Chapter Three

Australia, Hellas, and migration

3.0 Australian, Hellas, and migration

The preceding chapters have provided an analysis of the purpose and aims of this study and analyzed the types and theories of migration as well as the psychology of migration. This chapter focuses on the background to Australia’s immigration needs, the effects of migration upon the migrant and the two societies (loosing and receiving) involved, and the causes of Greek emigration. Such an outline of Australia’s immigration policy will be provided within a socio-historical context, while Greek migration will also be examined within a socio-historical with particular emphasis on Hellenic migration to Australia. Of particular interest in this chapter is the examination of the factors that affected Australia’s immigration policy since federation, and the selection criteria used in admitting or not Hellenes as immigrants – owing to Australia’s socio-economic structures and its cultural inheritance.

3.1 Australia: From British Colonies to Unitary State

Australia\(^1\) was colonised by Great Britain in the eighteenth century as a series of independent colonies. At the time it was inhabited by several discrete groups of natives (Aboriginals\(^2\)) who spoke a multitude of unrelated languages and who enjoyed diverse customs. The material culture of the native population was primitive and they did not offer much opposition to the European invaders/colonisers. In 1788, the first European settlement in Australia was established at Port Jackson (where Sydney now stands)\(^3\). It was a British penal colony and, by 1829, the entire continent had become a British dependency. By the mid-nineteenth century systematic, permanent colonisation, replaced the old penal settlements. Confederation of the separate

\(^{1}\text{For a map of Australia and its geographical location, see Appendix 3.1.}\)

\(^{2}\text{For further information on Australia’s native indigenous people (Aboriginals) see:}\)


\(^{3}\text{Dugan, M. and Szwarc, J. (eds.), *Australia’s Migrant Experience*, Edward Arnold, East Caulfield, Victoria, pp. 32-3.}\)
Australian colonies did not come until 1901 when the Commonwealth of Australia was founded as a federated state.\(^{74}\)

The granting of partial autonomy to the Australian colonies in the 1850s and the discovery of gold veins led to an economic boom due to the “gold rushes”. The discovery of gold led to an influx of many immigrants and fortune hunters with many Greeks amongst them. Most of these Hellenes were inevitably young and single, who settled in various towns around Australia but particularly in the NSW and Victorian goldfields.\(^{75}\) Only few of these early Greek miners desired to settle permanently, as they viewed Australia as a place where they could “make a quick fortune” and return to their native towns.

Early social problems manifested themselves with signs of discrimination against many non-British migrants. This attitude and the Greeks’ wide dispersement inhibited the formation of stable Greek communities during these early years. By the 1870s Hellenes moved to South Australia and Queensland, due to decreased opportunities in the goldfields. Some went to Tasmania in the 1860s while others ventured into Western Australia and the northern Territory (Alexakis & Janiszewski 1989: 15).

Australia, in common with Canada and New Zealand, was colonised by predominately Anglo-Celts of British and Irish extraction.\(^{76}\) Australia’s discriminatory immigration policies during the latter stages of the nineteenth

---

\(^{74}\) The six independent States (New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania) confederated to found the Commonwealth of Australia. The executive power of the Commonwealth is vested in the Governor-General (with each State having its own Governor) who represents the British sovereign, and a cabinet presided over by a prime minister representing the majority political party (or a coalition) in Parliament. The Australian Parliament consists of two Houses: the House of Representatives (where governments are formed and where the Prime Minister must be a member of) and the Senate (the House that represents the States’ interests). From its early years the federal government has been noted for its liberal legislation – universal suffrage (1902), old-age pensions (1909), invalid pensions (1910), maternity allowance (1912), child endowment (1941), and unemployment and sickness benefits (1944).

\(^{75}\) According to Tsounis (1988: pp. 42-44) “perhaps forty or fifty Greeks came in the 1850s and another hundred or so in the next twenty years during Australia’s first great economic boom”. Any attempt to establish with any degree of precision the actual number of Greeks present in Australia during this period is fraught with many difficulties owing to the Anglicization of many Greek. Messaris (1988: pp. 43-44) states that Greeks numbered about 200 during the 1850s, with their number progressively increasing to between 400 and 500 by the late 1870s. Jupp ([ed.] 2001) also provides relevant information on Australia’s first Greek immigrants.

\(^{76}\) Australia’s immigration policy traditionally preferred certain ethno-national groups over others. Such preferences were manifested by the availability of assisted passage for certain racial groups while being denied to others. Not only was this preferential treatment manifested in economic assistance – it also was reflected in Australia’s attitude and treatment towards the disparate immigrants that it attracted. Such attitudes were formalized in the White Australia Policy, through the enactment of the Immigration Act, which formalized and legitimized racial prejudice through the Dictation Test (Borrie 1954: 16).
century and the early parts of the twentieth were reconfirmed in the post-
World War II period. These discriminatory policies were calculated to ensure
the adaptation by new arrivals of the prevailing Anglo-Celtic cultural and
social mores and the abandonment of all previous cultural norms. However, as
Australia experienced periods of prolonged economic expansion and
diversification in the decades following World War II, it required a large inflow
of immigrants to satisfy the needs of its expanding labour markets. It slowly
emerged that the asphyxiating official policy of assimilation had failed and
that new policies were required, if Australia was to achieve its aim of
population and labour force expansion. Assimilation was abandoned as
governmental policy and new immigration policies adopted, based on non-
discriminatory principles, occupational criteria, family links and reunions, and
humanitarian considerations.

These new selection immigrant criteria have resulted in new immigrant
minorities that, in their turn, have seen the development of an increasingly
heterogeneous population profile for the country. From 1860 until after World
War I, approximately forty percent of British immigrants to Australia received
financial assistance\textsuperscript{77} from government sources and, as a general rule, the
British government did not contribute to these schemes\textsuperscript{78}. After the war, however, and together with the Australian government, the British
government agreed to provide free, or subsidised passages, for thousands of
selected British migrants to settle in Australia. This change of policy, by the
British, came about as the result of a Royal Commission\textsuperscript{79} in 1917.

Britain was concerned that the rising industrial might of Germany and
the United States would threaten its industrial supremacy. The purpose of the
Commission was not egalitarian; it was purely self-serving in that it sought to
establish whether the British Empire could function as a self-contained

\textsuperscript{77} Assisted migration has been a key feature of Australia’s development and expansion since its discovery by
Captain Cook. Even before convict transportation ceased, in the 1830s, much of the labour force was the
product of assisted migration. Between 1810 and 1820, 52,000 immigrants arrived of whom 42,000 received
free passage. During the decade between 1850 and 1860, over 600,000 immigrants arrived – many of whom
received assisted passage (Kern 1966: 31; Australian Immigration and Population Council 1976: 23-29; and
Borrie 1954: 14).

\textsuperscript{78} Appleyard, R. T., (1972), Immigration and National Development, in Roberts, H. (ed.), Australia’s

\textsuperscript{79} Royal Commission on the Natural Resources, Trade and Legislation of Certain Portions of His Majesty’s
Dominions, Final Report, Chapter VII, Migration and Minutes of Evidence, Part 1: Migration and Land
Settlement.
economic unit, under British hegemony and tutelage. An integral part of the Commission’s plan was the transfer of British people from the motherland to the dominions. The reasons were simple enough – Britain would solve its problem of over-population, the scarcely-populated dominions needed the extra immigrants to populate their empty spaces, the defence of the dominions would be enhanced, and the future economic wellbeing of the Empire would also profit from such an enterprise. Altruism was not a guiding principle in this change of attitude – it was simply a practical and commonsensical acceptance of changed circumstances.

3.1.1 Australia and World War I

The discovery of gold in the 1850s dramatically and inalterably changed Australia. Whereas it had previously been the recipient of miniscule quantities of non-Anglo-Saxon immigrants, it now became the destination point of thousands of gold seekers. The inflow of these immigrants resulted in an increase of Australia’s population to about 1,300,000 by about 1890, and in fact was the cause for the creation of a multicultural society in Australia, before the advent of the creation of such a notion in the 1970s. The creation of the Commonwealth of Australia in 1901 (through the federation of the six independent states) saw the introduction of the Immigration Restriction Act (1901), which became known as the White Australia policy.

The reason for the adoption of the White Australia policy was a very strong desire by the newly federated Australia to maintain a strong national identification with the British Isles (the Mother Country) and also the belief that culturally and politically Australians were superior to non-White (British) citizens. More than 620,000 adventurers, seeking instant enrichment, sought to try their luck in Australia. The majority of these fortune-seekers came from Great Britain, USA, China, Germany, and Greece – with the Chinese constituting the greatest non-British group.

The White Australia policy, adopted by the then Australian government (and followed by successive governments till after WWII), was founded on ethno-racially based policies in vogue at the time. Hostility towards non-whites and Southern Europeans, as potential immigrants, allied to a strong desire to remain a White Nation (and to prevent the country being swamped by Asians [Chinese]), led to the adoption of a racist and nationalist immigration policy. See: Jupp, J. 1995, From White Australia to Part of Asia: Recent Shifts in Australian Immigration Policy Towards the Region, p. 209, in International Migration Review, XXX (1), Spring, pp. 207-228 and Cigler, B. & Cigler, M. 1985, Australia: a Land of Immigrants, Jacaranda Press, Melbourne, pp. 4-6.
races. The depth of racist feeling is revealed when the government of the day can state “...we can never have the country we want if it is racially mixed. It is better to suffer short-term loss in order to have a superior race”\textsuperscript{84}. This racist, prejudicial, and offensively blind nationalistic immigration policy has been well documented by Jupp: “Australian racism argued that Asians and other non-Europeans (including especially Aborigines) were inferior and would only depreciate the existing population if allowed to intermarry and produce children”\textsuperscript{85}. The success of the \textit{White Australia} policy was owed to the ingrained racism displayed against Chinese immigrants, in the nineteenth century\textsuperscript{86}, and against Japan, as a result of World War II\textsuperscript{87}.

Prior to World War I, Germans had been welcome in Australia – being regarded as excellent settlers and at least comparable, if not superior, to the average British immigrant. Soon after the war, however, perceptions changed. There were already fears of unemployment, following World War I, and there was resentment displayed by Australian and British workers towards former British enemies\textsuperscript{88}. “The most notable groups protesting against Germans during the latter half of the war were the Salvation Army, the Australian Natives’ Association and the Returned Sailors and Soldiers’ Imperial League of Australia (RSSILA), formed in late 1916”\textsuperscript{89}. This unlikely alliance, of disparate bodies of influence, indicates the widespread state of anxiety and fear that pervaded Australia at the time. Politicians were concerned about Germans forming anti-war movement in Australia and about ‘aliens’ who may have been spies. Practically all Germans who entered Australia during the war were prisoners of war\textsuperscript{90}.

