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Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter describes the composition of the migrant population of Australia, and outlines the history of the migration of the Italian-born, the largest non-British category in the population. It then explains why the Ovens Valley area of Victoria was chosen for the location of this study, and discusses the methods of investigation that were used. It concludes with an outline of the thesis.

Chapter 2: Assimilation and Interaction

This chapter discusses the concept of assimilation, and a variety of approaches to the study of assimilation which have been used in the sociological literature. It pays particular attention to the view that assimilation is a process made up of a number of sub-processes, the relationships between which are still undetermined. It then considers some of the difficulties in the way of the development of a general theory of assimilation. The reasons for focusing this study on the interaction between Italians and Australians are discussed, and the theoretical implications of this focus are considered.

The discussion then turns to the explanation of the three types of interaction which are referred to in this thesis: indirect interaction, direct categorical interaction, and direct non-categorical interaction. Three types of areas of life in which migrant-host interaction may take place are also considered: those in which interaction between migrants and hosts seems necessary, those in which it is voluntary, and those in which it is unlikely.
This chapter begins by discussing the differences between this study (which is concerned with the Ovens Valley area only as a setting for migrant-host interaction) and a community study. It also considers some of the differences between the Ovens Valley area and other rural areas which are described in the literature. The physical characteristics of the area are described, and the history of the area and of its tobacco growing industry are outlined. The effects of the development of the tobacco growing industry are discussed, and it is emphasised that this development was the chief factor attracting Italian migrants to the area. The demography of the area at the time of this study is described, and the origins and some of the characteristics of the Italian migrants to the area are discussed. The patterns of chain migration and sponsorship which led to particular patterns of Italian settlement in the area are also considered. Finally, the discussion returns to a more detailed examination of some of the sociological characteristics of the area. It is noted that it was an area in which considerable social change had taken place; that although a rural area it was considerably involved in the metropolitan region surrounding Melbourne; that considerable differences of social status existed between different ethnic categories and different occupational sections of the population (Italians generally ranking lower than Australians but higher than other migrants); and that although considerable opportunities for social conflict existed between the various sub-sections of the population, membership of the various sub-sections overlapped considerably, and conflict between them was usually confined to specific situations and did not lead to the development of permanent factions within the population that opposed one another on every occasion. It is also noted that the hostility towards Italians which some Australians felt was related to social
change, and alterations in relative social status in the area, and did not prevent Italians and Australians co-operating with one another in a number of situations. The deepest division in the population was that between the supporters of the rival tobacco growers' associations, and neither association had an exclusively Italian or Australian membership.

Chapter 4: Areas in Which Interaction was Necessary

This chapter describes interaction between Italians and Australians in the areas of life in which interaction between them was accepted as necessary: the areas of religion, education, the tobacco growing industry and other occupational situations. It shows that interaction in these areas, though extensive, was generally categorical.

As Catholics, most Italians were brought into contact with Catholic Australians through their religious observances. However, this contact was almost entirely categorical, and did not lead to much friendship between Italians and Australians. Moreover, Italians were not generally included amongst the leaders of the lay Catholic population of the area, positions on various parish committees being generally reserved for leading Australian members of the congregation. In many respects the social lives of the residents of the Ovens Valley area were arranged along denominational lines, so the Italians' Catholicism reduced the possibility of contact between them and Protestant Australians. A handful of Italians had become Jehovah's Witnesses, and consequently enjoyed intensive categorical and non-categorical contact with the Australian members of the sect; but their conversion tended to isolate them from all non-members of the sect, both Italian and Australian.

The educational system provided considerable opportunities for the children of Italian migrants to make both categorical
and non-categorical contacts with Australians, though because Italian children usually attended Catholic schools where they are available these contacts were largely confined to Catholic Australians. The education of adult migrants in English was attempted in the Ovens Valley area, but it was not well supported by the migrants, and did not lead to any significant Italian-Australian interaction.

The tobacco growing industry led to considerable contact between Italians and Australians, though mainly of a categorical kind. Italian sharemen working for Australian farm owners worked under their employers' supervision for much of the year, and at certain seasons employers and sharemen worked together. Moreover, the fact that sharemen lived on the farms on which they were employed discouraged the development of a residential enclave of Italians: migrants and hosts were both scattered all over the Ovens Valley area. However, Italians who had become farm owners generally preferred to employ Italian sharemen, and this reduced the amount of contact between Italians and members of other ethnic categories. The competing tobacco growers' associations, in spite of the divisions which they expressed, tended to unite Italians and Australians. They each had both Italian and Australian members, and included both Italians and Australians amongst their leaders, organisers and spokesmen.

Some of the other occupational situations in the area discouraged interaction between migrants and hosts: examples are the employment of migrants in firms run by migrants, and the development of services such as Italian groceries employing migrants to serve migrant customers. Other occupational situations increased contact between migrants and hosts, and these were becoming more common as Italians and their Australian-born sons and daughters entered the general commercial life of the area: examples are the development of a number of services (such as cafes and service stations)
owned by Italians and used by both migrants and hosts, and the employment of the Australian-born children of migrants as shop-assistants, clerks, mechanics, etc.

Chapter 5: Areas in Which Interaction Was Voluntary

This chapter describes interaction between Italians and Australians in the areas of life in which interaction between them was voluntary: the areas of politics, voluntary associations, commercial entertainment, and neighbourhood and friendship. It shows that, though interaction in these areas was fairly uncommon, what interaction there was tended to become non-categorical.

It appears that neither the Italians nor the Australians in the Ovens Valley area took much active interest in politics at the State and Federal levels, but that on the whole Australians supported the Country Party, while Italians had a bias towards the Liberal Party. There was slightly more interest in politics at the local government level, and here Australians participated more than Italians. However, the region of the Ovens Valley area with the highest percentage of Italian names on its voter's roll had a Shire Councillor of Italian origin.

In the various community associations of the area there was little mixing of the two ethnic categories, but some Italians who were fluent in English and economically successful were members of organisations such as Rotary. However, many of these same Italians were amongst the founder members and leaders of the Italian 'Savoy' Club. Apparently the foundation of this club was a response to the strains of migrant-host interaction and the need for an occasional refuge from them.

Organisations designed to bring Australians and migrants together, such as the Good Neighbour Movement, had little
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Italians and Australians did not mix in sporting associations, mainly because the two ethnic categories played different games. Soccer (which was not played by Australians) was a point of contact between Italians and other European migrants.

Commercial entertainments, such as the cinema and television, were used equally by both Italians and Australians. This did not lead to much interaction between the two categories, but it was a form of indirect interaction, exposing them both to the same influences upon their attitudes, and so leading to some uniformity between them.

Members of each ethnic category tended to make friends with their co-ethnics, rather than with members of the other category, and this tendency was reinforced by the importance of such things as kinship and knowledge of one another in childhood in determining who a man's friends would be. For similar reasons, the neighbours whom a man knew best were usually those of the same ethnic category as himself.

It is clear that, although there were forces in the Ovens Valley area tending to increase the interaction between Italians and Australians, there were also forces tending to increase interaction between migrants.

Chapter 6: Areas in which Interaction Was Unlikely

This chapter discusses the kinship and family life of the Italians and Australians in the Ovens Valley area, and points out that the importance of these areas of life to members of both ethnic categories tended to reduce the opportunities for interaction between the two categories.
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The chapter begins with a discussion of the concept of kinship, and of both Italian and Australian kinship terminology. Australian and Italian kinship behaviour as they are described in the sociological literature, and as they operated in the Ovens Valley area, are then discussed in turn. It is noted that rural Australians and migrants from rural areas of Italy generally behave alike with respect to kinship, and that this was also the case in the Ovens Valley area. The discussion then turns to the concept of the family circle (a group of acquaintances based on kinship links). It is shown that the family circle was an important factor in the social lives of both Italians and Australians in the Ovens Valley area, though it was more important for the former than for the latter. The discussion of kinship continues with a consideration of the extent to which northern and southern Italians differed from one another in their kinship behaviour, and ends with an account of the importance of kinship on the tobacco farms.

This section shows that, although the kinship behaviour of Italians and Australians, and of northern and southern Italians, showed more similarities than differences, the effect of the use of kinship to select friends and work-mates was to reduce the interaction between different ethnic categories. Since there had been little intermarriage in the Ovens Valley area, members of different ethnic categories were rarely kin to one another.

The second part of the chapter is concerned with the nuclear family. This was the area of life which most discouraged interaction between migrants and hosts. However, it was strongly affected by the consequences of migration, because the various members of it interacted with the host population in different degrees.

This section opens with a brief discussion of the Italian and the Australian nuclear family as they are
described in the sociological literature. It goes on to discuss the nuclear family household in the Ovens Valley area amongst both Italians and Australians, and then turns to a consideration of marriage in the area. It appears that intermarriage between hosts and migrants was restricted by the tendency of both Italians and Australians to find their wives from near their own homes, from their own religious denominations and from roughly equivalent social status levels. However, people were even less likely to marry outside their own ethnic categories than to marry outside their own neighbourhoods, denominations and status categories. Consideration is then given to fertility in the Ovens Valley area, and it is concluded that if anything the fertility of Italian wives was slightly lower than that of the rural Australian women in the area.

