

**Patricia Riak**  
**Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania**

## GREEK AS SELF: AUSTRALIAN DIVISION AND CONVERGENCE

Many years ago, the ancient Greeks created mirror craftsmanship and a student learned the very delicate art of sand polishing a metal until they created a reflective surface without scratching it. The result was that the mirror was highly polished at the front that gave the reflection. From this invention, the ancient Greeks invented the mirror that formed two disks that closed like a clamshell: one mirror was highly polished and the other was unpolished and served as a protective cover. This paper is a metaphoric division and convergence in that it is both reflective and protective. For a Greek to meet with the reflection of self-understanding, it is sometimes clear and reflective, sometimes blurred and reflective, sometimes clear and protective, sometimes blurred and protective. Self-reflection is not of just a single self but a cultural and historical understanding that deflects to gaze upon images from native and intellectual cultures framing it.

### THE MAKING OF THE SELF IN A KEYWORD

*Home* is a subjective corner stone and as Tilley (2001) analyses the house it is a very important metaphor for producing and reproducing social relations. He argues that to enter a house is to enter a body, a mind, a sensibility, a specific mode of dwelling or being in the world. The house consists of a complex array of artifacts where people collect and organize themselves through time. He argues that because of this many social groups are referred to as houses and action and agency come out of these (Tilley, 2001: 263). Tilley on the metaphor of the home as an object in a space comments on Pierre Bordieu and the symbolic division of the home is created through practical actions and social strategies of the social actors rather than it being an inherent feature of the internal space - a dialectics between agency, structure and meaning. Tilley also comments that often parts of

the home are anthropomorphized as bodies which may provide cosmological models of the world in a smaller form expressing divisions and practices for example, hierarchy and gender as seen in metaphoric understandings of men and women and the role they play in the home.

Poetic language is present in the work of Heany through his exploration of the pivotal motive of *homecoming*. Home cannot be taken for granted, it must be sought after because it is *absent*. For Heany, homecoming is not an event but the possibility of an advent. Heany recognizes something of home 'imprisoned in a linguistic contour which no longer matches the 'language of fact' because of the need to negotiate a transition from old language to new in order to learn new names and to make them *our home*. In a poem entitled *Homecomings* Heany focuses upon the homing maneuvers of a sand martin as it circles back to its nest:

At the worm mouth of the hole  
 Flight after flight after flight  
 The swoop of its wings  
 Gloved and kissed home  
 A glottal stillness. An eardrum  
 Far in featherbrains tucked in silence  
 A silence of water lipping the bank  
 Mould my shoulders inward to you  
 Occlude me  
 Be damp clay pouting  
 Let me listen to your eaves

Heany, sees that homecoming is instinctual for the sand martin and homecoming is used as an analogy to return to an originating womb of earth where it may regain a sense of prenatal silence, unity, and belonging. Heany draws in the image of the *omphalos* in the poem as a hidden underground well of childhood memory. The Greek word *omphalos* means *navel*. The water pump marked an original descent into earth, sand, gravel, water making its foundations, the *omphalos*. The positive images of home are identified with nature, mother earth and childhood. They describe dwelling in harmony with the natural environment, a primordial identity, a *self-consciousness*. (Kearney 1998).

## HOMELESSNESS AND DIVISIONS



Greek Migration to Australia upon the Ellinis and the Patris, seen here docked at South Melbourne Peer (Bottomley, 1992).

A patriarchal emigration of people over chains of mountains and plains with legendary names! And I shall be a sort of Moses, – an imitation Moses – leading the chosen race to the Promised Land, as these people are calling Greece. Of course, to be really worthy of this Mosaic mission, I should have done away with my elegant leggings, which you tease me, about and wrapped my legs in sheepskin. I should also have a long, wavy beard, and above all a pair of horns. But I'm sorry ... it's easier to change my soul than my costume. – Nikos Kazantzakis, 1962: 147.