\textsuperscript{86} Castles, S. and Collins, J 1988, Restructuring, migrant labour markets, and small business, in \textit{Migration}, No. 8, p. 49.
\textsuperscript{87} It was thought that the “right” immigrants would perpetuate the Australians belief in high living standards while the Asians would be happy to seek a much lower living standard – thus lowering the entire society’s standard in general.
\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Australian Archives (AA)}, CRS A2, item 1916/3742.
\textsuperscript{90} \textit{Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates}, 30 May 1918, vol. LXXXV, p. 5296.
The arrival of two ships\(^91\), in 1916, with a total of 303 immigrants, together with the prior arrival, the year before, of a mixture of various nationalities of immigrants from South America, exacerbated public opinion in Australia, during this stressful and delicate period, because of strong union opposition, fears about contract labour leading to fear about wage levels and working conditions and, most importantly, racial uncertainty. The Maltese immigrants (although British subjects) were subjected to the infamous ‘dictation test’ (a measure that guaranteed absolutely the rejection of any undesirable immigrant in a ‘legal’ manner) in Dutch, and were deported to New Caledonia. These events resulted in tough official responses – for the first time in Australia’s history specific exclusion restrictions were placed on immigrants of European origin. Greeks and Maltese were declared prohibited immigrants from 1916 till 1920\(^92\). Not only had the White Australia Policy excluded non-Caucasian people, it now excluded Caucasians according to country of origin. The ugly head of racism had surfaced all too clearly to be seen in Australia.

The strength and vociferousness of Australia’s feelings against its [or Britain’s] former enemies is to be seen in its enactment of the Amending Immigration Act of 1920 that prohibited the entry of ex-enemy aliens, that is, Austrian Germans, Bulgarians, Germans, Hungarians and Turks\(^93\). Once again, certain European nationalities were been excluded from considering Australia as a migratory destination, owing to the circumstances of a state of war that had existed between Britain/Australia and their respective countries. Australia was not alone in taking such a course: Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States had also enacted similar legislation.

The exclusion of potential migrants, based solely on ideology held (or displayed) by the intended migrants’ countries, was a new element in Australian immigration thinking. Now all those nationals that desired to

---

\(^{91}\) The arrival in 1915 of a group of migrants from Patagonia in South America (this group was of mixed nationalities: 28 Welsh, 113 Spaniards, 45 Russians, 30 Italians, 1 Argentinian, 1 Frenchman, 1 Serbian and 1 Greek) together with the arrival of the Arabia, in September 1916, carrying 97 Maltese immigrants and, one month later, the arrival of the Gange with another 214 immigrants, inflamed public opinion against immigration in general and against certain ethnic groups in particular. See Langfield, M. 1999, Recruiting Immigrants: The First World War and Australian Immigration, in Journal of Australian Studies, March, pp. 57-8.

\(^{92}\) Langfield, M. op. cit. p. 58.

\(^{93}\) Official Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia, No. 14 (1901-1920), 1038. Folder containing records of the Aliens Committee, August to December 1918, AA, CRS A3562, item 349/311.
migrate to Australia, from banned countries, were placed in the one basket – there was no individual differentiation. Ideology had never previously been a part of the criteria on which all potential immigrants were judged. Those potential immigrants that held Irish Republican principles (members of the Sinn Fein), or Bolshevik sympathies, were expressly excluded\textsuperscript{94}. Through the War Precautions Aliens registration regulations of October 1916, Europeans were required to register and report any changes in their residential addresses. This foreshadowed the stricter controls that were to be imposed on European immigration to Australia, which were to be implemented in the 1920s\textsuperscript{95}.

While the policies pursued on immigration during, World War I, excluded Japanese immigrants, they also excluded, because of the colour of their skin, fellow-members states of the British Empire that had fought valiantly with the Allies during the War. This, in particular, applied to India – the jewel in Britain’s Empire. Australia felt under some obligation towards India, as a result of its own experience with Indian troops, and in 1925 the Australian government exempted Indians from those racial disabilities, as enshrined in Australia’s restrictive and racial immigration legislation. These exemptions were later extended to other non-European members of the British Empire (Burma, Hong Kong, Sri Lanka and the Straits Settlements [Malaysia and Singapore])\textsuperscript{96}. The importance of these, and other similar agreements (with Anman, Egypt, Hawaii and the Philippines), lay in the acquiescence of these foreign governments accepting the provisions of the dictation test for their nationals\textsuperscript{97}. Thus, the ‘White Australia Policy’ principle remained unaltered and unadulterated\textsuperscript{98}, since Australia retained the mechanism to exclude any potential immigrant that it considered undesirable.

The number of assisted immigrants, during this time, showed a precipitous decline. The British government’s policy of banning the emigration of those eligible to migrate (owing to conscription requirements) saw the cessation of organised efforts by the various Australian organizations to entice

\textsuperscript{94} Commonwealth of Australia Amending Immigration Act, 1901-1920; AA, CRS A458, item P156/1.
\textsuperscript{95} Australian Archives, CRS A367, item C3075AG. See also Langfield, M. (1991), The Control of European Immigration to Australia, in Journal of Intercultural Studies, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 1-13.
\textsuperscript{98} Despatch from W M Hughes to Governor-General in October 1917, Australian Archives, CRS A2, item 17/2015.
suitable British immigrants. This cessation coincided with the socio-economic conditions that prevailed in New South Wales and Victoria – at the time the prolonged drought and the slackened demand for labour. Although immigration efforts had been drastically curtailed, they had not ceased completely. The New South Wales and the Victorian governments still sought to entice domestic servants and other nominated persons (and later juveniles – aged thirteen or fourteen)\(^99\). Most British youth previously brought to Australia for farm work had been aged between seventeen to twenty years of age. Although the various schemes, engaged in by the different states and private enterprise, had ceased to operate, a small number of immigrants continued to be expected during the war years\(^100\).

It is often assumed that the relationship between war and immigration is tenuous, simply because in times of war immigration virtually ceases. In Australia’s case, both global wars of the twentieth century provided a stimulus to immigration in the following years. Policy changes made immediately prior to the outbreak of the World War I were reversed in its aftermath, while others envisaged at that time, and which were to have been put into effect when immigration resumed after the war, were disregarded. Well before the outbreak of World War I, Australia had seen a drastic decline in immigration for a variety of reasons, including the state of the national economy, reduced demand for labour, and increased shipping fares\(^101\). State governments had been facing severe economic difficulties for quite some time and the advent of the war was perceived by some government officials as offering an opportunity for a way out from an embarrassing and costly immigration program that they were unable to sustain. The problems that had been afflicting most State governments for so long, regarding immigration, led to a greater degree of cooperation between them till, in 1920, the Commonwealth assumed sole responsibility for immigration into Australia. Henceforth, Australia would have a unified attitude towards the type of immigrant it sought, without the paternalism or idiosyncrasies exhibited in the past by State governments.

---

\(^99\) *Argus*, 3 February 1915.

\(^100\) *Argus*, 5 February 1915.

There was recognition amongst politicians now that Australia’s post-
First World War policy on immigration was in urgent need of attention and
reformulation. At a conference in Melbourne in 1916 the problem of soldier
resettlement on the land was addressed [Australia lacked any other means of
absorbing these soon-to-be-unemployed men]. The New South Wales
government decided to expedite its irrigation works so that soldiers, being
British subjects [the strong and almost maniacal preference for “British”
subjects had not abated – if anything, it had been reinforced] who had fought
in the war\textsuperscript{102}, could be settled in the countryside; this was conditional upon the
Australian or British government financing the scheme. The Premiers felt
that Australian soldiers ought to have priority in any land resettlement
program but that there should also be made a strong effort to entice British ex-
soldiers, provided always that the Federal or British government would make
the necessary funds available. The newly-federated Commonwealth did not, at
this stage, have a coordinated or common policy vis-à-vis immigration for
Australia as a whole.

The end of World War I forced Australia to refocus on the question of its
population size. The war had demonstrated that Australia’s population was
insufficient to be able to defend the country on its own. Australia was
dependant upon alliances (Britain at this stage) to guarantee its independence.
Australia had felt its isolation and vulnerability as a result of the war. This
cased many politicians to admit to the fact that the only long-term solution
was an increase in the size of the population. Since natural increase was
insufficient and very slow, the only alternative lay in an immigration program
of some magnitude.

The need for immigrants was paramount. All Australians recognised
the need for a much larger population to safeguard the country against any
potential aggressor. But the defence requirements were not the only issues
that confronted Australia during this period. The economic development of the
country and the exploitation of its natural resources demanded a much bigger
home market and labour force. A larger population would also bring with it as
concomitant greater regional influence. However, owing to the state of the

\textsuperscript{102} Archives Office of New South Wales (AONSW), \textit{Settlement of British ex-Soldiers after World War One, 1916-17}, 4/6248, Sydney.
Australian post-war economy, and the economic turmoil that was to soon envelop the rest of the world, it would be some years before Australia could realistically increase its population through immigration.

It was expected that the 1920s would be a great exodus of people from Europe and Britain for Australia. One of the major concerns, reminiscent of the pre-World War I years, was that immigrants would swell the already large urban population of Australia. The main causes for the loss of non-urban population to the cities were the decline of the goldmining industry (which had caused the greatest loss of population from country districts), restrictions on the occupation of land in mining districts, the closure of local industries, the greater job opportunities to be found in urban areas, higher wages and better conditions in the cities, the lack of entertainment and cultural facilities in rural areas, and the monotony of life and tyranny of distance.

Censuses (before WWI) had revealed a ‘surplus’ of women in Britain and a surfeit of men in Australia. The war, however, caused the demise of thousands of young Australian men with the result that Australia’s population balance between the sexes remained relatively stationary during the war years. Britain’s problem with surfeit women, on the other hand, was exacerbated (also because of the war) and its attempt at inducing Australia to accept an excess of British women as immigrants (so that its problem of an excess of women over men be eliminated or, at least, reduced significantly) can hardly escape the conclusion that, even at this time, Britain still viewed Australia as a “dumping” ground for its surplus human stock.

3.1.2 Australia and World War II

Australian governments were faced with public hostility in justifying any immigration during the war years and notwithstanding the quite low level of immigration during the World War I years. Events during these years

---

103 The Sun (Sydney), 29 April 1916.
104 Argus, 9 April 1918.
107 Argus, 18 June 1919.
(1914-1918) were instrumental in changing Australian public opinion about the relative merits of the different classes and nationalities of immigrants, stimulating new theories about Australia’s future development, and influencing post-war demographic policies. In addition, there was a marked falling off in the number of people that were anxious to migrate to Australia, owing to European governments’ restrictions (conscription being the main factor) on people able to emigrate, the Australian governments’ restrictive entry qualifications, and the shortage of shipping caused by wartime exigencies. Whatever immigration there was during this period was predominantly British.\footnote{Langfield, M. 1999, Recruiting Immigrants: The First World War and Australian Immigration, in Journal of Australian Studies, March, p. 56.}

During the World War I, criticism of Japan was not permitted in the Australian press (Japan not being an enemy) but there was evidence that fear of Japan was growing, partly as a result of continuous attacks by Japan on Australia’s immigration policies.\footnote{Johanson, D. in Rivett, K. (ed.), 1962, Immigration: Control or Colour Bar? The Background to ‘White Australia’ and a Proposal for Change, Immigration Reform Group, Carlton, pp. 18-21.} At the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, the Japanese demanded the removal of immigration restrictions. They believed that the League of Nations would be impractical without the removal of all racial discrimination. The Japanese attempt was frustrated by Australia, whose Prime Minister (William Hughes) won his argument that the Japanese demand did not confer the right to anyone to enter Australia unhindered.\footnote{Fitzhardinge, L. F., 1979, William Morris Hughes: A Political Biography, Part II, The Little Digger, 1914-1952, Sydney, chapter 7 and pp. 205-7.} This defeat of Japan’s attempt (to liberalise universal migration) at Australia’s hands did nothing to lessen the perception of Australia’s immigration policy as being racist: in particular, the ‘Yellow Peril’ aspect provoked strong internal and external reactions. Most Chinese and Japanese who entered Australia during the First World War years were granted exceptions under the provisions of the Immigration Restriction Act. The United States, under the Johnson-Reid Act of 1924, totally prohibited Japanese immigration.

