shelter. There they felt protected from any intolerance in the host society (Tamis, Interview 10/11/1988).

Unlike other Southern Europeans, such as the Italians who found the Catholic Church already established by Irish or other Catholic migrants before them, the Orthodox Greeks found no church or social organisations to which they could attach themselves (Price 1963:210). As they proceeded to establish churches, social organisations, lay communities, brotherhoods and Sunday or language schools, they were faced with contempt, prejudice and discrimination from British-Australians for setting up their own formal and informal type of organisations and entertainment. Discrimination often was the result of Hellenic reaction against attempts to Anglicise their culture. Often out of ignorance, British-Australians resented the Greeks for attempting to keep their own culture, language and value system. This is evident in the way the editors of the first newspaper issue of the *Hellenic Herald* addressed their readers in English instead of Hellenic, stating their aims in an apologetic tone and style:

> Our aim in inaugurating this journal is primarily to enlighten our fellow-countrymen, the Greeks, in this noble country, and particularly those who have not had the advantage of long residence on its shores ... Our sole aim is to enlighten and educate. We are absolutely and sincerely non-partisan. We neither support nor condemn any particular party, and our watchwords will be Truth, Right and Justice to all (*Hellenic Herald*, Tuesday, 16th November 1926:1).

Hostility towards Greek migrants continued throughout the inter-war years, and with many unable to find suitable employment they were the obvious targets of discrimination. Greeks seeking work outside the Greek community's shopkeeper's occupations were often rejected. Raftopoulos maintains before Greeks established themselves in some sort of small business, many had gone
through all kinds of employment discrimination and hatred because they were Greeks. In discussing his experiences in Australia Raftopoulos recalled the following:

I remember the late Floros Demetriades in 1924, when he went to McIlraith. It was a large steam shipping company and it was seeking somebody who knew French and other languages. So Floros went there for an interview. He was welcomed by the manager there and had a long talk. He was asked if he spoke French sufficiently and was told to begin work on Monday. He said goodbye, and as he was stepping out of the door...the manager asked, "By the way, where did you come from?" Floros at the time was a young man, with blond hair, very good looking and educated. He said "I'm a Greek from Cyprus", and then the manager turned to him and says, "No Greek will ever work in this establishment" (Raftopoulos, Interview 10/10/1988).

At best, when employment was being offered outside the self-contained Hellenic shopkeepers' community, Greek employees could not easily negotiate their employment rights, nor were there any appropriate government employment agencies to help newly-arrived migrants find work. As Price (1963) was the first to point out, Greeks had to help other Greeks to find both work and accommodation. As the Peter Stevens (originally named as Panagiotis Tsirginis; migrated from Promario, Mitilini in 1925) put it:

I came to Australia in 1925. I went to a place in Ipswich. I found an oldie, a gambler, who used to gather at the coffee shops. I actually stayed at the beginning for six months in Sydney and then I went to Brisbane. He wanted to send me to pick up cotton. But this oldie gambler said to me I'll send you to a village where you gonna work. But don't ask for too much money because things are very bad. Twenty five shillings a week was the wage (Stevens, Interview 21/1/1987).

Irrespective of the reality of life within the Hellenic community, and the needs of the newly arrived, Australian government authorities often dealt with Southern Europeans by monitoring their activities and ordering inquiries into their activities. For example, in 1925 Commissioner Ferry investigated the socio-economic practices of migrants of North Queensland. This report made "scathing
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remarks" about Greek lodging houses and cafes. It claimed that "Greeks did not engage in agriculture", and that "socially and economically this type of immigrant is a menace to the community in which he settles, and it would be best for the state if his entrance were altogether prohibited". "They engage in no useful work that could not be better performed without their assistance" (Ferry 1925:76).

Ferry's views were challenged by the findings of a report prepared by the Hellenic Society of Northern Queensland, which denied that Greeks were only city dwellers. Greece's Consul General wrote to the Daily Standard (29/6/1925:12), asking the newspaper to publish the report, which stated that of 250 Greeks in the "Innisfail district, 200 were employed in farming" and only 50 were employed in business. Other nearby towns, the report stated, had more Greek agriculturalists than the Innisfail district. Ferry's remarks were based on xenophobia rather than pragmatic outcomes (Daily Standard 29/6/1925:12).

Following Ferry, Lyng (1927) in writing about the Hellenic presence, overtly discriminated against Southern Europeans by showing preference for the Northerners. He describes the Northern Europeans as "well-to-do immigrants" because they were farmers, carpenters, mechanics and educated, clean-living industrious people (Ferry 1925:76; Lyng 1927:141-143). In contrast, he claimed that the "Greeks are the least popular foreigners" and that Australia does not need this type of immigrant, because:

(1) they live mainly in low-class lodging and boarding houses and occasionally, in restaurants owned by Greeks;

(2) with the exception of a few, most are city dwellers; and

(3) when they have become well-to-do, they generally return to Greece.
Lyng's criticism went beyond the immediate socio-economic status of Greeks in Australia by attacking the political order of Greece. Yet his discussion ends with a contradiction when he states that the 7,000 Greeks settled by 1927 had been absorbed into Australia's social mainstream "without any unpleasant incident", adding patronisingly that "we will miss the Greeks if they leave us" (Lyng 1927:141-143).

Unlike Ferry and Lyng, Price (1963), Alexakis and Janiszewski (in GOC 1988) and Gilchrist (1985; 1992) have indicated that there were historical and economic factors in operation, forcing migrants to behave in particular ways for their economic survival in Australia. In addition it can be expected that because many Greeks left impoverished agricultural conditions in Greece, they would try to avoid farm work once in Australia. The movement of Greeks to the cities following the end of gold rush, constituted a resettlement stage and the beginning of a new era with many immigrants now seeking to raise families in a more stable social milieu. As Greeks were getting out of goldmining and waterfront jobs, they were moving instead into cafes, restaurants, shopkeeping and oyster-farming occupations which they pioneered. While social groups formed in the cities, Greeks had no intention of forming ghettos; indeed, by the 1930s, only half of all Southern Europeans were living in cities, a proportion which held throughout the following decades (Price 1963).

Price (1963:133-134;199; 16/3/1993) shows that prior to 1947 there were only about 1,000 Greek settlers in each of the bigger cities of Sydney and Melbourne out of a total of about 15,000, with a lesser concentration in parts of central Brisbane, Adelaide, Perth, Darwin, and the mining towns of Boulder-Kalgoorlie and Broken Hill, and the industrial fishing town of Port Pirie.
"Southern European migration, therefore, was not markedly rural-to-urban before 1947 as it had been to the United States", and even as late as 1947, Hellenic settlement in the cities was still only 55.7 per cent (Price 1963; Tsounis 1971a). From the evidence available it is not possible to conclude that concentrations of people from the same Hellenic region ended up in the same region of Australia, although this was true in the early years when "regional loyalties and support were necessary as a starting point" (Price 1963:161).

Unemployment, especially from the mid-1920s to the mid-1930s, led to many incidents of racism and discrimination against foreigners that often caused violence. Greek labourers were used in undesirable or provocative jobs in the labour market. One such instance of violence was an attack by British-Australians on the Acropolis Cafe in 1928, after more than 100 unemployed Greeks took on work at the Melbourne waterfront while the wharf labourers were on strike. Union members, insensitive to the financially degrading position of non-British migrants, were outraged at the participation of unemployed Greeks as scab labour. As a consequence, Greeks were physically attacked and on the 1st December 1928 a bomb blew up the cafe, injuring fifteen people. Five British-Australians, including one trade unionist, were charged and sentenced to 15 years imprisonment (The Age, 5/12/1928:3, 4)

The socio-economic situation in Australia prompted Mr. Hrysanthopoulos, Greek Consul General of Sydney in 1928, to request his Government to intervene and reduce Hellenic migration to Australia. There is little doubt that the prevailing socio-economic conditions had become almost intolerable for both the host Australian society and the newly arrived immigrants, especially those individuals
from non-British countries. As the Hellenic newspaper *Ithaki* of Athens commented at the time:

> Ever since [1926], there has been an observed increase in the migration influx. As a result of this trend, the observed lack of employment in Australia and the hatred against foreigners, the majority of Hellenic immigrants completely lacking language and/or occupational skills, go about the streets or remain without employment in the Hellenic καφενεία=καφενεία (coffee houses), which operate under the constant surveillance of the police authorities. Sydney's Hellenic newspaper *Hellenic Herald* published an article in which it describes the tragic conditions of these young immigrants who as it says, in the flowering of their age, full of life and energy, are going about ragged and hungry in search for employment in vain. The Greek newspaper attributes the immigrant influx to ignorance about the [socio-economic] conditions in Australia on the one hand and on the other to the deceitful methods of some shrewd travel agents. The Greek Consul General suggests that Greek citizens must be informed so that they would not migrate to Australia unless firstly, they do have secured employment. He further suggests that in this case Greece needs to take disciplinary measures [restricting and prohibiting migration to Australia] (*Ithaki*, 1 May, 1928).

Conflict often erupted without consideration of costs. The "anti-dago" riots in the Boulder-Kalgoorlie region in 1934 are such an example. Following the death of an Australian footballer who had been killed after refusing to pay for his beer in a local hotel, British-Australian miners, after overpowering police, looted a number of Southern European shops and burnt to the ground at least five Italian, Greek, and Slav hotels or clubs and over fifty houses. Many Southern Europeans fled to the bush in panic (Price 1963). In their analysis of the social history of white men's settlement at Kalgoorlie, Pascoe and Bertola (1985) maintain that the "rhetoric" of the 1934 riot was certainly economic. "An Italian bar-tender accidentally killed a local Anglo-Australian sports hero: the rioting which ensued became crystallised into a set of industrial demands by organised labour" (Pascoe & Bertola 1985: 23). Government interference led to enforcement of a law which, from then on, required all mine employees to have a sufficient knowledge of the
English language (Price 1963). Peter Manos, a victim of the riots, was interviewed by Tsounis in 1969 about the events and told of Greeks and others who had lost more than 100,000 pounds in property damages, but received only a maximum of 10,000 pounds in compensation (Tsounis 1971a; Tsounis, Interview 1989). There was no significant reaction by Australian organisations to the events. The main exception was that of the Communist Party of Australia (CPA), which was one of the few organisations to see the violence as a product of capitalist economic relations. The CPA shortly after the riots distributed a leaflet to inform all members of the community about its view of the matter. The leaflet was written and distributed by Ted Docker just before a general gathering of miners at Kalgoorlie and read:

The Communists stand four-square for unity amongst all workers irrespective of racial, political or any other differences. Had the policy been adopted, no bloodshed or burning of workers' houses would have occurred (Tribune 14/6/1980).

Many more, albeit milder, events of this sort have been reported both before and after the large-scale immigration of post-WWII, particularly in inner and working class suburbs or otherwise industrial geographic localities of the larger Australian cities where these migrants often lived. There were few sympathisers to turn to in moments of need, as racial prejudice came from both public and formally organised forums. Lack of social justice and equal opportunity in the job market and the indifference or even hatred of general society organisations, led many Greeks to either support or become members of radical political organisations such as the Communist Party of Australia.

With the exception of the CPA, the other political parties excluded the non-British from their lists. In contrast, a 1922 CPA membership list showed that 28 per cent of members were from non Anglo-Saxon backgrounds. A list of 150
names of communists handed over to the New South Wales Parliament on the 23rd of December 1931, revealed that at least 30 individuals were from a non-British background. This included Russians, Jews, Germans, and Greeks (Parliamentary Papers, N.S.W., 1930-31: 465-467).

Although the actual proportion of Greek membership of the CPA is not known for the pre-WWII period, it is estimated that the CPA had a higher proportion of Southern European participation than any other British-Australian organisation. Unlike other parties such as the United Australia Party and ALP, the CPA with its ideology of uniting different nationalities on an equal footing, welcomed membership from across the social and racial strata of society.

According to George Georges (originally named as George Georgouras), an Australian ex-senator, who joined the CPA after being a member of the Eureka Youth League, in the League there was no racial discrimination as in the other political parties of Australia. When asked if he faced racism in the Eureka League, he spoke of an all-embracing mentality that existed amongst the members of the League. He said:

Not in the Eureka Youth League, not in the young socialist groups and that's where Socialist groups have the advantage over other groups, they differ from the Labor Party. Strangely enough even though I have forced myself to the top in a way that I can use in the Labour movement, there is still that "you're a nice fella" patronising about it. But in the early days in the ALP, it was very apparent and I think you couldn't succeed and get very far on contacts and I had to make a very hard decision to shorten my name ... Of course there was that blatant racism in the Electorate. "He's just a bloody wog" (Georges, Interview 20/4/1987).

Another veteran member of the CPA, Peter Stevens, when asked whether he faced any kind of racism in the CPA responded that it was "very good. No problems.
Well, problems existed but minor ones, and we solved them with discussion” (Stevens, Interview 23/1/1987).

Despite the fact that Greeks have a strong tradition of political culture, Australia’s Greeks of the time, as Tsounis (1971a:99-101) observes, were more concerned about non-party political activities than party politics in Greece or Australia. The majority of Greeks in Australia were generally focussed on their own Hellenic Community life and practices, tending to be preoccupied with the development of their koinotites (Hellenic lay communities) and Church politics in Australia, a trend which continued for several decades (Tsounis 1971a; Tsounis, Interview 1989). As Georges recollects:

you have to realise that Greeks were still separated and they weren’t in anyway integrated or assimilated. They had their close community built around them...and it was within that community that young people started to stir and rebel against the close traditions of the community which held them apart, through arranged marriages and the rest...(Georges, Interview 20/4/1987)

By the end of the Depression in 1933, the number of Greek-born unemployed was up to 33 per cent as against 20 per cent for the general Australian population (Commonwealth Bureau Census and Statistics 1933). The few jobs in non-Greek-owned businesses were offered preferentially to British-Australians and the immigrant quota was not filled for about ten years. About five thousand Greeks left Australia for destinations unknown due to the economic crisis (Price 1963). Although most Greeks either owned their own business or were employed by other Greeks, the Great Depression left its mark on Greek-born job seekers.

Many suffered due to the socio-economic situation and some ended up gambling. Approximately 50 per cent remained permanently, often separated from Greece and from each other within Australia by the tyranny of distance, without ever managing to return home (Raftopoulos, Interview 25/3/1988).
Gambling was one aspect of degraded Hellenic life during the Great Depression. Many, because they were excluded from their ethnic culture due to migration were isolated and led lonely, rugged lives. Not having anywhere to go in search of their luck, they spent many hours in smokey *kafeneia* largely within the Hellenic community. These views are highlighted in the work entitled *Κάτω Από Ξένους Ουρανούς* (*Under Foreign Skies*) by the playwright Alekos Doukas (1963). 

Doukas who arrived in Australia 1927, just before the Great Depression, provides a vivid biographical description of several Hellenes, other migrants and Australians, as to how they lived and coped during the Depression. He emphasises how many, not knowing where to go to find a job, wandered about the country towns and the cities, looking aimlessly for work year after year.

Doukas' work is based on prose, and is ideologically within a Left framework; it is noteworthy for its socio-historical importance in understanding the era that evolved during and immediately after the Depression, until the outbreak of the WWII. The author argues that the employers, big bosses, masters, (who he calls *αφεντικά*) hold the workers divided with employment preferences within the reserve army of labour. “This preference was in favour of the local labour as against the foreign-born. The same way they had bought many labour leaders. The same way they had bought Judas with thirty coins ... few are the those who cannot be bought even with all the gold of the world ...” (Doukas 1963:155). These people are *palikaria* (good hearted, brave and generous), that is, with a strong sense of *philotimo* (Doukas 1963).

Doukas' discussion of the social problems caused by increased unemployment, embodies the wider spectrum of society rather than that of migrants alone. He describes life in the farms and the country towns and argues
that the banks provided no credit to local farmers to help them sustain a living in their farms. As a result many farmers became "refugees" within their own county, by migrating to the cities (Doukas 1963).

The Depression increased local resentment against foreigners because many still thought that "we take their jobs" (Raftopoulos, Interview 10/10/1988). It was extremely strenuous for the Greeks who came during the economic crisis of 1930s (75 per cent of whom were men), often spending almost four years paying off their passage fees (Price 1963). According to Paroikia:

Many Hellenes [as late as 1930's] were forced to wander about the country as seasonal workers, or woodcutters, and quarry workers, working in the lime pits, often crossing long distances, because the Collier's Government in Western Australia did not grant migrants permission to work in the cities" (Paroikia 1995:38).

During this period with only few migrants able to find a job in Australian-owned business, Greek businesses provided the solution for many of their compatriots. For example, according to the Greek bulletin Parikia (1995:38) the tobacco industry owned by Petros Michelides in Perth, was operating mainly with Greek workers, because British-Australian employers did not want to employ them. If they did employ migrants "the Anglo-Celtic employees went on strike" (Parikia 1995:38).

Although Greeks offered work to other Greeks, this often required having to conform to an unequal relationship between the employee and the "boss", both of whom had different expectations from each other and by the nature of their status already had different material interests. Doukas distinguishes at least four categories of Hellenes during this period: those who belonged to the employed, employers, and unemployed categories, and those who due to the prevailing poverty in society led degraded lives. The Hellenes who had failed, led degraded
lives and were excluded from both the general and Hellenic communities. Those who owned shops, or managed some kind of small businesses, he perceived them ironically as the "bosses", and yet he recognised that at the same time they worked under inhuman conditions in order to earn their living. Many suffered from having to stand on their feet "endless hours" often involved in doing a "dirty" and "unhealthy" job such as cleaning fish shop environments. There were a few others who saw themselves as rich because they had been successful in establishing a business. This type of character hated all those Greeks who voiced their views or had progressive ideologies; consequently, they informed local authorities about the activities of such Greeks. In addition, there were those who worked for an underpaid wage, thus often being exploited even by their own compatriots who employed them to work in their shops. According to Doukas, this experience was the outcome of the decline of work in the farms, but "the farms now looked like sterile cows whose udders went dry" (Doukas 1963:164). In the absence of sufficient employment, most had no choice and once in a job worked up to fifty hours over and above the national union labour standards. In writing about hard work in the shops, Doukas, who in his play is represented by his hero Stratis Mourtzos, says:

Stratis was getting paid 30 shillings a week. He knew very well that the wage was 85 shillings for 48 hour week. He worked 75-80 hours a week for 30 shillings ... one day Stratis asked for increase ... [the boss responded] ... if you don't like the work look for another... (Doukas 1963:165)

But mostly detrimental was the monotony of this life [in the shops], that was killing Stratis who remembered ... life in the farms under the full sun in the company of others (Doukas 1963:164).

Although Greeks posed little threat to British-Australian employment prospects, local perception of cultural and language differences continued to exacerbate friction. As Price (1963) observes, although economics has always
been a source of friction between members of the host country and immigrants (and this was further exemplified by the North Queensland and Murray-Murrumbidgee disputes about questions related to ownership of property), hostility was evident even in areas where economic competition had been minimal. He argues that there was hostility even in areas where British-Australians had never shown much employment interest, for example in the areas of market gardening, small retail, deep sea and scallop fishing businesses. These were areas where Australians enjoyed the benefits of Southern European goods, and the seafood caught by the fleets of Southern Europeans of Port Pirie and Fremantle (Price 1963:213).

Many Greeks were caught between their dreams of Australian prosperity and their inability to fulfil their obligation - as the myth has it, to complete the Odyssean journey by returning home to their beloved ones. Many Greeks who "stayed behind" in mobility terms, often also failed to return to Greece. The failure to return home can be understood in the context of the Hellenic sense of philotimo. Greeks regarded returning home without wealth or some other resources acquired while they were abroad as entrope, that is, "an inward sense of shame" (Raftopoulos, Interview 10/10/1988). Their sense of philotimo, their honour, pride or entrope, often undermined their eudemonia (their virtue, their happiness). Failure to return home due to entrope had serious ramifications for individual migrants and their families awaiting success in order to come with their loved ones from abroad. This outcome is highlighted by the fact that in Hellenic culture, philotimo and entrope are linked to the individual's debates which takes place in the agora, forming part of the collective perception of the koinɔvīa (koinonía, society), and vice-versa. In other words, going back home like a good Odysseus implied some form of success. It was often preferable to postpone
returning home until individuals succeeded either economically or socially, in order to avoid humiliation of the migrants individually or their extended family in "the eyes of koinonia" (society). However, there is no evidence to suggest that if they remained in Australia success was forthcoming, and that they were to be faced with less humiliation, particularly since they remained excluded and deprived from the wider range of occupational and social opportunities of the host society.

Since Australia did not always welcome its foreigners, throughout the inter-war years discrimination against foreigners took various forms of violence, whether the precipitating factor involved culture, language, occupational or economic differences. Lack of English as a medium of communication was often sufficient cause of conflict between the locals and the newcomers. In a question about the amount of racism during the early interwar years, Stevens recalled the following event:

Oh yes, I had bad experiences. In those early days if you didn't know how to speak proper English they look at you as a stranger. I went to drink a beer and without saying a thing someone punched me. There were three other blokes there too you know (Stevens, Interview 23/1/1987).

According to Peter Alexander (Interview 29/1/87), "many Australians, in those days (1920s and 1930s) treated Hellenes as inferior, as if they were lower than second and third class citizens. Since there were no educational facilities like they have today". Similarly, ex-Senator George Georges (20/4/1987) stated that many immigrants were considered as a "sort of semi-lunatic because they couldn't express themselves in English". People "shouted" at his father to try and make him understand:

it wasn't because he couldn't hear, it was because he couldn't understand, so it was terribly difficult in those days...I resented that, I
Chapter 8: Host Australian Society Attitudes Towards Hellenic Settlement

had to fight against it, it was one of the things I had to fight against. That in a sense developed militancy, it was hurtful. There is no doubt of the hurt one feels at being considered inferior (Georges, Interview 20/4/1987).

The outbreak of WWII did not improve local perceptions of migrants, especially since British-Australian xenophobia continued at a high pitch towards foreigners generally. When the Government of the Commonwealth in 1940 ordered the Aliens Control, the Greeks were not excluded (Commonwealth of Australia, Certificate of Registration of Alien 1940). As Raftopoulos recalls:

we queued inside and outside police stations. It was an unforgettable and painful experience especially when some of us had been here for many years and had worked very hard, while others like myself were raised in this country and attended local schools ... The whole thing reminded one that we are undesirable settlers who cannot and should not be trusted when it comes to the security of Australia. Yet there were no evidence for such suspicions (Raftopoulos, Interview 10/10/1988).

Even when Greece had joined the Allies in the anti-fascist cause, Hellenes in Australia still suffered from local hatred. Hostility and suspicion toward "aliens" increased, and little attempt, if any, was made to differentiate between "allied" and "enemy" aliens, so entrenched was Australian-British xenophobia. Although in WWI both Italy (in 1915) and Greece had joined with the Allies, during the WWII period, Greeks and other non-British were still suspected by their hosts. In contrast to the Italians, who were placed in internment camps because their government allied itself with Germany, the Greeks, as in WWI, were on the side of the Allies, fighting against the expansion of fascism, both in Europe and in the Middle East. For the second time in thirty years, Greeks, Australians, New Zealanders and British soldiers were fighting together, with some of the most decisive battles for the outcome of the war taking place on Greek soil in Crete in
In the retrospective commemoration of these events, Australia’s Hellenic media reminded its readers that those battles were battles against fascism, against the powers of darkness. The Hellenic media has repeatedly emphasised that those battles helped build a historical bond between Hellenes and Australians because both were fighting for freedom and democracy, in order to preserve the dignity of humanity. As the editor of the *Parikia-Greek Monthly Review* wrote, “this was a test for the strengthening of existing relations between the Allies at a crucial moment of history” (May 1986:34).