The roles of wives in the Ovens Valley area and the particular problems of migrant wives are considered next. It appears that migrant wives did harder work on the tobacco farms than Australian wives did, but only if their husbands were sharemen. The wives of Italian farm owners did not do more work than their Australian counterparts. The particular problems of migrant wives sprang mainly from their isolation from other residents of the area, and from their kin who had remained in Italy. They rarely spoke English as well as their husbands did, and they were more dependent on their husbands for companionship and for cushioning them in encounters with the extra-domestic world than they would have been in Italy.

Discussion then turns to the roles of children in the Ovens Valley area, and to the sources of inter-generation conflict within migrant families. Conflict between migrant parents and children seemed to be rather more serious than conflict between Australian parents and children, and apparently this was related to the fact that migrant children had more contact with Australian society (through their
schools) than their parents did. It also appeared to be related to the fact that in the Ovens Valley area a difficult decision about providing for the future had to be made. Migrant parents, even more than Australian parents, had to choose on their children's behalf between aiming for success in local terms (becoming a farm owner, for example) and aiming for success in metropolitan terms (becoming a trained and qualified employee as a mechanic or teacher, for example). In spite of the potential for conflict within migrant families, however, Italian migrants often came to be more dependent upon their children (who could encounter and deal with Australian society on their behalf) than they would have been in Italy.

It is concluded that, although the Italian nuclear family in Italy is similar to the rural Australian nuclear family, the effects of migration are such as to make the migrant Italian family very different from the rural Australian family. The members of the migrant family with least knowledge of the host society tend to depend upon members of the family who have more knowledge. Wives therefore become more dependent on their husbands, and parents become more dependent on their children, than they would have been in Italy. It is likely that the tensions arising out of this lead migrants to turn to other migrants who have similar problems for social support, and so reduce their desire to interact with Australians.

Chapter 7: Interaction Between Migrant and Hosts

This chapter traces the development of interaction between migrants and hosts as it has taken place in the Ovens Valley area during the lifetimes of the Italians interviewed, and as it may be expected to take place in similar migrant-host situations.
The chapter begins by examining the amount of interaction with hosts of four groups of Italians: those who arrived in the area after 1955; those who arrived between the end of the Second World War and 1954; those who arrived before the Second World War; and the Italo-Australians who were born in Australia of Italian-born parents or grandparents.

It then outlines the development of migrant-host interaction in formal terms, demonstrating that interaction begins with categorical interaction in areas of life where interaction is necessary, proceeds to non-categorical interaction in areas where interaction is voluntary, and in a few cases ends with interaction in areas of life where it is unlikely. It is shown that the process is a very slow one, and that it cannot normally be completed within the lifetime of an adult migrant.

This chapter then continues by examining the development of interaction between migrants over time, and it is shown that this proceeds in the reverse direction from interaction between migrants and hosts. It begins with non-categorical interaction in areas of life in which interaction with hosts is unlikely, and ends with categorical interaction in areas of life in which interaction with hosts is generally thought to be necessary. This process, too, is a lengthy one, but it is not quite as lengthy as the development of interaction between migrants and hosts.

The discussion continues with an examination of the relationship between interaction between migrants and hosts, and interaction between migrants. The two processes generally run counter to one another, and in many cases interaction with hosts and interaction with other migrants compete for the migrant's time and attention. However, in some cases an increase in one kind of interaction may lead to an increase in the other. The development of interaction between migrants
may be to some extent a reaction against the effects of increasing interaction with hosts; and in several cases migrants increase their interaction with hosts as a result of having increased their interaction with other migrants, who introduce them to hosts.

The chapter ends with a discussion of the relationship of the development of interaction between migrants and hosts to other sub-processes within the overall process of assimilation, and it is demonstrated that the process of increasing interaction cannot take place unless it is made possible by other sub-processes (such as the minimal acculturation of migrants). Once under way, however, the process of interaction in its turn facilitates the further development of the other sub-processes of assimilation.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

This chapter summarises the conclusions of this thesis with respect to five topics. First it considers two topics which are subsidiary to the main subject: the study of Italians in Australia, and the study of rural areas of Australia. (This study confirms much that has already been written on Italian migrants, but it raises several questions with respect to rural areas of Australia which are involved with metropolitan regions.) This chapter goes on to summarise the conclusions of this thesis with respect to three aspects of its main subject: interaction between Italians and Australians in the Ovens Valley area; the development of migrant-host interaction in general; and interaction as an aspect of assimilation. (These conclusions are derived from Chapter 7 of the thesis.)

Finally, it is suggested that further research is needed into Italian migrants in Australia, rural Australia, and the process of assimilation in general.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is a study of the amount and kind of interaction between Italian migrants and Australians in the Ovens Valley area of Victoria. It has been undertaken with a view to increasing sociological understanding of interaction between migrants and hosts, which is regarded as a crucial aspect of the process of assimilation as a whole. The theoretical considerations which prompted this study will be discussed in the following chapter. This introduction will discuss the considerations that prompted this study, the choice of the fieldwork site, and the methods that were adopted. Finally, it will indicate the outline of the remainder of the thesis.

Migrants in Australia

A very high percentage of the population of Australia was born overseas. It has been pointed out that in 1961 Australia had a higher proportion of foreign-born residents than any of the other major migrant-receiving countries such as Canada, New Zealand or the United States. In 1961 the foreign-born population of Australia formed 16.9% of the total; by 1966 this percentage had risen to 18.4%. In

1 Throughout this thesis, the term 'migrant' refers to a resident of Australia, or another country, born elsewhere.
2 See below, Chapter 2, pp.17-48.
4 See Census of the Commonwealth of Australia, (Census), various dates; Census, 1961.
both years nearly half the foreign-born residents of Australia came from the British Isles. Italian-born migrants comprised the largest category of non-British residents in Australia.

In 1966, 10.6% of the total population (57.4% of the foreign-born population) had a non-British origin. The Italian-born formed 2.3% of the total population; the next largest categories were the Greek-born (1.2% of the total) and the German-born (0.9%).

Successive Australian governments have encouraged the immigration of various national groups and various categories of migrants in a number of ways, and the existence of a large, diversified group of migrants in Australia has prompted research into various aspects of migration; for example, there have been studies of the factors which encouraged migrants to stay or to leave after some time in their new country; studies of factors associated with immigrant adjustment; studies of the origins of migrants and the processes by which they are encouraged to migrate; and several studies of social aspects of the lives of migrants in Australia. An impressive bibliography of works on

1 See Census, 1966.

2 The most recent account of Government policies is to be found in Jupp, Arrivals and Departures, 1966.

3 For example, Appleyard: British Emigration to Australia, 1964.

4 For example, the studies surveyed in Taft: From Stranger to Citizen, 1965.


migrants in Australia was compiled by C.A. Price in 1966\(^1\) and a number of works have been published since then.\(^2\)

These discussions of migrants in Australia have almost all been descriptive and empirical. What theoretical discussion has taken place has tended to follow the lines laid down by students of migrant assimilation in the United States. These and other theoretical approaches will be discussed later.\(^3\)

History of Italian Migration to Australia

As well as being the largest non-British group of migrants in Australia, Italians have one of the longest histories of migration into the country,\(^4\) beginning in the 1850s. The first arrivals were pioneers, often regarding themselves as temporary migrants; but they frequently acted as spearheads for further migration from their own towns and villages in Italy. If they established themselves successfully, they assisted their relatives and friends to migrate, and brought their own wives and children out. Gradually a number of Italians concentrations developed. Up to 1919, though each of the four main areas of Italy\(^5\) was represented in

\(^1\) Price: *Australian Immigration: a Bibliography and Digest*, 1966.


\(^3\) See below, Chapter 2, pp.22-36.

\(^4\) This outline of the history of Italian migration to Australia is derived mainly from Price: *Southern Europeans in Australia*, 1963; Price: *The Method and Statistics of 'Southern Europeans in Australia'* , 1963; and Jones: 'The Territorial Composition of Italian Emigration to Australia, 1876 to 1962', an *International Migration*, Vol.II, No.4, 1964.

\(^5\) That is, Northern, Central, Southern and Island Italy; for the locations of the various areas, regions and provinces of Italy, see Map, II, below, p.116 and Table XXII, below pp.117-8.
Australia, the majority of Italian settlers came from the North (especially from the north-western regions of Lombardia and Piemonte). The area with the second largest representation was Sicily, due to the large number of migrants from the Lipari Islands, which are part of the province of Messina. By 1921 there were just over 8,000 Italian-born individuals in Australia.