Any immigration during the World War I years was not only very difficult to arrange – it also provoked severe criticism domestically. Politicians
of both political persuasions (labour and conservative) opposed the continuation of immigration. A point of contention during this period was that, while Australia’s young men had enlisted to fight overseas, immigrants were encouraged to replace those men fighting overseas in their various places of work in Australia. These pro-nationalist and anti-immigrant sentiments were more strongly expressed by the Australian trade union movement and the various labour councils affiliated with the Australian Labour Party.

Australia’s discriminatory immigration policies during the latter stages of the nineteenth century and the early parts of the twentieth were reconfirmed in the post-World War II period. Till 1936 more than 80 per cent of Australia’s immigrants were of British origin; however, between 1936 and 1940 non-British immigration rose to exceed that British (Borrie 1954: 37) for the first time. Till 1945 Australian immigration distinguished between Northern and Southern European immigrants; assisted passage was available to Scandinavians, Dutch, Germans, and Anglo-Celts but denied to other European ethnicities. The Hellenes that did migrate to Australia prior to WWII were largely sponsored by other Hellenes already residing in Australia (Price 1963: 133).

---

112 The 1925 Immigration (Amendment) Act further restricted entry into Australia for Southern Europeans. There was cultural and economic discrimination against any non-British migration, with any prospective immigrant not in possession of a written employment and accommodation guarantee denied entry. European-based Australian Consuls were advised to deny the issue of visas to any applicant whose command of English was considered inadequate. All these measures were designed to place the entire financial burden of migrating on the shoulders of the would-be-immigrants, or on their friends/relatives’ already residing in Australia. In 1934, the Lyons federal government legislated for the imposition of a £500 bond to be required of all non-assisted migrants; this was the approximate equivalent of two years full employment income – a sum calculated to prevent immigration by non-preferred immigrants but couched to appear non-racial. As economic conditions improved, in the post-1929 financial crash, this sum was reduced to £50, but was conditional on migrants being dependents or seeking to enter occupations where there were demonstrable vacancies (Sherington, G. 1980, *Australia’s Immigrants 1788-1978*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, p. 92).

113 This was the first major shift in Australia’s migrant composition; this was an impressive transfiguration of Australia’s migrant intake with a decided shift towards Southern Europeans.

114 The assisted passage did not apply to Southern Europeans because Northern Europeans were considered more likely to assimilate within the socio-cultural parameters of Australian society (Borrie, W. D. 1954, *Italians and Germans in Australia – A Study of Assimilation*, F. W. Cheshire, Melbourne). Of the 15,000 ethnic Greeks, estimated to have arrived in Australia prior to WWII, most had paid their own fares (Tsounis, M. 1989, *The Pre-War Greek Community of Melbourne*, RMIT, Coburg Campus, Melbourne 3 and Vondra, J. 1979, *Hellas Australia*, Widescope, Melbourne).

115 Between 1930 and 1940 Hellenes constituted the second highest non-British ethnic group (after the Italians) that migrated to Australia (Siew-Ean Khoo and Price, C. A. 1996, *Understanding Australia’s ethnic composition*, AGPS, Canberra, p. 40 and Vondra, op. cit. p. 24).

116 According to Price the original Greek emigrants often persuaded others to migrate by offering to pay travel costs and by offering accommodation and securing employment. Those immigrants who did not receive such assistance often needed to dispose of a piece of land or borrow money to pay for their passage. What is certain is that they did not receive Australian governmental financial assistance. Price estimates (1963: 62, 134) that over 80 per cent of Southern Europeans migrated to Australia (between 1890 and 1940) in this
Australia experienced periods of prolonged economic expansion and diversification in the decades following World War II and became dependent upon a large inflow of immigrants to satisfy the needs of its expanding labour market. However, these restrictive immigration policies were unable to sustain the pressures of a changing world and were slowly eroded in favour of new non-discriminatory selection perimeters, based on occupational criteria, family links and reunions, and humanitarian considerations. These new selection immigrant criteria have resulted in new immigrant minorities that, in their turn, have seen the development of an increasingly heterogeneous population profile for the country. This is best illustrated when it is realized that Chinese, Indians, and Vietnamese now constitute\[117\] a major force in the demographics of Australia.

### 3.1.3  Australian transformation

As a federated nation-state Australia has undergone tremendous demographic changes with the composition of its population undergoing a major metamorphosis. The increasing diversity of the Australian population\[118\] through the adoption of ever-changing countries as sources of immigrants and the adoption of severe counter-measures against illegal immigrants (particularly the hard-line policy regarding “boat people”\[119\] which has attracted maximum national and international attention) have witnessed a major transformation in the demographic make-up of the country's population. Immigration has enjoyed bipartisan political support in Australia since the end of World War II but this bipartisanship has not meant that there have not been manner and it is precisely this manner of migrating that distinguishes Southern European Migration from that of the Northern European and Anglo-Celtic.

\[117\] According to The 2005 Year Book Australia (Table 5.34) India has just replaced Vietnam as the fourth-biggest source of immigrants; Britain and New Zealand continue to provide the bulk of migrants while China holds third place at present. Hellenes in 2002 constituted 0.067% of Australia’s population; Indians 0.056% (but their numbers have only become noticeable during the past decade), United Kingdom migrants 6.0%, New Zealand migrants 2.1%, Vietnamese 1.05%, and Chinese 0.84%.

\[118\] Price (1989: pp. 8-9) has explained the three principal measures when counting ethnic origin numbers as follows:

- **Unmixed Origin** (or “pure origin”): refers to persons with no recent ethnic intermixture.
- **Total Descent**: this shows all persons with any particular ancestry, even if only one-quarter or one-sixteenth.
- **Ethnic Strength**: derived by adding fractions of ancestry.

\[119\] “Boat people” generally refers to the unauthorized attempt at forced immigration by people who arrive in (generally) unseaworthy boats, off Australia’s northern coastline, seeking to gain admission as refugees (economic or political), in an attempt to circumvent proper immigration procedures.
acrimonious arguments based on political, economic, and cultural perceptions about the nature and efficacy of Australia’s immigration policy.

No immigrants from Asia, Africa, or the Pacific Islands (except New Zealand) could acquire Australian citizenship under the *Naturalisation Act 1903*[^120] – this Act reinforced the racist provisions of the *Immigration Restriction Act*. Australia’s population grew rapidly during this period, with the British Isles contributing the largest percentage of immigrants and British-born immigrants constituting the majority of Australia’s population[^121]. The period 1919-1929 saw a majority of immigrants still sourced from Britain but there was an increasing interest in Greek and Italian migrants[^122]. The cessation of WWI hostilities saw the introduction of the *Empire Settlement Scheme* whereby Britain and its dominions assigned priority to migrants from the United Kingdom[^123]. The emergence of the *Great Depression* brought migration to a standstill as did WWII; by this time Australia’s population had surpassed seven million.

Australia, till 1945, applied many long-term and short-term measures against immigration by Southern Europeans in its attempt to retain the perceived superiority of its Anglo-Celtic culture. Often the official line was accompanied by host society’s cultural, economic, and social discrimination against those Southern Europeans already in the country[^124]. Most Australians considered that immigrants owed a debt to Australia for having been admitted as migrants, and it was the migrants’ duty to repay such debt by assimilating as quickly as possible. World War II was the catalyst in changing Australia’s attitude towards Southern Europeans as immigrants. Since 1945, it has placed a very high priority on immigration as the most appropriate means of increasing its population given that natural increase was insufficient to meet

[^120]: This Act was later amended (as a result of antagonism towards "aliens") to exclude the granting of naturalization to any applicant who did not renounce own nationality, had not advertised intention to acquire citizenship, and who could not read and write English. This came about as a result of animosities aroused during World War I. Before 1948 “aliens” referred to those who did not possess British citizenship. After 1948 the term applied to those not in possession of Australian citizenship.

[^121]: See Appendix 3.11 for details.

[^122]: See Appendix 3.6.

[^123]: Assisted migrants were offered assistance with the cost of translocating to Australia; the cost of the passage was born by the Australian government. This policy continued till 1981 when only refugees were eligible for assisted passage, with all other migrants required to pay the cost of their passage to Australia.

[^124]: Inter-marriage between Southern Europeans and Anglo-Australians was not as frequent as it was for Northern Europeans who appeared to more readily accept inter-marriage and assimilation and who were regarded by the host society as more suitable immigrants.
government population targets with the stated aim of a one per cent annual population growth through immigration. The aim was based on the premise that the country needed to stimulate its economy and defence capability through an increase in the labour force (through immigration) and expansion in the number of consumers. Thus immigration would secure for Australia its three primary objectives: economic expansion, larger domestic market, and an improved defensive readiness against any future potential military threat to the country.\textsuperscript{125}

Short-term economic fluctuations in the nation's economy affected yearly immigration targets\textsuperscript{126} but Australia's voluminous demographic policy continued unabated until the early 1970s, when world economic circumstances caused a rethink. The Displaced Persons program in the immediate post-World War II period gave Australian immigration a strong impetus, and this was to be followed by an aggressive immigration program, pursued by all governments, in the three decades after the war that saw the culmination of all these efforts with 185,000 new settlers arrive in 1969-70.

WWII proved to be the catalyst that focused Australia's mind to the danger and vulnerability of its isolated position\textsuperscript{127}, and also on the fact that most of its natural allies were very distant. The Japanese attack upon Darwin\textsuperscript{128} focused Australia's need to rapidly and immediately expand its economy and development as a bulwark against any future aggressor. This required an enormous increase of the size of its population – something which could not be achieved through traditional reliance upon preferred sources chosen on racial lines. Australia recognized the need to restructure its immigration program by placing greater reliance upon other source countries, given that the United Kingdom was unable and often unwilling to provide the

\textsuperscript{128} See Appendix 3.1 for Australia's geographical position within its closest neighbours and within its world position.
\textsuperscript{128} Acting Prime Minister F. Forde declared that "history will some day record how close Australia was to being overrun". Source: \textit{Immigration – Federation to Century's End – 1901-2000}, DIMA, Canberra, 2001. p. 11.
large number of migrants that Australia needed. Langfield\textsuperscript{129} observes that the experience of the Second World War had an important influence on the future direction of Australia’s immigration policy.

But the perception that Australia needed a larger population, to defend so large a land mass, did not dispel all fears regarding “undesirable” migrants. Australia decided to increase its population by 1 per cent annually, through immigration\textsuperscript{130} and this, together with anticipated natural increase of 1 per cent, was thought would eventually provide with a population capable of defending the nation against an unknown aggressor. Thus the 1970s abandonment of the preference for British immigrants and the abolition of the \textit{White Australia Policy} (which had severely curtailed non-Caucasian immigration) unleashed a new dynamism in the ethnic landscape of Australia\textsuperscript{131}. The post-WWII period also required Australia to further adjust country of origin sources, given that the number available through preferred sources was inadequate to ensure governmental intake targets. Australia decided to conclude agreements with a number of Southern European countries (amongst who was Greece) for the provision of assisted and non-assisted passages. This was achieved through the \textit{Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration} (ICAM) which was established at the same time that the “Displaced Persons Program” was abolished. Also, in 1957, non-Europeans with fifteen years residence became eligible to acquire Australian citizenship. Slowly the scene was set for the gradual abolition of institutionalized racist immigration principles, with the abolition (in 1958) of the infamous \textit{Dictation Test} being the first to go.