How prophetically Kazantzakis stages migration and calls upon a blurring in the understanding of who one should be when they decide to change a course of life and enter into life change. He writes of this *imitation Moses* calling for the re-emergence of historical narrative of momentum and movement. The nostalgic calls of Greek migrants mentioning the poem *Ithaki* by Cavafy echoes the longing to return back to the homeland. Many came to Australia with the hope that they would someday return and did not. *Ithaki* personalizes Homer's epic poem *The Odyssey*, written about the travel and the return of the King of Ithaca, Odysseus. Cavafy personalizes the poem so that life narrative represents every Greek found who has migrated away from their homeland.

In Heany's *Homecoming*, the sand martin returns to the nest with the conception of the *omphalos* understood as the essentially sacred and natural centre for the migrating bird. Cavafy magnifies the mythical significance of arriving back home to the island of *Ithaki* for those Greeks who have migrated away from it. Cavafy speaks of an island that one will leave and one shall come back to, an island that will find one changed and they shall find it changed. They leave optimistic excited, spirited and after a long journey, they will return contented, learned, experienced and old – wise for the journey they took. Cavafy speaks of the island as giving one the urge to leave and the urge to eventually return. Greek migrants coming to Australia often refer to *Ithaki* and also to Homer when reflecting upon their migration experience. Rather nostalgically and saddened they speak of never returning to Greece and of having failed the journey. Many in fact were destined to return to the homeland after spending some years working in *xenitia*.

Bonegilla Immigration Center was a migrant hostel and functioned as a displaced person's camp during the post war period (1947-1971). Many migrants assisted by the government with their passages to Australia stayed in Bonegilla and signed a two year working contract with the government. The contract defined migrants as government workers and it was the responsibility of the government to find them initial employment. The name of the reception center means in Aboriginal terms "the parting of the waters," the displacement from home. Greek Australian playwright, Tess Lyssiotis, created the script *Hotel Bonegilla* as a narrative documentary concerned with telling the migrant experience through stories told by one Greek, Italian and German couple. The play was created as a stage production and it was performed in Melbourne in 1983. The play came to represent Australia as an alien and inhospitable environment – stories about immigration officers, the bush land, migrants confusing "new food" such as cornflakes for potato peel and scared by the laughter of the kookaburra early in the morning. As one Greek migrant noted of his unpleasant experience with Bonegilla:

We boarded the buses that were to take us to Bonegilla. For a few moments I wondered about these people who break the law, who are sentenced to jail and others who are exiled ... I wonder whether we

belonged in this category and whether we were being punished. But what was our crime? – Stephanos Kastamonitis (Sophocleous, 1987: 4).

I found it to be quite ironic that Lyssiotis named the play as though it was a conscious reminder of the Eagle's song *Hotel California*. She parallels the migrant experience at Bonegilla with the experience of a horrid hotel the migrant feels they will never leave and as the quote mentioned earlier suggests, they felt that it was as though they were to become prisoners at Bonegilla.

For a cross-cultural child growing up in Melbourne, the duality of *we* and *they* was experienced from the time many Greek families migrated to Australia namely during the post war era. Personal experiences for children of Greek migrants are understandably associated to learning of the *they* (the Australian) and merging closer to the *we* (the Greek). The political ideologies that formed dominant culture and assimilation through the White Australia Policy continued in spirit after it's abolition. When I was a 16 year old, the society was declared *multicultural*. The *we* was inclusive of the Anglo-Celtic and Northern Europeans forming the dominant culture. The *they* were then all *others* forming minority culture. This historical ethno-centrism reflected assimilation and exclusion to the tune of social Darwinism for the residues of the British Empire. This racist staging was propped before the post-war

period when *white Australia* was imposed on the native Australian indigenous populations and on the Chinese who came to Australia at the time of The Gold Rush. Many migrants alongside indigenous peoples felt *homeless*.