Between the two World Wars migration to Australia was affected by the world wide Depression and the imposition of immigration restrictions in the United States in 1924. Many migrants who would otherwise have gone to the United States (particularly from the Southern provinces of Italy) were diverted to Australia. However, in the 1930s total migration from Italy to Australia fell off, migrants being discouraged by the Depression and by the policies of Mussolini's government. The migrants that did come spread all over the country in search of work, and by 1933 major rural concentrations of Italians had appeared in Queensland, Western Australia, New South Wales and Victoria. In this period, the province of Italy most strongly represented amongst the incoming migrants was Reggio Calabria, in the South, followed by two Sicilian provinces, Messina and Catania (on the east coast of the Sicilian mainland). However, migration from all the Northern provinces combined equalled that from all the Southern and Sicilian ones. In the migration from Northern Italy, the Veneto provinces of Vicenza and Treviso (in the north-east of Italy) provided more migrants than the north-western regions of Lombardia and Piemonte, which had been important before the First World War. By 1940, the Italian-born population of Australia had more than 33,000 members.

The Second World War prevented migration from Italy, but after it ended Australia received some people of Italian
origin as refugees from the former Italian provinces which were ceded to Yugoslavia at the end of the war. In addition there was a six-year backlog of family reunions to make up. Many men who had migrated alone before the end of the war had had to wait until it was over before their wives and children could join them.

Since 1947 Australia has been receiving more immigrants from Italy than ever before, in spite of the fact that Italy itself began to experience an economic revival in the 1950s. Approximately 306,000 arrived between 1947 and 1967. Of the Italian migrants who arrived between 1950 and 1962, nearly half came from the Southern provinces, particularly Reggio Calabria and Catanzaro, though some provinces of the Abruzzi and Campania regions were also important. Migrants from Northern Italy represented only about a quarter of the total, and these were mainly from the Veneto region. Messina and Catania continued to be the most strongly represented Sicilian

1 Throughout this thesis, 'people of Italian origin' normally means people born in Italy, plus people born elsewhere with Italian-born parents or grandparents. In this particular case, however, it means people born in territory that was Italian at the time of their birth but is so no longer.

2 These are the former Italian provinces of Fiume, Gorizia, Pola and Zara, and part of the former province of Trieste.

3 There has been considerable internal migration within Italy since the war, mainly from the Southern provinces to the growing industrial towns of the North. There has also been a great deal of temporary migration from Italy to the industrial areas of Germany, France, Belgium and other parts of northern Europe, particularly since the establishment of the European Common Market, of which Italy was a founder member. Many Australian migration officials in Italy believe that these migrants within Europe, having made a major break with their homes, and earning higher incomes than before, are both able and willing to pay their fares to Australia, and come forward as potential migrants to Australia during periods of recession in Europe or of localised readjustment in the Common Market economy.
provinces. Central Italy has remained comparatively unimportant throughout the history of Italian migration to Australia.

The post-war pattern of Italian settlement in Australia is in marked contrast to the pattern between the war. Jones points out that in 1933, 61% of Australia's Italian-born population was living in rural areas, compared with only 49% of the total population; in 1961, 71% of the Italian-born population was living in metropolitan areas, compared with 56% of the total population. In 1961, the Australian city with the largest Italian population was Melbourne, which contained one-fifth of the total Italian-born population of the country.¹

Chain migration and individual sponsorship systems provide the bulk of Italian migrants to Australia.² Government assisted-passage schemes have played a relatively small part, particularly since 1962, when the Italian government 'virtually suspended' the assisted-passage arrangements which it had operated in conjunction with the Australian government since 1951.³ In the period immediately

² Chain migration and the sponsorship system will be discussed below, Chapter 3, pp. 120-8.
³ Australia in Facts and Figures, No. 95, 1967. The same source gives a brief account of a new agreement on assisted-passage arrangements concluded between the Italian and Australian governments in September 1967.
before this suspension, from January 1959 to June 1962, 14.8% of intending settlers arriving in Australia from Italy were assisted-passage migrants, compared with 87.4% of the intending settlers from the United Kingdom and Ireland, and 63.3% of all intending settlers arriving in Australia. In the period immediately following the suspension, from July 1962 to June 1966, the comparable figures were 3.2% for intending Italian settlers, 91.8% for those born in the United Kingdom and Ireland, and 62.0% for all settlers arriving in Australia.¹ Having arrived in Australia Italian settlers seem, at first glance, to have comparatively low return rates. For example, in 1966 former Italian settlers (so stated) leaving Australia permanently represented 2.9% of intending Italian settlers arriving in the same year; the comparable figures for British settlers were 16.1% and for all settlers 13.0%.² However, Price’s examination of the 1959-65 statistics suggests that Italian settlers who leave Australia are far more reluctant than settlers from other countries to declare that they are leaving permanently. If the deficit between intending settlers arriving and intended settlers remaining in Australia is calculated, it appears that the total of U.K.-born settlers leaving Australia between 1959 and 1965 represented 20.4% of those arriving, while the comparable figure for Italian-born settlers was 27.2%. Italian-born declared settlers leaving Australia over the same period and stating that they were doing so permanently represented 1.5% of those arriving compared with a figure for U.K.-born declared settlers of 9.9%.³

¹ These figures are derived from those published in Australian Immigration: Consolidated Statistics, 1966.
² See figures given in Australia in Facts and Figures, No.93, 1967.
In 1966, 41.6% of the Italian-born population of Australia was to be found in Victoria, 27.2% in New South Wales, and less than 12.0% in each of the other States. Queensland received large numbers of Italian migrants before the Second World War, and probably still has many residents of Italian origin, but in 1966 its total number of residents of Italian birth was only 7.6% of the whole Italian-born population of Australia. In 1966, people born in Italy formed 3.4% of the population of Victoria, 3.4% of the population of Western Australia, 2.8% of the population of South Australia, and smaller percentages of the populations of other States. The masculinity ratio of the Italian-born residents of Victoria was 121.9 in 1966, lower than that of the Italian-born residents of any other State. This indicates that the Italian population of Victoria contained many men who had settled with their wives and families, and comparatively few single men trying out a new country.

Italian migrants are such a noticeable part of the Australian population that it is surprising that so few academic studies have paid particular attention to them. The studies that have been carried out can be divided into intensive studies of localised Italian migrant communities.

---

1 Jones points out that in 1933 Queensland had more Italian-born residents than any other State in Australia; see Jones, 'The Territorial Composition of Italian Emigration to Australia, 1876 to 1962', 1964.

2 That is, the number of males per 100 females in a given category.

3 All the figures in this paragraph are derived from Census, 1966.

and broader studies of all, or a large part, of the Italian population of Australia, carried out on the basis of official records or Census data.\(^1\) Both types of study have tended to discuss various migrant populations in isolation from the Australian population which surrounds them, and with which they are generally expected to become assimilated in due course. Only one recent Australian study has attempted to investigate the Australian society within which a migrant population exists at the same time as the migrant population itself,\(^2\) and this is not concerned with Italian migrants.

In view of the size and complexity of the Italian population in Australia, and the comparative lack of sociological studies of Italian migrants, it seemed desirable to undertake a further study of this section of the Australian migrant population. It also seemed worthwhile to arrange the study in such a way as to focus attention on relations between the migrant population and the members of the host society, rather than upon relations between migrants. It was therefore decided to carry out this study in an area where there were many Italian migrants, and where it would be possible to examine the local Australian population as well as the migrant one.

The Location of this Study

The Ovens Valley area of North-East Victoria met these criteria, and was also within easy travelling distance of Canberra. The 1961 Census showed that it contained a large Italian-born population. Other non-British groups were comparatively sparsely represented, so it would be possible

\(^1\) For example, Borrie: *Italians and Germans in Australia*, 1954; McDonald: *Migration from Italy to Australia, with Special Reference to Selected Groups*, 1958; Hempel: *Italians in Queensland*, 1959; Price: *Southern Europeans in Australia*, 1963; and Price: *The Method and Statistics of 'Southern Europeans in Australia'*, 1963.

to concentrate on relations between Italians and Australians\(^1\) without having to make allowances for the effects of other groups on the situation. At first it was hoped that it would be possible to restrict the study to Myrtleford, a non-municipal town in the area with a population of 2,123 in 1961, 9.0% of which had been born in Italy. Alternatively, it was hoped to limit the study to the area comprising the non-municipal town and the shire of Myrtleford, which together contained a population of 3,770 in 1961, 19.0% of which had been born in Italy.\(^2\) Under these circumstances it was hoped to carry out a small-scale community study, with a population small enough to be encompassed by participant-observation techniques.\(^3\)

During a preliminary visit to Myrtleford in October 1965 it became clear that this tentative plan would need

---

1 Throughout this thesis, 'Australian' is used to indicate people born in Australia, of British (or at least non-Italian) origin. As far as the Ovens Valley area is concerned, these are mainly the descendants of people who were in Australia before the first Italian settlers in the area arrived. Later migrant categories in the area (the Spanish, Greek and Yugoslav, for example) have not yet developed an adult, Australian-born generation.