In a moment of contemporary history - the most critical for the fate of humanity - Hellas and Australia came so close to one another and found themselves fighting from the same positions, had the same motives towards the ideals of freedom and democracy (*Parikia-Greek Australian Monthly Review*, May 1986:34).
According to Raftopoulos, the battles against fascism were a useful lesson for those who did not know Greeks well:

Hellenism had shown Australians and Americans and generally to the allies that Hellenes are democratically minded people and with our historical OXI= OHI (NO), we had made it clear to the AXIS forces of Mussolini and Hitler in 1940 that Hellenes fight for freedom, and Independence at all costs. We ignored Mussolini's threat when he said to the Hellenes that he had eight million bayonets, an equivalent number to the population of Greece at the time. Hellenes like other Australians also had occasional quarrels with Italian Australians who tended to support Mussolini. There was a significant difference in the way we felt as Hellenes of Australia and the world and the way Italians and Germans did ... and it is because of this that Hellenes were suddenly treated with less contempt by Australians in comparison to the suspected Germans and Italians who were placed in three or four concentration camps like Tatura. We instead concentrated all our efforts to provide assistance to the Committee for Australia's War Effort (Raftopoulos, Interview 10/10/1988).
To avoid brawls similar to those which took place during WWI when Greeks were often mistaken for Italians, the president of the Hellenic Orthodox Community, Antonis Lekatsas (changed to Lucas), together with the Hellenic Consulate of Melbourne, issued a bulletin requesting all Greek shop proprietors to inform the general public that Greece was Australia’s Ally. Small posters bearing the Hellenic Royal Crown at the top and also the words: "the owner of this establishment is a Greek Ally", were attached to the windows of Greek shops (Raftopoulos, Interview 10/10/1988). This participant further stated that:

we placed them on the windows of every one of our shops then, so they won't think we’re all Italians and thus have the same luck as the rest of our compatriots of 1914-1916 (Raftopoulos, interview 10/10/1988).

In contrast to the Hellenic experience in Australia, thousands of British, New Zealanders and Australians in Greece were given a great welcome, warm philoxenia (hospitality) and protection by fellow Hellenic families. "Many individuals risked their lives to protect the Allies". This behaviour towards the Allies was indicative of the Hellenic determination to make Allies feel at home away from home. It was ironic that the opposite was happening to Greek migrants living in Australia. The tendency of Greek immigrants to form organised groups incited members of the receiving society to various forms of control, including violence. As Raftopoulos recalls:

I remember an instance outside Yiannopoulos' bookshop in Lonsdale Street in the city of Melbourne. We were a group of Hellene-Australian soldiers and had formed a circle and were speaking in Hellenic. We all were of Hellenic origin serving in the Australian Army. As we were speaking in Hellenic and also making certain physical communication gestures, another group of British-Australian soldiers was passing by, dressed in khaki similar to ours with the same crown on the uniform ... but because we spoke in Hellenic, they attacked us and we were caught by the arms, although we were all the same kind of soldier, and all of us were struggling for the same cause, the same purpose (Raftopoulos, Interview 10/10/1988).
Despite the Hellenic stand in the War, hostility towards Greeks was only partially defused (Saloutos 1964; Parikia-Greek Monthly Review May 1986; Raftopoulos, Interview 10/10/1988). There is no evidence to suggest that Greeks were encouraged to participate in mainstream social and occupational activities any more frequently than other Southern European population groups. Although the declaration of Greece on the side of the Allies proved to be relief for many Greeks living in English-speaking countries, including Britain, United States and especially in Australia, where they were restricted to shopkeeping occupations, social mobility within the wider socio-economic and institutional structures of Australia still remained closed to foreigners. Raftopoulos argues that Australia remained a racist society which excluded non-British migrants from entering diverse mainstream social and occupational practices (Raftopoulos, Interview 10/10/1988).

However, over many decades, through diligence, hard work and related values attributed to their understanding of *philotimo* and progress, Hellenes had come a long way towards establishing themselves in business. Achieving economic prosperity in Australia goes back to the pioneer Greek settlers, who had established themselves in some kind of business. Because of their practice of Greeks employing Greeks, unlike most other Southern Europeans Hellenes posed less of a threat to British-Australians in the job seeking market. Yet, the average British-Australian did not distinguish between those who opened up new employment with no threat to the living standards of the locals, and other groups who were a threat (Price 1963:161; Borrie 1954; Kennedy 1976:51). Raftopoulos emphasises the high percentage of self-employment amongst Hellenes by the 1940s. He states that the Hellenes in Melbourne who were not employed in a
Hellenic-owned business by 1945 numbered less than 30 people. He adds that one day in Melbourne it was

myself, Kostas Trilivos, Floros Demedtriades, Odysseus Kostopoulos, Jim James... we all sat down and calculated at the time the number of Hellenes who were not employed by Hellenic-owned enterprises and found that they did not exceed the number of 30 individuals. This may sound unreasonable but it was true (Raftopoulos, Interview 10/10/1988).

Similarly, according to Commonwealth Censuses of two contrasting periods between the inter-war and immediate post-WWII years, Greek share in self-employment increased significantly. In the 1933 Census, 43 per cent of Greeks were employers or self-employed, running some kind of business (18% and 25% respectively), despite the Great Depression's negative effect on the national economy. By 1947 the percentage of Greek self-employment was even higher.

From a total of 8,730 in the workforce born in Greece, 55.5 per cent were either employers (2,729) or self-employed (1,917) (Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics 1947).

Self-employment was a vehicle through which Greek migrants (until the 1950s) were able to work in independent occupations and at the same time spread widely across the country, offering their services to Australian customers in their shops that fed outback Australia. Reflecting on their childhood, Dow and Factor claim that, "In those days, the best eating places in country towns were the cafes run by New Australians", adding further that until service stations started offering meals, "the only way to get a meal in a country town at night was to pop down to the Greeks" (Dow and Factor 1991:134-135; Kennedy 1976:44; Price 1963; Tsounis 1971a).
Illustration 8.5. Pictured here are the Taifalos brothers cutting sugar cane in Queensland. (Source: Rafiopoulos, S.)

More than two decades after WWII non-British migrants could not make public pronouncements against the status quo without the risk of being filed by the secret services of the police force and the immigration authorities. Australia, an essentially Victorian society which had experienced isolation, perceived itself as a largely homogeneous society by 1947. Consequently, "uniformity was held up for emulation" rather than permitting cultural differences, this was being further reinforced through a policy of assimilation (Encel & Bryson 1984:176-177). Languages other than English were still viewed as underground languages taught by clergy and untrained instructors. The Hellenes, although having established their first schools at the turn of the twentieth century, almost
immediately following the establishment of their Greek Orthodox Communities in Sydney and Melbourne, were still forbidden by WWI legislation to day-school education in languages other than English in the 1950s. According to Tamis:

a 1957 report on Greek afternoon schools in Australia suggested that their function should be restricted to that of Sunday Schools. The rationale for this was that only religious instruction should be taught because “the Australian community will not tolerate any language acquisition effort for tongues [that is Greek] and they will press for the elimination of any ethnic activity on their soil” (Tamis 1988:528).

Suddenly, this homogeneity, which continued to be protected by legislation for assimilation, was challenged by mass communications, with an unprecedented expansion in manufacturing industry, and boosted by urbanisation and the post-WWII mass migration program. The increasing suburban life style, the baby boom, and the massive population settlements formed by newly arrived migrants in the inner suburbs of the bigger cities, led Australia to become a consumer oriented society with expanding shopping blocks and mass produced goods.

Paradoxically, this emphasis on homogeneity that often deprived the rights of those who held varying views and opinions about political, social and economic issues, did not always stop those who were members of organised labour from challenging the order of the status quo. For example, by the early 1950s, some members of the Greek Left and members of the CPA were already entangled in a struggle for citizenship rights, and the abolition of the Dictation Test. One prominent member of the Greek Left, Jim Anastassiou from Cyprus, a member of the Building Workers Industrial Union, later a delegate and a member of the Committee of Management of the same Union, went to long lengths in his fight for the abolition of the Dictation Test. In a recent interview of Anastassiou by George Chatzevasiles of Greek newspaper Neos Kosmos, the successful
outcome of Anastassiou's struggles against the Australian bureaucracy in connection to the Dictation Test was revealed:

Dr Evatt, the great constitutional lawyer and ALP leader, had advised Jim Anastassiou, that failing the spelling Test [Dictation] did not take appeal, because [it was] the Government had the constitutional right to expel him from Australia. As it is apparent that Jim was not expelled, not because of the Government's generosity as much as the support of unionised labour. About five thousand waterside workers and other unionised labourers got together in the Town Hall and voted that "there will be no ship which will transport Jim Anastassiou from Australia! Finally, this terrible law was eliminated, and if today we are not in danger, we owe it to people like Jim Anastassiou who gave the battles so we can enjoy equality and multiculturalism... (Ch...vasiles, in Neos Kosmos 6/3/1995).

The Left's struggles for abolition of the Dictation Test in the post-WWII period coincided with the building of factories for mass production, which became centres (characteristically analogous to the sheep station), where often hundreds or even thousands of people worked in the same factory. During this period many migrants came "on a two year contract to undertake manual labourers' employment, as a condition of their entry" (Borrie 1949:44). Migrants were regarded as cheap labour designed to help Australia to achieve economic development. Hellenes and the majority of Southern Europeans were employed as Australia's "gastarbeiter" or "factory fodder" (Collins 1975; Collins 1988). Reflecting on the early post-WWII period, the editors of Parikia-Greek Australian Monthly Review (February 1986), characterised this migration as kind of "conscripted" labour force, for the completion of certain projects. The major part of this labour consisted of "individuals who presumably had limited commitments" outside their need for work and some cash. Hellenes, first males and then females, were brought to Australia to work as labouring hands. They were brought to Australia mainly by ships. These ships, especially those with the "brides", had created unforgettable emotional upheaval, and were described as the
"ships of tears ... the ships of loneliness and of desperation ... " (Parikia-Greek-Australian Monthly Review (March 1986:46). As Mourikis observes:

in the beginning were the shiploads of men. Those who were to fill the factories and mobilise them. Those who would open the roads and lay down the rail lines. Those who would build the hydro electric power stations (such as the Snowy Mountain Hydro Electricity Scheme). Then were the shiploads of women. The "ships with the brides", as the Australian newspapers were writing with irony at the time. As for the "labour" demand, it was unprecedented! (Mourikis 1986:38).

By the early 1960s, the transportation of brides via the ships had been supplemented by "airplanes with the brides" as a means of their speedier arrival. Either way, by this arrangement most immigrants' socio-economic achievement was to be contained within specific occupational enclaves. These categories involved jobs which Australians themselves did not want to do (Encel & Bryson 1984:178). At the peak of their arrival between 1964-1965, Greek migrants became largely involved in unskilled occupations and were preoccupied largely in factories which used Fordist techniques to maximise production¹. During this period, 68.6 per cent were classified as unskilled labour, with only 3.7 per cent in the professional and semi professional occupations, compared with 61.6 per cent and 1.6 per cent respectively for Italians, but 14.9 per cent and 16.4 per cent respectively for British (United Kingdom). Overall, as Price observes, only some of those Greeks who arrived in the earlier post-WWII period managed to succeed in establishing themselves in some kind of independent business (Price 1968:10-11). The only major exception to unskilled occupations was that some 20 per cent of Greeks and Italians belonged to "employed" (that is, self-employed) categories compared with 12 per cent migrants of U.K., 11 per cent Germans, and 7 per cent

¹ Fordist is an industrial technique which involves work in routinised occupations as in production line based on single tasks with extensive division of labour in which most post-WWII Hellenes of Australia were involved for many years following settlement.
Maltese (Price 1968:11). These categories included work in agriculture, retailing and food stores, such as milk bars, or fish and chip shops, and were all areas in which Greeks succeeded. Agriculture, however, as in the pre-WWII period, had caused many challenges and most Greeks avoided it, only a small proportion becoming involved in Australia.

Illustration 8.6. Many Hellene migrants were obliged to work for the greater part of their working lives as assembly "hands" in factories such as this GMH plant. (Source: Parikia-Greek Monthly Review, Dec. 1985:35.)

Illustration 8.7. Hellene women working at routinised occupations alongside other migrants and Australians in a Melbourne clothing factory in the post-WWII era. (Source: Parikia-Greek Monthly Review, 1985:37.)
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The high proportion of Greeks in the factories has been a subject of intense debate over many years; racism, "even in diluted form", continuing to provide the "justification for the super-exploitation of migrant labour by alleging directly or directly that migrants are inferior" (Collins 1975:123). Some have argued (Hunt 1972; 1978:86-116) that Greek involvement in the manufacturing industry was inevitable because they arrived in large numbers during the post-WWII period and thus could not have been absorbed within the Greek shopkeeper communities. Others (Collins 1975; 1986; Collins 1988) argued that Southern Europeans were brought to Australia to meet the nation’s manufacturing labouring needs. According to Zangalis (Interview 11/4/1995), however, it was not simply because Greeks arrived in large numbers that they could not have been absorbed in the Greek shopkeeper communities. It was because:

there was no other place to go to without capital. The little money they were getting, they were spending it to raise families and paying off the mortgages of their houses. At the same time, Australians did not want small business people, they wanted migrants to work in the factories and stay in the factories (Zangalis, Interview 11/4/1995).

Unable to be absorbed within the shopkeeper communities, the post-WWII newcomers were often viewed with contempt by the well-established Greeks due to socio-economic differences. Class differences were further intensified by the political conflict in the struggle for leadership dominance within the Hellenic communities of Australia. This conflict was being further intensified by the "great split" between the Hellenic lay community organisations and the newly founded Holy Archdiocese of the Greek Orthodox Church of Australia established in 1959 (Tsounis 1971a; Collins 1988). As Collins commented, "central to this struggle for dominance in the Greek community was the tension between class and ethnicity, particularly after the emergence of multiculturalism" (Collins 1988:94).
Issues of class differences became apparent even on the factory floor, where many different national groups were destined to work side by side during the post-WWII period. According to Zangalis (Interview 11/4/1995), within this environment the Greek workers became increasingly active through their participation in the industrial unions in seeking workers' industrial rights, and this involvement was strengthened by the role of the Left. In instancing the participation of Greeks in industrial unions, Zangalis stresses that of 100 CPA members who were working in General Motors in the 1950s, about 50 were Greeks. This was indicative of the fact that "we didn't see unionised Labour as a temporary phenomenon but as something continuous that involved the workers' class struggle". Within this framework, Greeks were able to see that "the answers to their problems were in their cooperation with other migrants, and generally with other workers..." "Once this was clear, then through the unions, they became participants in the affairs of this country and not just spectators". Zangalis argues further this cooperation could only have been achieved in the workplaces of factories, as it was throughout the 1950s and 1960s, "because the factories enabled the interaction of many ethnic groups at the same time". In fact, comparatively, Greeks had the highest proportion of union participation of all migrants groups: "90 per cent of Greeks in the 1950s and 1960s being union members", and many, because their Hellenic predisposition for democracy motivated an interest in changing the workplace, did not want to be just members. They wanted to become, as they often did, representatives, delegates and organisers, thus succeeding more than any other non-British migrant population groups. (Collins 1988; Zangalis, Interview 9/4/1995). He stresses that:

The point I wish to make here is that although the Greeks had no Trade Union or factory work experience, within 5-6 years of being in industry in Australia, they provided the largest number of delegates
and other union activist amongst migrants after the British (Zangalis, Interview 9/4/1995).

In spite of Greek workers' interest in unions, their representation in higher ranking positions such as officials remained limited. Tsounis (1971a) lists only twenty Greeks who held union positions throughout Australia -- this was rather minimum participation in positions of power as high union officials. This occurred because positions of power were denied to Greeks and other migrants although they formed the main labouring force in the manufacturing industry. Nonetheless, according to Zangalis, within the manufacturing industry itself, "Greeks were almost always the forerunners in establishing co-operation with other migrants and Australians workers", and for this reason they "were promoted as delegates and organisers in order to enable the unions to function on the base level, in the job environment" (Zangalis, Interview 11/4/95).

The Greeks in turn pressed hard the workers' demands to achieve improvement in the working conditions and wages, "which often led to industrial strikes throughout the 1960s and 1970s". According to Zangalis (Interview 11/4/1995), Hellenic involvement in strikes included the General Motors strikes in both in 1961 and 1964; but also the strikes of the Aircraft Industry and the Dunlop Rubber strikes; the Kitchen Union Lever, Railways, Building Industry, Liquor Trades, including Beer and Restaurant, Waterside Workers, the Seaman's Union strikes and others. In the 1973 Ford's Broadmeadows strike, Greeks had been the most militant group (Zangalis, Interview 11/4/1993; Collins 1975; Collins 1988; Lever 1984). Concerning this event, Hawkins (1973) in an article titled "Greek Community Backs Strikes With Words and Money", has written, "...Greeks certainly were prominent both at the riot on Wednesday and the meeting on Friday which decided to strike indefinitely ..." (Hawkins 1973:18-19).
Paradoxically, despite such mobilisation, immigrant labour remained highly concentrated in the nation’s manufacturing industry and, ironically, this was seen by the Australian public as an outcome of the abilities of Greek migrants and rarely as a situation arising out of the conditions of the host society which denied migrants the better jobs. While, on the one hand, it was seen that migrant labour ought to be integrated within the wider economy, on the other, little was being done to help them and their children to make the transition (Storer 1975; Collins 1988). As Hunt (1972) and Taft (1972:87) have pointed out, despite popular expectations, the reality was that immigrant integration could have not really occurred unless migrants were able to make connections with the host society. Formal contact, it was thought, would not really occur until the second generation through education and inter-marriages. It was all but inevitable that many of the first generation remained in unskilled or labouring occupations.
The high proportion of Southern European migrants involved in unskilled occupations, along with their residential patterns, led to the formation of migrant neighbourhoods, which many locals saw as "ghettos" (Hunt 1972; Taft 1972; Collins 1988). It was argued that national "ghettos" perpetuate themselves through the establishment of ethnic institutions and the use of ethnic language rather than English. However, it has been commonly recognised that such perpetuation in many cases reflected the failure of Australian institutions to provide improved structures which would incorporate the migrants' experience. Undoubtedly, Australian institutions failed to go beyond the rationale of "teaching sufficient fluency in English for the child to be absorbed into the economy, above the level of unskilled labourer" (Taft 1972: 86).

Throughout the 1960s and much of the 1970s upward mobility of immigrants remained limited, with serious repercussions especially in periods of recession -- when unemployment amongst immigrant almost always remained higher amongst immigrants than the rest of the Australian labour. As Collins put it: "Southern European immigrants function not only as a permanent addition to the secondary industry workforce, but also as a "buffer" group which absorbs disproportionately the unemployment generated in the business cycle" (Collins 1975:117). As in the pre-WWII period, in post-WWII, Greek workers often started their struggle for upward mobility after being unemployed for long-term periods. For example, in the 1961 economic crisis, of the 300 unemployed individuals who marched to the Victorian Parliament protesting for their unemployment situation, about 80 were Greeks, while another 5,000 out of 30,000 Greeks in Victoria were unemployed (The Herald 30/5/1961:3). Similarly, in the 1972 recession, unemployment amongst Greeks was 3.9 in comparison to 3.2 for Italians and 2.1 for all Australians (Collins 1975).
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The economic status of immigrant labour experience was highlighted in the Henderson Report on *People in Poverty* (1969). The study showed that the occupation of Greeks and other immigrants in the lower echelons of the occupational strata was accompanied with minimum income earnings in comparison to other Australians. This discrimination combined with discrimination in housing costs in purchasing a house, and which often were old weatherboard homes within the inner suburb "slums", prevented migrants from experiencing upward social mobility, with often unforeseeable implications for their future and the future of their children (Henderson, Harcourt & Harper 1969;1975; Collins 1975)².

The impact of the migrant experience in shaping the perception and attitudes of Australians has been highlighted in various studies. Public opinion surveys between 1948 and 1978 raised questions of acceptability, and documented Australian attitudes towards various migrant groups and their opposition to the entry of most groups, with the exception of British migrants. It is important to note that the "rating of favourability towards a national group was determined by its similarity to the Australian life style and one's share in English history" (Callan 1986:71). A survey taken in 1948 on attitudes indicates that 32 per cent of Australians thought that Greeks should be kept out and 42 per cent considered only a few should be let in. Only 8 per cent wanted to try and get the Greeks to come (Alomes, Dober & Hellier 1984:13). Surveys between 1948 and 1968, often using the Oeser and Hammond (1954) research as a bench mark, reported more positive attitudes towards immigrants and showed also more

---

² Henderson's report on *People in Poverty* (1969) found that Southern Europeans were experiencing high poverty. Henderson showed that when income earned and housing costs are combined in the calculation, then 29.3 per cent of Italians and 22.9 of the Greeks were living in poverty. These findings were reinforced by a later study on Poverty (1975), known as *Interim Report of the Australian Government Commission of Inquiry into Poverty*. 
favourable attitudes towards Germans, Greeks and Italians, with the widespread belief that migrants could assimilate (Taft 1966; Richardson & Taft 1968; FitzGerald 1988). The Perth studies (Taft 1966; Richardson & Taft 1968) indicated a widespread belief that immigrants should assimilate and, though prejudice still existed, it did not have a strong emotional basis. However, British-Australians still only rarely invited immigrants into their homes (Stoller 1966; Jupp 1966).

Despite improvement in attitudes towards the Greeks and other migrants over time (Taft 1978; Callan 1986:71), some hostility remained intact during the post-WWII years and often this hostility was expressed in the form of verbal attacks on migrants through a number of derogatory words. For example, Greeks were called "wogs", "fish and chips", "greasy Greeks", "dagoes", "strangers", "foreigners", "aliens", "migrants", "them" as against "us", to name just a few means by which Australians could exclude the unwanted (Patriarcheas, Interview 16/4/1981; Trahanas, Interview 14/5/1991). As Janiszewski and Alexakis stress,

Unfortunately though, as with the Anglo-Celt, stereotypes have also been imposed and feverishly maintained ... With the Greeks, an "urban stereotype" of the Greek fish-and-chip shop owner or cafe proprietor, or the "folkloric stereotype" of Greek festivals and dancers in traditional costumes, predominate. Accumulatively, such attitudes effectively "marginalise" Greek-Australians ... as being dwellers of the outer perimeters or fringes of mainstream Australian society (Janiszewski & Alexakis 1989:72).
Host society attitudes did not change following the industrialisation and socio-economic transformation of the post-WWII period, nor did this progress end the socio-economic inequalities experienced by various migrants and working class Australians (Collins 1976; Encel & Bryson 1984:176-177). Instead, these factors and the sudden socio-economic transformation of Australian society upset the smooth social transition. In addition there were other forces which continued to fuel xenophobic attitudes. Fear of the “yellow peril” continued to dominate public opinion (due to the Japanese attempt to invade Australia during WWII); the impact of the cold war and anti-communist propaganda, particularly in the wake of the Chinese Revolution and the Korean and Vietnamese wars, aggravated the tensions of life in Australia. All these factors, together with the large scale migration of the post-WWII period, resulted in increasing levels of discrimination against foreigners. Consequently, host society attitudes towards the Hellenic
presence in Australia, were moulded by intermingling socio-economic indicators which created a confusing state of affairs. As Alomes, Dober and Hellier point out,

The reaction against alien "foreign immigrants" was similar to fears about communism and invasion. Images of disease, or at least dirt and smell, of race and of evil were common in popular perceptions of migrants (Alomes, Dober and Hellier 1984:13).