\textsuperscript{129} Langfield, op. cit., p. 55.
\textsuperscript{130} Arthur Calwell, Australia’s first Minister for Immigration, established the Federal Department of Immigration in the Labor government that was elected in 1945. This government adopted the first \textit{Migration Program} that provided for the assisted passage to Australia of British ex-servicemen and their dependents as well as other British migrants. Additionally, other ex-servicemen of allied countries (Belgium, Denmark, France, Netherlands, Norway, and USA) were also eligible to apply as migrants, under similar economic provisions. The government also agreed to accept displaced persons. Appendices 3.10 (1 & 2), 3.11, and 3.12 give a clear indication of the changed nature of Australia’s altered immigration program in the post-WWII period.
\textsuperscript{131} The 1972 election of a Labor Party government (after 23 years of continuous conservative coalition governments, formed by the Liberal and Country Parties) saw a dramatic overhaul of Australia’s immigration policy. The despised and racist White Australia Policy was abolished with the adoption of a non-discriminatory and non-preferential immigration policy in its stead. Preferential treatment for British immigrants also ceased (they had previously been able to secure government “restricted” positions to the exclusion of other immigrants even though they were not Australian citizens). The new Labor government also permitted dual citizenship so an immigrant swearing allegiance to the British monarch when acquiring Australian citizenship no longer had to formally renounce the country of his birth. This particular policy found great favour among Mediterranean peoples who hold strong attachments to their birth countries.
The policy most responsible for Australia’s major transformation from a bulwark of inherited Anglo-Celtic culture in the South Pacific into a progressive, contemporary, and successful country in the second half of the twentieth century was the adoption of the policy of *multiculturalism* by the Whitlam government in 1972. By the late 1960s it was obvious that the attempt at compelling immigrants to conform to the then prevailing culture through assimilation had failed and that new measures were needed to ensure that difficulties and concerns experienced by non-English speaking migrants. The adoption in 1989 of the National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia gave all citizens equal rights regarding cultural maintenance, social justice, and equality of opportunity irrespective of place of birth or racial background. This provided for a genuine attempt at the creation of an egalitarian society based upon freedom of speech, gender equality, cultural freedom, and polyglossism.

Migration is one of the greatest agents of cultural change; its effects upon Australia have been mostly beneficial. Australia, a historically immigrant nation, has seen many changes to its society brought about through immigration, with the introduction of a multitude of spoken languages being one of its primary achievements. The Australian culture that originally developed on the imported attitudes of its original British-dominated population is very different from the cultural diversity of the Australian society that has developed since the end of the Second World War. These changes have been the result of a huge migration program undertaken, as a matter of national immigration policy, and supported by both major political alignments of the Australian political spectrum.

---


133 The 1996 Census revealed that more than 160, other than English, were spoken in Australia – excluding indigenous languages and dialects (ABS, 1999, *Australian Social Trends 1999*, Cat. No. 2032.0, ABS, Canberra). The same census revealed that more than 500 indigenous dialects were spoken prior to the arrival of Europeans with about 65 languages (and 250 dialects) currently being spoken by Aborigines (ABS, 1998, *Australian Indigenous Geographical Classification*, Cat. No. 4706.030.001, ABS, Canberra).


3.2 Migration and society

Public sentiment in Australia, however, was changing. Record intakes of immigrants were placing a strain on national resources and the population’s goodwill, so vital an element for a smooth and successful immigration program began to dissipate. Immigration intake targets began to be reduced until the government, in 1972, rejected the strategy of increasing the population of the country through high immigration intakes. With the end of the long economic boom, Australia’s migrant intake suffered such a loss that, by 1976, the emigrants (out-migration from Australia) outnumbered the immigrants (in-migration into Australia) for the first time in Australia’s history. Since this date, Australia’s annual immigration targets have fluctuated according to political exigencies and economic conditions in the country.

But it is not only numbers that is important when discussing immigration; the provenance of its immigrants continued to carry primary importance for Australia. While Canada has been more cautious than Australia regarding immigration levels, it led the way in moving towards a non-discriminatory selection policy. Canadian immigration policy has been described as a “triumph of economics over discrimination” in the sense that labour market demands could only be satisfied by tapping previously shunned and unwanted source countries.

Like Australia, Canada had legislated for the exclusion of “immigrants of any race deemed unsuited to the climate or requirements of Canada”. This Canadian equivalent of the “White Australia Policy” was a remnant of the nineteenth century xenophobic supremacist attitude displayed by predominantly Anglo-centric societies. Just as in Australia, changing world attitudes and economic necessities, combined with more enlightened and

137 Hawkins, op. cit., p.100.
140 Hawkins, op. cit., pp. 16-17.
altruistic attitudes, forced Canada to alter its immigration policies to reflect new world realities and awareness. The arrival of European refugees in the post-World War II period made possible the entry of other European migrants previously having restricted entry rights. The final dismantling of Canada’s remaining racial vestiges in immigration policy discrimination was the 1967 Act that saw the formal abolishment of racial restrictions and its replacement by a points system emphasizing the skills and qualifications of the intending immigrants.

As in Canada’s case, where economic realities and changing humanistic perceptions forced a change in immigration policy, so in Australia the previously explicit anti-Asian sentiments, formalized in the 1901 Immigration Restriction Act, were forced to cede ground owing to economic expediency and unfolding world events. The 1945 plans to recruit ten British for every one “foreign” migrant (so the country’s “Britishness” could be maintained) failed to materialize owing to improved economic conditions in Britain (that demanded extra labour for its expanding economy and manufacturing sector) and inadequate shipping capacity, forcing Australia to seek alternative sources of immigrants in order to meet its high intake targets. Foremost among these new sources, in the first instance, were the displaced persons in Europe of whom Australia absorbed about 170,000 between 1947 and 1952.

3.2.1 Immigration’s changing character

The abolition of the White Australia immigration policy, and its supplanting by that of assimilation, occurred after Australia was obliged to review its immigration policies in view of changed world opinion and altered domestic realities in the aftermath of World War II. Some commentators maintain that “it is almost impossible to exaggerate the significance of immigration to post-WWII Australia... [the significance of which] goes well

---

140 Hawkins, op. cit., p. 165.
beyond its demographic impact, and its political, economic and social implications have been all-important in Australia’s post-Second World War development. Post-war immigration has represented a complete break from the past, both in terms of the scale of movement and the diversification of the origins of immigrants.”

Whereas the White Australia policy had served as the means of controlling potential migrants externally (being selected in their country of domicile), assimilation was applied to migrants already residing in Australia – thus seeking to convert those immigrants already in the country to adopt the majority (Anglo-Saxon) culture. This applied till 1973 when assimilation was replaced with multiculturalism as official government immigration policy.

Following the collapse of the number of British-sourced immigrants and the need to increase Australia’s labour force the Australian government was forced to turn to Eastern and Southern European (mainly Greeks and Italians) countries as sources for its immigrants. This necessitated the introduction of a new means of assuring homogeneity within the Australian society. The question that arises is what was meant by assimilation? Zubrzycki perhaps best explains the etymology of this word by asserting that assimilation occurs “when the immigrant group is so completely incorporated into the society to which it has attached itself that its separate identity may be completely lost.”

While Zubrzycki may have had a detached attitude, no such restraint was demonstrated by the then Minister for Immigration (Billy Snedden) who stated that:

“We must have a single culture – if immigration implied multi-culture activities within Australian society, than it is not the type Australia wanted. I am quite determined we should have a monoculture, with everyone living in the same way,

---

144 Wooden et al state that Greeks constituted the following percentages of Australia’s population at various stages: 1861: 0.03%, 1891: 0.06%, 1947: 0.30%, and 1988: 1.98%. The 1996 Australian Census reveals that Greeks made up 0.71% of Australia’s population. Source: Census of Population and Housing – Basic Community Profile, 1996, Catalogue No. 2020.0, BOS.

145 Zubrzycki, J. 1960, Immigrants in Australia: a demographic survey based upon the 1954 Census, Melbourne University Press on behalf of the Australian National University, Parkville, p. 75.
understanding each other, and sharing the same aspirations. We don’t want pluralism.\textsuperscript{146}

Although the new \textit{Migration Act of 1958} put an official end to such overt racist immigration policies the reality was that it was surreptitiously replaced by an equally restrictive \textit{Point System} that sought to control the selection of intending immigrants according to the interviewing migrant officer’s discretion. This subjectively applied discretion sought to eliminate applicants who were considered unlikely to be able to integrate successfully with the existing society.\textsuperscript{147} The overthrow of this restrictive and racist immigration policy was not achieved till 1973 with the introduction of \textit{Multiculturalism} as Australia’s new guiding immigration policy. The introduction of the policy of \textit{multiculturalism} in the 1970s, by declaring openly and publicly, that “\textit{a society is composed of varied elements, especially those based on language, nationality or religion}”\textsuperscript{148}, and the adherence to it by successive Australian governments, has played a crucial role in modifying social attitudes during the past three decades.\textsuperscript{149}

As in Canada, Australia’s intake of immigrants was geared to meet the ever-increasing demands for labour by the nascent manufacturing sector, public works program, and building sector.\textsuperscript{150} Australia signed a number of agreements for the acceptance of European migrants and negotiated a series of

assisted passage agreements for skilled workers during the 1950s\textsuperscript{151}. Although British immigrants were still preferred, their unavailability caused Australia to seek and accept unskilled, and often unassisted, migrants from Southern Europe. Gradually the perception grew that British immigrants, on the scale sought, were unavailable and Australia sought to source at least fifty per cent of its immigrant intake from sources outside the United Kingdom\textsuperscript{152}.

The \textit{White Australia Policy} was formally disavowed by the new Labour Government of Gough Whitlam in 1973. The new government was concerned that Australia’s international public image had been smeared and was very anxious to rebut charges of racism being made at home and abroad at international forums. The new migrant classification [points] system was similar to that of Canada’s in 1967. Just as Australia had followed Canada in adopting multiculturalism (albeit with a different emphasis), so it now followed with replicating the points system – it seems that Australia has rarely been a pacesetter in such matters. However, the right of British, Irish and other Commonwealth countries’ citizens to enter Australia (as visitors or residents), without a visa, was not withdrawn until 1975\textsuperscript{153}.

3.2.2  Immigration modules

The points system was introduced in 1979 as the selection criteria for immigrant selection. It differed from the Canadian system in that it attached greater significance to the assessment of ‘personal suitability’; emphases on English proficiency and occupational skills still tended to favour immigrants from traditional source countries. During the 1980s, there was constant readjustment of immigration criteria as successive governments tried to balance the economically beneficial dimensions of mass immigration [supported vociferously by various ethnic communities, as well as by the growing crescendo of the humanitarian lobby] with opposition from more conservative and traditionally xenophobic sections of society. Growth in family reunion migration, as in Canada, has been an important factor in rising levels

\textsuperscript{152} Appleyard (1988), op. cit., p. 98.
\textsuperscript{153} Australian Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs, 1988, \textit{Australia and Immigration 1788 to 1988}, AGPS, Canberra, p. 59.
of Asian migration towards Australia, as has been the business migration program.

Thus Australia’s tortuous immigration policies, since Federation, have seen the adoption of a variety of officially designated immigration policies. Among them we have seen the extreme, racially-based immigration control mechanism of the *White Australia Policy* that led to that of *Assimilation*, which was followed by *Integration* and *Multiculturalism*. All these immigration concepts have been a reflection of Australia’s cultural inheritance and its peoples’ desire to ensure cultural stability. Yet the advance of human experience and aspiration cannot be denied or stopped; the internationalisation, globalisation, and universality of ideas and expectations are already focussing on the inevitability of the advent of *Interculturalism* in the field of inter-personal relationships.