2 See Census, 1961, for the origin of the figures given in this paragraph.

3 'Participant-observation' is a technique pioneered in anthropology by Bronislaw Malinowski. William Foote Whyte adopted and modified it for use in a sociological study of slum dwellers in an American city; see Whyte: Street Corner Society, enlarged edition, 1955, Appendix, for discussion of his method. A recent use of the same technique is demonstrated in Gans: The Urban Villagers, 1962, and discussed in Chapter 3 of that book. The use of participant-observation techniques in the present study, where they are combined with a sample survey and considerable use of published sources, is very much less intensive than the use made of them by Whyte and Gans.
modification. Myrtleford is in the centre of the area described in this thesis as 'the Ovens Valley area', which is the main tobacco growing region of Victoria. Its economic and social life can hardly be considered in isolation from the tobacco growing region which surrounds it. Time and resources were insufficient for a study of the whole population of the Ovens Valley area, and it was unlikely that a sampling frame could be devised which would provide a representative cross-section of this population. However, it was feasible to make a study of the tobacco growing section of the population. Since the study had to be a limited one, it seemed more appropriate to concentrate on an occupational section of the population than to select a geographical section; and the tobacco growers were the appropriate focus for a study of Italian migrants, since the majority of the tobacco growers were born in Italy.

---

1 See maps of the Ovens Valley area, Maps I(a) and I(b), below, pp.55-6.
2 In 1961 the total population of the local government areas which included the Ovens Valley area was 37,192; see Census, 1961.
3 The Voters' Roll for the local government areas which included the Ovens Valley area were of little assistance, since they excluded Italians who were not naturalised Australians, and included residents within their boundaries who were not residents of, or socially connected with, the Ovens Valley area; see discussion of the geography of the area and its relationship to local government boundaries below, Chapter 3, pp. 54-62.
4 The Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board List, 1965-66, which lists all tobacco growers, whatever their nationality, provided a sampling frame; see discussion below, Appendix I, pp. 390-7.
5 Most of the tobacco grown in Victoria is produced in the Ovens Valley area, and in 1961 77.4% of the total male population of tobacco growers in Victoria had been born in Italy; see 'Australia National University Occupational Analysis of the 1961 Census Data', currently being carried out.
As a result, the interaction that is investigated in this thesis is that of Italian tobacco growers with their Australian neighbours, and that of Australian tobacco growers with their Italian neighbours. Since tobacco growers participated with non-tobacco growers in several activities, it was necessary to follow up such participation when it was relevant to interaction between Italians and Australians; but the organisation and nature of social life in the Ovens Valley area were not subjected to analysis in their own right.

The Methods of this Study

The approach adopted in this study relies mainly on a sample survey of Italian and Australian tobacco growers, and partly on personal observation and local contacts in the Ovens Valley area, with additional reference to such sources as Census material. Altogether information was collected from nine main sources:

1. Sample survey of tobacco growers carried out between August 1966 and April 1967.

2. Information on life in the Ovens Valley area from conversations with residents of the area and from participant-observation during the period of residence there.

---

1 After a preliminary visit to Myrtleford from 28 October to 5 November 1965, I took up residence in the town from 6 March 1966 and remained there with only a few short absences until 3 February 1967. In August 1966 I paid a short visit to Melbourne to attend part of the tobacco sales. I paid another brief visit to Myrtleford from 17 March to 15 April 1967, and a final one, 15-16 June 1968. Altogether I observed the area continuously for rather more than a complete agricultural year, and in particular over the growing season from October 1966 to April 1967.

2 See discussion of the sample below, Appendix I, pp.390-401.
3. Census material.\(^1\)

4. Voters' Roll of the various local government areas which include the Ovens Valley area, 1966-67.\(^2\)

5. Excise list of registered tobacco producers (farm owners) in Victoria, 1965-66.\(^3\)

6. List of registered tobacco growers (owners and sharefarmers) in Victoria, 1965-66.\(^4\)

7. Background information from published sources on:
   (a) Italian immigration into Australia;
   (b) History and geography of Italy;
   (c) History and geography of the Ovens Valley area.

8. Statistics on the development of the tobacco industry in Australia in general, and in Victoria in particular, from official publications.\(^5\)

9. Information on life in Italy, and on the process of immigration, from personal observations and conversations with immigrants and immigration officials, both in Italy and during the sea passage to Australia.\(^6\)

\(^1\) Particularly Census, 1954; Census, 1961; and Census, 1966.
\(^2\) That is, Voters' Rolls, 1966-67 (see bibliography, below, pp.480-1).
\(^3\) That is, Excise List, 1965-66 (see bibliography, below, p.492).
\(^4\) That is, Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board List, 1965-66, discussed below, Appendix I, pp. 390-7.
\(^5\) In particular, from the Official Year Books of the Commonwealth of Australia, published annually; and from the Victorian Year Books, published irregularly.
\(^6\) The stay in Italy, the conversations with Australian immigration officials in Italy, and the sea passage from Italy to Australia all occurred between April and June, 1965.
The sampling frame for the survey was the list of registered tobacco growers (owners and sharefarmers) in Victoria, 1965-66. The study was regarded as an exploratory one, and only a few assumptions about conditions in the Ovens Valley area could be made. The questionnaire therefore contained a large number of open-ended questions, and informants were encouraged to talk generally round the topics covered by the questionnaire, as well as to give answers to a number of precise questions. The interviews were conducted verbally (in Italian where appropriate), usually in the informants' homes and in the presence of their wives and children. This led to lengthy interviews; few took less than an hour and a half, and some took much longer. The sample was therefore a small one, though it was random and apparently representative.

Wherever possible the statistical significance of particular results has been calculated, but the small size

---

1 See details of the way the sample was drawn below, Appendix I, pp. 390-5.
2 See copy of the interview schedule below, Appendix I, pp. 402-29.
3 I possessed a working knowledge of standard Italian, though not any Italian dialect. The non-English speaking informants (who came from various parts of Italy and spoke various local dialects) could all understand and make themselves understood in standard Italian (which is taught in Italian schools) even if they normally spoke a local dialect.
4 See comparison of the sample with the population as a whole below, Appendix I, pp. 397-400.
5 Significance tests have been carried out by means of the version of Zubin's nomograph for the testing of the statistical significance of differences between percentages in Oppenheim: Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, 1966, Chapter III. The advantage of this method of testing the significance of a result is that it can be used even when the sample, or the part of a sample, being tested consists of as few as 13 cases.
of the sample and the consequent possibility of disproportionately large effects from small coding errors mean that in some cases the apparent significance of results may be misleading. A larger sample, and a shorter questionnaire with a more limited range of questions, would have produced more reliable results. Nevertheless, the research strategy which was adopted seemed the most appropriate for the exploratory study which was envisaged. The focus of this study was interaction between migrants and hosts. Since this is an aspect of assimilation which has so far attracted little attention,\(^1\) there were no pre-existing hypotheses. The object of the research was therefore not to test hypotheses but to produce material from which viable hypotheses could eventually be derived. Both the operational formulation and the testing of such hypotheses are tasks for a later date, and perhaps for other researchers.

Outline of this Thesis

This chapter has indicated the reasons for undertaking this study, and for the choice of the Ovens Valley area as its location. It has also described the methods by which the study was carried out.

The following chapter considers the relevant sociological literature, and discusses the reasons for concentrating here on a single aspect of assimilation; that of interaction between hosts and migrants. It also discusses the implications of the concept of interaction, the kinds of interaction that may take place, and the relevance of interaction between migrants themselves to interaction between migrants and hosts. In addition, it defines the concept of 'areas of life' as it is relevant to this study. Three kinds of areas of life are:

\(^1\) See discussion of this point below, Chapter 2, pp.35-40.
distinguished: those in which migrant-host interaction is regarded as necessary by both hosts and migrants; those in which it is voluntary, and hosts and migrants may either segregate themselves or interact with one another; and those in which migrant-host interaction is unlikely. (In the Ovens Valley area, examples of areas of necessary, voluntary and unlikely interaction are, respectively, economic life, sporting associations and family life).

Chapter 3 describes the background against which interaction between migrants and hosts takes place in the Ovens Valley area. The purpose of this chapter is descriptive rather than analytical, since an exhaustive study of the sociology of the area is not attempted, but some relevant sociological characteristics of the region are briefly discussed.

Chapter 4 examines the amount and kind of interaction between migrants and hosts, and between migrants and migrants, in areas of life where interaction between migrants and hosts is regarded as necessary. Chapter 5 examines areas of voluntary interaction in the same way, and Chapter 6 examines areas in which interaction is unlikely.

These three chapters are synchronic, and describe interaction between migrants and hosts as it was in the tobacco growing population of the Ovens Valley area during 1966-67. Chapter 7 takes a diachronic view, and discusses the development of patterns of interaction over time.

Finally Chapter 8 summarises the conclusions of this thesis and suggests lines of further research.
CHAPTER 2

ASSIMILATION AND INTERACTION

In this thesis the detailed examination of a specific migrant-host situation is carried out in order to throw some light on the process of assimilation and to suggest lines of development for a general theory of assimilation.