As a teenage student of history, the country still seemed aptly depicted by the cartoon preceding. Immigrants with fair hair stop at the French. The first three sets of



Noah's Oz Arc Cartoon. A Collette – *The Herald*, March 3, 1984. Bridges and Heimann, 1988:88

couples entering the Oz Arc are all fair-haired (having spent time in Paris I recognized the French to have brown hair predominantly but that is beside the point here). The final three couples entering the Oz Arc all have dark hair. A clear visual distinction depicts a preference for the new white Australians to be fair-haired as indicated by those boarding the Oz Arc. The fact that Moses looks to be disgruntled while voicing for only *one Asian* to board indicates a continued undesirability for those of Asian origin to migrate to Australia. The Greek couple has been placed just before the Asian couple, hence the least desired of European migrants.

Jean Martin saw the process of ideological production in this way ... part of the capacity to dominate the construction of public knowledge is the capacity to describe what will happen to new public knowledge or new social knowledge, whether it will be permitted to become public knowledge and to what extent or whether it will be ignored or suppressed. Castles et al, 1988:4.

After the Second World War, the Australian government was very concerned with preserving a *white* Australia because of mass migration during this time and efforts were not focused on an indigenous or Asian population but a non-British European population who were still not *white enough*. The result was an assimilationist project which led to the *Australian Citizenship Conventions* held annually (1950-1970), producing a number of resolutions that were directed towards assimilating a migrant population. For example in 1950 the Minister for Immigration Harold Holt spoke of the concept of *The Welcoming Hand* that later led to the establishment of the *Good Neighbor Movement*. It was developed to encourage good neighborhood relations between *old* and *new* Australians. The *Good Neighbor Movement* was primarily designed to quickly assimilate a migrant population by mixing them in with a host population. The concern behind the *Good Neighbor Movement* was that politicians felt pressed with the problem of housing shortages and believed this to be a chief obstacle for assimilation as the situation in migrant hostels encouraged foreign languages to be spoken (Wilton and Bosworth, 1984: 20). Migrants were encouraged to meet Australians so they could be naturalized as quickly as possible. There was never a mention that Australians had to make any adjustments to the

ways of immigrants. After creating the *Good Neighbour Movement*, decisions about assimilation continued to be made by various government politicians and were presented by them as resolutions during the Conventions. Ideologically their actions and decisions at the conventions were representative of *any gathering of Australians* and that the statements they made were “*a unanimity among Australian citizens of all religions, all political views and all walks of life towards the nation’s immigration drive*” (Harris, 1979). Assimilationism was then implemented by the state by employing mechanisms of exclusion during the Conventions.

### ROYALTY AND A CONNECTION WITH BRITAIN

The *Australian Citizenship Conventions* attempted to preserve a white Australia by resolutions, that emphasized the significance of Britain and its monarchy. During the year of the royal visit speakers at the 1954 convention suggested migrants should be encouraged to take part in demonstrations of loyalty to the Queen during the Royal Tour because attention to royalty was a way of preserving an orientation toward the culture of British imperialism. After the Royal Tour the Queen’s crown and portrait were displayed at Assembly Hall in Canberra. Politicians stressed the importance of the coronation year for Australian *citizens* and encouraged migrants to take out citizenship and assimilate. By using the image of the Queen as Australia’s royal figure politicians continued their preference for bringing British migrants to Australia. This preference became a government campaign called the *Bring out a Briton Campaign*. It was launched for the host population in an attempt to encourage them to act as sponsors for prospective British migrants. Athol Townley who was Minister for Immigration in 1950 announced the campaign and was pleased to report that 28,500,000 pounds had been spent on Britons since 1947 against 9,500,000 pounds for nationals of 38 *other* countries (Wilton and Bosworth, 1984:27). Although government spending was astronomical for the advertisement of British migrants to come to Australia, the intake figures remained low and Australia was forced to look elsewhere.