### 3.2.3 Immigration and discrimination

Australia, for nearly thirty years, has been committed to non-discriminatory immigration policies and to multiculturalism. The various governments during this period (representative of the wider political spectrum) gave not just lip service to these principles but frequently and enthusiastically endorsed such policies. “Non-discriminatory” criteria applied only to race, nationality or creed, and not to an immigrant’s qualifications, entitlements or healthcare needs. Australia’s welfare provisions would reflect a discriminatory attitude towards new arrivals, according to method of entry and place of provenance. By 1996, Australia’s immigrant selection criteria had a three-pronged arc: humanitarian, family reunion, and skilled/business classification.

---

154. Australian governments, after stating that *multiculturalism* enables migrants to be able to develop and share their individual cultural heritage, also require migrants to accept the fact that *multiculturalism* imposes certain obligations and limits:

- Immigrants must accept, like all Australians, the basic structures and principles of Australian society (the Constitution, legal tradition, tolerance of speech and religion, equality of sexes, and English as the national language).
- The right to express one’s own culture and traditions requires the reciprocal duty of conceding others the same rights.
- Notwithstanding such rights as given, all Australians ought to have an overriding commitment to Australia, its national interests, and its unity.

Immigration trends since 1975 have altered the ethnic equilibrium in Australia away from Europeans towards Asians, and this has made the immigration and multicultural policies of government rather more controversial than previously. Australia’s multiculturalism grew out of immigrant settlement demands and was concerned with social justice and harmony, rather than ensuring the preservation of cultural differences and building a society based on the maintenance of mini-nations within a larger, heterogeneous national entity. In this it differed from the American policy of affirmative action, and the Canadian policy of cultural diversity.

According to Jupp\(^{156}\) Australian multiculturalism has been concerned with:

“ensuring the easy transition of immigrants into Australian society; limiting and reducing prejudice; developing access and equity in the provision of public services; encouraging non-English speaking Australians to maintain their languages and cultures; and advocating tolerance for new religions, cultural groups and languages within the context of acceptance of Australian laws and traditions”.

The development of these public policies on immigration has sought, as its primary aim, to alleviate social and personal stress and the avoidance of the creation of disadvantaged or alienated ethnically-based groups within Australian society at large.

### 3.2.4 Immigrants and cultural considerations

The integration of the migrant into the receiving society involves, according to Germani\(^{157}\) three, often interrelated, processes: acculturation (the process and degree of acquisition and learning by the migrant of ways of behaviour of the receiving society), adjustment (the manner in which the migrant is able to perform his roles in the various spheres of activity in which he participates), and participation (how many and in which roles s/he is

\(^{156}\) Jupp, op. cit., p. 31.

performing within the institutions, social groups, and various sections of the host community).

Migrating has many, and often heavy, costs – including not only the financial burden of the translocation itself but, among the heaviest costs, are the cutting of personal ties in familiar surroundings only to face economic and social uncertainties in a strange new land: it is a cultural break of unknown proportions. Obviously, an important aspect that warrants serious consideration is what one understands by the use of the term “culture.” Giddens gives the term an all-embracing meaning when he states that:

...culture consists of the values the members of a given group hold the norms they follow, and the material goods they create...culture refers to the whole way of life of the members of a society. It includes how they dress, their marriage customs and family life, and their patterns of work, religious ceremonies and leisure pursuits\(^{158}\).

If one were to accept the above definition, it follows that culture concerns the way of life of the members of a given society – their habits and customs, together with the material goods they produce. Since “culture” is such an encompassing aspect of one’s life, it follows, therefore, that culture concerns the way of life of the members of any given society – their dietary habits, their mode of thinking, their mode of appearance, their mode of behaviour, etc. In fact, without culture, man would not be a human (as one understands the term)\(^{159}\). Without culture, we would lack the necessary vocalization for expressing ourselves, and our ability to reason and to think would meet with other restrictive barriers.

Every culture contains its own unique patterns of behaviour, which might seem alien to people of different cultural backgrounds. It becomes, therefore, important to distinguish what causes social changes in a society. Among the influences are the physical environment, the political organization, and cultural factors\(^{160}\). Every culture contains its own unique patterns of behaviour, which might seem alien to people of different cultural backgrounds.

---

\(^{158}\) Giddens, op. cit., p. 31.

\(^{159}\) Op. cit., p. 32.

It becomes, therefore, important to distinguish what causes social changes in a society. Among the influences are the physical environment, the political organization, and cultural factors\textsuperscript{161}.

### 3.2.5 Immigration and changes

The physical environment often has an effect upon the development of human social organization. The weather obliges people to organize their lives according to climatic conditions: the Australian Aborigines never stopped being hunters and gatherers since the Australian continent where they reside hardly contains any indigenous plants suitable for regular cultivation or animals that would lend themselves to pastoral production. This, however, does not preclude the adaptation, by more advanced societies of new means of agricultural production and land utilization (as the Jews have done in the Negev Desert), since “there is little direct or constant relation between the environment and the types of productive system that develop”\textsuperscript{162}.

A second factor of major importance in the changing of societal values is a society’s political organization. The forces that propelled the primitive societies of hunters and gatherers were of little relative importance as factors of political organisation. This altered with a change in the type of society, such as those governed by hereditary chiefs, monarchies, republican, whose very existence demanded a strong, structured and relatively orderly social structure. The existence of such political institutions are the cause of developmental change within the society. An adjunct of a developed society’s strength has been its military power – for it is the military strength of a given society that is often fundamental in the establishing of most traditional states. The third, and perhaps most important, aspect of influence upon social changes are the cultural factors. Among the many cultural factors that must be taken into consideration can be included religion, means of communication, and individual leadership.

\textsuperscript{162} Ibid.
3.2.6 Migration in retrospection

In a world of glaring and ever-growing inequalities, innate prejudices, persecution and violence, and with a perseveration rate that transcends generations, it needs to be asked if nation/states are ethically obligated to accept migrants by opening their borders to the maximum inflow of immigrants possible – but within economically sustainable levels, and politically tolerable and acceptable limits imposed by the will of their own peoples. Is migration, then, to be regarded as an inviolable and basic human right, transcending national borders or, invoking the principle of national sovereignty, do the demands that governments must place the interests of their own citizens above all other considerations, take precedence above the needs of other fellow human beings?\textsuperscript{163}

Whatever a migrant’s classification and the underlying causes of migration might be, two discrete geographic places and three separate social groups are normally involved. The geographic places are the losing (out-migrating) and the gaining (in-migrating) areas; the social groups involve the society of origin, the new host society and the immigrant group itself.\textsuperscript{164} The movement of people associated with migration, whether the migration be intranational or international, enhances social transition that leads to social change. The migrant, either as an individual or as member of a family, may be regarded as a socially dynamic force that contributes to the social evolution within the host society. As Byrne\textsuperscript{165} has pointed out, “the migrant family is the \textit{microcosm} in which the dynamics of personal and group change, of acculturation and identity, and of adjustment to environmental stress, to a large extent, take place”.

For societies that do admit migrants, few issues have generated more public debate than the morality of admitting one class of migrant and not another. Does the principle of national sovereignty permit states to discriminate based on race, religion or ethnicity in choosing whom to admit? The White Australia Policy (a policy that reflected not simply a preference for

\begin{footnotesize}
\end{footnotesize}
Whites, but hostility towards Blacks, Asians, and other non-Whites), the pre-war United States policy of excluding Asians, and the reluctance of contemporary Germany and other Western European states to admit Gypsies and Muslims have all come under criticism. Today, such policies are widely regarded as morally unacceptable. Somewhat more morally acceptable are preferential immigration policies – by Israel for Jews, by India for Hindus, by Arab countries for fellow Arabs. There are also other kinds of preferences for people with certain skills, educational levels, family reunions, or financial resources. Australia deliberately chooses immigrants by classifying them, and according them a percentage of the annual intake migrant quota, according to their business acumen, potential capital investment, specific personal qualifications, etc.

3.3 Hellas and Australia

The aim of this section in this chapter is to place Hellenic migration within its historical, political, and its connection with the socio-economic development of the Modern Greek State. The section will argue that this development was both a cause and effect of mass migration from Hellas to America, Canada, and Australia since the inception of Modern Greece but particularly over the past 100 years. Although references will be made regarding Greek migration to America and Canada, the major part of the section will concern itself with Greek migration to Australia. Special attention, as migratory causes, will be paid to (Greek) underdevelopment and underemployment in Hellas, and the various waves of urbanization, internal migration, cultural factors, and emigration which have characterized the Greek state since its inception in 1828.

Greek settlement in Australia’s early pre-federation years was a sporadic affair, with individual Greeks (mainly males) arriving either as sailors or fortune hunters. Apart from their desire to amass a fortune and return home, Australia did not possess a very desirable appeal, as it was mostly viewed as England’s “dumping ground” for its undesirable citizens and

---

166 See Appendix 3.21 for details on the formation of Modern Greece.
social outcasts. Australia’s distance from known and developed outposts presented major problems in seeking to arrive here; also its then population of mainly English and Irish extraction did not readily or willingly admit “foreigners” (Vondra 1979). However, through the arrival of these early sailors or adventurers (Jupp 2001, Tamis 1997, Tsounis 1988), there developed links between Greece and Australia through the repatriates who continued to speak (often enhancing or minimizing reality) of the new and unknown land of Australia. Such stories told by repatriates undoubtedly would have been romanticized and caused others to follow in their footsteps. But no romanticized stories about foreign lands would be comprehensible without an understanding of the Greek character.

To better understand Greeks and Greece it is necessary to possess a synoptic and kaleidoscopic view of their history. The burden of history lies heavily on Greece. There are three important themes that transcend Greek history: the multiple identities of its civilization, the influence of the Greek Diaspora, and the role of foreign influence in Greek affairs and Greek dependence on foreign Powers. The fortunes of Greece have been linked in integral ways to the struggles of the Great Powers, in the nineteenth century, and the polarizing diplomacy of the late twentieth-century Cold War. The

---

167 Greece is an essentially mountainous country, with about 80% of its territory being mountainous (there are 28 mountains higher than 2,000 metres, with the highest being Mt. Olympus at 2,904 metres (Census 2002: I: 1: 5, p. 241) and only 22% arable land; although a small country, geographically (131,957 square kilometres) it has a very expensive coastline (about 15,000 kilometres), with no mainland point being more than 100 kilometres from the coast. The coastline is highly irregular marked by many bays, coves, and inlets; there are over 2,000 islands (of which about 170 are inhabited) scattered in the three Seas (Ionian, Aegean, and Mediterranean) that surround Greece. Its climate varies between hot, dry summers and damp, cold winters. The northern mountains have colder winters and more precipitation while the coastal regions and the islands are parched by dry summer winds. Rainfall is more plentiful on the West Coast and least on the East Coast and the Aegean Islands. About 98% of the population are ethnic Greeks (but this figure is fast changing with the large inflow of legal and illegal immigrants) and communication is not impeded through use of dialects. The 1991 census revealed a population of 10,259,900 (of whom 8,783,131 lived on the mainland and the remaining 1,476,769 on the islands). The age structure (source: US Department of State, Area Handbook of the US Library of Congress; estimated 2004 figures) is as follows: 0-14 years – 14.5% (male 792,938, female 746,119), 15-64 years – 67% (male 3,563,703, female 3,566,549), and 65 years and over – 18.6% (male 873,540, female 1,104,680). Life expectancy is 78.94 years for total of population (male: 76.44 years; female: 81.59 years). Hellas is divided into 51 νοµοί (nomoi – prefectures) and one autonomous region (Aghion Oros – Mt. Athos). There is universal and compulsory suffrage (18 years and over).