This chapter is concerned with the theoretical considerations underlying this study. It will begin with a discussion of the concept of assimilation and the various approaches to the subject that have been adopted by previous writers. It will then proceed to a consideration of the problems in the way of formulating a general theory of assimilation, and to a discussion of the reasons for focussing this study on interaction between migrants and hosts. The theoretical assumptions involved in a study of interaction will then be considered, and the method of approach to the study of interaction which has been adopted in this study will be explained.

The Concept of Assimilation.

The literature on immigration and assimilation is vast, and only those themes most relevant to this thesis can be touched on here.¹

¹ The literature on Australian immigration alone, up to 1965, comprises a lengthy bibliography: see Price: Australian Immigration: a Bibliography and Digest, 1966.
The word assimilation has been used in two ways in the sociological literature: first to refer to a final state in which an individual migrant or a migrant group is incorporated into the host society without much trace remaining of the original differences between migrants and hosts; and second, to refer to the general process which tends towards such a state.

The state of assimilation can hardly become a reality in the lifetime of any particular migrant, unless a man can be imagined who has lost all the attitudes, values and behaviour patterns which he acquired up to the time of his migration. The state is therefore purely an intellectual construct, indicating the point to which the process of assimilation tends. The process, however, is an observable phenomenon, and consists of changes in the migrants attitudes, behaviour and so on brought about by his contact with the host society. The word assimilation used in this thesis generally refers to the actual process rather than to the abstract state.

The term 'assimilation' has been used to refer to the total process or state by almost all the writers in the field of migration and ethnic differentiation. It was used by Park in 1913, and was still being used by Gordon in 1964. Related words, such as 'absorption',

---

3 See, for example, Eisenstadt: The Absorption of Immigrants, 1954.
'acculturation', 'amalgamation', or 'adjustment' are usually applied to aspects of the process or state, rather than to the process or state as a whole. The various types of theories in which 'assimilation' and related concepts have been used will be discussed in the following section.

The concept of 'assimilation' involves the assumption that there is an identifiable host society to which migrants may become assimilated, and implies that living for any length of time in a new country involves the abandonment of the ways of life of the country of origin. Both the assumption and the implication have been questioned.

Discussing professional and white-collar British migrants to Canada, Richmond argues that the concept of assimilation is anachronistic in view of the high rates of geographical mobility that characterise many industrial societies. In their study of coloured immigrants in

---

1 For example, see use in Gordon: *Assimilation and American Life*, 1964, p.71.

2 For example, see use in Gordon: *Assimilation and American Life*, 1964, p.71.


4 See discussion of the use of these different terms for parts of the overall process of assimilation in Gordon: *Assimilation and American Life*, 1964; and discussion of Gordon's use of the terms in Mapstone: *The Greek Macedonians of Shepparton*, 1966.

Britain, Rex and Moore similarly argue that because migrants are often involved in rapidly changing social situations the concept of assimilation is inadequate.¹ Several writers prefer to substitute the concept of 'integration' for that of 'assimilation',² for this term does not imply that migrants are involved in a process which may lead to their conformity to the attitudes and behaviour of the host society. 'Integration' seems to be preferred particularly by writers on migrants in countries such as Canada, where the host society itself is culturally notably heterogeneous.³

The problem is related to the debate contrasting 'pluralistic' and 'monistic' assimilation as policy objectives. A pluralistic society is one in which there is more than one major cultural system, and the advocates of 'integration' or 'pluralistic assimilation' argue that it is possible for migrants to retain their own ethnic identity, values and customs while participating fully in the society as a whole. The 'monistic' view assumes one dominant cultural system, and demands that migrants become fully 'assimilated' to

² 'Integration' was used in Borrie: The Cultural Integration of Immigrants, 1959; and the use of this term rather than 'assimilation' is discussed in Price: 'The Study of Assimilation', the Introduction to Price: Australian Immigration: a Bibliography and Digest, 1966.
³ See, for example, Richmond: Post-War Immigrants in Canada, 1967.
that culture as a matter of course. The dispute has consisted partly of a series of assertions about the relative merits of pluralistic and monistic societies, and partly of empirical studies aimed at establishing the degree of pluralism or monism in given social situations.

It is not the purpose of this thesis to argue the respective merits of pluralism or monism as long-term social objectives. The extent to which a given society should tolerate diversity or insist on homogeneity is an ethical and political decision which is beyond the scope of this study. Certain general observations about the actual situations in which migrants find themselves may be made, however. It seems realistic to expect that there is a considerable degree of pluralism in any complex industrial society (that is, any society of the kind that normally attracts migrants). In such societies multiple differences of social and cultural behaviour are associated

1 The polemic dispute in the United States between pluralists and monists (who themselves may be divided into two schools, the 'anglo-conformists', who believe migrants should adopt the values and behaviour appropriate to the 'anglo-saxon' host society, and the advocates of the 'melting-pot' theory, who believe that both hosts and migrants should develop a new, but homogeneous, synthesis of values and behaviour) is described in Gordon: Assimilation and American Life, 1964.

2 Two recent American studies of the latter type are Glazer & Moynihan: Beyond the Melting Pot, 1963; and Kennedy: Single or Triple Melting Pot? Intermarriage Trends in New Haven, 1870-1940' in American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 49, No. 4, January 1944.
with such factors as socioeconomic status and region of residence; and pluralism of another kind results from the original cultural diversity of different ethnic categories. In pluralistic societies migrants cannot even approach a state of assimilation with hosts in general because the host society itself contains a number of different subcultures, each with distinctive patterns of behaviour.

However, assimilation may be regarded as a process in which the behaviour and values of migrants tend to become indistinguishable from those members of the host society with whom they are residentially and economically involved (though under this definition there can be no assimilation if migrants live in a residential and economic enclave within the society). A migrant living in a rural area can be regarded as assimilated to the extent to which his behaviour and values conform to those of the host residents of the area. A migrant who is a construction worker can be regarded as assimilated to the extent to which he shares the behaviour and values of members of the host society who have the same occupation, or an equivalent occupation in terms of income and social status. In other words, even in a pluralistic society, there are collectivities which are sufficiently homogeneous to act as host societies for migrants who come into contact with them; and these collectivities need not be entirely devoid of internal diversity.

Some Approaches to the Study of Assimilation

Any study of migrants, or of host-migrant relations, has a theoretical orientation which is related to its methods and to the aspects of the lives of migrants and hosts which are described. In this section various approaches which have been adopted will be discussed, in ascending order of theoretical sophistication.
Some studies consist principally of statistical comparisons between selected ethnic categories and the host society. Differentials between categories are taken to indicate the extent of assimilation for the characteristic concerned.\(^1\) The rationale for this approach appears to be simply that an assimilated ethnic category is one which does not differ significantly from the host society. Studies of this kind provide valuable data, but they contribute little towards explaining how the process of assimilation takes place, or how its future course may be predicted.

Some writers have developed typologies of migrants or groups of migrants. For example, Jean Martin concludes her study of refugee settlers in Australia with a description of various migrant types;\(^2\) and in his study of migrants in the Latrobe Valley area, Zubrzycki distinguishes two different types of migrant community.\(^3\) In effect, such typologies are means of evaluating and schematising clusters of differentials. They go beyond the aggregate differential approach by attempting to show how the characteristics of particular types of migrants interact in the process of assimilation, and how they determine the stage in the process that individual migrants may have reached.

\(^1\) Dorothy S. Thomas has done a considerable amount of work in this field, beginning with Thomas: 'Research Memorandum on Migration Differentials' in Social Science Research Council Bulletin, No. 43, 1938. Similar approaches have been used in Borrie: Italians and Germans in Australia, 1954, and Zubrzycki: Immigrants in Australia, 1960.


\(^3\) Zubrzycki: Settlers in the Latrobe Valley, 1964.
reached. In this respect the typological approach is similar to studies of the stages in the process of assimilation.¹

More complex theoretical approaches can be seen in attempts to carry out detailed studies of the social relationships existing within migrant populations. Many of these studies make use of such techniques as differentials, typologies or assimilation sequences, but they are principally concerned with the range and type of interaction between migrants.² Such studies are particularly interesting for their analyses of the social institutions which migrants create in their new environment, and of the ways in which they meet the challenge of 'restructuring' their social relationships.³ Thomas and Znaniecki devote a considerable proportion of their lengthy, classic study of Polish immigrants in the United States to

¹ See, for example, Taft's sequence of integration in Taft: From Stranger to Citizen, 1965, (discussed below, pp.29-31); and Price's sequence of migrant groups in different stages of chain migration in Price: Southern Europeans in Australia, 1963 (discussed below, Chapter 3, pp.120-6).


similar considerations. By this means the processes by which migrant communities are created within the host society are uncovered, as well as the factors which hinder assimilation and encourage continued differentiation between migrants and hosts.