Between 1947 and 1960 the government, despite this vigorous campaign, was not very successful in encouraging citizens of the host population to sponsor British migrants. From the total figure of Australian Assisted Passage Schemes for the United Kingdom (378,578) only a very small minority (2,718) came to

Australia through the *Bring Out a Briton* migration scheme. The majority of these arrivals (2,455) came before June 1960. Between June and December 1960, a minority (263) arrived, with Victoria supporting the largest number of assisted passage arrivals (926) (Commonwealth Department of Immigration, 1961:10). Through the Inter-Governmental Committee for European Migration Australia signed an agreement with the Greek government for larger intakes of Greek migrants in 1952 and this was agreed upon six years *before* the Bring Out A Briton Campaign was launched (Kern, 1966:35). Furthermore, expense figures reveal the government's apathy for accepting non-British European migrants. This was no more evident than between 1955 and 1975 when the Australian government spent ten cents on publicity for every Greek, 180 dollars for every Swede and each German cost the government twenty times as much as each Italian (Wilton and Bosworth, 1984:32). The government's attempts were a clear indication that they wanted to preserve a majority culture by maintaining a large *white Australian* population. Subsequently, Arthur Caldwell expressed the hope that "for every foreign migrant there will be ten from the United Kingdom" (Rooth, 1969:59). Later during the 1952 convention, he stressed that ... "we must have a single culture. If immigration implied 'multi' culture within Australian society then it was not the type of Australia wanted. I am quite determined that we should have a monoculture with everyone living the same way, understanding each other and sharing the same aspirations. We don't want pluralism." Subsequently, Greece was the fifth largest source country to populate Australia between 1945 and 1970 with 184,715 migrants. Between 1945 and 1950, 5412 Greeks migrated to Australia. During the 1950s, 63,614 Greeks migrated to Australia. Greek migration to Australia was highest during the 1960s with 115,689 Greeks migrating (Appleyard, 1971: 217).

#### MASS MEDIA: A FOCUS ON RADIO AND THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Radio presentation was used to promote assimilationism where broadcasts explained what was meant by assimilation to migrants also informed the host population about what was happening as a result of immigration particularly in the field of assimilation. Radio announcements were aided through convention



resolutions. For example, in 1954, the government used convention information when promoting assimilation over the radio: 80 recommendations were made and 40 of them concerned naturalization and only one recommendation on migrant education. The following year 50 resolutions were made and all of them encouraged immigration and assimilation (Harris, 1979:26). Migrant education statistics suggest that the English language was a very important factor for assimilation. English day and evening classes were available to migrants as well as ABC radio correspondence courses. Victoria had the highest number of enrollments and the most number of running English language classes offered of all Australian states. However, the percentage of migrant attendance and turnover rate was the lowest of all states (Commonwealth Department of Immigration, 1961: 26).

### THE EDUCATION SYSTEM

As *political elites*, government politicians also required the services of *civil elites* such as academics to help impose the ideology of assimilationism. That was considered by the government to be a dominant, national ideology. Until the beginning of the 1950s, assimilationist ideology was advocated by the efforts of T. Hayes. He was the first secretary for the Department of Immigration to expand a bureaucratic empire. By 1950, almost 6,000 immigration officers were employed, as opposed to less than 100, four years earlier (Wilton and Bosworth, 1984: 19). As well as expanding the Immigration Department, he developed a network with *civil elites* such as academics to strengthen the political educating body for asserting assimilationism and monism in intellectual circles. One of Hayes' academic supporters was Charles Price who was a social scientist at the Australian National University. Through his academic position and his links to political circles through Hayes he received the position as a government adviser. Price advised that Australia should not allow too large a settlement of any particular migrant group in one particular area and he advised that migrants should not settle as groups but be dispersed and taught to discard their old ways in the interests of Australian nationalism. *Political elites* such as Hayes were incorporating *civil elites* such as Price into the educating body to intensify educational control through academic literature that was incorporated into social institutions such as universities about assimilationism (Wilton and Bosworth, 1984: 53).