The anxiety about communism was intensified by Menzies' public speeches, and by the Liberal government's anti-communist campaigns, creating political hysteria and further alarming the public (Alomes, Dober and Hellier 1984:2,10). Given the anti-communist hysteria of the period, and the high Greek migrant membership in CPA and in their own Greek Workers' Leagues organisations throughout Australia, Governments did not take kindly to their presence. As a consequence, the activities of the Greek Left were monitored by the special branch of the police force (Tsounis 1971a; Neos Kosmos 13 March, 1995)

The anti-communist hysteria of the period (1960s) forced the Federal government into the "infamous" decision to conscript by ballot Greeks and other immigrant population groups to serve in the Australian Armed Forces. What often occurred was the conscription of young Greek migrants such as George Kallianis (11/9/1967) who were not even Australian citizens, and had been less than one year in the country. The decision to conscript migrants outraged the Hellenic community and feelings ran high against the Liberal Government when Greeks were forced to undergo medical examinations by Australian recruiting army officers, to establish if they were "fit" enough to serve in the Australian armed forces. Those found fit could be and were sent to Vietnam. In fact, a list of 170 Hellenic names recently revealed shows them as being amongst the 50,000 Australians and other Hellenes who served in Vietnam (Greek Times, 29 April,
1995:1, 2). The Hellenic ethnic press and especially the *Hellenic Herald*, and *Neos Kosmos*, by the mid-1960s, were on the attack against the Government with many headlines against the war. These papers encouraged young Greeks to return home and live if they had to with "olives and bread", rather than fight in an "unjust, "imperialist war" away from home. The Greek Left, in conjunction with the CPA, and other Australian organisations (Tsounis 1971a;1971b), became extremely vocal, and through their own Greek Workers' Leagues' organisational publications and radio programs, alerted the community to mobilise against Hellenic and Australian participation in the war (Hearn 1971:151).

Conscription of migrants fuelled by cold war anxiety was an extreme example of the Government's policy of assimilation which required migrants to assimilate the Australian way of life. Academic and public opinion held that for immigrants and especially their Australian born and raised children, acculturation needed to be acceptable to Australian ways (Taft 1972:87).

According to Encel and Bryson, the general Australian response to immigrants from the 1950s to the 1970s included the Commonwealth government's "forceful promotion of assimilation policy. In short, immigrants were expected to assimilate without aid or encouragement from the locals and if they did not it was their fault" (Encel and Bryson, 1984:182 quoting Martin. J.). Martin, too, contrasted social reality with what some perceived as an idealised version of life in Australia, which most people wanted migrants to accept, but which few Australians could achieve themselves.

The expectation of immigrant assimilation often outraged Hellenes who, according to Grambas, had been "deceived by Australia's recruiting officers in Greece. These officials had failed to inform recruited migrants about factory
labouring, working conditions and assimilation. They had not informed the Hellenes that they were to live in the inner industrial "slums" and polluted environments, and that they intended to convert them as they did from rural to industrial workers within a week of their arrival. Australian officials had not said anything about racism and the exclusion of various migrants from the wider range of the host society's socio-economic practices such as higher ranking occupations, and that they would have to fight to assert their "rights" almost immediately after their arrival (Grambas, Interview 12/3/1991). Grambas' view is shared by Trahanas, who states further that Australians asked Greeks, Italians and other Europeans to come to Australia, but following settlement Australians failed to exhibit a sense of philotimo and philoxenia because they were aphilotimoi, and did not know what philoxenia was. They did not have a sense of philotimo, because Australian culture was nationalistic and above all materialistic. Trahanas insisted that materialism was all that mattered, and everything else mattered the least:

It was taken for granted that Hellenes came to Australia to stay and not because of the economic destruction that was brought about in Greece due to the events of WWII, and the role attributed to monopoly capitalism in investing capital elsewhere and thus targeting the transfer around of innocent people (Trahanas, Interview 14/5/1991).

In conclusion, this chapter has provided an account of the experiences encountered in Hellenic migrant settlement and the pattern of social mobility in the context of the host society's public and popular attitudes during the inter-war and post-WWII periods. The chapter argued that in spite of the contribution made by migrants in general and Greeks in particular to Australia, Australian racial discrimination against them, although waning over time, has remained intact through the inter-war and post-WWII years. Racism combined with exclusion of Southern Europeans from entering the job market which was controlled by
British-Australians, led Greeks in the pre-WWII period to remain within their shopkeepers' communities with equally segregated labour during the post-WWII period in the nation's expanding manufacturing industry. This expansion was the main cause of Australia's post-WWII Southern European mass migration program. Exploitation of migrant labour led to increasing organisation of Greeks within the Left movement, which challenged the Dictation Test and the policy of assimilation. Most Greek workers joined industrial unions, which in turn fostered their mobilisation on the factory floor for workers' industrial rights, thus becoming one of the main forces in many state and national industrial strikes. How the migrants' campaigns for rights, previously contained on the factory floor, became a part of a wider social movement is discussed in the next chapter.
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WHITLAM AND BEYOND

The preceding chapter argued that Hellenic migration and settlement in Australia aimed to fill occupational positions which Australians themselves were not willing to fill. It pointed out that Hellenes were forced into servile occupations with limited mobility outside their occupational and residential enclaves. This was the end result of the country's immigration policy and the host society's attitudes towards and expectations of all non-British migrants, who were to forego their own identity and conform to the White Australia Policy of assimilation. This chapter discusses how Greeks and other migrants became mobilised against discrimination by the Australian community through campaigns for rights and how governments, especially the Labor administration under Gough Whitlam, responded to their demands by the early 1970s. As argued in this chapter, the changes initiated during the Whitlam and post-Whitlam period mark the end of one historical era and the beginning of another, in which Australian government administrations started to introduce vital and often radical changes in migration policy. Features of this new period included the granting of legal rights to non-British migrants and the establishment of processes to encourage their interaction within the affairs of the Australian polity. Although non-British immigrant involvement was reticent at first, over the last two decades it has led to the increasing participation of Greeks in most aspects of Australian social, economic and political life. A feature of this participation has been a more liberal development in inter-ethnic relations, beginning with the role of the Greek Left and followed by the campaign of the Ethnic Rights Movement (ERM) for rights which led to establishment of Multiculturalism. Overall, the chapter shows that although Multiculturalism
failed to address certain structural inequalities that had been exposed by the ERM in Australia. Multiculturalism contributed to a more successful resettlement of migrants and their incorporation in the socio-economic and political life of Australian society.

The migrant campaigns for rights and social change in Australia had found many sympathisers within the Left movement and the ALP by 1970s. Amongst the sympathisers were ALP leader Gough Whitlam and his Minister for Immigration Al Grassby, whose famous 1973 speech on the "Family of Nations" contained the philosophical seeds for the establishment of an Australian multiculturalism, and a redefinition of the assimilationist terms "migrants" and "new Australians". By introducing the concepts "ethnos" and "ethnicity", Grassby's speech laid the basis for the emergence of "Multiculturalism" as understood and defined by the ERM. Thus, his views found much support within various academic circles and ethnic communities, although the term "multiculturalism" itself did not appear in government reports until 1977 (Grassby in Bowen 1977; Castles et al. 1988).

The policy shift rhetorically marked in the "Family of Nations" speech both acknowledged and heightened the increasingly vocal role of the Greek Left in asserting ethnic rights within the Australian bureaucracy. The initiatives of the Left were strengthened by the involvement of the Australian Greek Welfare and other Hellenic community organisations by the early 1970s. This period saw several Greek leaders enter mainstream debate for an Australian Multiculturalism. As the Greek-Australian lawyer George Papadopoulos observes:

In the beginning the Greek Welfare was the first overtly and aggressively ethnic agency, particularly in terms of the 1970's and working from a rights-based approach. This is not to say there were not other ethnic-specific agencies but that they operated on a quieter and at that time a more welfare (charitable?) based approach. In essence they were passive about their ethnicity ... (Papadopoulos 1993:1)
In contrast, Greek members of the ERM loudly demanded government recognition of Australia as a polyethnic nation (representing many different national and cultural origins) rather than a monolingual, monocultural society. In an interview, Papadopoulos, a prominent member of the Movement, argued that "Greeks were among the forerunners for rights in Australia" (Papadopoulos, Interview 30/3/1992). According to Matheson (Interview 8/11/1993), another veteran of the ERM, Greeks were an important force in this movement for "rights". Unlike other immigrant communities, "Greeks were very vocal about multiculturalism and the need for a more open and tolerant society" (Papadopoulos, Interview 30/3/1992).

A similar observation was made by Trahanas who stated that Australia needed social change because, until then, the viewpoint of Greeks, like that of all non-British migrants, was considered at worst irrelevant and at best secondary (Trahanas, Interview 14/5/1991). Trahanas further stresses that, the voice of migrants and of Hellenes in particular was not heard. No one asked the Hellenes what their needs were or why they actually migrated to this country; at the same time, the Australian public was kept in the dark as to why Greek migrants had come to their country (Trahanas, Interview 14/5/1991).

A method of exclusion of the migrant voice was the denial of their naturalisation. According to Collins (1975:121), by this method the authorities excluded those who were politically active, especially those of the Left. Some Greek migrants were denied Australian naturalisation, as for example a number of those who were involved in the formation in Melbourne of the branch of the "Committee for the Restoration of Democracy" in Greece following the 1967 coup by the colonels.¹

¹ The individuals involved in this organisation represented the wider section of the Paroikia and they were an important historical force which influenced future developments in Australian and Greek politics. By its foundation in 18 June 1967 this Committee that had replaced the previous Committee for the Support of Democracy in Greece, was partly the continuation of the Lambrakis Committee founded by the Left in Melbourne in 1964, in the name of a Left Wing MP Grigoris Lambrakis, (who was in addition a marathon runner and a champion for Peace and Disarmament), following Lambrakis assassination in Greece in 1963. Subsequently, the greater forces of the Left (known as PAM), was joined by the Centre Unity forces (known as PAK) of the Community that supported the veteran politician George Papandreou’s struggles for democracy in Greece. On the Committee which was formed in 1967 and lasted until democracy was restored in Greece 1974 served a number of
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Illustration 9.1. Prime Minister Gough Whitlam with self-exiled Andreas Papandreou, future Prime Minister of Greece, in Melbourne in 1974 at the invitation of a co-ordinated effort by the Hellene-Australians and the Melbourne Committee for the Restoration of Democracy in Greece. (Source: Greek Newspaper Neos Kosmos.)

This Committee, with Dennis Sikiotis as its secretary, in cooperation with other Greek Left organisations, lobbied politicians, unions and government administrators demanding Australian intervention for the restoration of democracy in Greece, and at the same time to end the discrimination against those who were denied citizenship rights due to the refusal of the Australian authorities to grant basic human rights, and to introduce timely social change following the demographic changes that occurred because of the post-WWII mass immigration. On the Committee were elected fifteen prominent members of the Greek Left and the Centre Unity forces of the political community leaders amongst others were: Victor Nollis (President), Dennis Sikiotis (Secretary), Theodoros (Theo) Sidiropoulos (Treasurer who later became the first Australian parliamentarian born in Greece, to serve in the State of Victoria), Christos Mourikis, Kyriakidou Lefkothea, Leo Doukkakros, Stelios Stathis, Nikos Linolakis, Takis Gogos, Yiannis (John) Tsitas, Georgia Liakou, A. Demoyiannis, N. Gotsis, Plutarch Deliyiannis, M. Papapanayiotou, George Zangalis, Panayiotis Stoicos, Vassilis Keramas, Yiannis (John) Zigouras, George Papadopoulos, Stathis Stathopoulos, Christos Fifis and others. At the same time, most of these people (who were also members of the Greek Orthodox Community of Melbourne and Victoria) were directly or indirectly behind the Hellenic Community's efforts to promote social change in Australia much of which came at the same time from within the greater Ethnic Rights Movement (Sidiropoulos Theo, Interview (17/4/1995)).
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spectrum, several of whom directly or indirectly had been entangled in a struggle for citizenship rights and social change in Australia since the 1950s. Amongst them were George Zangalis (Railways Union), Denis Sikiotis (academic of Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology), and Christos Mourikis (who was a waterside worker in the 1950s and a journalist from the 1960s onwards). Mourikis' case had previously reached the NSW Parliament chambers (Cavanagh 11/5/1965). According to Zangalis (Interview, 4/9/1993), there were about one thousand individuals, of whom up to one hundred were Hellenes who, although residents for more than fifteen years, were unable to gain Australian citizenship. Australian governments denied them citizenship because they were activist or active on the Left and extremely vocal in the anti-Vietnam campaigns and "rights for migrants" movement, and advocated the need for social justice at home such as the improvement in working conditions and remuneration for all Australian workers (Zangalis, Interview 4/9/1993). Zangalis recalls that:

Giovanni Sgro and myself became citizens in 1973 but I repeat there were more than a 1000 people who were denied naturalisation without any excuse apart of course from being active in non-Liberal party, in political and social organisation activities (Zangalis, Interview 4/9/1993). 271

Zangalis argues that the struggles of the "Ethnic Rights Movement" enabled ethnic communities to bring before those in authority the important issues and concerns of the migrant experience. He emphasises that, in an attempt to meet the varying needs of migrants, "the Ethnic Communities, or the migrant workers movement, or the Ethnic Rights Movement if you like" organised various conferences in the 1970s, including the Migrant Education Conference, the Communist Party of Australia (CPA) Conference, and the Conference on Health, which empowered migrants to elect their leaders, and
to make governments for the first time consult with Ethnic Communities about ethnic issues and provisions. The Ethnic Rights Movement, forced society to face up to this reality, that Australia is different, and that demographically and socially there are different classes of people in the work force where migrants go ... ethnic background is not and it should not be seen as synonymous to inferior in economic, social and political status (Zangalis, Interview 4/9/1993).

These issues were articulated in the *Ethnic Rights Power and Participation* (Storer 1975) "agenda", prepared by the Ethnic Rights Movement. It contained a number of articles addressing the multicultural needs of ethnic population groups in Australian society. Contributions were made by Greeks, and by other authors of predominantly non-British ethnic origin. The issues raised informed debate over government policy under the Whitlam administration, and thereby contributed to reforms which were continued and extended under the Fraser and subsequent Labor government administrations (Papadopoulos, Interview 30/3/1992).

According to Matheson (Interview 8/11/1993), the debate for rights has "never ended", with initiatives such as the Galbally Report (1978), and later the Jupp Report (1986), which were in line with the Rights Movement. The Galbally recommendations, for example helped to establish as part of multiculturalism SBS ethnic radio and television in the major Australian cities and to improve education provisions for the teaching of languages other than English, and "bilingual" programs at both primary and secondary levels in various Australian states. Almost ten years after the Galbally Report, the Jupp Report (1986) reviewed what had taken place in terms of policy and migrant services delivery and made proposals for future structures, policies and programs, to ensure the coordination of services delivery and their co-ordination (Jupp 1986). For Matheson (Interview 8/11/1993), the positive results of this ongoing campaign for rights is to be seen in such areas as education, where Greeks have been able to establish
their own schools at primary and secondary levels incorporating Hellenic language and culture into the teaching curriculum. This was a radical departure from the days of the White Australia Policy, when migrants were not allowed to speak their own language publicly. In 1994, there were about six bilingual Hellenic schools nationally, with most being in the states of Victoria and NSW. Although these schools were under-equipped to meet a more balanced bilingual and multicultural education of their students, in broad terms multiculturalism had enabled Hellenes to improve the status of cultural deficit previously experienced. This occurred through the partial incorporation of their own language and culture within the curriculum of government schools and, therefore, within the broader framework of the educational system operating in different Australian states.

In the area of education the objectives ... were in respect of languages and culture; the maintenance of languages, the notion of community, and the value of cultural diversity, I think we succeeded. I don't think it's perfect, we have a long way to go ... the respect for diversity, the richness is very much a part of Australia. In that broad objective we succeeded (Matheson, Interview 8/11/1993).

Others have contested the "success" of "multiculturalism". Zangalis (Interview 9/4/1993) pointed out that various members of the ERM preferred the compound terms *polyethnic* and *polyethnicity* instead of multiculturalism because Australia is a *polyethnic society* and the distinction of the different ethnic population groups and therefore the different ethnic cultures, or the mosaic ethnic character of Australian society, is better captured by use of this term. Similarly, Jayasuriya (1991;1993) commented, that the term multiculturalism, in its normative sense, is a "way of thinking about issues of migrant settlement which replaced the rigid monocultural assimilation of the 1950's and 1960's. In essence, multiculturalism signified that variant cultures can flourish in harmony side by side, provided that there is an acceptance of the commonalities of society embodied in the political and legal system" (Jayasuriya 1993:1). This
conception remains an unresolved issue politically and legally, and "signifies the paradox that what cultural pluralism needs to reconcile commonalities, and the existence of cultural differences" with an overriding universalism (Jayasuriya 1993:1). The author further adds that what even recent reports, and in particular the Labor Government's National Agenda (OMA 1988), have been reluctant to do is to present a coherent and defensible rational for multiculturalism in the 1990s. This needs to take account of the inherent strains and contradictions of the old model, without losing sight of the tangible achievements of the past, as well as to address sensibly, the needs and concerns of the host society and ethnic minorities. The denial of difference and adherence to universalism, [allows only for a] symbolic form of multiculturalism which extols the value of cultural difference provided it is relegated to the private domain as manifestation of one's ethnicity and culture (Jayasuriya 1993:6).

Even the concept "ethnic" has been used by certain authorities wrongly or in order to show difference between the British-Australians and other migrants. Unfortunately, "marginalisation" is commonly evidenced by incorrect and divisionist use of the "word ethnic" in Australia, to refer to all cultural groups other than the Anglo-Celts (Alexakis & Janiszewski 1989a:72).

It follows that, theoretically, multiculturalism came into existence as a generalised government policy in order to achieve the opposite to ghetto-like residential and occupational enclaves, by providing access and equity for all Australian citizens irrespective of ethnic background. With corresponding Government recognition ethnic communities have legal rights to linguistic and cultural maintenance. In addition, the provision of legal protection through the Racial Discrimination Act of 1975 and the ratification of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Kinds of Racial Discrimination, was welcomed by both politically militant and non-militant members of the Hellenic Community and consequently encouraged
significant residential and social participation in the general Australian society.

In practice, however, and despite multiculturalism, government decision-making often discriminated against certain migrants, and the implementation of anti-discrimination laws, including policies of access and equity for all Australians, did not stop injustice occurring against specific ethnic population groups who lived on the margin of the Australian society. As Zangalis (4/9/1993) argues, post-Whitlam administrations have failed to consult with representatives of ethnic communities (one of the key objectives of the Ethnic Rights Movement), leaving decision-making, instead, in the hands of selected bureaucrats irrespective of background and understanding of the views and opinions of those affected. The result has been that decisions are often made to the detriment of ethnic community minorities. Reflecting on the immigrant experience, Bottomley observes:

Although it is undoubtedly true that Australian institutions have still not really faced the task of providing services and opportunities for immigrants and their offspring, those who define policy and practice need a more radical reorientation to take into account the different kinds of cultural capital held by people of non-English speaking background (Bottomley 1991:104).

What this suggests is that in Australia the fear of cultural difference has not been sufficiently eliminated. A recent survey found that 55 per cent of general respondents thought that multiculturalism led to urban concentrations of minorities (Jupp/McRobbie/York 1990:12), and the determination of certain ethnic groups to have their point of view heard has often been criticised and condemned by Australian government bureaucrats and mass media in offensive and defamatory ways. As mentioned, because Greeks were vocal about the establishment of policies that celebrated cultural difference and granted migrants rights, this involvement had been accompanied by "envy" from their hosts (Bottomley 1993:13; Sidiropulos,
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Interview 17/4/95). A well known example was the so called "socio-medical syndrome" that became known by varying names such as the "Greek back", "Mediterranean back", or "migrant back", all of which replaced the "Irish back". This "migrant back syndrome" took political dimensions within the Australian bureaucracy and became formally known as the Greek Conspiracy Case against the Department of the Social Security. The title Greek Conspiracy, as used by a section of the mass media for several years, aimed at stigmatising the Hellenic community through manipulated news stories, ignoring how deep the emotional impact on Hellenism had been as a result. This attitude was nothing more than a blatant government attack characterised by hysteria through overt and covert discrimination against the Hellenic community for being vocal about migrants' rights. They were accused of lying and false creation of the so-called "Greek" or "Mediterranean back" syndrome, and therefore, for causing an unprecedented Social Security scandal. This scandal involved injured Greek and other workers (Greeks were only a minority amongst many other groups of people) receiving Social Security benefits under false pretences. Many of these people were unlawfully arrested by the police and had their pensions cut, while others were scared off and suffered from Government-led or publicly caused anxiety (Aitkin 1977; Contact (Epaphe) 1984:21-26). In response to this situation, the Greek-born Labor MLA for Richmond, Theo Sidiropoulos, questioned the legality of the actions by the Social Security Minister, Senator Guilfoyle, over the alleged fraud.

I told the Victorian Parliament that there were criminal elements in every community and that the headlines about the alleged fraud, discriminated against not only Australian Greeks, but "ethnic Australians". I emphasised that this discrimination marked a sharp contrast to privileges enjoyed by the Chief Secretary, Mr Dickie, during the land deals inquiry. Also that the media headline had not been seen announcing "White Anglo-Saxon, Australian fraud", and that there was no mention of the Australian Housing Commission officers involved ... and that the outrage in some conservative quarters about the amount of money going out of the country in social services payments would have been better directed at multi-national companies.
such as Utah which had paid $141.2 million in dividends to its United States parent company the previous year (Sidiropoulos, Interview 17/4/1995).

Illustration 9.2. ALP MPs in Melbourne, 1986, with visiting delegation. Theo Sidiropoulos (far right) was the first Greek-born member of the Victorian Parliament, and Andrew Theophanous (3rd from left) the first Greek-born member of the House of Representatives. (Source: Sidiropoulos, T.)

Bottomley (1993) argues that this was a phenomenon of State intervention that "goes beyond the efficacy of icons of Australian democracy celebrated in works such as the FitzGerald Report" (Bottomley 1993:13). She further argues that practice has shown that the State in Australia has exceeded both what multiculturalism stands for and democratic practices, ignoring the rule of law and the individual's rights of freedom of speech. This denial of rights was manifested in the Greek Social Security scandals.

In explaining this point the author stresses that:

powerful emotions have revealed themselves countless times in Australia, not only in the complex relations between Aboriginal people and settlers, but also in various anti-immigrant campaigns and in national scandals such as the 1978-1983 social security witch-hunt where virtually all Greek-speakers were slurred into a mess of potage as cheats, liars, and organised criminals, hundreds were arrested in dawn raids on their homes, untold millions of dollars of taxpayers' money was spent in legal and related
expenses involving extremely shady practices by public authorities, and the whole circus resulted in dismissal of all charges, after the longest and most expensive legal proceeding in the history of British law (Bottomley 1993:13).

It follows that to the detriment of the community at large the investigation as a whole had certain beneficiaries. Other than the media, which used the Conspiracy Case as propaganda against Hellenism to attract the attention of its readers and drive Greeks to silence, there was the legal profession of the country. This profession was able to extract maximum financial benefits due to the number of cases and the duration of the investigation.

Despite the lack of evidence to prove accusations often made against selected sections of the population, through their control of the "immense" public power of the State, the bureaucrats tend to either ignore or devalue the importance of cultural identity and the dichotomy between the "private" and "public" spheres of life. Moreover, unable to estimate the invaluable source of symbolic and cultural as well as material capital of the "private" sphere the bureaucrats, with their homogeneous identities defined within the contours of that power by definition deny the challenge of the cultural difference. The pluralist policy of multiculturalism has valorised ethnicity and played down other forms of power relations, such as those based on gender and class (Bottomley 1993:15).

A policy of Multiculturalism, as Zangalis (Interview 4/9/1993) notes, has not provided solutions to problems of working conditions and remuneration for Australian workers, nor led to a greater representation of migrants as union officials, nor addressed poverty in Australia. Although Greek migrants have remained highly active in industrial unions, and have had the largest number of representatives as well as union members of any other non-British ethnic population group throughout the post-WWII period, nonetheless, they were still under-represented in jobs as high union officials even by the 1990s. In summing up his reasoning for these failures Zangalis
states, "in a world of injustice it is difficult to achieve justice" (Interview 4/9/1993; 11/4/1995). That is, in spite of multiculturalism and many years of concerted effort, Greeks, like other working-class migrants, remain on the margins of the Australian economic and occupational structures (Henderson 1975; Collins 1988). It is in this sense that multiculturalism departed from the "rights objectives", at least as viewed by the Greek Left. This is articulated by Papadopoulos, who comments that:

in recent years Australia's discussions of Multiculturalism are ... vitiated by reliance on ethnicity as a non-dependent variable and by omitting class, race and gender from certain key elements of discussions re policy and issues ... (Papadopoulos 1993:1).