168 Greece is both a Mediterranean country and a Balkan country. And, throughout its history, Greece has been a part of both the Near East and Western Europe. During the Bronze Age and again at the time of the Greek Renaissance of the eighth century B.C., Greece and the Near East were closely connected. The empire of Alexander the Great of Macedonia brought under Greek dominion a vast expanse of territory from the Balkans to the Indus. The Byzantine Empire, with its heart in Constantinople, bridged the continents of Europe and Asia. Greece’s history is also closely intertwined with that of Europe and has been since Greek colonists settled the shores of Italy and Spain, and Greek traders brought their wares to Celtic France in the seventh century B.C.

169 For an explanation of the Greek Diaspora see Appendix 3.22.
history of Greece and the Greek people, then, is bound up with forces and developments on a scale larger than just Southeastern Europe. To understand the history of Greece, one has to examine this complex interplay between indigenous development and foreign influences. The first major influence on Greek culture and history was the intervention by the Roman Empire into the Greek world\textsuperscript{170}. The second major influence was the arrival of Christianity\textsuperscript{171}. Another physical aspect which contributed towards the development of the Greek character was the mountainous terrain which, in Greece's early history, encouraged populations to develop lasting traditions of independence because of their lack of communication with the outside world, due to the isolating effect of the mountainous environment. From ancient times the sea has endowed Greece with a seafaring tradition, but it has also exposed the Greek Peninsula to the vagaries of foreign attack.

3.3.1 **Hellenic migration in retrospection**

Greek settlers can be found in every continent of the world apart from East Asia. The Greek demographer Nicos Polyzos (1947) identified three types of Hellenic emigration through the millennia\textsuperscript{172}. Much of Greek emigration is owed to the chronic underdevelopment of Hellas. Some of the factors that led

\textsuperscript{170} Appendix 3.23 contains details on Hellenism and the history of the Greek language.

\textsuperscript{171} By the second century A.D., Christianity and Hellenism had come into close contact in the Eastern Mediterranean. In the early fourth century, the policies of Emperor Constantine the Great institutionalized the connection and lent a lasting Greek influence to the church that emerged. Although Christianity was initially practised within Semitic populations of the Roman Empire, by the first century A.D. Greeks also had learned of the teachings of Christ. In that period, the epistles of Paul to the Ephesians and the Corinthians and his preachings to the Athenians were all aimed at a Greek audience. Other early Christian theological writers such as Clement of Alexandria and Origen attempted to fuse Christian belief with Greek philosophy, establishing the Greek world as the home of gentile Christianity.

\textsuperscript{172} Polyzos’ identified types are as follows:

1. The *agrarian* emigration of antiquity = caused by population pressures in the Greek city-states which, in turn, saw Greeks seeking to settle in distant places within their known world – such as Asia Minor, North Africa, and Sicily.
2. The *commercial* emigration of the Middle Ages = the causes of emigration during this period were due to trade considerations. This period covers the time between the Middle Ages and the end of the nineteenth century. This Greek migration had as its aim known destinations such as Venice, Genoa, Corsica, Vienna, Asia Minor, Egypt, and Russia.
3. The *industrial emigration of the twentieth century* = in contrasts to the preceding two emigration epochs, the industrial emigration of the late nineteenth and the twentieth centuries involved the emigration of workers (including professionals, scientists, and students) from Greece to the industrially advanced metropolitan centres of the western capitalist economies. Migration from contemporary Greece towards advancing economies has continued almost uninterrupted since independence.
to this underdevelopment are to be found in lack of industrial development, lack of secondary industry, and (principally) in the immutability of cultural attitude which prevented changes that would have benefited the country and its people. It is not the purpose of this dissertation to examine minutely such causes, but it must be stated that governmental neglect of the country's rural population, political conflicts and instability, and infrastructure underinvestment only served to deny Hellas its proper place among Western nations for many years. The net result was that many Hellenes believed that migration offered the only escape from stagnation and often poverty.

Greece’s War of Independence (1821) and the founding of the Modern Hellenic State (1828) were of themselves incapable of stopping out-migration, or to attract the return of the thousands of Greek expatriates\textsuperscript{173}. Much of Modern Greece’s post-Independence history has been characterized by political conflict which caused emigration to be underestimated as a major social problem within the country\textsuperscript{174}. Otto’s autocratic style of government ignored the Hellenic revolutionary leaders – he was imbued with the idea of the possible regeneration of a nation based on the model of the powerful and despotic Byzantine state\textsuperscript{175}. Consequently, in the absence of democracy, he

\textsuperscript{173} Most of these Greeks had chosen self-exile during the Turkish Occupation and had settled in various overseas Greek Communities. Repatriation for most of them remained a dream owing to the failure of the Hellenic state to develop suitable repatriation policies that would have encouraged them to repatriate and bring their wealth and expertise to Greece (Vgenopoulos 1985: 38). During the years of Ottoman domination, Greek speakers resettled over a wide area inside and outside the empire. Greeks moved in large numbers to Romania, along the coast of the Black Sea, and into all the major cities of the empire and became merchants and artisans. Over 80,000 Greek families, for example, moved into the territories of the Habsburg Empire. Thousands more settled in the cities of the Russian Empire. Commercial dealings between the Ottoman Empire and the outside world were increasingly monopolized by Greeks. Important merchant colonies were founded in Trieste, Venice, Livorno, Naples, and Marseilles. Amsterdam, Antwerp, London, Liverpool, and Paris also received sizeable Greek populations. The Diaspora communities played a vital role in the development of Greek culture during the Ottoman occupation. Greek enclaves in foreign cultures reinforced national identity while exposing their inhabitants to new intellectual currents, including the ideology of revolution. Many diaspora Greeks became wealthy then helped to support communities in Greece by founding schools and other public institutions.

\textsuperscript{174} Kapodistrias’ administration (Greece’s first President, 1828-1832) and the administration by Greece’s first monarch Otto (1833-1862) “...proved unable to restrain the revolutionary leaders who were followed by the agricultural masses. The political orientation of the nation was unfocussed and unrealistic. Similarly, the young and inexperienced Bavarian king Otto was granted authority to control the newly liberated State whose revolutionary leaders under different conditions would have become statesmen” (Saloutos 1964: 11).

\textsuperscript{175} In an 1832 treaty signed by Britain, France, Russia and Bavaria, these powers, without Greek participation, agreed that Otto von Wittelsbach, 17-year-old son of King Ludwig I of Bavaria, should become King Otto I of Greece. Attica with Athens and a stretch of land to the north of the Gulf of Corinth were included into the young Greek monarchy. Yet Crete, the Dodecanese islands, the region around Smyrna were left outside of the Greek state, as were Thessaly, Macedonia, Thrace and Epirus. Young King Otto I (he reigned between 1832 and 1862) arrived in Nafplion, the provisional capital. Otto, still a minor, needed to have regents (Bavarian) to act on his behalf. These courtiers introduced law codes based on continental
“was faced with political and social unrest which ultimately curbed his powers” (Saloutos 1964:12). With continuing political unrest the government had little time or will to deal with internal economic problems. The country’s development was deprived of the social change which the Industrial Revolution had brought to Western Europe, although Diasporic Greeks, who were exposed to the changes in Europe, contributed towards a cultural renaissance of the Hellenic Republic. This contribution, however, did not obliterate the effects of the “brain drain” during Turkish rule, which had left the country bereft of the intellectual resources necessary for speedy development.\footnote{In part, their contributions substantially helped embody the wishes of the Diaspora Greeks, as the newly established University of Athens was influenced by the revival of the ideas of the Greek Classics in Europe. Only a few decades after liberation this institution became the spiritual centre of all Diaspora Greeks (Svoronos 1972: 91-101).}

But not all problems were associated with lack of internal foresight – political pressures were exerted on Greece by European Great Powers.\footnote{Among whom were England, France, Germany, and Russia who pursued their own interests within the newly-born nation. They intervened in the internal affairs of the new country and sought to establish a client-state relationship (Saloutos 1964).} The vested interests by these European Powers in the Hellenic State brought about its political and economic dependency by setting the stage for lasting political control through the establishing of a patron-client relationship between themselves and the Hellenic State. These Powers, in pursuit of their own self-interest, exerted great influence and regularly tried to impose their will on the newly liberated nation.

Pivotal to Greek migration were the difficulties associated with land reform as well as agricultural and industrial development. These problems were further exacerbated by political instability and unwise investment policies.\footnote{According to Vgenopoulos (1985: 38) in 1883 only 20,000 farm families owned their own land out of over 120,000 families, while by 1842 more than two thirds of cultivable land remained uncultivated. Peasants who had fought to liberate the country from the Turkish yoke and who had been promised free land found themselves in penury and in a state of near serfdom.} Broken promises were further exacerbated by the Donation Law of European legal traditions and an education system based on central European experience. These measures showed little sensitivity for Greek traditions or culture. Otto also became unpopular owing to his heavy taxation policy and absolutist rule. Failure to annex Crete in 1841 (an attempt that alienated Great Britain) led to the revolt of 1843 which forced Otto (a roman catholic in an Orthodox country) to grant a constitution that provided for his successor to be Orthodox. Further, the Bavarian oligarchy was now replaced with a Greek oligarchy. Otto toyed with the “Great Idea” – the re-establishment of the former Byzantine Empire with its capital in Constantinople, but he failed to gain or expand Greek territory and his backing of Austria in the Italian War of Independence (1859) further damaged his credibility. He was deposed in a revolt in October 1862 and returned to Bavaria.
1835, which provided for “the right to purchase small plots by annual payments over 36 years. This law was not very popular and its implementation proceeded at a snail’s pace” (Mouzelis 1986: 39). It required more than 50 years for the next major land reform to take place during Venizelos' premiership in 1923, and by this time there was a mass exodus by Greeks towards the USA. Associated with land distribution problems was the crisis caused by the fall in the price of currants (a major export for Greece) in 1893; this caused the first wave of emigrants to head for the USA and Egypt. This emigration was not discouraged by Greek authorities who saw remittances by emigrants as an important economic contributor for the Greek economy.

Land reform required the national government to acquire control of tsiflikia and redistributing the land to landless peasants. Greek governmental measures to acquire and redistribute these large landholdings became more desperate as a result of the need to accommodate the inflow of refugees as a result of the “Catastrophe of Asia Minor” of 1922 when Greek armed forces were defeated by Kemal Ataturk who put an end to the “Great Idea”. The net result of all these impediments was dissatisfaction for Greek peasants who often saw emigration as their only means of ensuring their own wellbeing (Vgenopoulos 1985, Mouzelis 1986). By the end of the 1930s land reform had seen 172,000 hectares distributed amongst 305,000 families (Filias 1967: 128).

---

179 The first effective land distribution policies were carried out under the premiership of Koumoundouros, in 1871, by permitting the purchase of small plots of land by residents of Peloponnesos, who thus became landowners.