During the 1960s convention resolutions were developed from academic discussions about migrants. These discussions introduced intellectual changes through the concept of integrationism. Terminologies became an intellectual concern for politicians as academics were concerned with how to define the term *migrant* but this was meant for the convenience of the host population and not the migrant population. Essentially Migrants were defined in terms of their own intellectual constructions and not in a manner that benefited the migrant conception of *self*. Further, As an intellectual construction integration did not come from the state itself but from a *greater pluralism*. In the 1960s, attitudes were no longer borrowed from Britain but from the United States where the society experienced a turbulent period of critical self-assessment. Migrant power was one of a number of social movements developing alongside black, women and gay liberations. New academic concerns were created during this humanitarian climate and convention papers were delivered mainly by academics and, by the end of the decade conventions were held at the Australian National University. Discussions continued to be primarily concerned with terminology debates, whether *new* be dropped from *Australian* or *migrant* be dropped for *newcomer*. Many migrants had been present in Australia many years before these terminology debates began. Even the Prime Minister contributed by announcing that the migrant was now 'something more than a truncated ethnic specimen.' It was during the latter half of the 1960s that migrant guest speakers were welcomed to present papers. Were the 1960s really a far cry from the 1956 convention *Together We Build?* (Harris, 1979: 56). Traditional intellectuals persisted in preserving *white Australia* in spirit. R. Taft followed in the footsteps of Charles Price, in the decade of the 1960s. He was an academic psychologist and a specialist in psychological policy regarding immigrants and like Price advised the government about the *integration* of migrants. He gave a reflection of assimilation (not integration) by converging assimilationism to his 28-point scale of Australianism. The scale was put together to test what made a *good Australian*. As well as academics, politicians in the 1960s also continued to serve as proponents for assimilationism. For example, Hubert Opperman followed in the footsteps of Arthur Caldwell. As minister for Immigration, he presided over the change in doctrine from assimilation to integration when the White Australia Policy was abolished in 1965. His reaction to the bipartisan agreement spirited Calwellian aggression...

Australia has no history of social pluralism ... it may develop gradually and to a limited extent but that is something not to be forced on any nation of people including Australians. Furthermore, the minister commented that “we ask particular of migrants that they be substantially Australians in the first generation and complete Australian in the second.” (Castles et al, 1988: 52)

The Australian Citizenship Conventions were a way the government attempted to produce a hegemony by forcing British cultural philosophies in the hope of preserving a *white Australia*. The Liberal administration was the major educating body of the state during the post war period and state politicians – *political elites* and academics – *civil elites* played a significant role in continuing to stage *white Australia*. As a state apparatus, the Liberal Government directed daily practices in the hope of producing the *homogenous citizen*. Liberal incentives desired to make citizens of the state functional to state ideological control and continuity through *non-confrontation*. State ideological construction of *white Australia* enabled the government to disseminate cultural ideals for *self identity*. White Australia was promulgated by the state as a *dominant, national self concept*. The state attempted to implement a means of *mystifying* or *hiding* ethnic cultures. Morrissey (1984) asserts that any migrant difficulties that developed because of assimilation were in fact to be seen as difficulties arising out of their own ethnic culture. It was their ethnicity that was the cause of any difficulties and not the wider society. Consequently, any difficulties attributed to adaptation were considered *assimilationist in nature* by the state. Dominant ideology thus related migrant experience to their *cultural exoticness* (Morrissey, 1984:74). This mystification of cultural identity discloses Gramscian *mystification and false consciousness*.

## HOME IN CHAINS

They (Greeks) are not met by immigration officers but by relatives. Relatives will find them work and lodging. It is natural that for reasons of security, language and culture the migrant will aggregate with his own ethnic group (Moriatis, 1975: 4).