Obvious class differences can be found in the occupational scales which multiculturalism has not helped to alleviate, with most Southern Europeans continuing to be occupationally segregated. According to the 1976 ABS Census (see Appendix 5), most Greek people were still involved in the "Tradesmen, etc" occupations (61.23 per cent of females, and 50.67 per cent of males), whilst their participation in the professional and administrative occupations was only 3.15 per cent and 10.67 per cent respectively. In comparison, the figures for British-Australians in manual labour were significantly lower (37.61 per cent with 7.31 per cent for the female population), with a much higher participation rate in professional and administrative occupations (26.1 for males and 11.75 per cent for females). Similarly, the modal category for British-Australian females was the "Clerical Workers", in contrast to Greek women who had only 6.95 per cent employed in this category, with the modal category being the "Tradesmen, etc" occupations.

This lack of occupational dispersion of Greeks into the broader Australian economic market was linked to the host society's low level of institutional readiness as a receiving society. Australia had failed in recognising and capitalising on Hellenic and other migrant skills and
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qualifications obtained from overseas non-British institutions. For example, during the post-WWII period, with the domination of the medical profession by the Australian Medical Association, Greek doctors often joined other qualified migrants in seeking employment in manual labouring occupations. When bridging courses to re-train qualified migrants according to Australian standards were introduced in the late 1970s, government policy had already left many thousands of individuals in deskilling occupations. Though bridging courses to retrain qualified migrants have been increasingly introduced over the last twenty years, only a small proportion have completed them and equally only a small proportion have managed to obtain employment in their occupational field. According to the chairman of Ethnic Affairs of South Australia (Nocella 5/12/1994), of the 3,000 doctors, for example, who did a bridging course in Australia, only 800 managed to pass the stringent requirements of such courses. Although the outcomes of those who undertake bridging courses in other professional and skills areas may be proportional, at least the debate for the recognition of overseas qualification is still going on with much needing to be done to accommodate such migrants in Australia (Nocella 5/12/1994).

A report prepared by the Bilingual Consultancy Network (BCN 1994)) for OMA and the National Office of Overseas Skills Recognition (NOOSR) has made a series of recommendations necessary to improve the speed of processes for the recognition of Overseas Skills and Qualifications. The report found that of the 72 migrants interviewed from Asian, European and Arabic backgrounds, only one in four participants who arrived under the family migration scheme had their qualifications assessed pre-migration, and that they were often unemployed because their qualifications were not recognised. Similarly, many "participants were confused about the migration assessment purposes and the formal skills/qualifications recognition required
by individual associations and trades." In recollecting the post-WWII Hellenic migrant experience in Australia, Trahanas estimates:

that up to about 20 per cent of Greek migrants had either completed high school or were tertiary students in Greece prior to migration, not mentioning the graduates. Many stopped studies for financial or other family reasons to come to Australia. Although many had excellent academic results from our studies. When arrived in Australia neither government authorities nor any other organisation asked us what could be done with our qualifications, our skills and abilities ... no one encouraged or guided us how to improve our chances to get a better job with our skill, qualifications or make use of our motivation and determination. Instead, we were all lumped together in the factory as labour force. Soon we realised that all Australians were concerned about was to increase the numbers of their European working hands. It follows that when we came here in the 1950's and 1960's Australia, not only did not have the infrastructure as a receiving society neither was it willing to create the ground to help its migrants improve their lot (Trahanas, Interview 14/5/1991).

Following years of concerted effort many Greeks managed to find better jobs and break away from the factory segregated manual labour. According to the 1981 ABS Census, the income status, occupational and educational mobility of Greeks and other ethnic groups in Australia began to reverse the trends previously observed (see Appendix 6). It is observed that the first and second generation Australian and British born showed a high degree of similarity across the occupational and educational spectrum (Hugo 1986). In contrast, the NESB migrants, particularly the Greeks, Italians and "Yugoslavs", exhibited the greatest occupational divergence and increasing attainment of higher educational qualifications between generations. In 1981 almost half of the Greek (47.1 per cent) and over half of the Italian (51.3 per cent) and Yugoslavian (58.6 per cent) first generation were employed as tradesmen and unskilled workers; whereas a quarter or less of the second generation were employed in these occupational categories (Greeks 20.7 per cent; Italians 25.5 per cent; "Yugoslavs" 25 per cent). Thus, there had been a significant shift between the first and the second generations, from tradesmen and unskilled to a whole range of practices in the "top end" of the
occupational ladder. Illustrating this change, there has been a significant shift in the professional occupations, from 5.7 per cent to 17.4 per cent, between first and second generation Greeks. These same intergenerational shifts were also observed for other Southern European ethnic population groups: (from 5.7 per cent to 12.6 percent for Italians and, 4.9 per cent to 14.8 per cent for the "Yugoslavs"). In contrast, the 1981 Census shows that intergenerational mobility of first and second British and Irish generation migrants and Australians in occupations has been horizontal and static (with 23.6 per cent of these groups remaining in trades and unskilled occupations and 18.4 per cent in professional categories) (Hugo 1986; Collins 1988:189-191). Similarly, according to the 1986 Census, there has been further occupational divergence with a drastic increase in number of Greeks in the "Self Employed" occupational category, with more than 28 per cent of all Greeks in NSW being self-employed and employers (Castles 1991). The figures suggest that there is a clear departure from the previous occupational practices (see Appendix 7). A similar trend has been observed in the area of tertiary educational qualifications obtained between generations by 1981: from 1.4 to 7.2 for Greeks and from 2.2 to 5.3 for Italians, 1.6 to 5.7 for the Yugoslavs and 7.9 to 7.8 for Australians. This trend is further elaborated by an intergenerational mobility study between first- and second-generation migrants prepared by BIR. The study, which is based on the 1991 Census, shows that while Greeks have the highest proportion of people with no qualification, at the same time they also have the highest proportion of individuals between two generations who have gained a degree from tertiary institutions amongst Western Europeans and British-Australians (18.8 percent of Greeks gained degrees in contrast to 13.1 per cent for Italians, 15.2 per cent for "Yugoslavs" and 10.8 per cent for Australians) (see Appendix 8).
Other Hellenes, as with their earlier compatriots, continued to pioneer in establishing certain industries such as opal and pearl industries throughout the post-WWII period. In fact, for over a century Hellenes had contributed significantly the establishment of the pearl industry and with the increasing number of Kalymniots brought to Australia during the post-WWII period in Darwin, Hellenes became amongst the nation's legendary pearl luggers and pearl businessman in Darwin (Northern Territory) in Broome (Western Australia) and elsewhere (Janiszewski & Alexakis 1989a:72). Many others sought for their luck in searching for opal in the mines of Lightning Ridge (New South Wales), Coober Pedy, Mintabie (South Australia) and in some of these places managed to gain control of a large part of the mining and marketing of opals (Karefylakis, Interview 9/4/1994).

**Illustration 9.3.** Denis George, Pack Island, Torres Straight, 1957. As the caption in *O Kosmos* states: "A young Greek migrant full of ambition aspiring to cultivate a south seas pearl". Thirty years later, in Cairns. Like many other Hellenes, George gave his working life to the development of Australia's pearl cultivation industry. (Source: George, C. D., and Alexakis & Janiszewski in *O Kosmos*, Dec. 1989:72.)
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On the other hand, in some industries, such as agriculture, Hellenic participation has remained almost static between the 1970s and 1980s. This in part reflects the comparatively low number of Greeks who have managed to enter in agricultural occupations. Many of those who did succeed in purchasing farm properties in the 1960s and 1970s did so through hard work and savings. The purchasing of farm properties was often the cause for internal chain migration of many Greeks, a practice which often resulted in the conversion of predominantly British Australian areas into Southern European ones. Such conversion occurred despite efforts by locals to prevent Southern Europeans from entering British-Australian areas in large numbers. As Price observes (1963), in some farm districts such as Mildura, Shepparton and Murrumbidgee, "often deserted and derelict land sold by British Australians to pay off debts, were bought by Greeks". Similarly, because of land sales in Robinvale and the Riverland, many Greeks who had managed to save for a deposit, and (encouraged by banks) borrowed the rest of the money, were able to become owners of farms, and most made very significant inroads into land and building ownership. As a result, by 1988 in
some towns of the Riverland (Renmark, Berri, Loxton, and Barmera, Paringa, Monash), for example, Greek fruit-growers owned up to 25 per cent of the irrigated land (Renmark Irrigation Records 1988; Berri Land Irrigation Records 1988).

**Illustration 9.5.** Hellenic family fruit growers picking fruit in Renmark during 1965. Rear left, brothers Angelos and Panayiotis Kalantzis, Anna Vlachos, Voula Kalfantis. Front left, Yiannis Kalantzis, Konstantina Kalantzis, Dionysios Vlachos (Source: Kalantzis, Y.)

In spite of Hellenic inroads in the area of ownership of land and buildings in agricultural areas, there was discrimination against Greek agriculturalists in the Riverland, Mildura, Shepparton and elsewhere. According to local informants, local authorities, through their control of the Land and Irrigation Authorities of the Riverland, created regular problems for Greek and other migrant fruit growers in relation to the timing and volume of irrigated water. Similarly, in contrast to British Australian farmers, Greek growers faced severe economic problems due to exploitation from the Riverland Fruit and Wine Co-operatives, who often failed to make
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payments for the produce purchased, with the result that many lost large amounts of money (see Appendix 9). British-Australians, having full control of the administration of the fruit growing industry and of the affairs of fruit growers, were able to use hidden agenda tactics that enabled them to extract greater benefits from that industry for themselves and the local farmers who usually received favourable treatment in their dealings with local authorities, thus depriving Greeks and others non-British migrants of their rights (Dedes, Interview 23/12/1988).

In the Riverland, throughout the post-WWII era, and especially in the 1970s and 1980s, in an attempt to achieve their "rights", Greek fruit growers organised themselves and became politically mobile. They did this by firstly electing a committee\(^2\), and secondly, by exerting significant political pressure on the local authorities and then, together with the locals, exerting pressure on the Federal and the South Australia state governments. According to Dedes, towards the late 1970s two hundred cars were driven to the South Australian-Victorian border at Kealba. This purpose of this mobilisation,

was to close the highway (number 20) that links Victoria to South Australia and N.S.W. We believed in this way we would make the Federal Government show interest for our economic devastation. When we arrived there the police intervened and told us to stop because we were obstructing the traffic...! The message finally arrived at the Government in Canberra not only because of the rally but because of our poverty here in the Riverland and consequently the continuation of our campaigns and efforts. The Fraser Government had sent Ian Sinclair, Minister of Agriculture and leader of the National Country Party. When he came on the 19th of December 1978, the word was spread quickly and about one thousand of us got together at the Renmark football oval. When we asked him to find ways so we could sell our produce so we can get paid for it, he told us that "there was an economic crisis and that the Government will try and look for a solution". I've told him that we suffer economically and that we have difficulties in meeting our bank loans terms, and he told me "you should go to the

\(^2\) The establishment of the Committee was of a temporary nature, and was constituted amongst others by: Tom Oikonomou who was the coordinator, with Peter Zervoulias, Peter Markeas, Sotiris Polymeneas, and Vangelis Dedes as members (Dedes, Interview 26/4/1995).
unemployment office [and get the dole]... In other words, these were the Government incentives believe it or not ... Then I told him that this is a nice answer to want to convert people who operated small businesses into bludgers. In reaction to this, he took his comb out of his pocket and started to comb his hair so he can be photographed and look beautiful in the newspaper. The Federal government had given us the PULL SCHEME both before and after our mobilisation which was a failure. Because it meant that we had to uproot our trees and vines and were to be compensated (as some did later) with $800 - $1000 an acre. It was obvious from the beginning that his scheme did not and could not have worked because it was not a productive solution to our crisis ... since if you uprooted a tree or a vine as some of us did under this scheme, we had to wait for at least five years for new produce (Dedes, Interview 23/12/1988).

While the demonstrators may not have achieved all their goals, their ability to mobilise at this level demonstrated a capacity to organise to apply political pressure on a number of Australian politicians to improve developments in agriculture and in the fruit growing industry (Dedes, Interview 23/12/1988; The Advertiser, 20/12/1978).

Illustration 9.6. Hellene fruit growers meeting Minister of Agriculture Ian Sinclair during their mobilisation at Renmark SA on 19 December 1978. Here, growers Panayiotis Zervoulias and Evangelos Dedes make their point to the Minister. (Source: The Adelaide Advertiser, Wed., Dec. 20, 1978:1 and also Dedes, E.)
The changes observed in the area of different occupations, and their ability to organise and mobilise themselves, were followed by significant changes occurring in the level of overall Hellenic cultural homogeneity due to the processes of settlement and resettlement. Initially, a very high level of homogeneity characterised Hellenic migration: a homogeneity based on a common nationality, identity and religion (with, for example, 95 per cent of all Greek migrants belonging to the Greek Orthodox Church), and manifested in intensified resettlement concentration in the larger metropolitan areas of Australia. The nature of such concentration enabled chain-migration mechanisms to operate in a way that brought relatives and friends from the same village, town, or other parts of Greece to join their compatriots in settlements within industrial zones. There, the Greeks, Italians and other immigrant communities created social and residential formations that gave the impression of ghetto settlements, by creating social space enclaves (Burnley 1976; 1977). These settlement concentrations had a strong impact on previous neighbourhood structures, with the result that often the British-Australian felt compelled to move out towards the newly built suburban neighbourhoods, leaving the industrially dense and polluted environments to newly arrived immigrants.

Following maturity of settlement, accompanied by government policy changes to help migrant resettlement, Hellenic residential mobility was inevitable. By 1986 (ABS Census) many Greeks had moved further out to some of the cleaner, newly-built and more affluent suburbs. This mobility started with Greeks moving from one inner to another inner area within the industrial centres, with resettlement occurring over many years to inner-outer and outer suburbs. The rate of this movement between inner city to inner-outer city and outer suburbs ranged from 4 to 50 per cent in different areas over the ten year period 1976 to 1991 (see Appendix 10). According to a Bureau of Immigration Research (BIR) study by Bell over the period 1981
patterns of net migration of the Greek-born are distinctive, with substantial losses from the Inner City regions of Sydney (region number 01) totalling more than 4000 persons in aggregate. There were compensating net gains of Greek-born persons in St George-Sutherland (03) and Canterbury-Bankstown (region number 04; 812 and 660 persons respectively), and in the Inner-eastern (27) region of Melbourne (1371 persons). These patterns again reflect progressive outward diffusion of the Greek-born from their traditional regions of first settlement in the inner suburbs. Net gains and losses of Greek-born persons elsewhere in Australia are comparatively small, reflecting the smaller number of Greek-born persons in the remaining states and the larger geographic size of the regions in their capital cities (Bell 1992:191,194).

This mobility was the product of many and interrelated factors, including the failure by Greeks to materialise their initial objectives and return to Greece with sufficient wealth, the lack of timely and sufficient policies by Hellenic governments to encourage repatriation, and the granting of rights to ethnic groups in Australia through the establishment of Multiculturalism. The result was that the inner suburbs became "transitional zones" for subsequent migrant resettlement within the Australian social space.

As well as not remaining stationary residentially, Greeks succeeded in being mobile in a whole range of other areas, including: an increasing proportion of inter-ethnic marriage, mainstream political participation, and the taking up of Australian citizenship. Studies by the BIR have shown Greeks amongst the top six non-British ethnic population groups in Australia in terms of Australian citizenship (BIR 1990;1994). According to the 1976 ABS Census figures (Price 1979a), 65.33 per cent of those born in Greece who had been in Australia for less than twenty years, had taken up citizenship. This number increased to 90.7 per cent in 1986, reaching an average of 94.2 per cent for the whole population born in Greece and 96 per
cent for those who had been in Australia for 15 years or longer by 1991 (BIR 1986:10; 1994:16).

Similarly, the marital status of post-WWII Greek migrants was strongly affected by the length of stay in Australia. In the mid-1960s, during the early stage of their settlement, Greeks remained very highly endogamous, with 88 per cent marrying partners from the same country. This is in contrast to Italians who had 64 per cent of endogamous marriages, and non-British Northern Europeans who had approximately 60 per cent endogamous marriages during the same period (Immigration Advisory Council 1969). However, as Greek settlement matured, statistics indicate that there was an increase in the number of inter-marriages (Immigration Advisory Council 1969; Price 1989). Price (1989:35-36) has shown that, by 1988, 25 per cent of second generation Greek women entered mixed marriages. Similarly, according to the archives of the Holy Archdiocese of the Greek Orthodox Church of Australia (1994), by 1992 more than 33.1 per cent of all Greeks were marrying outside their own ethnic population. As illustrated in Figure 9.1, between 1975 and 1992 the rate of inter-marriages celebrated within the Greek Orthodox Church was constantly increasing, for 14.8 percent of the total marriages in 1975 to 33.1 per cent by 1992.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Greek Marriages</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2324</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Christian Marriages</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9.1**

**Source:** (Holy Archdiocese of the Greek Orthodox Church of Australia 1994)
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The figure indicates that between 1975 and 1992 inter-Christian marriages entered into by Greeks increased by more than 123 percent. In addition to the marriages celebrated within the Greek Orthodox Church, there must have been a significant number of mixed marriages outside this institution. In some parts of the country, such as Western Australia, where maturity of Hellenic settlement has been greater and the group size proportionally smaller, inter-marriage has also been greater, with 64.3 per cent of all Greeks now choosing non-Greek partners (Holy Archdiocese of the Greek Orthodox Church of Australia 1994). These findings suggest that the greater the maturity of Hellenic ethnic settlement, the greater the degree of inter-ethnic marriage amongst Hellenes, which suggests that passage of time is key feature in inter-ethnic interaction.

As well as the changes in the occupational, residential, marriage and Australian citizenship status of Greeks, greater social interaction between Greeks and the Australian society since the 1970s has resulted in the increasing connection of Hellenic organisations within broader society networks, along with an increasing involvement of more and more leaders of Hellenic origin within these networks. Since the 1970s, in contrast to the earlier Post-WWII period, Greek-Australians have shown significant levels of social involvement and political participation outside their immediate communal organisational settings (Petrolias 1959; Davies 1972; Tsounis 1971a; 1971b; Hearn 1971). As discussed earlier, the increased involvement of Greeks in the wider society was initiated mainly through the activities of the Greek Left (Tsounis 1971a; 1971b; Zangalis, Interview 4/9/1993; 11/4/1995) asserting their rights as immigrant workers within the wider Australian radical left movement; and in participating in the numerous struggles of the people in Greece and elsewhere. "In both cases the field of operation was mainly the Greek ethnic communities in Australia and the principal agencies through which the Greek Left acted were workers clubs,
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that had Grecian focus" (Tsounis 1971a:55). Similarly, Hearn (1971:149) stressed that although "Greek and politics are often regarded as synonymous, in Australia this relationship is fully operative within the confines of the Greek community which is eminently suited for the purpose". In fact, as Papadopoulos points out:

At the time of the formation of the Greek Welfare [early 1970s], only the various elements of the Greek Left, principally the Communist Party branches, did any sort of social policy discussion—consider the issues of Epitheorisis and the Greek Left Review and the Neos Kosmos newspaper. The Left analyses were, however, maintained within constrained frameworks, in particular by over-reliance on class as a non-independent variable... At the ... time (other than the Communists), no other political party had any ethnic affairs policies or ethnic branches ..., Greek branches of the Australian Labour Party were then forming. But they became more publicly involved and influential in policy discussion and communal issues in ... the later 1970's (Papadopoulos 1993:1).

As Australian political parties began to accept Greek and other Southern Europeans as members, their increased active involvement in Australian politics became a matter of time. As their involvement in various Australian parties increased, many Greeks were able to divert their focus from the CPA, which had served their needs and framed their ideological perceptions during the pre- and early post-WWII periods, to other parties, including the ALP and the Liberal/National Parties, both of which until the 1950s had refused the participation of non-British migrants (Jupp 1966; Storer 1975). Consequently, Greeks had remained pre-occupied with the politics of their own communities (Petrolias 1959; Tsounis 1971a;1975), leading Reich to comment in 1981 that "social mobility and the drive for status privilege and power have been taking place largely within the Greek communities' organisations in important spheres of social and cultural life giving the Greeks ample opportunities for social and political positions which have generally been denied to them by the Australian society" (Reich 1981:171)³.

³ In quoting Tsounis, Reich (1981) claims that the number of positions increased with the segmentations of communities and growth in size of various organisations, which were about 600
According to Collins (1975), to understand the lack of migrant involvement in Australian politics, requires locating the discussion of the migrant labour experience within a Marxist analysis of Australian capitalism. He stresses that immigrant labour under capitalism formed the function of an "industrial reserve army", artificially divided from indigenous workers elevated to a "labour aristocracy" by the granting to them of special privileges. Immigrant participation in Australian politics, according to this framework, could be best realised if immigrants and the "indigenous working class" united to break the barriers of racism and "labour aristocracy" created under capitalism. Only then could the capitalist political order be overcome and worker exploitation ended. Until that time, migrant workers, as an underclass, would be denied participation in mainstream Australian institutions, including political parties.

Aitkin (1977) argues that in spite of "talk of Italian and Greek ghetto formation, there were very few parliamentary constituencies until the mid-1970's". He argues that social mobility of migrants had failed to disturb the equilibrium in the party system and that massive immigration had little effect, with migrants having accepted the party choices offered to them, with only marginal benefit to the non-Labor bloc. Bottomley (1976:95) pointed out the resistance of Australian institutions to migrants and the demand of political parties to absorb them into the existing party structures rather to form ethnic branches. "Anglo-conformism combined with class-location constrained and pre-defined the life chances of those from less favoured ethnic groups, while the same groups were under-represented in the political system at all levels (Bottomley 1979:13). Allan (1981) emphasises that party loyalties can affect whole ethnic communities by single government actions...
or mistakes, as did for example, the Mediterranean or Greek back syndrome which led to the infamous Social Security scandal (already discussed). As Allan notes, "the so-called Greek Conspiracy Case involving the alleged use of fraud by a number of Greeks to obtain Social Security pensions ... turned many Greek-ethnics against the Liberal Party" (Allan 1981:22; Jupp 1988).

Nonetheless, as Greeks became increasingly socially mobile, there was evidence of an increasing Hellenic participation in Australia's major as well as smaller political parties. This participation marks a shift in Hellenic politics beyond their ethnic community organisations and the CPA -- initially the only party prepared to accommodate non-British migrants. After the initial establishment of political party branches by the Communist Party of Australia (Jupp 1966, cited in Storer 1975), the Australian Labor Party (ALP) in Victoria followed suit in the 1970s, offering non-British migrants the opportunity to set up party branches by different ethnic populations. Initially, the ALP was seen to be as racist as the Liberal Party, but in the face of social change during the post-WWII period in Australia, combined with the realisation that with the "migrant vote" it could win power after twenty three years in opposition, it encouraged the establishment of different ethnic branches.

The establishment of ethnic branches enabled the emergence of Greek participation in ALP politics as a strong political force by the late 1970s. As a result, Greeks in Australian politics have arguably higher participation than that any other non-Anglo ethnic group (Jupp 1988:145). Allan emphasises that the Victorian ALP experienced great ethnic transformation, and that the dominance of Irish Catholics, replaced by

---

4 According to Jupp (1988:144), as early as "1958 ALP Leader H.V. Evatt recognised the existence of great potential support for the ALP from Greek-Ethnics". This view appears in "his policy speech for the 1958 Federal elections, where Evatt sought to win Greek-ethnic support by promising to support justice for Cyprus while Greece was in diplomatic dispute with Britain over the future of the then British-occupied island"."
Anglo-Protestants after 1955, is now under challenge by Greeks (Allan 1985:133-143); Jupp emphasising that "such control is not sinister, and should not be looked as such as it is by some members of the ALP. Greek control is not likely to prove any worse, and may even be of higher calibre than that of other groups in control of local councils" (1988:148).