However, a study of the factors which hinder assimilation often involves the study of prejudice and discrimination on the part of the host society, as well as the study of the migrants themselves. Moreover, as this thesis argues, assimilation can be regarded in almost all cases as the outcome of interaction between migrants and hosts, and from this point of view it involves some study of the host society as well as the study of migrants. There are to date comparatively few studies of assimilation which have discussed the relations between migrants and hosts, but it seems likely that this will be the approach which will ultimately identify the major factors involved in the process of assimilation. The studies of migrant-host relations which have been carried out so far mainly consist of description, with detailed analyses of concrete situations but no general theory that satisfactorily articulates the different variables involved.

While descriptive studies of assimilation have been becoming more theoretically sophisticated, formal theories of assimilation have become more complex and less coherent as a result of their attempts to take into account the mass of available descriptive material.

---

1 See Thomas & Znaniecki: The Polish Peasant in Europe and America, 2nd. ed. 1927.

2 An example of such a study is Rex & Moore: Race, Community and Conflict, 1967.
The theory of the 'race-relations cycle' formulated by Park and Burgess\(^1\) was the first formal statement of the possible stages of assimilation and the processes by which they might be linked; and it is much simpler than later ones. The theory states that whenever two or more ethnic groups come to live in the same place, their relationships will pass through a cycle of:-

I. **Peaceful contact**;

II. **Competition** for scarce resources;

III. **Conflict** as a result of competition;

IV. **Accommodation** (a **modus vivendi**, sometimes based on the acceptance by one group of inferior status, and sometimes on the physical and social separation of the two groups);

V. **Assimilation**, by which Park and Burgess mean intermixture and intermarriage.

Park seems to have begun by assuming that this cycle is inevitable and irreversible, but by the 1930s he was discussing cases of regression in the cycle - for example, outbreaks of conflict after periods of accommodation. He also suggested that 'stabilization' might be achieved at the stage of accommodation without the final stage of assimilation ever being reached.\(^2\)

---


2. See the essays written by Park in the 1920s and 1930s, reprinted in Park: *Race and Culture*, 1950.
In its later formulations, Park's cycle hardly provides a predictive theory of relations between ethnic groups, and therefore it is not testable. Moreover, it is not a causal theory in either the earlier or the later version, and does not attempt to investigate the way in which various factors operate to bring the cycle about. Its chief advantage is that it provides a vocabulary for discussing the broad categories into which particular social situations might fall. Zubrzycki and Patterson have both found it useful in studies of minority groups in Britain.

Several writers have argued that Park's categories are too broad even for this application. Banton writes:

'...some index is required which is susceptible to measurement and can be used for the comparison of different cases and stages of the assimilative process... social, cultural, political and other aspects of assimilation [should] be kept separate. 'Total' assimilation may then be regarded as the resultant of a series of variables, the variables not being selected to conform to the categories of an a priori definition.3

Following a similar line of thought, Gordon has distinguished seven sub-processes within the overall process of assimilation.4 These are:

I. Change of cultural patterns to those of the host society: 'cultural' or 'behavioural' assimilation, or 'acculturation';

II. Large-scale entrance into the primary groups of the host society (clubs, cliques, 'etc.): 'structural assimilation';

1 Zubrzycki: Polish Immigrants in Britain, 1956.
III. Large-scale intermarriage with the host society: 'marital assimilation' or 'amalgamation';

IV. Development of a sense of peoplehood based on the host society: 'identificational assimilation';

V. Absence of prejudice on the part of the host society: 'attitude receptional assimilation';

VI. Absence of discrimination on the part of the host society: 'behavioural receptional assimilation';

VII. Absence of value or power conflict between the minority group and the host society: 'civic assimilation'.

Gordon's approach, particularly his emphasis on structural assimilation, has been used in at least two studies of migrants in Australia. However, Gordon's seven sub-processes are not mutually exclusive: for example, it is difficult to see why civic assimilation should be a separate sub-process, rather than being distributed between structural assimilation, identificational assimilation and behavioural receptional assimilation.

Other schedules of sub-processes can be drawn up which have at least as much justification as Gordon's. For example, Mapstone has six sub-processes in a scheme which is a variation of Gordon's, though it is rather more concerned with group processes than with individual ones.


Taking another approach, Taft distinguishes four 'facets' of assimilation in the course of carrying out a socio-psychological study of migrants' attitudes. These facets are:

I. 'Acculturation' or 'accommodation';
II. 'Adjustment' or 'adaptation';
III. 'Amalgamation';
IV. 'Absorption'.

Taft is concerned with the assimilation of individuals rather than that of groups, and focusses his attention almost entirely on the facet of 'acculturation', which is particularly amenable to study by the investigation of individual attitudes. Taft regards absorption as a facet related to group assimilation rather than individual assimilation, and he takes a similar view of amalgamation (which refers to intermarriage and biological merging).

Both Gordon and Taft have discussed how the various sub-processes of assimilation, as they each define them, are related to one another. Gordon maintains that some of his sub-processes may take place independently of one another; that cultural assimilation is likely to take place first, and may in some cases be the only sub-process that occurs; and that the crucial sub-process is structural assimilation. Once structural assimilation has occurred he expects that all the remaining sub-processes will be carried to completion. Taft, however, finds that acculturation appears to depend upon the development of a sense of identity with the host country, and the achievement of some level of satisfaction with it. His findings are in line with those of Richardson, who distinguishes three stages in the process of acculturation:

---

1 Taft: From Stranger to Citizen, 1965, p. 70.
satisfaction with the new country, identification with the host population, and finally acculturation, the acquisition of the behaviour patterns and values of the host society. Taft distinguishes two stages of assimilation, the first consisting mainly of satisfaction and identification, and the second of acculturation and social participation with hosts.

The difference between the two assimilation sequences suggested by Gordon and Taft is largely due to the different definitions they attach to 'acculturation'. For Gordon, acculturation is a minimal condition of knowing enough of the language and the skills required by the host society to survive in it: a sine qua non of the migrant's existence in the new country. For Taft it is a wider concept, apparently referring to a process culminating in the complete re-socialisation of the individual into the behaviour patterns and values of the host society. In this wider definition, acculturation is a process with stages of its own, and Richardson has in fact distinguished three stages of acculturation.\(^1\) Obligatory acculturation is that which a migrant has to acquire in order to exist in the host society (corresponding to Gordon's definition of acculturation itself); advantageous acculturation is that

---


which a migrant must acquire in order to succeed economically and socially in relation to members of the host society; and optional acculturation is that which the migrant need not acquire unless he wishes to become indistinguishable from members of the host society.

On consideration it appears that each of the sub-processes of assimilation suggested by Gordon and Taft can be seen as a lengthy process, which continues in relation to the other sub-processes and is affected by them. However, unless it is indicated what the stages within each sub-processes are, it is impossible to know what the inter-relationships between the various sub-processes might be. It can only be said that it seems unlikely that any one process can be fully completed before any of the others is also completed.

Difficulties Hindering the Development of a General Theory of Assimilation

The theories of assimilation which have been developed recently in response to descriptive studies of various aspects of migrant, and migrant-host, behaviour are somewhat incoherent and contradictory. There are many reasons for this, and only gradually will workers in the field succeed in differentiating the various issues involved and re-integrating them into a coherent view of the process of assimilation as it takes place in different settings. The difficulties are two-fold: first, the process of assimilation is apparently a complex one in any

---

Mapstone takes the view that the various assimilation sub-processes are dynamic and continually interacting variables, any one of which continuously affects all the others; see Mapstone: The Greek Macedonians of Shepparton, 1966.
setting; and second, there is a bewildering variety of assimilation situations, and the process varies considerably from one situation to another.

For example, assimilation in a developing country like Australia, where both migrants and hosts are aware of expanding economic opportunities, is apparently associated with less tension and social conflict than in a country like Britain, where economic opportunities and the supply of amenities are more limited.\(^1\) Again, the process of assimilation in Australia, where large numbers of new migrants are still arriving, differs from that in the United States, where the bulk of migrants arrived before 1930.\(^2\) In addition there are differences between the process of assimilation when racial (that is, marked physiognomic) differences between hosts and migrants are involved,\(^3\) and the process when they are not: and there are obvious differences between assimilation situations where discrimination against migrants (or minorities) is practiced by the host (or dominant) population,\(^4\) and situations where

---


2. See discussions of the assimilation process in the United States in, for example, Glazer & Moynihan: *Beyond the Melting Pot*, 1963, and Gordon: *Assimilation and American Life*, 1964.