Despite the fact that until 1958 Greece was the sixth largest country of twelve displayed to receive government assistance for migrant passages to Australia, the

figures for Greek migration suggest that until 1952 a small number of Greeks were actually granted government assistance. For example, between 1947 and 1952, only 43 Greek migrants were granted government assistance as opposed to 10,275 Greek migrants arriving as unassisted migrants. However after 1952 patterns emerge for Greek assisted migration. Even after the introduction of assisted migration schemes (1952-69) Greek *assisted* migration was not the major characteristic of Greek migration to Australia. Of total arrivals between 1952 and 1969 (174,397), less than one third (56,362) were assisted by the Australian government. The remaining figure (118,035) indicates that *chain migration* was the most important characteristic of Greek migration to Australia (Appleyard, 1971: 217).

Chain migration led to a large movement of Greeks to Melbourne through relatives and friends offering direct assistance through sponsorship, accommodation and work through the Family Reunion Scheme during the 1950s and 1960s. Chain migration for southern Europeans, particularly Greeks was relatively more successful than the Bring Out A Briton Campaign (Martin, 1975: 21). It was particularly successful among Greeks because it enabled them to reconnect with members of the home country. Victoria supported the largest Greek population of any Australian state. By 1966, 60,793 Greeks lived in Melbourne, which was 43 per cent of the total Greek population in Australia (Burnley, 1972: 170).

Tonnies' (1974) concept of the *reference group* defines a *reference individual* migrates first and others who seek to migrate after the reference individual. This form of reference group is based on kinship and ethnic ties. As a reference individual, the migrant exerts influence over the entry into another social aggregate. They become a means of reinforcing the belief and conduct that they have acquired in their nuclear family leading them to become somewhat indifferent to socializing influences of the host group. The reference individual serves as a standard for comparison of the 'self' with a set of beliefs and a source of norms and values that operate their life through the historical biography. The development of chain migration as a *nuclei of pioneer settlers* who determined further migration and directed the places of settlement. *Pioneer settlers* of the post war period acted as *ethnic anchor points* for attracting later generations of migrants (Wooden, 1990:256). For example, migrants from the Florina region of Macedonia settled in

Richmond and Collingwood. Migrants from Epirus settled in East Brunswick. Ithacans settled in South Carlton. Migrants from the island of Lesbos settled in Northcote, Prahran and South Melbourne (Burnley, 1975: 329-30). The more specific trend for the number of Greeks in Melbourne indicates that Fitzroy and Collingwood were suburbs of the highest Greek concentration in 1961 with residency figures dropping by 2,713 in 1971 making Fitzroy and Collingwood the smallest of displayed areas. Brunswick and Northcote were the second highest areas for Greek concentration in 1961 but residency figures increased by 7,239 in 1971, which made them the largest of Greek populated areas. Richmond was the third largest area with Greek concentration in 1961 and by 1971 figures increased to 2,133 still making it the third largest area of Greek concentration. Similarly, South Melbourne was the forth-largest area of Greek concentration in 1961 and by 1971 remained the forth-largest area of Greek concentration. Prahran was the fifth largest in 1961 but by 1971 became the second largest area of Greek concentration in Melbourne (Dollis, 1986: 1-5). Chain migration determined clustered demographic patterns and by 1961, more than 80 per cent of the foreign born population lived in urban areas and slightly more than 64 per cent in metropolitan areas. Southern Europeans were *over* represented with 71 per cent of Italians and 80 per cent of Greeks living in metropolitan areas.

Home in the context of Australian post war re-construction formulated an agenda that brought an influx of Greek migrants that conflicted somewhat with another more political agenda of the state - the desire to maintain the hegemony of British origins in a white Australia. The state's solution to this conflict was a policy of assimilation and great efforts were made to integrate the new population into the matrix of existing Anglo-Saxon society. The intention was the erasure of any difference between Australians, the creation of a monoculture. The reality of migration was not to be exactly as the state intended. Despite the hegemonic influence of state power, an elite intelligentsia in who pressed for migrant dispersion. Greeks actually tended to come to Australia in a process of *chain migration*, following other Greeks into the same areas of concentration. Melbourne became one of the main centers of Greek settlement in Australia and it was here that a Greek community began to develop. This degree of alienation was a major factor in assuring that Greeks determined to maintain connections with their own cultural legacy. The ways in which such a sense of legacy was formed and main-

tained in the new country constitute a response to the dominant ideology of nationalism and understandings were little appreciated by the Australian society. The ideology of assimilationism reflected the failure of white Australian values of the post war era and the monistic imperatives of the state.