The new level of Hellenic participation in Australian life reflects the beginning of their political incorporation within the structures of the wider Australian society. One measure of this incorporation is the increasing number of Members of Parliament of Hellenic origin serving the Australian nation (Allan 1985; Jupp 1988). No longer do Greek-Australians have to campaign for leadership positions within the Hellenic Australian organisations alone, as was the case until the early 1970s (Petrolias 1959; Tsounis 1971a; 1971b; 1975; Reich 1981). Instead, they now have the choice to participate, if they so wish, in the general society's political arena. In fact, in 1995 the secretary of Greek ethnic branches of the Victorian ALP, Michail, confirmed the existence of eleven ALP Greek ethnic branches in Melbourne alone, generally located in areas with high Greek populations (Allan 1985:136; Michail, Interview 1995). Similarly, as in 1975 following the initial establishment of the Greek branches of the ALP, twenty years later in 1994 there were still 1200 members of these branches (Sidiropulos, Interview 17/4/1995). In addition, there was increasing participation by Greek immigrants or their children in the English-speaking branches in Melbourne, with one estimate by the ALP in Victoria (Michail, Interview 26/4/1995) that approximately 200 Greek persons were participating in five Victorian English-speaking branches by 1994. Similarly, the Liberal Party acknowledges the existence of at least two bilingual Greek branches in Melbourne, with an increasing number of individuals from the Hellenic community taking up membership. From only five members in the 1950s, Greek membership of the Liberal Party of Victoria in 1994 had increased to
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least 500 out of 20,000 total membership in Victoria alone (Petrolias 1959; Karavitis, Interview 1995). The number of Greeks standing for pre-selection in both of the major Australian parties, but especially in the ALP, has similarly shown an increase; and while the proportion of Greeks granted preselection in the coalition of the Liberal/National Parties remains marginal, it nonetheless marks a departure from the previous disinterest by the Liberal Party in migrant politics.

In 1994, other than the increasing (although proportionally far from adequate) Hellenic participation in various Australian organisations and local government councils, there were at least 14 Greek Australian politicians, representing both the Liberal and the ALP parties, elected to the Federal and various state parliaments (see Appendix 11). An important feature of the migrant participation in Australian political life is that MPs of Hellenic ethnic origin do not have to depend entirely on the resources and support of the Hellenic community, but draw from the broader base of Australian society. Conversely, although Greek voters support Greek candidates, ultimately their vote is given largely to candidates according to the policies and party they represent, whether it is the ALP or the Liberal/National Party (Neos Kosmos 17 Oct., 1994).

---

5 The Liberal Party does not keep separate figures for each ethnic community group. But according to Con Karavitis (Interview 7/1/1995) who was pre-selected to represent the Liberal Party in the area of Pascoe Vale in the last elections for the state of Victoria and who was very active in organising Hellenic Community support for his pre-selection, there were no less than 500 members from the Hellenic Community of the Liberal Party in Victoria. Similarly, according to Frank Hingan (Interview 24/4/1995) from the head office of the Liberal Party in Victoria, there was an increasing proportion of Greeks who are now members of the Liberal Party. He further stated that the Liberal Party has 100,000 members nationally of which 20,000 were in Victoria and there the Greek Community is a very large and probably there are more than 500 Greek members. Hingan estimated the proportion of Greek participation in the Liberal Party in other parts of the country such as Queensland and Western Australia would be even higher.

6 Twelve MPs of Hellenic origin were elected predominantly in the inner suburbs of Sydney and Melbourne where most Hellenes of Australia were concentrated until 1995. Six of them were elected in Melbourne and another six in Sydney.

In this respect, Hellenic party loyalties are influenced by length of settlement. As with most other voters, Greek voters differentiate parties and support candidates according to their perception of how political and economic issues affect their lives. Over the last decade the mass media, especially radio and print media, including the previously Left and subsequently exclusively pro-Labor newspaper *Neos Kosmos*, have increasingly covered the activities of the Liberal Party, and in particular the activities of Greek Liberals. There has not only been a differentiation of support between the two major parties, but also a growth in support for and commitment to new minor parties.
Illustration 9.8. Hellenes marching in the anti-nuclear campaign of 1983. During the 1980s, Hellenes featured in many Australian demonstrations for Peace and Disarmament. (Source: 90th Anniversary Album of the GOCM&V.)

The "Greenies", with their conservationist views, have made significant gains within the Hellenic community, especially with the establishment of an independent Hellenic conservationist body in Melbourne. Although not identified as political, the "Greek Greenies" have sought community support for conservationist issues and have campaigned for the involvement of Greeks in the conservation and protection of the Australian environment and natural resources. This political diversification reflects both the broader social and economic changes within Australia's Hellenic population outlined previously and the increasing incorporation of Hellenes in a wide range of positions of power. As Tsounis states:

We observe a fairly large ... Hellenic presence in the political life of the country: within labour unions ... in a level of leadership positions in unions; there is participation in many political parties and in other political and social organisations; with participation in local government being fairly evident ..., there are three Hellenes in positions as mayors in three of the six capital cities - in Perth, Adelaide, and in Hobart- cities which have relatively less Hellenism; Parliamentarians in State and Federal Parliaments- and at least one Federal Minister and, other Ministers in State
Governments or as appointed advisers, as in Ethnic Affairs Commissions (Tsounis 1989a:8).

Tsounis (1989a:8) adds that, by being empowered to participate in the political life of the country, Hellenism is increasingly being incorporated into the legal and political system of Australia, with all of its attendant rights and obligations. For the majority of Hellenes, the choices they make at this level are largely irrelevant to what happens within the paroikies (Hellenic communities abroad) and their Koinotites (lay community organisations) and whether there is internal conflict and divisions (Tsounis 1989a:9). Greek participation at both these levels reflects both the success of Multiculturalism in facilitating migrant participation in the social, economic and political life of the broader community. This participation, has never ended the migration experience of Hellenes, which remains one of continuous struggle for rights and equality within an evolving multicultural framework. This evolution, which is distinguished by increasing social and political participation and incorporation within the wider community, and upward social mobility, will be demonstrated graphically in the next chapter.
Chapter 10

SOCIAL MOBILITY AND POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR OF GREEKS IN AUSTRALIA

Analysis of single socio-economic variables and class status

The preceding chapter dealt with the collective advancement of Greeks in Australia in the context of the nation's immigration policy and host society attitudes toward the settlement and mobility patterns of such migrants. This chapter will investigate the socio-economic variables such as residential and occupational mobility, as well as the economic status over time of those who migrated. A field study survey was conducted using a survey questionnaire to collect data on these variables (as explained earlier). Correlation of the variables indicates the Greek immigrants' position in terms of social class rankings, and provides the basis for an overall analysis of the social class attained by them since settlement. Using this class analysis, the political behaviour of Greeks in Australia is explored, delineating the significant factors affecting political party affiliation.

The statistical analysis of data gathered from the field survey utilised both univariate (single variable) and multivariate (many variables) methods. Univariate methods included frequencies and cross tabulations, while multivariate relied on Discriminant Analysis. The statistical package SPSS-X was used to process the data and also to apply the statistical procedures. Frequencies of the variables were calculated via the FREQUENCIES procedure, tables were formed via the CROSSTABULATE procedure and $\chi^2$ statistical significance as well as Discriminant Analysis were via the DISCRIMINANT procedure. Graphs (figures) have been drawn using the Microsoft Word package.

Residential Mobility

Residential mobility of Greek immigrants in Australia refers to the movement or lack of movement across different geographical localities after settlement. The survey elicited information for first and last places of residence, categorised in terms of the inner, middle, and outer suburban areas of Melbourne, Victoria, and country areas of the Riverland, South...
Australia. Inner to middle suburbs are defined as those which extend from Thomastown to Prahran and from Northcote to Footscray. Outer suburbs are Doncaster, Bulleen, Box Hill and areas stretching along the Eastern and North Eastern suburbs of Melbourne (see Figure 10.1 below). The country area (see Figure 10.2 below) stretches along the Murray River and includes the fruit growing towns of the Riverland. The residential mobility between the first and last places of residence are compared in Figure 10.1.

Figure 10.1. Categorisation of inner (or industrial), middle, and outer suburban areas of Melbourne, Victoria. Source: Burnley 1980:172 (adapted). Black dots refer to first and green dots refer to last places of settlement.
Figure 10.2. Categorisation of fruit growing regions (Riverland) along the Murray River of south eastern Australia. Source: Menzies 1980:9 (adapted)
Figure 10.3 below shows the total percentages of movement from first to last places of residence. Of the 267 participants who initially lived in the inner suburban area of Melbourne, at the time of the survey, 18 per cent had moved to the outer suburbs and 7.9 per cent had moved to the country. At the same time, only 1.5 per cent had moved from the outer to the inner suburbs and 1.1 per cent had left the country for the city. The shift to outer suburban areas is a highly statistically significant result with a $\chi^2$ on 4 degrees of freedom = 158.75; df = 4; $p = 0.0001$). This result will be illustrated more clearly in Figure 10.4.

$\chi^2 = 158.75; \text{df} = 4; \text{p} = < 0.0001$

1 There were 353 participants in the survey, but there were a number of missing responses per case. The 267 valid case in Figure 10.3 occurred because only these participants had non-missing values for both the first and last places of residence. Unfortunately missing cases occur in all the tables but the number of valid responses is sufficient to indicate patterns of change.
Figure 10.4 shows that of the participants living in the inner areas at the time of the survey, 95 per cent initially lived in the inner areas of Melbourne. This is in contrast to the outer and country areas: 72.7 per cent of the outer-suburban residents and 34.4 per cent of the country residents initially lived in the inner areas of Melbourne. The mobility from the inner to outer suburbs and the country was not reciprocated in the reverse direction. This is shown by only 5 per cent (2.9 + 2.1 per cent) moving from the outer and country areas to the inner suburbs.

The degree of residential movement has also been subject to the length of time in Australia. Figure 10.5 below shows the median number of residential moves in Australia by the length of time in Australia. The values in Figure 10.5 are calculated by taking the 50th percentile of the
number of moves made in each category of time residing in Australia. The most discernible feature of the graph is the increasing number of moves over time. For participants who had been in Australia for 15 years or less, the median number of moves is 1.79, which progressively increases to 2.99 moves for participants who had been in Australia for 31 years or more.

The upgrading of residential status, reflected in the movement away from the inner toward the outer suburban areas, can be seen as the beginning of residential dispersement and consequently settlement maturity of Greeks in Australia. This resettlement was achieved through social transition leading to social change or improvement in the social status of participants. This change was further enhanced when movement between social spaces was accompanied by changes in people's occupational practices as well as in their economic status within the society into which they had settled. To examine this phenomenon more closely, the occupational mobility and social class of Greek residents are discussed below.
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Occupational Mobility of Greek Migrants in Australia

The residential pattern of the Greek immigrants showed a movement from the inner to outer suburban and country residences. The residential transition, however, has accompanied changes in the occupational practices of this Hellenic population.

The occupational classifications used here to designate the occupational categories of male and female participants applies to jobs they performed in Greece and as well as in Australia. This classification includes the following categories:

1. Professional (upper & lower professional)
2. Farmer/Grower (owners of the means of agricultural production)
3. Shopkeeper/Self employed (owning their own business such as a shop providing self employment, merchants, business people)
4. Clerical-Sales-Trades/Skilled worker
5. Semi-Skilled/Home duties
6. Student.

It needs to be stressed at the outset that those who classified themselves as farmers or self employed in Greece, in most cases had been involved in family business and thus the means of production was family-owned. In contrast, if stated as farmers in Australia this means that they did, in fact, personally own the means of production. Equally important is the fact that many of the unskilled and semi-skilled occupations in Greece during the post-WWII period employed people who had experienced largely multi-task occupations within the semi-agrarian economy. This experience was obtained within a setting where there was a minimal division of labour, with little or nothing known about the Fordist model or division of labour as known in the industrially advanced Western economies. Instead, collaboration with other members of the community, and especially their extended family network, allowed them to pursue a more democratically collective effort, in contrast to the single-task occupations later assigned to them in the developing industrial economy of Australia. Such industrial occupations involved extensive division of labour through labour segmentation in routinised tasks.
As Figure 10.6 below shows, in Greece the majority of male participants (78.4 per cent) worked as either Farmer/Growers or in Clerical/Sales/Skilled, or were students.

This distribution changed upon migration to Australia where the majority of immigrants (60.1 per cent) were employed in Semi-skilled and Unskilled occupations, and 26.5 per cent were employed in Clerical/Sales/Skilled/ occupations. This shift from skilled to semi-skilled occupations appears to be statistically highly significant in relation to occupational status.

In Figure 10.7 it is shown that as far as the percentage distribution of occupational status of female participants prior to migration is concerned, the majority (77.4 per cent) worked as either Farmer/Growers, in Clerical/Sales/Skilled professions, or were students. This trend is similar to the male participants' occupational distribution in Greece. The percentage distribution...
of occupational status changed upon settlement in Australia to the extent that 74.7 per cent of this ethnic population were employed in Semi-skilled and Unskilled occupations in the manufacturing industry. This occupational transition is very significant given that only 22.4 per cent of this population sample held the same occupational status in Greece.

It is evident that the Hellenic participation in Australian agriculture is rather small if the actual numbers of Greek involvement in this industry are taken into consideration (BIR, 1990; 1994). It can be argued however, that during the post-WWII period that in Greece the population was forced to migrate to the Hellenic cities in search of employment opportunities. This occurred largely because of a lack of modernisation and the lack of appropriate policies in Hellenic agriculture, although proportionally many more were employed in services and small industries in Greece than the Greeks in Australia. Movement in search of work in Hellenic cities, unlike the Hellenes living in distant Australia, offered them the opportunity not only to retain their farm property in their village or town of origin, but also to cultivate it. This
Chapter 10: Social Mobility and Political Behaviour of Greeks in Australia
cultivation often occurred by arranging their employment commitments in the cities in such a way that enabled them to make occasional visits during the year to their place of origin or by appointing another local farmer in order to cultivate their produce, thus ensuring that they were provided with foods and fruits to which they were accustomed, while residing in the cities. In addition, they were able, more often than the Hellenes of Australia, to enjoy their holidays in ways to which they were accustomed: returning to the countryside to celebrate the seasons of the year in traditional ways and in their accustomed physical environment. In contrast, the Hellenes of Australia, although often retaining contact with their country of origin, because of the distances travelled and the prevailing social and economic situation in the host society, found it made it very difficult, if not impossible, to continue their traditional cultural practices.

Unlike residential movements, occupational mobility of the Greek immigrant population was hindered initially by lack of financial independence: hence the need to enter into any available or immediately financially rewarding occupation. Financially rewarding occupations were vitally important since Greek immigrants were short-term economic immigrants. More often than not the occupational requirements of Australian industrial development led immigrants to choose a lower level of employment than their previous occupation in Greece. This phenomenon is more apparent within the female section, although both males and females of this ethnic population group appear to have been disenfranchised from their pre-migration status by having entered largely semi-skilled and unskilled occupations. In this sense there is no significant gender bias as to the kind of occupation Greek immigrants entered after initial settlement in Australia.

Figure 10.8 below shows the similarity of occupational status between males and females in Greece prior to and following migration. This indicates that there existed an equilibrium of occupational practice regardless of gender in the home country. The semi-agricultural economy of Greece
was essentially based on the structure of the extended family unit where individual members of given families usually collaborated in occupational practices regardless of gender. At the same time, often the experiences obtained in the *agora* debates, and the social memory maintained between generations enabled undertaking of tasks to be directly informed with precedents of others who had undertaken similar work tasks in the past. Social memory provided participants in Australia with a framework of accounts and values for the worth of their work, helping them to limit the anxiety which they experienced because of migration and alienation. It enabled them, for example, to avoid conflict which was caused by single tasks occupations, and the rather rigid hierarchical control by "bosses" who ensured the maximum exploitation of workers through segmented labour or even the denial of their democratic rights as the true makers of goods produced in Australian industry. In this sense social memory operated as a catalyst against stress or emotional conflict caused to migrant workers by various types of occupational tasks or working conditions in capitalist industrial structures based on the Fordist model. Emotional and mental stress affected most Hellene migrants whose work experience in their place of origin involved extensive co-operation and collaboration with other family members.
and the community at large. Thus, there was no division of labour based on rigidly divided occupations or such tasks carried out in production line as was the case when participants concerned entered the occupational structure of Australia's capitalist industrial economy.

In contrast to Figure 10.8, Figure 10.9 shows the occupational status of males and females following settlement in Australia. Most of the occupational categories had equivalent proportions of representation, except for the Semi skilled/Unskilled and Clerical/Sales/Skilled categories. In the Semi skilled category, females had a higher proportional representation than males (by 14.6 per cent). In the Clerical category, males had a higher representation of 14.5 per cent. This minor difference agrees with the earlier conjecture that male and female immigrants had similar occupational status upon arrival in Australia, although the females initially entered at a slightly lower occupational status. Although in terms of gender females appeared to have been exploited more than males, generally migrant labour experience and their high participation in the unskilled and semi-skilled occupations could be understood better in

![Graph showing percentage distribution of first occupations in Australia for both male and female participants.](image)
the Marxist analysis in terms of reserve army of labour and labour segmentation in Australia as argued by Collins, the Australian labour segmentation theory proponent (Collins 1975; 1986; Collins 1988; Castles et al. 1988).

Figure 10.10 below shows the beginnings of a difference between the occupational status of the male and female participants. This dissimilarity between genders is apparent with females having less opportunity to rise in occupational status than males, as is shown in the comparison of last occupation held by both males and females in Australia. Most importantly, there is a diversification of the occupational status of the participants. This diversification is indicative of a permanent shift away from the single unskilled task occupational practices, initially available to Greek immigrants, towards their participation in a much wider range of occupational categories that reflect a broader section of the Australian labour market.

---

2 Figures 10.10 to 10.12 have been set to the same vertical scale to allow easier comparisons to be made.
During the post-WWII period, immediately after settlement in the majority of cases, both male and female Greek immigrants suffered downward occupational mobility through their mass entry into the unskilled and semi-skilled jobs in the industrial economy of Australia. As discussed in Chapters Seven and Eight, there were many reasons for this downward mobility, among them Australia’s immigration policy, host society attitudes, language difficulties, the single-tasks occupational practices offered, and misunderstanding of Hellenic values such as the importance of collaboration and altruism at work that formed an integral part of the Hellenic sense of philotimo. This connection between values and work was important since labour exploitation was high by disempowering foreign workers in terms of improving or developing the migrant’s personal skills, and non-portability of trades, all of which ranked highly in limiting occupational mobility. It could be argued that the employment status of Hellenic migrants in Australia imitated the distribution of occupational status of the semi-agricultural economy of Greece, but it would be an erroneous supposition, as the migrants in Greece had learnt many and varied skills that were portable within the semi-agricultural economy of their home country. On the contrary, in Australia, it is seen that the final occupation tends to mirror the original occupation or skills that were attained in Greece. This trend could have been facilitated in an earlier time period, if the single task semi-skilled/unskilled occupations available in Australia had become more multi-skilled or multi-task occupations which may well be a necessity in post-modern industrial economies.

Over time Hellenic occupational mobility in Australia is indicative of highly significant transition to a higher or diverse occupations and/or levels of employment. With the exception of the professional occupational category (as is seen in Figure 10.10), there is an issue of gender bias against the female migrants, whose transition towards higher occupational status appeared to have been more difficult even after they had been in Australia the same number of years as the males, and had also been fully employed in the Australian labour market for that time.
Analysis of Economic Variables Leading to a Definition of Class.

In the preceding sections, the analyses of residential and occupational mobility has demonstrated that a general diversification of both residence and occupational status has occurred over time. Migrant economic status is now analysed to enhance the understanding of their true socio-economic position following years of settlement.

The economic status of Greek immigrants was investigated by grouping individuals into social classes dependent on family income, property value, property numbers, and capital investment. The classifications were divided into: (i) when the family income was known; and (ii) when the income data were unavailable (see Figures 10.11 and 10.12). If participants satisfied any one criterion they were classified as being in that class. The class analysis included the examination of Variables V68-V71 (see Appendix 2). Of the 353 participants, the number of answers computed for class (economic) status were 308 of whom 248 answered for family income, 265 for value of property, and 205 answered for both family income and value of property.

If Family income was available, the class categories were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Family Income</th>
<th>Property Value</th>
<th>No. Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Lower Middle</td>
<td>&lt;$40,000</td>
<td>&lt;$160,000</td>
<td>0 or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>&gt;$40,000 and &lt;$60,000</td>
<td>&gt;$160,000 and &lt;$250,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>&gt;$60,000</td>
<td>&gt;$250,000</td>
<td>&gt;=3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 10.11**

If Family income was unavailable, the class categories were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Property Value</th>
<th>No. Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Lower Middle</td>
<td>&lt;$160,000</td>
<td>0 or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>&gt;$160,000 and &lt;$250,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>&gt;$250,000</td>
<td>&gt;=3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 10.12**
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The first analysis of economic status will be with area of residence. Figure 10.13 below shows the distribution of economic status by the participants' place of residence.

![Figure 10.13 Percentage distribution of economic status of participants given last residence.](image)

\[ \chi^2 = 20.77; \text{df} = 4; p = 0.0001 \]

The Figure 10.13 shows that the distribution of participants' economic class position varies across residential area. Of the inner area residents, 64.4 per cent had a low/lower-middle economic status, whereas only 33.3 per cent were of low/lower-middle class status in the country area. However the middle class had only 27.4 per cent residents in the inner areas increasing to 51.3 per cent in the country areas. This result indicates a significant change in the distribution of economic classes within different areas, with the distributions of class over residential areas having a highly significant result with a \( \chi^2 = 20.77; \text{df} = 4; p < 0.001 \).

The finding indicates that the lower/lower-middle classes have a significantly decreasing proportion from the inner areas to the outer and country areas, but the opposite occurs with the middle and upper classes where the percentages increase from the inner to the country areas, showing that there is a higher degree of affluence in the outer and country areas, which is in accordance with the patterns of the ABS Socio-Economic indicators (1986; 1991).
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As in Figure 10.13, Figure 10.14 presents a similar result, in that the lower class tends to decline in proportion to increasing time in Australia and the middle and upper classes experience the opposite effect where they increase in proportion with increasing time in

![Graph showing percentage distribution of economic status of participants given number of years in Australia.](image)

\[ \chi^2 = 30.22; \text{ df} = 8; p < 0.001 \]

Figure 10.14 Percentage distribution of economic status of participants given number of years in Australia.

Australia. Of the participants who were in Australia for less than 15 years, 80.8 per cent were of a lower class status. This proportion constantly decreases to where only 33.3 per cent of participants are of a lower economic status when they have been in Australia for 26 to 30 years. Conversely, only 15.4 per cent of the immigrants in Australia for 15 or less years had attained a middle class status, with a sharp increase to 52.4 per cent when participants had been in Australia for 26 to 30 years. The participants' pattern of attaining middle and upper class status increased significantly in proportion to the number of years in Australia. The significance of the result can be seen in the \( \chi^2 \) value of 30.22 on 8 degrees of freedom (\( p < 0.001 \)). It is acknowledged that there may have been individuals who, following migration, were unsuccessful with upward social mobility and decided to return home, and others who, having
failed to achieve their goals and aspirations, ceased being visibly Hellenic, either because of their *philotimo* and *entrope*, or because the successful ones were not interested in their views and opinions. That is, because they “stayed behind” in mobility terms, they were rejected and could not take part in the aura of success stories among fellow compatriots within family gatherings and *agora* debates. While the Australian socio-economic system has historically been “pushing” migrants into menial jobs, it has done nothing for unsuccessful migrants, who became destitute, eventually forming part of the often forgotten lumpen proletariat -- remaining unemployed and underprivileged.