180 Vlachos (1968: 54) quotes part of an intending emigrant’s letter as to the reasons for leaving Greece: why remain to struggle for a piece of bread without any security for the future, without honour and independence?...Why not open your eyes and see the good that awaits you?...Harden your heart and seek your fortune abroad, where so many of your countrymen have already made theirs...or are you waiting to cultivate the barren lands? Have you not seen how much progress you have made thus far?

181 Between 1890 and 1914 almost a sixth of Greece’s population emigrated to USA and Egypt (see Appendix 6.1). For a detailed history of the Greeks’ presence in Egypt see Yialourake’s (1967) excellent book on the history of Greeks in Egypt.

182 Tsiflikia were large estates owned by a handful of landlords who exploited the peasants that lived within their lands, and who monopolized land ownership.

183 Turkey had managed to safeguard Turkish tsifliks in north-central Greece by signing a treaty with Greece in 1913. This treaty was detrimental to the demands of Greek peasants for the granting of land since it assured Turkish land interests within an independent Greece. An example of the insidious nature of tsiflikia can be gauged from the fact that of the 2,658 villages of Epirus, Macedonia, and Thessaly, 1,422 (53.5%) belonged to all-powerful landowners (tsiflikathes), (Filias 1967: 113).
Associated with the slow implementation of equitable land redistribution were the absence of governmental rural welfare policies; the agricultural workers were unable to access information regarding availability of arable and/or irrigable land, or advice as to how best maximise crop production (Malliaris 1982: 335). Agriculture was pivotal to Greece’s future – yet was constantly overlooked by bureaucrats and politicians ensconced within the security of their urban comforts. The loss of rural population not only depopulated large rural and semi-urban areas but it was also responsible for the loss of productive land due to its conversion to pasture or abandonment (Svoronos 1972: 100-103). Concurrent with land misdistribution and underutilization was the lack of agricultural modernization and capital investment in the rural sector which combined to deprive rural areas of economic progress. The underinvestment on agriculture saw farming methods remain static, archaic, and often feudal in nature.

Although rural policies and land distribution were chief agents in causing thousands of Greeks to migrate they were not the only causes; poor rural investment policies were also reflected in developing the country's secondary industry. Most of the industrial goods consumed within Greece were sourced overseas. The country’s industrial sector was still in its infancy by the end of the nineteenth century (Rodakis 1976: 31-36) and simple things that were available were very expensive compared to other European markets. Poor land utilization, underinvestment in infrastructure and industry, and lack of a proletariat class to provide the necessary industrial class all contributed to retard the modernization of Hellas and its

\[184\] The 1951 Census revealed a total population of 7,632,801 for Greece, which was an increase of 287,941 over the comparable figure revealed during the 1940 census. Most of the increase is attributable to the population of the Dodecanese Islands which were re-incorporated with Greece in 1947 (Census 1951, Vol. I, p. XLVIII). The same census indicates that the rural population of Greece constituted the majority in 1940 (3,846,592; 52.37%) of the entire population while it was just below majority in 1951 (3,764,661; 49.32%).

\[185\] According to Price (1963: 115) by 1928 peasant Greeks constituted two thirds of the total population and the size of out-migration during the 1890-1920s period was so large as to have caused many villages to become depopulated and virtually abandoned; this emigration caused a dramatic fall in the population of Epirus, Peloponnesus, and Islands.

\[186\] For a brief analysis of Greece’s post-WWII economic development see Appendix 3.24.

\[187\] Tsoukalas (1977: 262) states that pocket knives “sold so cheaply in Paris...” could not be produced in Greece because of the lack of skilled workers to produce them.
urbanization. Greek capital, seeking to maximize its profits, sought to invest in trade and shipping\textsuperscript{188}.

Aside from the continuous economic problems that beset the new nation, its interminable political turmoil (through inter-party rivalries and clientalism) further aggravated Greek society’s socio-economic equilibrium. These problems enhanced the deterioration of the already poor living conditions of many Hellenes leading to poverty and despair. Their only alternative was to seek refuge and salvation in uprooting themselves from their country of birth – justifiable Fairchild (1911: 9) declared that “…Greece has always been a splendid place to go away from to make a fortune…”

Greece experienced a mediocre expansion of its secondary industry during the first decades of the 1900s, but lack of any heavy industry prevented the retention of the internal migrants who had started to congregate around the principal major metropolitan centres. These centres were now viewed as temporary staging posts, in preparation for the inevitable emigration. Whatever secondary industry had evolved lacked technical innovation and was fully exposed to international competition, through the lack of protective measures that was a virtual condemnation of its future existence (Malliaris 1892: 1-10). The Great Depression witnessed Greece’s worsened economic situation\textsuperscript{189} with national bankruptcy been declared in 1932 (Svoronos 1972: 101). Overshadowing the country’s terrible economic conditions were its political and military conflicts which continued to exacerbate the overall situation. The 1930s saw social unrest continued, with the resulting multitude of workers' strikes. Trade unions multiplied – but also evident was a rise in militancy by left-wing elements as well as a rise by right-wing forces,

\textsuperscript{188} Investment in shipping encouraged the expansion of the tertiary sector as ship-owners sought educated and qualified officers to man their ships but this did not enhance the fortunes of the green industrial sector whose expansion was necessary if there were to be more employment opportunities created.

\textsuperscript{189} In 1928 the unemployment figure stood at 75,000; by 1935 it had reached 150,000 (Filias 1967). Interest rates ballooned, with rates of 30 to 40 per cent were not uncommon, and even these rates were often exceeded by usurious exploiters of the needs of the weak and unprotected members of society. The national debt rose astronomically and there were continuous devaluations of the drachma, in an effort to remain competitive. Shipping (which had seen nearly two thirds of its tonnage lost during WWI) was the only beneficiary of low wages and continuous devaluations.
culminating in the dictatorship of Metaxas\textsuperscript{190} in 1936. Migration continued its unabated course with about 200,000 Hellenes migrating overseas between 1920 and 1940\textsuperscript{191}. As always, Greeks sought refuge in foreign heavens during critical times at home.

But if the events of the preceding for decades were not enough to totally destroy the ethos of Hellenes, WWII and the ensuing Civil War ensured that the country would suffer irreversible damage. According to Iatrides (1981: 1-36), between 1940 and 1949, over 8 percent of the Greek population (more than one million persons) died. The utter destruction of the country’s infrastructure and economy and the population’s decimation presented an unprecedented situation which was virtually outside the scope of human correction or control\textsuperscript{192}. But Greece did not only suffer such massive destruction of its capital assets. Once again foreign Powers started to seek to exercise sway over Greece’s future direction by ensuring that certain Greeks and social classes complied with the foreigners’ plans, in return for self-advancement and individual pursuits over common good (Clogg 1985). Greece lost the ability to exercise individual judgement and self-determination by agreeing to enter into such self-defeating and unwise alliances\textsuperscript{193}.

Through the extreme measures taken by the right-wing political hierarchy, Greece’s development in the post-WWII period progressively lurched more and more to the right-of-centre\textsuperscript{194}. The country’s administrators steadily eroded traditional political bipolarity and corrupted state administrative institutions. Societal stability was threatened by internal

\textsuperscript{190} Ioannis Metaxas’ right-wing dictatorship forced many Greeks to leave the country to avoid incarceration (if not worse) and, as Petropoulos (unpublished monograph) has argued, many of these Greeks preferred self-exile in overseas countries (among which Australia) rather than contend with the extreme policies of Metaxas.

\textsuperscript{191} These 200,000 represented 5\% of the Greek workforce. Of them, approximately 50\% repatriated before the outbreak of WWII (Malliaris 1982: 365).

\textsuperscript{192} By 1950 Hellas was financially and economically ruined; agricultural production had decreased by nearly 75 per cent and its mainstay merchant marine fleet had seen its tonnage reduced to not much more than 25 per cent of its pre-WWII tonnage.

\textsuperscript{193} The Americans (who had supplanted British interests in Greece, as a result of Britain’s inability to carry to financial burden) assumed the role of Greece’s “protector” in 1947 from Britain. Under the Truman Doctrine America exercised incredible influence over internal and external Greek affairs. America poured vast sums of money to support the Greek economy – but this economic assistance came at great political cost. The Americans were responsible for the exclusion of people considered to be left-wingers, or left sympathizers, from all positions in public life and the state bureaucracy (Mouzelis 1986: 160). The only people to profit from American influence peddling were right-wingers and their associates in the Armed Forces.

\textsuperscript{194} For an appreciation of the political climate that existed in the country and for the consequences of not belonging to the “right” political side. See Appendix 3.20 (used with the kind permission of interviewee MF53-R66-S66) for an individual’s personal experiences during this period, and its aftermath.
migration which saw the congregation of hundreds of thousands of people crowd metropolitan areas in search of work, socio-economic disequilibrium, and massive unemployment. The inevitable outcome of such social unrest and economic deprivation found an answer in yet another dictatorship – imposed this time in April 1967, by the “Colonels”. With such a massive destruction of the national economy, social inequality of opportunity and political manipulation, Greeks sought relief from poverty, lack of opportunity, social disadvantage, and penury through migration\footnote{Post-WWII emigration has been described by a number of observers as the greatest exodus of Greeks in contemporary Hellenic history. Mouzelis (1986: 138) claims that more than one and a half million Greeks (17% of the population of 9 million) left the country. Between 1955 and 1974, according to Vgenopoulos (1985: 42) 1,179,076 permanent departures were recorded as well as 966,744 of temporary nature.}

After the hardships of WWII and the GCW, the governments’ promises of new economic opportunities, centred on Athens, attracted many villagers to the megalopoleis. Between 1955 and 1971, an estimated 1.5 million agricultural workers left their lands. This demographic transformation is reflected in the composition of the Greek population, which saw the share of agricultural workers in the workforce dropped from 53 percent to 41 percent, and whereas, in 1940, over 50 percent of the population lived and worked in agricultural areas, only 25 percent of the population remained rural by the mid-1990s. Since WWII the population of Hellas underwent a noticeable shift towards the geographical axes defined by Athens in the South and Thessaloniki in the North. Unlike pre-WWII migration, post-WWII was focussed mainly on European destinations instead of transoceanic destinations. Europe attracted 61.8 percent of all emigrants (728,756) between 1955 and 1974, compared to 35.3 percent who chose transoceanic destinations\footnote{Of the 406,195 Greeks who chose transoceanic migration, 214,068 (18.2%) chose Canada; Australia (and New Zealand) took 174,565 (14.8%), and USA the remaining 17,562 (2.3%).}. Care needs to be taken not to assume that these figures represent the totality of Greek migration during this period, as they do not include figures of Greeks who migrated from countries of the Greek Diaspora (Egypt, Middle East, Romania, Soviet Union, etc). The post-WWII emigration phenomenon came to a full cycle by the early 1970s, when there occurred the novelty of more Greeks repatriating instead of emigrating (Malliaris 1982: 39).
Besides socio-economic and political considerations there were other circumstances which often caused Greeks to emigrate; inheritance laws, climatic conditions, adventure, and cultural values also played an intrinsic role in Hellenic emigration. Any Hellene would readily admit to knowing what φιλότιµο (filotimo) is, but would probably find it very difficult to articulate its nuances. Filotimo is essentially an intense awareness of personal values, which manifest themselves linguistically, behaviourally, and socially.

Many a brother has emigrated so as to procure his sister/s’ dowry, or to secure a higher education for his younger siblings. The importance of a dowry for a female cannot be underestimated – many of the female informants chose to emigrate as a direct result of the lack of such an asset. The inability of a family to provide dowries for its female members would imply humiliation for the parents as their daughters would remain “on the shelf” and unable to marry.