4. See discussion of migrants in situations of racial discrimination in, for example, Epstein: *Politics in an Urban African Community*, 1958.
such discrimination is absent. In addition, different factors are involved in assimilation when the migrants belong to elaborately structured ethnic communities, which form apparently autonomous sub-sections within the host society, from those that are involved when migrants join with hosts in various organisations of the host society (for example, churches and voluntary associations) rather than establish institutions of their own.¹

There is also the question of the aspirations and expectations of the migrants themselves. For example, because the aspirations of refugee migrants are somewhat different from those of people who have migrated in order to improve their socio-economic position, their behaviour in relation to the host society may also be different.² Conversely, the process of assimilation is affected by the attitudes and expectations of the host society. The extent of the 'social distance' which the hosts perceive as existing, or desire to maintain, between the migrants and themselves (their willingness to have members of particular ethnic categories as neighbours or as marriage partners for their children, for example) may have a powerful effect on the process of migrant assimilation.³

¹ See discussion of this point in, amongst others, Zubrzycki: Settlers in the Latrobe Valley, 1964; Rex & Moore: Race, Community and Conflict, 1967; and Collins: Coloured Minorities in Britain, 1957.
² Compare, for example, the refugee settlers discussed in Martin: Refugee Settlers, 1965, and the economically motivated Italian migrants discussed in Hempel: Italians in Queensland, 1959 and in this thesis.
The related problem of cultural distance between migrants and hosts (the extent to which the behaviour and values of one ethnic category differ from those of the other) may also be important.¹

Another difference which may exist between different host-migrant situations is whether assimilation is a process which affects individuals or one which affects groups (and in some situations it may be regarded either way). In the United States and Britain it appears from the literature that assimilation is a question of reducing the extent to which different ethnic or racial categories are socially distinct from one another². In Australia, on the other hand, assimilation appears to be mainly a question of the individual migrants' acquisition of the values and behaviour patterns of members of the host society.³ However, to some extent this difference in approach is dictated by the orientation of the students of assimilation in different contexts.⁴ Although both the United States

---


² See for example the discussions of relationships between different ethnic groups in the U.S.A. in Gordon: Assimilation and American Life, 1964, and in Glazer & Moynihan: Beyond the Melting Pot, 1963; and the discussion of ethnic relations in Britain in Rex & Moore: Race, Community and Conflict, 1967.

³ See, for example, Taft: From Stranger to Citizen, 1965.

⁴ For example, in relation to migrants in Australia, Taft (a social psychologist) concentrates on the 'acculturation' of individual migrants in Taft: From Stranger to Citizen, 1965; whereas Zubrzycki (a sociologist) concentrates on the 'structural assimilation' of various ethnic categories in Zubrzycki: 'The Questing Years', 1968.
and Britain appear to contain segregated minorities whose assimilation depends largely on the reduction of social discrimination against them, they also contain ethnic categories whose individual members may acquire the characteristics and the privileges of the host society; and although in Australia individual migrants may eventually become almost indistinguishable from members of the host society, there are several ethnic 'enclaves' within the society whose assimilation can usefully be examined from the 'group assimilation' point of view.

However, most writers on assimilation in Britain and the United States have taken the group assimilation approach, and most writers on assimilation in Australia have preferred that of individual assimilation, and this difference is in accordance with the salient types of assimilation problems in each society.

There is as yet no overall theory of the process of assimilation which takes account of the multiplicity of factors revealed by the diversity of migrant-host situations; and the partial theories that exist have mainly been developed along the lines of the group assimilation approach of American sociologists. It is difficult to apply these to the individual assimilation approach which appears to be more generally appropriate in Australia. Taft's and Richardson's attempts to map the process of individual assimilation in this country have concentrated on the psychological aspects of the migrant's changes in attitudes. The migrant-host situation examined in this thesis is one in which individual rather than group assimilation is in question; but the approach is sociological not psychological. Interest is focussed on the social processes involved in the migrant's contact with members of the host society, not internal changes in
migrants' attitudes. As yet none of the partial theories of assimilation which already exist cover this particular aspect of assimilation, and this thesis therefore suggests the first steps towards the construction of a theory which might deal with this aspect of the problem. Ultimately, it is hoped, sociology will develop a theory of assimilation which will cover all aspects of the phenomenon, bringing together a number of partial theories dealing with different aspects of it.

The Study of Interaction Between Migrants and Hosts

This thesis is concerned with a situation in which individual rather than group assimilation is in question, and with the sociological rather than the psychological aspects of individual assimilation. It is postulated that it is interaction with hosts that provides migrants with the necessary opportunity to learn the values and behaviour patterns of the host society (or, rather, of the sub-section of the host society with which they are associated).

This proposition is derived from role theory and socialisation theory which emphasise the importance of interaction with other people in the processes of acquiring skills, learning rules of behaviour and identifying with social values.1 This approach to assimilation is in line with Eisenstadt's view that the whole process of assimilation may be regarded as a re-socialisation process. Eisenstadt distinguishes three 'different though closely connected phases' in the process of assimilation: the acquisition of various skills.

1 See Mead: Mind, Self and Society, 1934, for one of the earliest discussions of interaction and learning, and Biddle and Thomas: Role Theory: Concepts and Research, 1966, for a symposium of some of the most recent.
including knowledge of the language of the host society) which enable the migrant to survive in his new setting; the learning of new roles necessary in the new society; and the re-building and re-formation of the migrant's idea of himself and his status-image by the acquisition of a new set of values, tested out in relation to the new roles available to and required of him. Since re-socialisation may be conceptualised, like primary socialisation, as a consequence of interaction, the total process of assimilation may be viewed as a consequence of the amount and kind of interaction taking place between migrants and hosts. (It should not be forgotten, however, that re-socialisation rarely eradicates primary socialisation, and that assimilation is a tendency that cannot be expected to be fully realised in actuality).

This thesis views assimilation as a process which tends towards a situation in which an individual's position-set (that is, the set of roles he plays and the ways in which he plays them) change from the state it was in at the moment of arrival in the country of adoption to a state in which it is indistinguishable from equivalent position-sets in the host society.

---

2 See Biddle & Thomas: Role Theory: Concepts and Research, 1966, p.41.
3 As indicated above, since the host society is often heterogeneous, assimilation should be regarded as a process leading to the adoption by migrants of the characteristics of those hosts to whom they may be regarded as equivalent by reason of residence in the same areas, similar occupations etc.
The behavioural and attitudinal adjustments made necessary for migrants by their new environment are carried out by a process of adopting new roles and learning how to play them, and of learning new ways of playing old-roles - in other words by a process of re-socialisation. It might be added that the large-scale immigration of migrants into a given area is often both the accompaniment of considerable social change, particularly the types of social change consequent upon economic development, and the cause of social change in itself. Individual position-sets within the host society may therefore have to be adjusted to meet the demands of the changing environment. A considerable amount of re-socialisation may thus become incumbent upon members of the host society as well as upon migrants. In this thesis, however, the discussion is centred upon the re-socialisation of migrants.

New roles, and new ways of playing already existing roles, are learnt by migrants in the course of their interaction with members of the host society. Re-socialisation, like primary socialisation, is a product of interaction. There are a number of possible types of interaction; and a number of areas of life\(^1\) in which interaction is possible. The amount of assimilation achieved depends partly upon the amount and types of interaction which take place, and the areas of life within which they occur.

The re-socialisation of adult migrants will generally be incomplete, because the effects of the socialisation they underwent in their countries of origin will not easily be eradicated. For the children of migrants educated in the

\(^1\) The concept of 'areas of life' as it is used in this thesis is discussed in the following section; see below, pp.45-7.
host country, socialisation into its attitudes and behaviour patterns may be very like the socialisation of members of the host society themselves. The children of migrants may learn about the host society through their contacts outside the home in the same way and at the same time as their contemporaries who are the children of hosts, provided no barriers of discrimination intervene between them and members of the host society. However, such extra-domestic socialisation is distinct from the primary socialisation of the child in his home, and if there are marked discontinuities between the values and attitudes of the migrant home and those of the host society, a re-adjustment and re-learning may occur when the child encounters the host society, similar to the process which occurs in the case of the adult migrants.

Levinson distinguishes three specific senses in which the term 'role' has been used in sociological literature. These are:-

1. The structurally given demands associated with a given social position;
2. The individual's orientation or conception of the part he is to play; or
3. The actions of individuals seen in terms of their relevance for the social structure, in accord with or in violation of a given set of organisational norms.

---

The first sense is the one in which the term 'role' is used in this thesis, but the other two are closely related aspects of the same concept. The second aspect is the individual's interpretation of the structurally given demands associated with his position, and the third is the judgment of other people about how closely he conforms to those demands.

The learning of new roles by migrants may be limited by at least two constraints. First, the roles open to a migrant may be limited by discrimination on the part of members of the host society, and some roles might be closed to him. In some host societies, and with reference to some migrant categories, a wide range of roles are closed. This point is not central to this particular study, but in countries where discrimination by hosts is an important factor inhibiting the processes tending towards assimilation, it justly attracts considerable attention. It is apparently the factor which Banton has in mind when he states that a migrant group has been assimilated when an individual's membership of it does not in any way hinder him in his relations with non-migrants.¹

Second, the roles which a migrant plays may be restricted by the extent to which he is involved in relationships with other migrants, and the degree to which he learns new ways of playing roles which he had in the old country as well as in the new (such as husband and father) will be affected by the extent to which he is still involved in relationships with members of his own ethnic category. For example, he cannot conform to the

¹ See Banton: The Coloured Quarter, 1955, p.234.
expectations of the host society regarding the behaviour appropriate to a husband if his migrant wife expects behaviour which would be appropriate in the old country. In other words, the way in which he plays his different roles is a function of the ethnic composition of the aggregate position complements (the aggregates of individuals who hold complementary positions to him in his role networks) in which he is involved. Since he tends to play his roles in ways that accord with the expectations of other members of his position complements, the more his position complements include members of the host society the more his behaviour will accord with the expectations of members of the host society; and the more he will be socialised into the values and behaviour of the hosts.