Figure 10.14 is interesting. The rise to the middle and upper classes of migrants resident from 16 to 30 years stops from 31 on. The lower/lower middle (L/LM) class then rises significantly with a decrease in the middle and upper classes by 50 per cent and roughly 33 per cent respectively. It is important to note there is a parallel relationship between years in Australia and old age (possibly pensioners), and the sharp downward spiral when residence of 31+ years is considered. Being bound by a strong cultural heritage, this means that Hellenes, as a family-oriented population group, often make extensive efforts to help their children succeed financially and otherwise, by purchasing them a home or by offering financial assistance which would otherwise have been important to save for their old age. Such sacrifices often caused financial difficulties for elderly Hellenes, who, no longer able to continue with work, suffer in poverty.

Figure 10.15 below shows the economic class status of the participants' given their willingness to return to Greece. Their willingness to return was categorised as either 'No', 'Maybe', or 'Yes'.
Figure 10.15 shows that economic status and the participants’ willingness to return to Greece are independent (that is, not statistically significant). The distribution of class status is the same for all three categories of willingness to return to Greece. This figure indicates that the participants’ belief that they will or will not return to Greece has not always affected their ability to attain different positions in economic class rankings. For those not intending to stay in Australia, their willingness to re-migrate to Greece can be dependent upon a range of familiar social and cultural reasons, including both subjective and objective forces. These forces can include homesickness, alienation from the host society, and family reasons - such as ageing of relatives, or sickness of loved ones. They can also include climatic conditions or simply an attachment to the cultural traditions or their agoras, and the physical environment of their home countries in general.

Figures 10.16 and 10.17 investigate the relationship between class status and organisational affiliation. Figure 10.16 shows the relationship with ethnic organisational affiliation, and Figure 9.17 shows the relationship with mainstream society organisational
affiliation. The mainstream society organisations include business groups, municipal associations, sporting clubs and other similar groups.

In Figure 10.16 below, the lower to lower/middle class has a declining proportion of people with more ethnic affiliation, whereas the middle and upper classes have an increasing representation. This can be seen most clearly where 59.1 per cent of participants with no affiliation are from the lower to lower/middle class. This figure steadily declines to 46.2 per cent for greater than one affiliation. The middle class tends to increase the most. Only 27.8 per cent of participants with no ethnic organisational affiliation are from the middle class. The middle class increases to 40.5 per cent having one ethnic organisational affiliation, although there is no significant difference between ethnic organisational affiliation and economic class status. Nonetheless, the visibility of those who have gained economic success is more apparent than those who belong to the lower classes. Often the organisational affiliation of the "haves" as against the "have nots" enables their ethnic visibility within their organisations. This rise

\[ \chi^2 = 6.38, df = 4; p = 0.1722 \]

**Figure 10.16 Percentage distribution of economic status of participants given ethnic organisational affiliation.**
within ethnic organisations enables them to exercise cultural control over the rest, who may be forced to be less affiliated at the same time.

Figure 10.17 below shows a significant dependence between class status and mainstream society organisational affiliation ($\chi^2 = 16.95; \text{df} = 4; p = 0.002$). The major difference occurs in the lower to lower/middle classes. Of the people with no affiliation there are 62.4 per cent in the lower classes, whereas there are only 24.7 per cent in the middle class. There is a progressive increase and decrease for the middle and lower classes respectively evidenced by only 44.2 per cent of people with one affiliation coming from the lower classes compared with 45.1 per cent for the middle class. The people with greater than one affiliation, from the lower classes, decreased to 36.4 per cent, whereas the proportion from the middle class rose to 54.5 per cent, indicating the reluctance of the lower to lower/middle classes to participate in mainstream society organisations. As in Figure 10.16, in Figure 10.17 those who belong to the higher classes have a greater number of organisational affiliations, with membership in both ethnic and general society organisations at the same time. This simultaneous affiliation in ethnic and general society organisations is not mutually exclusive. Whether it is their class status or the mere wandering
derived from their Hellenic myths and stories, or their culture, or the reality of life of host society, there is a definite drive which enables them to be increasingly involved in both, specific ethnic and general society organisations.

Figures 10.18 and 10.19 show the relationship between economic class status and occupational status for males and females. The Figures show the occupational status given their economic status.

Figure 10.18 shows the contrasting trends that are apparent between the lower to lower/middle classes and the middle class. The lower classes dominate the proportion of participants on the Clerical/Sales and Semi-skilled/Unskilled categories, yet the opposite occurs with the middle class dominating the proportion of participants in the Professional and Farmer/Grower groups, indicating a relationship between upward occupational status attained by the middle class male participants, and the immobility of the lower class of male participants. This result is highly statistically significant with a $\chi^2 = 47.90; df = 10; p < 0.00001$. 

\[
\chi^2 = 47.90; \text{df} = 10; \text{p} = 0.001
\]

\textbf{Figure 10.18 Percentage distribution of economic status of participants given final male occupational status in Australia.}
derived from their Hellenic myths and stories, or their culture, or the reality of life of host society, there is a definite drive which enables them to be increasingly involved in both, specific ethnic and general society organisations.

Figures 10.18 and 10.19 show the relationship between economic class status and occupational status for males and females. The Figures show the occupational status given their economic status.

\[ \chi^2 = 47.90; \text{df} = 10; p = 0.001 \]

**Figure 10.18** Percentage distribution of economic status of participants given final male occupational status in Australia.

Figure 10.18 once again shows the contrasting trends that are apparent between the lower to lower/middle classes and the middle class. The lower classes dominate the proportion of participants on the Clerical/Sales and Semi-skilled/Unskilled categories, yet the opposite occurs with the middle class dominating the proportion of participants in the Professional and Farmer/Grower groups, indicating a relationship between upward occupational status attained by the middle class male participants, and the immobility of the lower class of male participants. This result is highly statistically significant with a \( \chi^2 = 47.90; \text{df} = 10 \ p<0.00001 \).
Figure 10.19 shows virtually the same result as in Figure 10.18. As mentioned, the middle class female participants exhibited the same upward mobility trend as males, and a similar level of immobility for those ranked as the lower class. Once again this is a highly significant result with $\chi^2$ on 10 degree of freedom $p<0.00001)$. One marked difference between male and female participants is in the Clerical/Sales group where females exhibit a difference of only 14.3 per cent between the lower and middle classes, whereas for males the difference is 38.7 per cent from the lower classes to the middle classes.

Figure 10.20 indicates that only 10.7 per cent of those belonging to the lower/lower middle income groupings anticipate moving over the next few years as against 83.1 per cent...
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\[ \chi^2 = 6.122; \text{ df } = 1; p = 0.0468 \]

Figure 10.20 Percentage distribution of participants who anticipate moving in the next few years given their economic status.

who do not anticipate moving. The figure changes significantly as one's economic status improves. The \( \chi^2 \) value here is 6.122 on degrees of freedom with \( p = 0.0468 \).

This change is clearly evident, especially in the case of those who belong to the upper economic bracket with 35.3 per cent wanting to move as against 64.7 who do not. This trend may indicate that they are still residing in the inner suburbs, for as people's economic power improves they may be more likely to move elsewhere to some other residential and geographic space within the country. Thus a higher level of economic status tends to yield a more residentially mobile and residentially less permanent member of society.

The analysis of the economic indicators of class status with other socio-economic variables such as residential and occupational status, as well as organisational affiliation showed that as the immigrants attained a middle class economic standing, their residential status changed from primarily inner suburban living to outer and country residence, from clerical and unskilled
work to professional and self-employed work, and from an insular ethnic organisational affiliation to a more general mainstream society membership.

Analysis of Political Behavioural Trends and Voting Preferences

This section deals with the analysis of voting trends of this group by tracing the history of the participants' political party voting behaviour between their country of origin and their host society, and also by their residential, occupational and economic status. A number of socio-economic variables were analysed in regard to participants' voting preference for Australian political party organisations. The voting preference has been coded into a "Left" and "Right" categorisation. The "Left" wing political parties in Australian politics are designated as the ALP, Democrats, Socialist parties, and Communist parties. The "Right" wing political parties are the Liberal, the National and Country parties, and also any further Right-wing political party organisations.

Firstly, the participants' affiliation to their family was investigated. As most people are influenced by family values in their political affiliation, Figure 10.21 below shows the political affiliation of participants' fathers in Greece, as well as the participants' voting preference for political party organisations of Greece (prior to migration), and the participants' voting preference in Australia.
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\[ \chi^2 = 76.21, \text{ df} = 1; p < 0.0001 \]

Figure 10.21 Percentage of participants' fathers and participants' political affiliation in Greece as well as participants' political affiliation in Australian politics.

The participants and their fathers had a similar voting preference in Greece, indicated by the almost equal proportions of left and right voting preference in Greece of approximately 40 to 60 per cent respectively. The odds of the participants taking on the same affiliation as their fathers in Greece was 121 times that of changing their affiliation, also illustrated by a \( \chi^2 \) value of 76.21; df = 1; p < 0.00001 indicating a high level of dependence between the father's political affiliation and the participants' Greek political affiliation. The situation changes markedly in Australia where the voting preference was 80 to 20 per cent respectively for the left and right wing parties. There are a number of reasons that will be investigated below regarding this party political preference swing.

Figure 10.22 shows the voting preference with the time in Australia. The time in Australia has been categorised into groups to allow the effect to be seen much more clearly.
Figure 10.22 shows Percentage of participants voting Left or Right wing (ALP and Liberal/National parties) politics respectively by the number of years in Australia.

Over ninety three per cent of the participants who have been in Australia for less than 15 years duration voted for left wing parties in Australian politics. However, the number of left wing voters tended to decline as the number of years resident in Australia increased, so that only 63.3 per cent of those who had been in Australia 31 years and over voted for left wing political parties. Conversely (as indicated by the white columns), there was a voter preference trend towards right wing party politics as the numbers of years in Australia increased. While only 6.3 per cent of those who had been in Australia for less than 15 years voted right wing, this trend changed significantly over a period of time, with 36.1 per cent of those who had been resident for more than 31 years voting for right wing political parties. The $\chi^2$ value here was 16.56 on 4 degrees of freedom with $p=0.0024$ indicating a significant dependence of political party preference to time in Australia.

Apart from the time factor and the socialisation which conditions people’s political behaviour, the trend towards the Left wing, especially the ALP, and the eventual shift towards
conservative politics, has a long standing history in Hellenic political culture and the political behaviour of Greeks in Australia. The political history of Greece, especially during the post-WWII period, involved administrations by Right wing governments, and foreign powers such as the United States which undermined the political stability of the Hellenic nation. Mass out-migration too occurred, by and large under Right wing governments, which not only had undermined the elevation to power of the Left wing but also were responsible for the deprivation of their livelihood of many hundreds of thousands of young Hellenes since such administrations had done nothing in terms of agriculture and welfare policies. Following settlement in Australia, too, it was under conservative administrations that Hellenes, along with many other immigrants, were "forced" to work in the manufacturing industry and pressured to assimilate, thus forgo their past history of life and adapt to a new life quickly.

In contrast, Prime Minister Whitlam, in the eyes of the Hellenes a worthy statesman in his contribution to Australian political life (like another Pericles, the father of democracy), made Promethean efforts against the intervention of foreign interests in Australia and to a great extent succeeded in providing Australians with a set of policies and a vision for a more equitable society for the future. Because his administration provided both new policies but, more importantly, a hope for a voice and democracy for all Australians irrespective of ethnicity, class or gender, Hellenes regarded him as the "greatest politician in Australia’s history", and as an Australian with a strong sense of philotimo (Greek Times, Friday 14th April, 1978:1,5). The subsequent shift to the Right, however, signifies a change in the perceptions of immigrant life in society which has started to come to terms with the presence of different ethnic population groups, enabling many to accept or be accepted by the new society, and thus in choosing the party of their own preference according to their individual interests or perceptions along with other Australians.

Both the male and female participants gave similar trends of voting preference (see Figures 10.23, 10.24). The Farmer/grower, the Self-employed, and females in Professional occupations voted Right wing in higher proportions than the less skilled professions. This
swing was more apparent amongst females than males, with approximately 67 per cent voting Right wing in the Professional to self-employed categories. The males have a higher proportion voting for the Left wing parties per occupation, with the exception of the Farmer/Grower and shopkeeper/self employed categories, which present an increasing voting trend in favour of the Right wing parties. The female participants’ party political affiliation does show a significant dependence on their occupation ($\chi^2$ was = 17.63; df = 5; p=0.0035. The male participants’ dependence is not significant at the 5 per cent level, but the trend is increasingly dependent on occupational status.

![Figure 10.23 Percentage of male participants' occupation by political vote in Australia at the time of the survey.](image-url)
The area of residence of the participant may influence the political party preference. Figure 10.25 below shows final area of residence given participants’ political party preference.
The area of residence did have a significant effect ($\chi^2 = 9.74$, df = 2, $P = 0.0077$) on the political affiliation of the participants. The country residents had a higher proportion voting for the Right wing parties as opposed to the metropolitan residents. This proportion of 2 to 1 (66.7 per cent) for the Left wing parties changed drastically in the city and outer suburbs where the ratio of voter preference was 5 to 1 (83.6 and 85.1 per cent respectively) for the Left wing. Given that the National Party is Right wing and its mission is to assist the “man on the land”, it was not surprising to find a higher Right wing preference among country participants.
Figure 10.26 shows that participants belonging to the lower and lower/middle classes tended to vote for Left wing political parties. This result shows a significant dependence through a $\chi^2$ value of 16.41 on 2 degrees of freedom ($p=0.00027$). This tendency to vote Left wing declines with an increase in the economic status of the participant towards the Upper class. This increase towards the Right wing vote can be seen in the proportion of Right wing voters from 11.8 per cent for the Lower class, 26.3 per cent for the middle class and 37.5 per cent for the Upper class. Latest voting trends indicating a return to the party affiliation they had in Greece.

Figure 10.27 shows that of the 353 Greek participants, 182 (82.5 per cent) perceived themselves as very active in Australian party politics, voting for Left parties as against 17.5 per cent who voted for Right parties. This trend is also consistent with those who belonged to the active and not active classification.
This indicated that 85.3 per cent of those who were active voted for Left wing parties as against 14.7 per cent who voted Right wing. Likewise, 75.9 per cent and 24.1 of those who are not active in Australian politics vote for Left and Right wing parties respectively. This result is interesting, although the analysis shows no statistical significance. It poses the question as to why the change from predominantly Right wing affiliation in Greece by both father and participant to Left wing affiliation in Australia. The answer is to be found in the interest in migrant worker needs shown by Labor Governments since the 1970s (such as multicultural issues as discussed in Chapter Eight).

Of the participants who were frequently swinging voters, 26.3 per cent were Right wing voters which is more than the overall amount of 20 per cent of total participants (N = 353). The
voters who stated that they rarely swing or never swing had 16.1 per cent and 18.6 per cent who were Right wing voters. This difference tends to show that Right wing voters from this ethnic population had a greater tendency to swing their vote than the Left wing voters but statistically it was not significant.

Figure 10.29 below shows the participants’ requirements in Hellenic community elections and their political affiliation. The main feature here is that strong leadership is a requirement for more Right wing voters in Hellenic community elections. This feature is more of a requirement than the importance of political issues to the Right wing voter.
In summary, what can be ascertained from the relationships studied earlier is that the longer the participants were in Australia, the higher the tendency to vote for Right wing parties. A similarity can be seen in the occupation of participants where both a higher level of occupation and a higher class status tended to have more Right wing voters. The other relationships studied were not statistically significant.

**Analysis by Multivariate Methods**

The previous sections in this chapter have dealt with an analysis of a number of socio-economic and political variables for the Greek ethnic population, for which univariate analyses were employed. To understand the full extent of any relationship, a multivariate analysis needed to be applied.

The multivariate technique used here was Discriminant Analysis. This technique allowed the variable of interest to be discriminated into groups based on the independent variables. The significant variables were used in a model to reclassify the observations.
The significant variables are found by comparing an F-ratio which indicates the effect of the variable to the model with the table of F values. If the F-ratio falls in the significant region of the table (usually the upper 5 per cent), the variable is classed as significantly contributing information to the dependent variable of interest. As an example, if a discriminant analysis on political affiliation is performed, the independent variables such as economic status, age, area of residence would be classed as significant only if the probability of their F-ratios were less than 0.05.

The three main dependent variables of interest in this study were area of residence, economic status and political affiliation in Australia. These variables were discriminated with the independent variables of Greek political affiliation, time in Australia, age and sex of participants, education of males and females, initial place of residence of participant, male and female occupation, father's political affiliation in Greece, and other similar socio-economic variables.

Participants' choice of place of residence (residential area) was seen to be influenced by many factors. The most significant factors were time in Australia, economic status, age of participant, and the occupations of male and female. The area of first residence was close to being significant with a probability value 0.0623. For significance at the 95 per cent confidence level, this is required to be below 0.05.

The time in Australia could be expected to be significant as the longer the participants resided in Australia, the greater the residential mobility. The economic status indicated a higher degree of affluence influenced the last area of residence, as did the occupational status of both the male and female participants in Australia.
The significant factors found in the discriminant analysis for the classification of economic status were time in Australia, the occupational status of the males and females, their Australian party-political affiliation, and the last area of residence. With Australian party-political affiliation, the higher the economic status the greater the participant’s tendency to vote for Right wing political parties.
Australia, the moves may have been within and between areas many of which do not appear to have been reported.

The political behaviour of participants in Australian party politics was found to have a significant relationship between the following variables: participants' occupations, area of initial and last place of residence, time in Australia, and economic status. It was found that the higher the economic status and occupational status, the greater the tendency to vote for Right wing political parties. Also, the further from the inner metropolitan area, the higher the tendency to vote for Right wing parties. The F-ratios for the discriminant analysis are given in Figure 10.32 below. The discriminant analysis shows similar results to the univariate cross-tabulations performed earlier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N = 266</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek political affiliation</td>
<td>0.0098</td>
<td>0.9212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Australia</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic status</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of male</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
<td>0.9636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of female</td>
<td>0.1123</td>
<td>0.7379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First place of residence</td>
<td>4.706</td>
<td>0.0312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last place of residence</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.938</td>
<td>0.1654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Greek political affiliation</td>
<td>0.2006</td>
<td>0.6547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.448</td>
<td>0.1192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status of husband</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status of wife</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of political activity</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>0.9301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to swing vote</td>
<td>0.1972</td>
<td>0.6575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters requirements in elections</td>
<td>0.2767</td>
<td>0.5995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, the immigrants who came here to become quickly affluent and return to Greece did not do so. Instead, they chose to reside in Australia and the willingness to return to Greece was either postponed or became a mere personal matter irrespective of economic gains which may or may not have made while working hard in Australia. Returning to Greece became a personal, not a collective ethnic, interest irrespective of economic status acquired following many years of settlement.
Change of residential area in relation to economic mobility is open to question. This change has been shown to be statistically significant, but the question of why is still unanswered. Inner city residences can be council-owned, cheap, or private single-fronted Victorian cottages “worth a fortune” on today’s market. Those who have attained upper class status and are economically able, may still choose to live amongst their own as of old. Those who moved out from the inner industrial areas to outer suburban or country areas could well have been drawn back to the agrarian life style from which they came. Occupational and the accompanying economic, upward mobility attest to the determination to succeed, a dominant trait of the Hellenic character. Time in Australia, however, has been shown to be significantly associated with upward social mobility, together with a change in political party affiliation. The closure of the host society to immigrants’ entry to participation in political and organisational life had a very significant impact on the voting patterns of Greeks in Australia for many years. Only now, two decades after the struggle for "ethnic rights" and the subsequent enactment of the policy of Multiculturalism, are Australia’s Greeks (with their increasing naturalisation) demonstrating a change back to the political affiliations of their former country, and generally reflecting that their voting patterns are in accordance with their particular socio-economic position within Australia’s social stratification system.
This study charted a complex picture of the Hellenic community in Australia, as one of the many migrant communities who have had to come to terms with a new society which, until relatively recent times, had not been accepting or tolerant of ethnic, cultural and racial differences. The process of settlement and attainment of social mobility by the Hellenes, as this study illustrated, has been long and hard. Simplistic and superficial formulations such as the "passage of time" cannot adequately explain this process. Such formulations ignore and deny the complex nature of the lived reality of cultural adjustments, struggles, accommodations, deprivations and sacrifices that individuals, families and communities make.

Given that the study has focused on social mobility, a number of indicators relating to the causes of migration and social mobility were utilised to establish whether socio-economic differentiation led to changes in the political behaviour of Greek-Australians following more than ten years of settlement in the country. Although the study emphasised the post-WWII period, it was necessary to place the discussion in an historical framework to answer a range of key research questions. It was also necessary to adopt a multi-disciplinary theoretical approach to explain the complexity involved in migration and in the social mobility of migrants. The discussion was, in turn, contextualised within Greece's own economic development, and within Australia's changing immigration policy, including the host society's attitudes towards Hellenic settlement. It was within these contexts that this thesis has accounted for the social mobility and political behaviour of Greek Australians.
The study investigated the impact of the "ethnic factor" on the social mobility of Greeks in Australia. On the one hand, it proved that social mobility is a continuation of Hellenic migration experiences to be understood in terms of Greece's socio-economic and political developments since the nation's formation in 1828. On the other hand, it also proved that, following settlement in Australia, Greeks like many other migrants experienced the closure to them of social and institutional structures and a lack of readiness on the part of the host society to deal with the needs and aspirations of non-British immigrants such as the Southern Europeans. This lack of readiness, it was argued, restricted rather than promoted social mobility of Greeks in Australia. One of the important consequences for Australia has been the failure of the nation to capitalise on the skills and initiatives of Greeks and other Southern Europeans from the late 1800s up to the implementation of a multicultural policy in the 1970s.

Ethnic groups arriving in Australia en masse, especially through chain migration processes such as those of the Hellenes and the Italians in the 1950s and 1960s, found themselves consistently encapsulated in the so-called ethnic enclaves, residentially, occupationally and economically, often until subsequent generations broke away from the "social mobility traps". Many first generation immigrants were forced into the secondary labour market, especially in the manufacturing industry, due to a number of social factors operating against them, including lack of language and labour market skills and the lack of recognition by the host society of the skills and qualifications of newly-settled migrants.

The marginalisation of ethnic groups in Australia has traditionally been based on the migrant's country of origin, ethnic or cultural background, racial and gender differences (Collins 1986). As Collins states, "the two most
important sources of late capitalism's reserve army have been female and migrant labour, reflecting an internationalisation of the division of labour" (Collins 1986:57). As a consequence, the marginalisation of ethnic groups in Australia has been subject to dual labour market strategies found also in other capitalist societies such as the Western European Nation States (Dimitreas 1981; Collins 1986:43; Castles, Booth & Wallace 1984).