Another important aspect of the cultural value encapsulated in filotimo is the high value traditionally associated with good education. The acquisition of a good education, and the title that accompanies it, parallels in

---

197 The family is the basic social unit of all strata of Hellenic society – whether rural, semi-urban, or urban. The basic household unit revolves around the nuclear family but it may also include parents or other family members according to circumstances. The primary purpose of marriage is considered the begetting of children and thus the continuation of the family line; the second goal is the augmentation of family assets. For an individual to remain single or to live apart from his family is often considered to be unacceptable behaviour. Sons and daughters still live with their families till they marry; it is also quite common for an extended family (covering 3 generations) to be living within a single building but different dwellings. Families can still play a large role in the selection of their children’s partners although the traditional arranged marriage is now much less in evidence. However, traditional expectations of modesty and innocence in a woman that were the prerequisites till the late 1960s have given way to a full adoption of all the West practices. Hellenic traditions require individuals to often make personal sacrifices for the sake of other family members; many a Greek has migrated not by personal choice but as a result of a family commitment or undertaking.

198 For a description of filotimo, Greek way of life, religiosity, the Church’s role in Greek society, clergy’s position within Hellenic society, and Greek mentality, see Appendix 3.25.

199 Large sums of money were forwarded to Greece by expatriates to not only secure themselves some desirable real estate but also to promote the social and economic welfare of their siblings and parents. Foreign remittances constituted a major part of overseas income for Greece; in 1955 migrant remittances constituted 13.9% foreign income while in 1971 it constituted 24.4% (Vgenopoulos 1985: 64-66).

200 See Chapter Five for details.

201 The PASOK government, in the 1980s, outlawed dowries thinking that such legal provisions would overcome deeply ingrained social customs. Unfortunately, such attempts at legislating out of existence unacceptable social customs has not met with total success as the nomenclature may have been altered but not the practice. Strangely, such adherence to dowries all but evaporates for Greeks of the diaspora; outside of Greece, Hellenes adapt themselves quite readily to new circumstances and norms.

202 Education is esteemed because it brings with it high social standing and societal respect; this is particularly important in a country where agricultural pursuits do not enjoy high social status (Tsoukalas 1977).
importance good health\textsuperscript{203}. Many Hellenes have sought to obtain tertiary qualifications outside of Greece. This is owed to the fact that education opportunities were limited in Greece or they had failed to matriculate. A concomitant of overseas-obtained education was the decision by many of these Hellenes to seek permanent residence overseas. This effectively led to the loss of academics and other skilled personnel by emigration. Thus the failure to qualify for admission, at tertiary level in Hellas, has led to a considerable net outflow of Greeks and sometimes their entire families\textsuperscript{204}.

Aside from cultural, socio-economic, and political reasons, another cause of emigration has been the land inheritance laws. It must be remembered that life was difficult and often extremely hard for the people on the land, who often toiled with unproductive land and old fashioned farm equipment. Often the only thing that was certain was the daily grind and nothing else which barely provided for subsistence living. Nevertheless, tradition dictated the just division of farmers’ property between all children – mostly a daughter would expect to receive a piece of land, or a simple house, as her dowry upon marrying and, where such a situation failed to materialize, the farmer would seek to provide cash settlement upon his daughter’s betrothment. The inevitable result of such multiple divisions and inheritance problems was the continuous diminution of individuals’ land holdings and their ever-decreasing productive capacity. Many families would resort to compulsory emigration by some of the males in the family so that the remaining children could expect to inherit a piece of land or the family home. For those who did not seek emigration and expected not to inherit anything, the alternatives were the acquisition of a skill or advanced education\textsuperscript{205} – with the inevitable result of having to abandon the family home and village for distant cities. Saloutos (1964: 8) noted that “...perhaps the hardship of rural life accounts for the

\textsuperscript{203} Education is particularly prized by those that are involved in agricultural pursuits; often the “ticket” to escape the low social status attached to rural life is the acquisition of tertiary qualifications and the obtaining of a suitable position which would ensure social status and prestige (Tsoukalas 1977).


\textsuperscript{205} Medicine and law were the preferred professions as they attracted maximum social status.
incentive to improve working skills. Small wonder then, that in 1907 Greece had one lawyer for every 888 people".

Natural phenomena often caused emigration through their cataclysmic effects. The 1953 earthquake\textsuperscript{207} that destroyed the beautiful Ionian Sea islands of Cephalonia, Ithaca, Lefkatha, and Zakynthos was instrumental, aside from killing hundreds of people, in thousands of Hellenes abandoning their homeland in pursuit of a new life in distant countries. The Greek State was unable to rebuild the physical and personal lives of the \textit{σεισµόπληκτοι} (seismoplektoi – earthquake stricken), because it lacked the necessary funds and because it was unable to create employment opportunities within the victims' social environment. Another earthquake with significant population after-effects was the one that hit Kalamata in September 1986. Scores of people were killed, many more were injured, and thousands became homeless\textsuperscript{208}. Clearly, the very geographical position of Greece has contributed in forcing thousands of Hellenes to seek a safer and more secure existence outside their homeland.

Often Hellenic migration to Australia has been influenced by chain letters written by émigrés who tended to portray Australia as the “lucky country” – through their description of desirable goods to be had for the asking, plentiful and cheap clothing, houses brimming with the latest furniture and furnishings, and motor vehicles there for the taking. All these colourful and

\textsuperscript{206} The 1998 (NSSG 2001, Table V: 14, p. 157) figures for Greece provide the following statistics regarding the number of lawyers (both active and retired members of the profession): population 10,662,138, active (insured) lawyers 45,314 (ratio 1:425), total number of lawyers (45,314 active & 15,373 retired and receiving pensions) 60,687 (ratio: 1: 570).

\textsuperscript{207} The catastrophic earthquake of August 1953 (the tremors continued between 9-14 August) hit the Ionian sea islands of Cephalonia, Ithaca, Lefkatha, and Zakynthos destroyed most of the elegant Venetian buildings and many of their inhabitants; the earthquake reached 7.3 on the Richter scale (a scale that reads between 0 and 8 and on which each point is 100 times more powerful than the previous), which occurred on the 12 August. It was a soul-destroying earthquake which wiped out the lives of thousands of people and destroyed their livelihoods on the islands. The Islands’ very foundation was shaken with more than 100 tremors and appalling damage. Entire villages and towns were razed to the ground, thousands were made homeless, the very infrastructure of the islands ceased to exist, and it was a desperate time for many thousands of people. Many left their homeland in pursuit of a better life overseas, with the main destination countries being America, Australia, Germany, Great Britain, and South Africa.

\textsuperscript{208} Kalamata is located 240 kilometers southwest of Athens, which had a population of 45,000 in 1986. The earthquake (6.2 on the Richter scale) left 70% of its buildings damaged, with over 240 houses and 3 churches collapsing, over 460 houses becoming uninhabitable, and over 3,000 houses suffering damage.
cheerful representation fostered a glamorous image of Australia and created 
the desire in many to participate in such plentifullness. Any images that would 
have dispelled any such myth were carefully curtailed: portrayals of hardship 
on the factory floor or exploitation because of linguistic inadequacy were rarely 
displayed and few were the migrants that did not speak in glowing terms 
about their new environment. This succeeded in presenting an often 
inaccurate and unjust picture of Australian reality. The Greek State, in its 
efforts to reduce unemployment and underemployment in the country, and 
some international organizations\textsuperscript{209} that operated in the post-WWII period in 
Greece, were also instrumental in encouraging emigration by explicitly 
encouraging external migration. Private capital (shipping companies and 
travel bureaus) played its role by disseminating untruths and falsehoods that 
were easily and unquestionably accepted by poorly educated peasants. 
Organizations like ICEM played a national role in Greece, with its recruitment 
of potential migrants being selected by its travelling representatives in the 
countryside.

But political upheavals have never ceased to cause Greeks to 
emigrate (Price 1963: 116). Hellenes interpreted threats to their civil liberties 
and restrictions to their political rights as major reasons in choosing 
emigration. During most of the 1920s Hellas was racked by political\textsuperscript{210}

\textsuperscript{209} Organizations, like the International Committee for European Migration (ICEM – known in Greek as Διακυβερνητική Επιτροπή Μεταναστεύσεως εξ Ευρώπης), were instrumental in strongly encouraging emigration. ICEM was founded in 1951, as an initiative of Belgium and USA, and was initially known as International Migration Conference which shortly after became the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe (PICMME), before it finally assumed its title as ICEM. This 
organization was responsible for processing over 400,000 refugees, displaced persons, and economic 
migrants during the 1950s. By 1960 it had assisted over one million migrants, and by 1973 over two million. 
In 1980, ICEM changed its name to ICM (Intergovernmental Committee for Migration) to more accurately 
reflect its universality and, in 1989, it became known as the International Organization for Migration (IOM). 
By 2000 IOM claims to have assisted more than 11 million migrants.

\textsuperscript{210} Greek political parties have traditionally been based on personalities and personal connections. They have 
lacked the organizational capacity and mass appeal of Western-style political parties. Hellenes have tended to 
pursue satisfaction of personal self-interest through a patron-client relationship with politicians, instead of 
seeking to promote common interest through mass political participation within an organized framework. 
PASOK was the first mainstream political party to seek to apply, in place of clientelism, a disciplined and 
organized mass approach in the process of political participation. Other parties (ND), followed PASOK’s 
lead, which by the 1990s saw the emergence of a general pattern of mass-based and issue-oriented political 
parties akin to Western political parties. Nevertheless, clientelism still pervades the Greek political landscape 
with PASOK the principal practitioner of ρουσφέτι (rousfeti – personal favours arranged by politicians for 
their constituents). New Democracy (Nea Demokratia – ND) is the other major political party (of the centre-right) 
founded in 1974, in a revival of the National Radical Union (Ethniki Rizospastiki Enosis – ERE), both 
of which were led by Konstantinos Karamanlis. Aside from the two principal, mainstream and dominant, 
political parties, (PASOK and ND), there exist some smaller, peripheral, political parties: Political Spring
turmoil. Between 1924 and 1928 ten prime ministers held office, the monarchy was abolished, two presidents were deposed, one resigned, and eleven military coups occurred. The disastrous 1922 military defeat suffered by Greece, at the hands of Turkey, ensured that Greek society would be deeply polarized for decades to come. In that time political stability was rare and it would be exacerbated by the world economic crisis of 1929-30.

The Lausanne Treaty of 1923\(^{211}\) formalized the closure of military hostilities between Greece and Turkey and provided for the exchange of respective nationals between the two countries, based solely on religion. The world financial crisis of 1930-31 initiated a period of political chaos for Greece; its traditional exports of tobacco, olive oil, and raisins fell sharply, as demand decreased, owing to the economic crisis, and remittances from expatriate Greeks dropped alarmingly for the same reason. Politics and economics combined to keep the country on knife’s edge till the dictatorship of Metaxas, in 1936. It would appear that ancient and contemporary socio-economic, political, and historical factors have played a determinant role in Greeks’ persistent efforts to advance their socio-economic and personal objectives.

Methodology, the chapter that follows, details research strategy, documentation procedure, selection criteria in the choice of informants, respondents’ characteristics, and analyzes problems and limitations associated with the thesis’ research.

---

\(^{211}\) See Appendix 3.26 for the provisions contained within the Treaty of Lausanne.