## REFERENCES

- Appleyard, R.T., 1971. "Immigration: Policy and Progress". In J. Wilkes (ed.) *How Many Australians? Immigration and Growth*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 205-226.
- Bottomley, G., 1992. *From Another Place: Migration and the Politics of Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bridges, J. and R. Heimann, 1988. *Australia: The Cartoon*. Carlton (VIC): McCulloch Publishing.
- Burnley, I., 1972. "The Ecology of Greek Settlement in Melbourne, Australia", *International Migration*, 10(4): 161-174.
- Burnley, I., 1975. "Immigration Absorption in the Australian City, 1947-1972" *International Migration*, 9(4): 319-332.
- Castles, S., B. Cope, M. Kalantzis and M. Morrissey, 1988. *Mistaken Identity: Multiculturalism and the Demise of Capitalism in Australia*. Sydney: Pluto Press.
- Dollis, N., 1986. "The Greek Community: A Demographic Profile" *Greek Action Bulletin*, 11(2): 1-5.
- Harris, R., 1979. "Anglo-conformism, Interactionism and Cultural Pluralism: A Study of Australian Attitudes to Migrants" In P.R. De Lacey and M.E. Poole (eds) *Mosaic or Melting Pot: Cultural Evolution in Australia*. Sydney: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich Group, 23-39.
- Jupp, J. (ed.), 1988. "Greeks" In *The Australian People: An Encyclopedia of the Nation and Its People*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson.
- Kazantzakis, N. 1962 Kazantzakis, N., 1969. *Zorba the Greek* (Transl. C. Wildman). London: Faber and Faber.
- Kearney, R. 1998. 'Poetry, Language and Identity'. A Note on Seamus Heaney" In Mohoney, J.L. (ed.) *Seeing into the Life of Things. Essays on Literature and Religious Experience*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Kern, K.K.L., 1966. "Immigration and the Integration Process" In A. Stoller (ed.) *New Faces: Immigration and the Family in Australia*. Melbourne: F.W. Cheshire, 30-44.
- Martin, J., 1971. "Migration and Social Pluralism" In J. Wilkes (ed.) *How Many Australians? Immigration and Growth*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 97-129.

- Moriatis, S., 1975. *By the Way: A Series of Talks on the Background and Problems of Greek Migrants in Victoria*. Richmond (VIC): Clearing House on Migration Issues.
- Morrissey, M., 1984. "Migrantness, Culture and Ideology" In G. Bottomley and M. de Lerpervanche (eds.) *Ethnicity Class and Gender in Australia*. Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.
- Rooth, J.S., 1969. "Government Responsibility and the European Migrant" In H. Throssel (ed.) *Ethnic Minorities in Australia*. Sydney: Australian Council of Social Services, 57-71.
- Sophocleous, M.A.. (ed.), *The Endless Journey of Stephanos Kastamonitis: From the Diaries of A Migrant*. Box Hill (VIC): Elikia Books.
- Tilley, C. 2001. 'Ethnography and Material Culture.' In P. Atkinson et al (eds.) *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: SAGE.
- Tolhurst, J., 1978. *The Forgotten Market: An Appraisal of Migration and the Ethnic Communities*. Glebe (NSW): Market Segment.
- Tonnies, F., 1974. *Community and Association* (Transl. C.P. Loomis). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Wilton, J. and R. Bosworth, 1984. *Old Worlds New Australia: The Postwar Migrant Experience*. Richmond (VIC): Penguin.
- Wooden, M., 1990. *Australian Immigration: A Survey of the Issues*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.