The post-WWII Australian labour force remains highly segmented. Based on worker segmentation, the labour market has ensured the maximum exploitation of labour through a strategy of "divide and conquer" of the working classes, including migrant workers. The social relations which the capitalist mode of production creates have traditionally forced migrant workers to become segmented within the labour market, not only in terms of work practices but also in accordance with their respective ethnic origins and gender (Collins 1986; Castles et al. 1988:26). Labour segmentation, therefore, often blocks upward social mobility of immigrants who, alternatively, have been encouraged or directed toward certain settlement and employment zone areas. Historically, there has been a strong link between country of birth, gender and types of employment people are likely to obtain. As Castles, Cope, Kalantzis & Morrisey argue:

Segmentation means exclusion of certain individuals or ethnic groups from entering some categories of employment in favour of some other individuals or ethnic groups for a significant amount of time length after arrival. Segmentation means that job opportunities are not based on a person's work ability, qualification and productivity, but also on non-economic ascriptive criteria, linked to ideologies of gender, race and ethnicity. Labour markets are structured to place women, migrants and racial minorities at a disadvantage, and their low-status positions are in turn taken as practical proof of innate inferiority (Castles et al. 1988:26).
Despite the segmentation of the labour force and the marginalisation of Southern European ethnic population groups, this study indicated that through concerted effort and struggle over many years, Greeks have become socially mobile within Australian society. Using interview material and empirical research data, it was suggested that Greeks in Australia are now increasingly spread throughout the existing social stratification system, and it was argued that Australia's "experiment" of mass immigration of NESB immigrants during the post-WWII period has proven significantly successful in the longer term for both the Hellenic community and the host Australian society. It was argued that until the 1970s there were strong factors operating against the upward social mobility of Greeks in Australian society. Until WWII, lack of economic opportunity and discrimination in employment forced Greeks to live and work in closed, essentially "shopkeeper communities", or to become itinerant seasonal workers (Gilchrist 1985; Price 1963; Tsounis 1971a). During the mass immigration program from the 1950s to the 1970s, the new arrivals were attracted by and concentrated in the easily accessible unskilled labouring occupations, from which few were able to escape. They were still there at the beginning of the 1980s, according to the 1981 Census data (Storer 1985b). However, there were also signs that Greeks were beginning to appear, albeit in small numbers, at levels of power within the structures of the host society, such as parliamentarians and business community leaders (ABS 1981). Since then, as this study showed, there has been a much more even distribution of Greeks in various occupations and a much wider social distribution, with Hellenic incorporation in Australia's broader societal network evident economically, socially, politically and culturally. Moreover, there has been fairly substantial Hellenic representation in the political life of Australia, which includes the trade unions, local government, state and Federal parliaments and the bureaucracy, as well as a comparatively high number of individuals of Hellenic extraction entering tertiary education (ABS
1991; Jupp 1984; Castles, in Goodman, O'Hearn, Wallace-Crabbe 1991). As this study indicated, while this incorporation of Hellenes into general Australian structures is recent, aspirations for upward social mobility have always been present in the Hellenic immigrant community in Australia, even when prevailing attitudes and cultural trends compelled them to be latent.

As indicated, in the post-WWII mass migration era, British and Northern Europeans were given first and second preference respectively as immigrants, with Southern Europeans the least favoured of the Europeans, whereas non-Europeans such as Asians were not even considered. This bias was also reflected in the type of socio-economic mobility Greeks were able to aspire to in Australia, particularly when the employment offered was only in low pay labouring and factory jobs with no incentives and provisions to improve their occupational status. In contrast, Northern Europeans, as preferred migrants, were given similar socio-economic and occupational privileges enjoyed by members of the dominant British-Australian society.

Not until the late 1960s and the 1970s, under the impact of social change experienced in large Australian cities such as Sydney and Melbourne, did policy issues affecting migration, post-migration and settlement experiences come under increasing scrutiny by academics and politicians. It was during this period that Australia's segmented labour market and the nation's assimilation policy, including the racist White Australia Policy, were seriously challenged. For the first time, individuals and organisations raised questions regarding access and equity, and the degree to which the nation's institutional structures (at least in terms of policy and rhetoric) were willing or able to accommodate the socio-economic needs and aspirations of the ethnically and racially diverse population which had settled in Australia as a result of the post-WWII immigration program.
As a result of these changes, social and religious organisations as well as rising social movements challenged old structures and ways of thinking. It was argued that the Ethnic Rights Movement (representing various ethnic and general society organisations throughout the 1970s and 1980s), challenged the closed and monocultural structures of what was largely an Anglomorph Australian society. What the ERM demonstrated was that, until Australian economic structures began to open, with multiculturalism advocated by interested parties including members of ALP, there was little evidence of social mobility by Greek Australians outside designated labouring occupations. According to the ABS Census (1981), Greeks remained largely occupied in the manufacturing industries, despite the implementation of Multiculturalism as Australia's official policy by the Fraser Government. The picture of the decline of Hellenic participation in the manufacturing industry became clearer with evidence provided by the 1986 and 1991 ABS Censuses, showing that Greeks had achieved significant upward mobility across a number of socio-economic indicators, with increasing contributions in professional, business, law and political administrators areas. Evidence also showed that Greeks had attained a significant level of residential mobility, moving away from the inner industrial suburbs where they had initially settled, forming residential enclaves, towards the outer, more affluent suburbs and better residential localities. There had been, as well, significant demographic changes as a result of increasing numbers of inter-ethnic marriages by Greek-Australians, which had been on a continuous increase in the last two decades.

Occupational and economic mobility attests to a powerful trait of Hellenic character: the determination to succeed. Following many years of concerted effort and hard work, initially as factory labour, Greeks have
managed to become socially mobile and by the 1980s many had achieved a higher social status. Empirical data collected from a cross stratified random sample revealed that as Greeks had become residentially, occupationally and economically upwardly mobile, this previously culturally homogeneous population group had begun to be differentiated across a number of socio-economic rankings. This differentiation is reflected in the changing voting patterns of Greeks in Australia. Whereas they had previously overwhelmingly been strong ALP supporters, there is now evidence to suggest that this support has begun to wane in favour of conservative Australian political parties. The data indicated further, that with maturity of settlement and Hellenic acquisition of higher social status (in terms of economic, residential and occupational rankings), they manifested varying political voting allegiances in Australian party politics reflecting the voting trends of the general society.

In contrast to most writings, it was argued that migration, migration settlement, and social mobility or immobility within receiving societies, could neither be understood or defined in terms of a single theory, such as neoclassic or Marxist, nor comprehended in terms of a single discipline. The complexity of external and internal socio-economic forces operating behind people’s decisions to migrate, it was suggested, required both a multi-theoretical and multi-disciplinary approach, which this thesis has provided.

Although the construction of a Weberian-based model, because of the inclusion of status, provides for a more complex analysis of stratification than a Marxist model, the model was found to be more appropriate for demographically and economically stable societies than for societies which experience rapid social change due to migration. The Weberian model "breaks down" in the study of migration because ethnicity either brings with it characteristics of its own understanding of power, status and class, or because
it creates varying dimensions of power, class and status which operate both inside and outside the existing status system of the host society. In the Weberian model, society is seen to function on stable, mainly inherited rewards, in contrast to the dynamics of class struggle as defined by Marx.

The study of migration and migrant mobility cannot be clearly understood nor defined if status, in Weberian terms, is placed above the significance of class struggle in Marxist terms. In Marxist class terms, most post-WWII Hellene immigrants have been proletarians and even sub-proletarians (Collins 1975;1986; ABS 1981; Collins 1988). This lack of power in class terms has produced a long-term struggle of intensely hard work on the part of immigrants to enter the dominant class through the attainment of financial power. It is only relatively recently that the official policy of Multiculturalism has rendered the Weberian model potentially relevant to providing for the allocation of status to ethnic groups. Yet the bulk of the migrant experience has been and remains in the context of class struggle. It is evident that Weber's views on migration are not clearly defined. Weber, like Marx, was concerned with the consequences of industrialisation and the rise of capitalism. He noted the importance of religion and what he called the "Protestant ethic", which he regarded as responsible for capital accumulation and which helped to bring about the rise of modern capitalism with its related disciplinary code imposed on the workforce. He was less impressed by this system's disintegrating effects and he saw migration, for example, as an incidental factor creating new employment opportunities for new social classes and ethnic status groups (Richmond 1988:31).

Although neither Weber nor Marx directly addressed the question of race, there have been indications of interest for a more dynamic and accessible contribution to a Marxist analysis of racism, although the
debate remains undeveloped (Solomos 1986:84-109). Specifically, Marxist approaches to racism have focused on the social relations and the roles of the capitalist state in reproducing or countering racist practices. They have touched upon issues such as the origins of racist ideologies, the role of political power relations and the capitalist state's institutions in reproducing the political and cultural ideology of racism, and located them within the conflict of class struggle within the capitalist economic system. Coupled with questions of political and ideological reproduction, the question of ownership of the cultural "means of production", in relation to racial and ethnic minority cultures, needs to be debated and defined within an expanded and integrated Marxist theoretical framework.

The ethnic factor, however, cannot be inserted so easily into the conventional sociological models, such as the Weberian structuralist-functionalist. These models fall short in tackling the historical importance of migration as a force of transition or social change, experienced through the migratory process, where the cause of such development is linked with the impact and the effect of real issues in host societies that ultimately lead to increasing ethnic stratification. Neither is it possible to justify in Marxist terms studies based on Weberian structuralist-functionalist sociological perspectives and to understand them if capitalism is the cause of labour transfer in order to exploit it. Nor is it possible to state that in the Australian situation social classes are characterised by a closure due to endogamy, because historically different ethnic groups have a tendency to intermarry widely in society (Price 1988; BIR 1990). Past studies on migrants have utilised horizontal measurements which are not committed to a vertical analysis of migration or a radical critique of Australian society, for example, in the studies of Birrell (1987) and Burns (1977). In contrast, this thesis has utilised both horizontal and vertical approaches in order to chart a more
comprehensive and critical picture of the upward movement of migrants across a number of indices such as occupation, education and place of residence. This approach has contributed to an overall view of migrant mobility within the existing social stratification system, and has helped to ascertain if there has been any qualitative change in the status of migrants as a result of their social mobility in Australia.

Multiculturalism as an integrative mechanism has indeed occurred for post-WWII Greek migrants, their children and grand-children. They now appear to have gained acceptance into, and themselves accept, the "Australian way of life", at the same time preserving their own culture and values by membership of their ethnic clubs and associations. However, in the continuing history of Hellenic incorporation into Australia's social milieu, there still remain unanswered questions - whether remaining in Australia was by choice, economic circumstances, or related to philotimo or entrope (shame) -- which cannot be ascertained by this particular research. It is proposed that future research examines the extent to which acceptance of Greeks is not simply a product of Government policy, such as the policy of Multiculturalism, but reflects positive changes in line with the subjective perceptions and feelings of Australians towards Hellenes, to establish evidence of the true level of acceptance between the two groups. To this end, investigation of the perceptions, attitudes, and behaviours of other (non Greek) society members toward Hellenes, and their perceptions of second and third generation Greek-Australians, could be enlightening. A replication of the study in other states, using the same residential classifications, taking into consideration the nation's enormous social changes in the last eight years, could give a clearer picture of the success of Multiculturalism for Greek Australians.
Chapter 11: Discussion and Implications

Much of the migrant success in Australia, as in any receiving society, is associated with the type of "social incorporation" model in operation for the accommodation of migrant workers and their families. The absence of a formal social incorporation model militates against the further development of a partnership based on equity rather than the social marginalisation of the ethnic groups in Australian society. What has been increasingly evident during the post-WWII years, is that if greater involvement of various ethnic population groups in Australia's social, economic and political structures is to occur, a tolerant and liberal model of social incorporation based on social justice and diversity is required. Admittedly, formal incorporation of migrants in this country is far greater than in most countries of Western Europe, where during the first two decades migrants are seen as temporary "guest workers", and only after a considerable period of time, are they "regarded" as settlers (Castles, Booth & Wallace 1984:4; Castles 1988). In Australia, as in Britain, in addition to the fact that new arrivals are offered immigrant status and related legal protection, there has also been an absence of major legal obstacles connected with the migrant settlement processes. As Castles, Booth and Wallace (1984:4) have stressed, in contrast to other European countries such as West Germany, in Australia the expectation of permanent residence, even if not universal, caused the migrant community to become settled relatively quickly. These authors argue that due to lack of socio-economic balance in regard to the improvement of migrant life in Australia, there has not been readily accessible opportunities for migrants following initial settlement. Instead, there have been various hindrances that have obstructed people's movement across the social strata. As a result, migrants often required many years of settlement and substantial amounts of effort before they experienced any discernible advancement in socio-economic terms.
Chapter 11: Discussion and Implications

Despite the absence of a fundamental model of social incorporation at both structural and cultural levels, and the failure of the policy of Multiculturalism to respond to many of the migrants' needs, it can be argued that, even in its mildest form, as a political campaign slogan or political rhetoric, multiculturalism has helped show Australians the merits of other cultures. It has helped to reduce the prejudice of the host society, which many ethnic population groups, especially those from Non-English Speaking Backgrounds (NESB), saw as oppressive, both institutionally and culturally. Multiculturalism has also mitigated against ghetto formation, by encouraging migrants to venture out of their ethnic communities into the social and institutional ranks of the host society.

Although Australia has not adequately managed to develop a complete multicultural model, nonetheless it has steadily managed over the last two decades to develop and incorporate diverse ethnic, institutional and cultural responses. These experiences have placed Australia in an advantageous position among many nations of the international community, and especially those nations located in its immediate region of the Asia Pacific, most of which are sending rather than receiving societies, either because they are economically poor or because they are industrially underdeveloped. The continuing migrations of people crossing international borders, place new demands on Nation States' administrations with having to accommodate racial and ethnic diversity. In its ability to cope with the new challenges, the State faces a future which is difficult to predict with certainty, especially in light of the increasing demands placed on its legal and political system, the almost endless financial pressures and the need for economic reform associated with an internationally integrated economy. At the same time, there are the increasingly demanding questions of citizenship and the intervention of law of the State beyond its national borders in order to offer protection to
its citizens and interests abroad. In addition, pressures against the State have been coming from the increasing appearance and involvement of NGOs which deal with a variety of questions that range from human rights (of migrants and others) to environmental issues, all of which complicate modern government options of an already diminishing notion of the Nation State.

For many Hellenes, the movement for success now brings them, together with other Australians, before the challenges which face their adopted country in the context of regional economic integration of cultural diversity within an increasingly socio-economically incorporated world. It is within these new contexts that many Greek-Australians are already crossing the borders of the countries of the Pacific and South East Asia for business purposes or in search of better remuneration by offering their professional services and skills.

However, these new contexts do not mean some of the older questions on migration and mobility can now be left unexplored. Future investigations need to examine the impact of the migration experience on those who, after many years of concerted effort in industrial work structured by Fordist production techniques and segmented labour markets, suffered injuries and sickness, were retrenched and forced to join in the unemployment queues following the economic restructuring of the 1980s (Social Justice Consultative Council 1992. These are ongoing issues central to our understanding and assessment of the success or failure of Hellenic migration to Australia up to the present and into the future.

The challenges awaiting Australia in the future bring together other Australians with the descendants of Odysseus in a common struggle for success. The struggle for a better life has not ended in Hellenic migration and
the subsequent social mobility within the adopted country. Instead, it continues (as the myth and legends have it) beyond their present and past agoras which they still remember, beyond the horizons of furthest mountains and the endless Australian plains, towards the other unknown and unexplored destinations of the Asia Pacific and the World.
Appendices
Appendix 1

Interview Schedule

(1) When did you come to Australia?
(2) Did you come on your own or with your family?
(3) Why did you come to Australia?
(4) Which part of Greece are you from?
(5) Is this your original Greek name or have you changed it?
(6) What was your occupation in Greece?
(7) What was your parents occupation?
(8) Where did you first arrive/settle in Greece?
(9) Did you live on your own, or with: (a) friends/ (b) relatives?
(10) What were your first impressions of Australia?
(11) What were most Greeks doing for a living in those days?
(12) Why were they involved in such occupations?
(13) Was it easy to get a job?
(14) What was/is your job history?
(15) Did you experience any racism in Australia during settlement?
(16) Did you meet with other Greeks?
(17) Did you join Greek or Australian organisations?
(18) Do you remember/recall other Greeks and their activities during the earlier years?
(19) Were any Greeks in Australian political parties?
(20) Did you join a political party and if so why?
(21) How many hours did Greeks work during the earlier days (or in contrast to the post WWII period)?
(22) (a) If you joined a mainstream organisation, (b) was there any racism?
(23) Has a lack of proficiency in English caused any problems for you in Australia?
(24) Did the fact that you from Hellenic origin pose any problems for you?
(25) Have you been a member of Hellenic Community Organisations?

(26) What was it like for Greeks during the inter-war years in Australia?

(27) How did the Greeks who came to Australia during the pre-war years see the Greeks who came to Australia during the mass migration of the post-World War II years?

(28) Do you have any children?

(29) How did you feel about your children growing up in Australia (satisfied/dissatisfied)

(30) Do your children keep in close contact with you?

(31) What do your children do for a living/occupation?

(32) Do your children celebrate the Greek holidays with you?

(33) Are your children married to (or wish to marry) to Greeks or Non Greeks?

(34) Do you intend to return to Greece?
# Social Mobility of Greeks in Australia

**Please read the questions carefully and write the answer which best describes what you feel/think (or tick the right box)**

## 1. Sex?
- Male 1
- Female 2 □ □ □

## 2. Marital Status?
- Married
- Single
- Divorced
- Widowed
- De Facto
- Separated □ □ □

## 3. Your age (in years)? □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

## 4. In which country were you born (write in)? □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

## 5. If born in Hellas: Please write the name of the area, village or town where you were born (e.g. Koroni, Messinias)

## 6. In which country was your wife/husband born? □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

## 7. If your wife/husband was born in Hellas: Please write the name of the area, village or town □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

### If you came to Australia as an adult:

#### 8a. Why did you come to Australia? Tick the most important reasons.

- To make money? □ □ □
- For better living standards? □ □ □
- For a better future for my children? □ □ □
- To join relatives already here? □ □ □
- For political reasons? □ □ □

#### 8b. When you came to Australia, how long did you intend to stay?

- Intended to stay forever? □ □ □
- Intended to stay for a long time? □ □ □
- Intended to stay for a short time? □ □ □

#### 8c. Are you an Australian citizen? □ □ □ YES □ □ □ NO □ □ □
If you were NOT born in Australia:

9. How long have you been in Australia (in years)? ....... 

If born in Hellas:

10. Have you been back to Hellas? YES [ ] NO [ ] \n
10a. How many times have you been back to Hellas? 

10b. When was the last time you were in Hellas? 

10c. How long did you stay there? (the last time) 

10d. Do you think that you will go back to Hellas to live?

   Will definitely NOT go to Hellas to live ............... 1
   MAY go to Hellas to live .................................. 2
   WILL DEFINITELY go to Hellas to live .................... 3
   Cannot decide .............................................. 0

11. Please give details of your children's occupation. Starting with your oldest child please say whether he/she is employed full-time, employed part-time, is a housewife, is unemployed, a retired pensioner or a student. Then answer for your 2nd, 3rd and 4th child, etc..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your oldest child</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st oldest child</td>
<td>V36</td>
<td>V37</td>
<td>V38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd oldest child</td>
<td>V39</td>
<td>V40</td>
<td>V41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd oldest child</td>
<td>V42</td>
<td>V43</td>
<td>V44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th oldest child</td>
<td>V45</td>
<td>V46</td>
<td>V47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th oldest child</td>
<td>V48</td>
<td>V49</td>
<td>V50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11a. Do you own a house?  
1. Yes  
2. No  

11b. Are you still paying installments?  
Mortgage  
1. Yes  
2. No  

12a. If you do not own a house, are you renting one?  
1. Yes  
2. No  

12b. If housing is rented, what is the monthly payment?  

13. Regardless of whether you own a house or not, do you own any other property?  
(Write the number you own)  
number of houses ... shop(s) ... flats ... land ... other ...  

14. Could you possibly give the approximate value of each of your properties, e.g.  
house(s) $ ... shops $ ... flats $ ... land $ ... other $ ...  

15. What is the main source(s) of your family's income?  
1. Self Employed  
2. Wage/Salary  
3. Capital Investment  
4. Old Age Pension  
5. Invalid Pension  
6. Unemployment Benefit  
7. Widow's or Single Parent's Pension  

16. What is the approximate income from your business (if any) and other sources of family income?  
(Example, between $15,000 - $30,000 etc.)  
Husband $ ... Wife $ ... Oldest Child $ ... Second Oldest Child $ ...  

17. If your two oldest children are not living at home, where are they living at the moment?  
(Give name of suburb only)  
Oldest child ...  
Next oldest child ...  
If other, please specify ...
18. Please write the time and type of residence for each place where you have lived in Australia -

Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1939-1940</th>
<th>Lived in a room in a boarding house in Fitzroy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940-1950</td>
<td>Bought my own house in Coburg and lived in it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Write Below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exact Duration</th>
<th>Type of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V76 V77</td>
<td>V78 V79 V80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V81 V82</td>
<td>V83 V84 V85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V87 V88</td>
<td>V89 V90 V91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V92 V93</td>
<td>V94 V95 V96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V97 V98</td>
<td>V99 V100 V101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Do you anticipate moving in the next few years to some other area or suburb?

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

V102

20. **If the answer to question 19 is Yes, what area do you anticipate moving to?**

........................................................................................................................................

V103

V104

20a. Why would you want to move to that area?

........................................................................................................................................

V105
21. If you do not anticipate moving to another area, please state why you choose not to move. Please number your preferences from 1 to 10.

- Close to Transport
- Close to Schools
- Close to Shops
- Close to an Hellenic Church
- Close to the City
- Close to your work
- Close to Friends/Relatives
- Cheap to live here
- Like the house
- Prestigious Area

If other, Specify

22. Could you please state the names of area/suburbs in which three of your closest family friends live in Victoria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIFE'S FRIENDS</th>
<th>HUSBAND'S FRIENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example, Broadmeadows</td>
<td>Example, Footscray West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. VI17  VI18</td>
<td>1. VI23  VI24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. VI19  VI20</td>
<td>2. VI25  VI26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. VI21  VI22</td>
<td>3. VI27  VI28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FAMILY OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY**

23. What were/was your main occupation(s) in Hellas before migrating to Australia?

A. ..............VI29.................

Were you self-employed (tick answer). Yes □ VI30

24. What was your father's main occupation(s) in Hellas (Egypt or Cyprus)?

A. ..................VI31
26. Are you satisfied with your present job? Yes [ ] No [ ]

27. If you are not satisfied with your present job, please state why not.

28. Do you feel that your two oldest children are satisfied with their present job? (only if they are working).
   1. Oldest Child Yes [ ] No [ ]
   2. Second Oldest Child Yes [ ] No [ ]

29. What occupation do you expect to have in four years time?
   Same [ ] Other [ ]
   Specify if you wish

30. CHILDREN'S OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY (positions held for more than 6 months)

Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>Bank Clerk</td>
<td>1975-78</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OLDEST CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v194</td>
<td>v195</td>
<td>v196</td>
<td>v197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v197</td>
<td>v198</td>
<td>v199</td>
<td>v200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v201</td>
<td>v202</td>
<td>v203</td>
<td>v204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v205</td>
<td>v206</td>
<td>v207</td>
<td>v208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v209</td>
<td>v210</td>
<td>v211</td>
<td>v212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v213</td>
<td>v214</td>
<td>v215</td>
<td>v216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If running a family business:

31a. Which members of the family, if any, are presently employed in the family business?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest Son?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest Daughter?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(s), please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31b. Is the whole family presently occupied in the family business?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

31c. What business is it?

[ ] 32.

32. How proficient would you consider you are in the Hellenic language?

Very Proficient [ ] Average [ ] Poor [ ] Rather Bad [ ]

33. Where did you learn the Hellenic language? Please tick the appropriate answer below indicating which were the most important sources of learning.

In Hellas? [ ] At home in Australia? [ ] With friends? [ ]
Formal Education? [ ] Language School? [ ]
Special Government Night School [ ]
By Myself? [ ] Never learnt? [ ]

34. What other languages, if any, do you speak? Please name them.

1. [ ] 2. [ ] 3. None [ ]

35a. Please state which is your main language? [ ]
35b. If language is other than English, please state whether you are using this language daily?

Yes □ □  V232
No □ □

36. If your answer is yes for Question 35 please state where you are using that language in your daily life (e.g. at work, home, etc.)

V233

37. If you speak English, please indicate how proficient you are in that language? (Tick one)

Very Proficient □ □ V234
Average □ □
Poor □ □
Rather Bad □ □

38. If you speak English at all, please tick the appropriate answer below, indicating which were the most important sources of learning (Tick Yes or No for each question).

1. Adult migrant classes? V235
2. At work? V236
3. Formal Education in Hellas? V237
4. Formal Education in Australia? V238
5. By myself? V239
6. At home in Australia? V240
7. At home in Hellas? V241
8. With friends? V242

39. Has lack of the English language been a barrier in your life in Australia?

Yes □ □ V243
No □ □ V244

(If your answer is yes, state why) .................. V245

(If your answer is no, state why not) .................. V246

40. How often do you attend live theatres in Hellenic (Tick one).

Very Frequently □ □ V246
Frequently □ □
Rarely □ □
Never □ □
41. How often do you associate with friends and relatives of Hellenic origin? (Tick one)

Very Frequently ☐
Frequently ☐
Rarely ☐
Never ☐

42. What is the ethnic background of your best friends?

Friend 1. ........................................... ☐
Friend 2. ........................................... ☐
Friend 3. ........................................... ☐
Friend 4. ........................................... ☐
Friend 5. ........................................... 

43. What is the ethnic background of the people you associate with daily?

1. Most of the people at work or business are ........................................... ☐
2. Most of the people I meet for recreation and social occasions are ........................................... ☐

44a. Do you have any books at home? Yes ☐ No ☐

44b. If yes, what kind of books are they, e.g.

1. Hellenic poetry and literature ☐
2. Hellenic Encyclopaedias ☐
3. ........................................... ☐
4. ........................................... ☐

If others specify

1. English poetry and literature ☐
2. English Encyclopaedias ☐
3. ........................................... ☐
4. ........................................... ☐

44c. Have you got a Library Card? Yes ☐ No ☐

44d. What kind of reading do you enjoy most (e.g. mystery, politics, etc.).

........................................... ☐

........................................... ☐
45. Which is the major language you presently use in the following circumstances? (Tick the most appropriate answer).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hellenic Only</th>
<th>Mostly Hellenic</th>
<th>Hellenic and English Equally</th>
<th>Mostly English</th>
<th>English Only</th>
<th>Other Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural pursuits &amp; entertainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings Books &amp; Papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home with family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45a. Do you write letters in Hellenic to your friends/relatives in Hellas?

......... \( \checkmark \) ...............

46. How frequently do you listen to the Hellenic Radio Programs? (Tick one)

1. Whenever there is an Hellenic Program 
2. Most of the Hellenic Programs 
3. Some of the Hellenic Programs 
4. Few of the Hellenic Programs 
5. None of the Hellenic Programs 

If other, specify please .....................

47. How often do you watch TV programs in Hellenic? (Tick one)

1. Whenever there is an Hellenic Program 
2. Most of the Hellenic Programs 
3. Some of the Hellenic Programs 
4. Few of the Hellenic Programs 
5. None of the Hellenic Programs 

If other, specify please .....................
48. How frequently do your two oldest children watch TV and other theatre programs (including cinema) in the Hellenic language? (Tick one)

- 1. Whenever there is an Hellenic Program
- 2. Most of the Hellenic Programs
- 3. Some of the Hellenic Programs
- 4. Few of the Hellenic Programs
- 5. None of the Hellenic Programs

If other, specify please .........................................................

49. How often do your two oldest children associate with Hellenic friends and relatives? (Tick one)

- Very frequently
- Frequently
- Rarely
- Never

50. Which language(s) do your two oldest children use presently in the following circumstances?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hellenic Only</th>
<th>Mostly Hellenic</th>
<th>Hellenic and English Equally</th>
<th>Mostly English</th>
<th>English Only</th>
<th>Other Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Friendships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. With Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Social Gatherings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Reading &amp; Playing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Radio &amp; TV Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. With their brothers and sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. With other relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATIONS

51. And now a few questions about organizations that you belong to.

52a. There are many different kinds of ETHNIC organizations. Below is a list of the most common ones. (Please tick the ones you belong to).

1. Ethnic social club
2. Ethnic sporting club
3. Ethnic political club
4. Ethnic school parents association
5. None of these

If other, please specify ..........................................................

52b. And now GENERAL COMMUNITY (non ethnic) organizations. Below is a list of some of the most common ones. (Please tick the ones you belong to).

1. Sporting club
2. Social organization
3. Welfare organization
4. Political organization
5. Trade Union
6. None of these

If other, please specify ..........................................................

..............................................................
3. What were the barriers, if any, that stopped you from reaching the desired level of education?

4. What level of education would you wish your children to complete? (Tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Education</th>
<th>Other Education</th>
<th>Child's Education</th>
<th>Other Education</th>
<th>Child's Education</th>
<th>Other Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V314</td>
<td>V315</td>
<td>V316</td>
<td>V317</td>
<td>V318</td>
<td>V319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V320</td>
<td>V321</td>
<td>V322</td>
<td>V323</td>
<td>V324</td>
<td>V325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V326</td>
<td>V327</td>
<td>V328</td>
<td>V329</td>
<td>V330</td>
<td>V331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What other country and education system was attended in country other than Australia or in countries where the education was not specified below? Please state below.

6. Any other tertiary training attended in both Australia and another country?

7. Attendance in both Australia and tertiary training attended in both Australia and another country.

8. Number of years attended in both Australia and tertiary training attended in both Australia and another country.

9. Any other education attended in both Australia and tertiary training attended in both Australia and another country.

10. Number of years attended in both Australia and tertiary training attended in both Australia and another country.

11. Primary School

12. Secondary School

13. Tertiary School

14. Tertiary Technical

15. Country of Education was attained in count of other than Australia or in countries where the education was not specified below.

16. Please state below.
RELIGIOUS AFFILIATIONS

54a. A few questions about religion.

What church, if any, do you believe in? (Tick one)

- Hellenic Orthodox
- Evangelical church
- Roman Catholic
- Anglican Church
- Do not belong to any church

Other, specify ..............................................

54b. How often do you attend a religious service? (Tick one)

- Once a week or more
- Most weeks but not every week
- Several times a year
- Rarely (funerals, weddings, etc.)
- Never

54c. What church do your children belong to? (Tick one)

- Hellenic Orthodox
- Evangelical Church
- Roman Catholic
- Anglican Church

Other, specify ..............................................

54d. How often do your children attend a religious service? (Tick one)

- Once a week or more
- Once a month
- Twice a year
- Once a year

Other, specify ..............................................

54e. Is the Hellenic Orthodox Church convenient to your residence?

Yes
No

54f. Which Hellenic Orthodox Church is nearest to where you live? (Please state name of church and give approximate distance in kilometres).

.................................................................
POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS

55a. Are you eligible to vote in Federal Elections? Yes ☐ No ☐ 

55b. Did you vote in the last Federal Elections? Yes ☐ No ☐ 

55c. Generally speaking, in Australian politics do you usually think of yourself as Liberal, Labor, National Country Party, Democrat, or what?

Liberal ☐ Labor (A.L.P.) ☐ National/Country Party ☐ Australian Democrats ☐ Communist ☐

Other, specify ........................................

55d. Would you consider yourself a strong supporter of that party?

Very strong ☐ Fairly strong ☐ Not very strong ☐ 

55e. In the past, did you ever think of yourself as being closer to a different party?

Yes ☐ No ☐ 

55f. If YES in e: Which party was it?

Liberal ☐ Labor (A.L.P.) ☐ National/Country Party ☐ Australian Democrats ☐ Communist ☐

Other, specify ........................................

55g. Has there been any major event or occurrence that has caused you to change your political affiliation? Event - 

55h. How frequently does your vote change?

Very frequently ☐ Frequently ☐ Rarely ☐ Never ☐
56. Are you a member of a political party? Yes [ ] No [ ]

56A. If "YES" to question 56 to which party do you belong?
- Liberal
- Labor (A.L.P.)
- National Country Party
- Australian Democrats
- Communist
- Other, specify ..............................

56b. Are you an active member of that party?
- Very active [ ]
- Active [ ]
- Not active [ ]

57a. Have you got close relatives or friends that are very active or active members of a political party?
- Very active [ ]
- Active [ ]
- Not active [ ]

57b. If active which party are your relatives/friends members of?
- Liberal
- Labor (A.L.P.)
- National Country Party
- Australian Democrats
- Communist
- Other, specify ..............................

58. Which party did you vote for at the last Hellenic elections before your arrival in Australia?
- EPEK
- ERE
- EK
- EDA
- LAIKO KOMMA
- PROODEYTIKO KOMMA
- SYNAGERMOS

59. Do you know which party your father voted for in the Hellenic elections. Please state name of party - .................................
60. When you vote in elections in the Greek community (or an association of which you are a member) do you usually vote for the candidate who would be the strongest leader OR the candidate who comes closest to agreeing with you on the main issues OR are strong leadership and issues equally important to you? (Please tick one answer)

(a) Strong leadership most important
(b) Political issues most important
(c) Both strong leadership and political issues equally important

61. Are newspapers an important source of political information for you?

Yes ☐
No ☐

63. Which other source of political information do you use?

Radio? Yes ☐
No ☐

Television? Yes ☐
No ☐

Friends? Yes ☐
No ☐

63. Which newspapers do you read for your political information? (Tick the ones you read)

(a) Nea Patris
(b) Panellinios Kirikas
(c) Nea Ellas
(d) Neos Kosmos
(e) Other, specify

HELLENIC

AUSTRALIAN

(a) Sun
(b) Herald
(c) Age
(d) National Times
(e) the Australian

(f) Other, specify

64. Which Radio or Television station do you follow for your political information? (Tick the ones you follow)

RADIO

(a) A.B.C. Radio
(b) Commercial Radio(s)
(c) 3CR Hellenic Programs
(d) 3EA Hellenic Programs

TELEVISION

(a) Channel 10
(b) Channel 7
(c) Channel 9
(d) Channel 2 (ABC)
(e) Channel 0/28

Other, specify

65. Please supply any other sources (of political) information that has not been included in the questionnaire.
55a. If you had a daughter or a son, whom would you like them to marry?

- A Hellene
- No Difference
- A Non Hellene

56. Can you do Hellenic dances?

- Yes
- No

57. Can your two oldest children do Hellenic dances?

- Yes
- No

58. If your two oldest children are married, do your two oldest children cook Hellenic dishes often?

- Always
- Mostly
- Sometimes
- Never

59. In your opinion, to what degree are your children attached to the Hellenic tradition?

- Very strongly
- Strongly
- Moderately
- Not at all

60. Would you like your children to maintain the Hellenic language and culture?

- Yes
- No

61. Please state one major aspect associated with Hellenic culture or lifestyle that you mostly dislike – (where possible please give reasons as to why you think so) –

- V375
- V376
- V377

62. Now state one major aspect associated with the Hellenic culture/lifestyle that you admire (where possible please give reasons as to why you think so) –

- V378
- V379
- V380
73a. How often do you take a vacation/holiday?
- Once a year  
- Or more?  
- Less than once a year  
- Never  

73b. Where have you been vacationing? (e.g. Hellas, Melbourne, Australia, etc.)

74. How often do you attend symphony concerts?
- Frequently  
- Rarely  
- Never  

75. How often do you go to lectures, museums, recitals or art galleries?
- Frequently  
- Rarely  
- Never  

76. What do you like to do in your spare time? (e.g. play backgammon or cards)

77. Please state one major aspect associated with the Australian culture/lifestyle that you dislike mostly (where possible, please give reasons as to why you think so) -

78. Now state one major aspect associated with the Australian culture/lifestyle that you admire (where possible, please give reasons as to why you think so) -

79. If your aspirations did not materialize what do you intend or plan for your children now?

80. If there is anything more you would like to say/add please do so at the end of the questionnaire.
Appendix 3

Interview Questions

(1) (a) Where were you born/raised; (b) How long have you been in Australia?

(2) (b) What is your occupation?
   
   (a) in Greece/Cyprus/Egypt/Other
   
   (b) in Australia

(3) Which part of Greece/Cyprus/Egypt/Other do you come from?

(4) (a) What made you come to Australia?

(5) Did you have relations in Australia?

(6) Did anyone else migrate from your village/town to Australia or to other parts of the World?

(7) (a) How did you imagine Australia to be prior to your migration? (b) How did you find out about Australia?

(8) Has Australia fulfilled your expectations? (Explain)

(9) Retrospectively, has Australia provided you with answers to what you were/have been searching for? (e.g. did you fulfill your goals and aspirations?)

(10) Has Australia given you the opportunity to provide your children with what they need in life?

(11) Have the Australian society (mainstream) and Australians at large treated you as you expected them to?

(12) Have you been able to get the kind of job and the kind of rewards you hoped for or have there been any barriers against you in achieving them?

(13) What kind of forces operated in Greece (social, political, economic) that accentuated the mentality of out-migration?

(14) (a) Was out-migration a necessary from Greece/Cyprus/Other?

   (b) Why the Greek Governments did not take any measures to curtail migration or did they encourage out-migration?

(15) What about the Greek political parties, what were their views on mass out-migration?
(16) Other than travel agents, were there any other organisations who were interested in Hellenic out-migration? (and if so who were they and why?).

(17) How long did you intend to stay in Australia?

(18) What did you expect to achieve in Australia?

(19) Have there been any barriers which stopped you from achieving your goals?

(20) What was your occupational status prior to migration?

(21) What has your occupational history been in Australia?

(22) Has the Australian society provided you (and other Greeks) with hospitality?

(23) To what extent are/have you participating across the mainstream society's social and organisational life at large?

(24) Which organisation was/were these?
   (b) What were its objectives?
   (c) Have these objectives been achieved?
   (d) Who else was in that organisation
   (e) What was your role in contrast to the role of others in that organisation?
   (f) Did the organisation meet its objectives?

(24) In contrast to earlier years do you think Greek Australians are now gaining entry in sufficient numbers in mainstream organisation?

Further Questions for Second Generation Australians of Hellenic descent

(25) If born/raised in Australia, when did you parent come to Australia?

(26) Which part of Greece/Cyprus/Egypt/Other did they come from?

(27) What was your parents' occupation in Australia.

(28) What is your occupation?

(29) Have been involved in Australian political organisation?

(30) Have you been involved in other mainstream organisations?

(31) Have you been a member of any Hellenic community organisation?

(32) If you are involved in an Australian political organisation have you been discriminated because of your ethnicity (Greek)?

(33) Did you have to join some radical political organisation out of social necessity?

(34) (a) Have heard of the existence of radical/other Hellenic community organisations? (b) Have you been involved in any?

(35) Are your friends of Hellenic origin involved in political organisations? If yes which ones?
(36) Do you usually identify as an Australian or as an Australian of Hellenic origin amongst Greeks and British Australians?
Appendix 4

Anglicisation of Hellenic Names

Some of the names that have been either partly or totally Anglicised include: Samuel Donnes (i.e. Andonis?), Nicholas Emelsen, Vacillius Macryannis, Jeremiah Mitaxa, James Nicklos, John Pannam, Demetrius Carra, John Carpattes, Michael Manusu, Spiridion Candiottis, Nicholas Megne, Lafar Constantine, Nicholas Brown, William Constantine, Nicholas Karkoe, Constantine Crocos, Andoni Fossilo (Phasoulas), George Doicos, Joachim (James) Zannis, Athanasius (John) Carpatus, Jeremiah Perry (Apozogy or Apergis), Dennis Key (Dionisios Korkuchakeys), Jeremiah Williams (Vasilakis), Nicholas Lambert, Antony Ioannou, Andreas Lukas (Lekatsas), George Marks, John Lewis, George Morphesis, Leonidas Koledas, Nicholas Paris, Con Fischer (Constantine Argyropoulos), John Manolato, Anthony Barber, Constantine Lalechos, John Pericles, John Kapazzo, Themetre Moustaka, George Georges (Georgouras), John Black (Mavrokefalos), Peter Stevens (Panayiotis Tsirginis) and Peter Alexander - amongst many others.
### Occupation by Birthplace. Employed Population

#### Table 14. Occupation by Birthplace, Employed Population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>BIRTHPLACE</th>
<th>ANGLO-AUSTRALIA</th>
<th>GREECE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional,</td>
<td>319,790</td>
<td>275,925</td>
<td>1,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>(10.31%)</td>
<td>(15.70%)</td>
<td>(1.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative, etc</td>
<td>279,989</td>
<td>48,212</td>
<td>3,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.02%)</td>
<td>(2.74%)</td>
<td>(6.31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Workers</td>
<td>281,017</td>
<td>578,357</td>
<td>1,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.06%)</td>
<td>(32.94%)</td>
<td>(1.82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>189,509</td>
<td>280,794</td>
<td>5,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.11%)</td>
<td>(9.06%)</td>
<td>(9.73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers, Fishermen, etc</td>
<td>280,794</td>
<td>155,970</td>
<td>1,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.05%)</td>
<td>(8.88%)</td>
<td>(2.56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miners, Quarrymen, etc</td>
<td>27,261</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.87%)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(0.24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport,</td>
<td>225,392</td>
<td>37,297</td>
<td>3,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>(7.26%)</td>
<td>(2.12%)</td>
<td>(5.89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradesmen, etc</td>
<td>1,166,383</td>
<td>128,316</td>
<td>36,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37.61%)</td>
<td>(7.31%)</td>
<td>(61.23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service,</td>
<td>138,201</td>
<td>230,317</td>
<td>4,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport, Recreation</td>
<td>(4.45%)</td>
<td>(13.12%)</td>
<td>(7.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members Armed</td>
<td>53,867</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>(1.74%)</td>
<td>(0.17%)</td>
<td>(0.04%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequately</td>
<td>138,853</td>
<td>138,606</td>
<td>2,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Described</td>
<td>(4.48%)</td>
<td>(7.89%)</td>
<td>(3.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EMPLOYED:</td>
<td>3,101,055</td>
<td>1,755,776</td>
<td>60,368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 6

Occupational Status According to Birthplace of Parents:

1981.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace of parents</th>
<th>Occupational status (percentage distribution)</th>
<th>Farmers, fishermen, hunters</th>
<th>Tradesmen, process &amp; production</th>
<th>Service, sport, recreation</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional, technical, executive</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK &amp; Ireland</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rep.)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Income of Individuals according to Birthplace of Parents, 1981.

Table 8.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace of parents</th>
<th>Income status (percentage distribution)</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>$1-$8000</th>
<th>$8001-$12000</th>
<th>$12001-$18000</th>
<th>$18000 and over</th>
<th>Not stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK &amp; Ireland</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rep.)</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Percentage of Workforce Self-Employed and Employer, NSW, 1986. By Selected Country of Birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th></th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK &amp; Eire</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1986 Census
Educational Qualifications in Population aged 15 years and above According to the Birthplace (First Generation) or Birthplace of Parents (Second Generation), 1981.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace or birthplace of parents</th>
<th>Educational qualification (percentage distribution)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK &amp; Ireland (Rep.)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

The High-Achieving Second Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No qual.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR and Baltic states</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 9

Money Lost by Greek Fruit Growers in the Riverland

(For legal reasons the name of the cooperative and its manager have been deleted.)

Various informants in the Riverland stressed that they had lost large sums of money because local fruit industries deceived and exploited them because being foreigners. Specifically, it was stressed that due to lack of appropriate control, the management of one specified fruit cooperative and especially a specified single person who was managing it over a number of years in the 1970s and 1980s, cheated the growers because he failed to meet the agreement and pay them for fruit purchased over a several years while making vast profits over several years. According to Dedes, there were other private factories outside Adelaide there too people lost lots and lots of money, but the local fruit cooperative known as *** was the Hiroshima of the Riverland. There was no “new Australian” who was not complaining about it or who did not loose something in the range of ten to seventy thousand dollars each, money which was almost equivalent for each to buy another house or fruit block, because it involved several years of work (Dedes, Interview 23/12/1988).

Dedes mentions the names of some of the people who lost significant sums of money as a result of their agreement with the cooperative. He states categorically that in Renmark alone some of the people who lost money were: Soterios Polymeneas $10,000, Yiannis Alexandropoulos $12,000, Demetrios Arnaoutis $60,000, Stefanos Grevezas $65-70,000, Tzanavaras $10-12,000, Peter Markeas 10-15,000, Christos Polymeneas $20,000, Yiorgos Atsaves $25,000. The huge trouble that occurred in the Riverland was to the fruit growers of Loxton, Berri, Barmera, Monash, many of whom were Hellenes (Dedes, Interview 23/12/1988).

\[1\] For over a decade since the mid-1980’s this *** cooperative has changed its name because it was sold to private enterprise.
## Appendix 10

### Comparison of Greek-Born in Melbourne LGAs

(1976, 1981 & 1986 Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>1976 Numbers</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>1981 Numbers</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>1986 Numbers</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>1991 Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster/Templestowe</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>+64.03</td>
<td>2241</td>
<td>+45.07</td>
<td>3251</td>
<td>+16.36</td>
<td>3783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorabbin</td>
<td>2723</td>
<td>+9.36</td>
<td>2978</td>
<td>+2.72</td>
<td>3059</td>
<td>+6.86</td>
<td>3269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcote</td>
<td>6291</td>
<td>-17.07</td>
<td>5217</td>
<td>-13.57</td>
<td>4509</td>
<td>-27.50</td>
<td>3911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakleigh</td>
<td>4290</td>
<td>+4.90</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>-5.33</td>
<td>4260</td>
<td>-2.86</td>
<td>4138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>3677</td>
<td>+4.03</td>
<td>3825</td>
<td>-4.47</td>
<td>3654</td>
<td>-5.83</td>
<td>3441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittlesea</td>
<td>3471</td>
<td>+23.97</td>
<td>4303</td>
<td>+5.25</td>
<td>4529</td>
<td>+1.70</td>
<td>4606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1200-2999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>1976 Numbers</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>1981 Numbers</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>1986 Numbers</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>1991 Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadmeadows</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>+5.58</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>+3.88</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>4401</td>
<td>-17.72</td>
<td>3621</td>
<td>-21.29</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>-15.23</td>
<td>2416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>+11.36</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>-4.70</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>+4.35</td>
<td>1608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulfield</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>-10.21</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>-8.00</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>1577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coburg</td>
<td>2459</td>
<td>-3.42</td>
<td>2375</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>2367</td>
<td>-5.79</td>
<td>2230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footscray</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>-14.50</td>
<td>2495</td>
<td>-20.48</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>-16.83</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keilor</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>+22.61</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>+20.43</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>+16.14</td>
<td>2382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>-14.43</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>-8.99</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunawading</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>+49.17</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>+4.43</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>+4.06</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>3835</td>
<td>-35.15</td>
<td>2487</td>
<td>-29.07</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>-24.26</td>
<td>1336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prahran</td>
<td>3707</td>
<td>-24.68</td>
<td>2792</td>
<td>-26.58</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>-17.41</td>
<td>1693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>+9.09</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>-3.33</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>-5.91</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springvale</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>+12.88</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>-4.22</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>+9.28</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>+46.76</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>+18.44</td>
<td>2826</td>
<td>+12.84</td>
<td>3189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources of Appendix 10:

*1976 Ethnic Distribution*, DIEA,


Although settlement within some of the inner suburbs remains fairly high (eg., Brunswick, Coburg, Richmond, Prahran, Footscray, Northcote), there is no doubt that there has been a very significant movement away from the inner/industrial suburbs towards the better, cleaner or socio-economically more affluent suburbs such as Doncaster/Templestowe (Northeastern), Waverley (Eastern) and also Keilor (Northwestern).
Appendix 11

Australian MP's of Hellenic or Part Hellenic Origin: 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>State or Federal</th>
<th>Pol. Party</th>
<th>Electoral area</th>
<th>First Elected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theophanous, A.</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>Calwell</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrianopoulos, A.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>St Albans</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollis, D.²</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophanous, T.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>Jiga-Jiga</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandazopoulos, J.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>Dandenong</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgiou, P.</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Kooyong</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, P.</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>Shortland</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, A.</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaldis, J.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>(Upper House)</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samios, J.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>(Upper House)</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photios, M.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Ryde/Ermington '88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souris, G.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Upper Hunter</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolkus, N.</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>(Senate)</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dondas, G.S.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>(Legislative)</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fouras, G.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>Ashgrove</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


² Dollis replaced former MP, T. Sidiropoulos in Richmond, and in Queensland was also previously elected the first Australian of Hellenic origin George Georges who represented the people of Queensland in the senate (ALP) of the Federal Parliament from 1968 until the 1980’s. Representing the people of Northern Territory in the State Parliament was Nicholas Manuel Dontas who being elected in Casuarina in 1974 and served in a number of positions including as a speaker of the house until 1993.


ABS, Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1986, Census, Socio-economic index (indicators) for areas.
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