If the hosts whom a migrant interacts with are homogeneous in behaviour and attitudes, the migrant is likely to adopt a consistent and stable set of attitudes and behaviour patterns reflecting theirs. If there is a great diversity of attitudes and behaviour patterns amongst the hosts, the migrant's re-socialisation is likely to be superficial. The migrant is likely to confine his adoption of a particular set of attitudes and behaviour patterns to the occasions on which he interacts with a particular host. The degree of homogeneity in the host society (or, rather, in that part of the host society with which a migrant comes in contact) therefore affects the extent of a migrant's assimilation. The length, frequency and significance of a migrant's encounters with hosts will also affect his assimilation.

---

1 See Biddle & Thomas: Role Theory: Concepts and Research, 1966, p.41.
**Types of Interaction**

Although migrants can be said to acquire the attitudes and values of the host society through interaction with members of that society, it is clear that not all interaction is of the same kind, and that different types of interaction lead to the acquisition of attitudes and behaviour in different ways. For the purposes of this thesis, only a very simple differentiation between different types of interaction will be attempted.

First, a distinction will be made between indirect and direct types of interaction. In indirect interaction, the contact between migrants and hosts is not a personal, face-to-face one. Migrants interact with members of the host society indirectly when they read or listen to or watch the mass media of the host society; and when they deal with the host society via other migrants (as when a migrant wife depends on her husband to do the shopping for her, or to make arrangements with the school for the education of the children). It is stretching the meaning of the word 'interaction' somewhat to apply it to this sort of contact, but in this context the stretching seems legitimate. Through indirect interaction migrants learn several behaviour patterns that are appropriate in the host society (such as the operation of the hire purchase system, school enrollment procedures, and so on); they are made aware of several of the attitudes of the host society; and they are enabled to take appropriate action in practical matters such as furnishing their homes and educating their children. They acquire several pieces of knowledge that are essential to them in their new country, and they become accustomed to dealing with the host society in an appropriate manner.
Direct interaction is face-to-face interaction between individual migrants and individual hosts. A second distinction will be made between direct interaction which will be described as 'categorical' and direct interaction which will be described as 'non-categorical'. In categorical interaction, migrants and hosts interact in situations in which their respective roles are clearly defined, and it is only incumbent on the migrant to learn the behaviour appropriate to that role. Examples of categorical interaction are to be found in the relationships between migrant sharemen and host farm owners, migrant laity and host priests, migrant customers and host shopkeepers.

In non-categorical interaction the definition of roles is less clearly defined. Both parties to the interaction are constantly involved in establishing the rules of the relationship. Nadel describes this type of relationship as one in which the mutual expectations of the parties concerned are determined by a 'mutual steering process'\footnote{Nadel: The Theory of Social Structure, 1957, p.44.} in which both parties are involved, as distinct from a relationship in which the expectations are predetermined by social usage.\footnote{In terms of Parsons' 'pattern variables' it might be true to say that categorical relationships are characterised by affective neutrality and specificity, while non-categorical ones are characterised by affectivity and diffuseness: see Parsons: The Social System, 1951, Chapter II. However, the concern here is to distinguish between two broadly different types of interaction, rather than to analyse the components of the actors' orientations, so the words categorical and non-categorical are used rather than words incorporated in a Parsonian scheme.} Examples of non-categorical interaction


may be found in friendships between migrants and hosts, and in the relationships between migrants and hosts who are affiliated by marriage.

However, the type of relationship involved does not entirely determine the type of interaction within it. If a relationship can be referred to as being one of a particular type (such as 'friendship' or 'priest-layman') it must have rules attached to it which are expectations predetermined by social usage. To that extent, therefore, any relationship is categorical. Relationships vary, however, in the degree to which the behaviour within them is categorical. Relationships such as friendship leave many aspects to be determined by the 'mutual steering process' of the parties concerned. At the other extreme, relationships such as priest-layman are extensively predetermined by custom and ethics. Relationships, in themselves, cannot be classified as either categorical or non-categorical; but they may be compared with one another with respect to the degree to which they make non-categorical behaviour possible.

Whether the individuals participating in a particular relationship actually take advantage of the opportunities it offers for non-categorical behaviour depends on their attitudes towards one another. Interaction in most relationships may either be confined to the purely categorical aspects, or extended to include non-categorical aspects. It is therefore possible for migrants and hosts to co-operate in a particular relationship without tackling the problems of non-categorical interaction, while hosts in an identical relationship with one another may include many non-categorical aspects in their interaction.

The three types of interaction referred to in this thesis may be ranged in order according to the relative
difficulty migrants have in maintaining the interaction. Indirect interaction with hosts is the easiest, for it imposes least demands upon the migrants participating in it; direct categorical interaction is rather more difficult, for it demands that migrants learn and sustain several rules of behaviour; direct non-categorical interaction is the most difficult, for it poses communication problems for the participants if they have difficulty in understanding one another's expectations. Since many of the clues individuals give one another about their expectations are culturally specific, migrants and hosts with different cultural expectations may find non-categorical relationships very difficult to handle.

It may be assumed that what migrants learn about the behaviour and expectations of members of the host society in the easiest forms of interaction enables them to proceed to more difficult forms. Furthermore as migrants learn more about the expectations of hosts they become more acceptable to members of the host society, and so hosts become progressively more willing to interact with them directly, and eventually non-categorically. Consequently, each move that tends towards assimilation (that is, each item of host behaviour and attitude which a migrant acquires through interaction) makes the next move possible (the next move being interaction of a more difficult kind that will make the acquisition of further knowledge possible).

**Areas of Life**

For the purposes of this thesis, the term 'areas of life' is used to refer to groups of social organisations classified according to the degree of interaction between migrants and hosts which they facilitate. It is possible
to make almost any number of distinctions between different aspects of social life, and to do it according to a wide range of criteria. The resulting classifications have been labelled variously by different writers. For example, Lowie refers to his set of classifications as 'social institutions', ¹ and Schnore refers to his rather different set as 'facets of community life'. ² The term 'areas of life' has been chosen here partly to avoid confusion between the classification made for the purpose of this thesis and the somewhat differently based classifications developed by other writers for different purposes.

For the purpose of discussing the Ovens Valley area, three types of areas of life are distinguished. The first type contains the social organisations in which migrants and hosts feel they are obliged to interact. It includes economic organisations (in which migrants must interact with hosts to earn a living), religious organisations, and educational organisations. The second type contains the organisations in which migrants and hosts may interact if they have a mind to. It includes the various clubs, voluntary associations, political associations and friendship patterns of the area in which they live. The third type contains the institutions in which interaction between migrants and hosts is unlikely. It contains chiefly the institutions of kinship and family life. These three areas of life will be referred to respectively as areas of necessary interaction, areas of voluntary interaction, and areas of unlikely interaction.

---

¹ See Lowie: Social Organization, 1950.
Though similar distributions of the local range of social organisations into a three-fold classification of areas of life could be carried out for most migrant-host situations, the particular location of particular organisations might well differ. For example, if migrants adhered to a distinctive Church of their own, which had no counterpart in the host society, then religious organisations would fall into the area of unlikely interaction between hosts and migrants; this would be the case in migrant-host situations involving Greek migrants to Australia. In the Ovens Valley area, however, the Italians share a religious affiliation with many members of the host society, and their religious observance therefore obliges them to interact with hosts in religious institutions.

The three-fold classification of areas of life suggested here suggests an analogy with Richardson's three-fold classification of levels of acculturation (obligatory, advantageous and optional acculturation); and like Richardson's scheme it suggests a progression as a migrant tends towards greater assimilation with the host society. It is to be expected that a migrant will begin by interacting with hosts in the areas of life in which interaction is obligatory, and later extend his contacts with hosts into areas of life where interaction is voluntary. Finally, he may interact with hosts in areas of life where such interaction seems unlikely. It may be expected, therefore, that interaction will spread from one area of life to another in a similar way to the manner in which the types of interaction may extend from the easier to the more difficult forms of interaction.

---

1 See discussion of Richardson's schema above, pp.29-31.
Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the concepts used in this thesis. In the main body of the thesis, these concepts will be applied to the analysis of interaction between migrants and hosts in the Ovens Valley area. Before undertaking this analysis, however, it is necessary to describe the social setting in which the interaction takes place. The following chapter will therefore describe the Ovens Valley area and its residents, and discuss the sociological characteristics of the area which affect interaction between Italians and Australians.
CHAPTER 3

THE SETTING OF THIS STUDY

The main body of this thesis discusses the interaction between Italian migrants and members of the Australian host society in the Ovens Valley area. Before discussing this interaction, however, it is necessary to describe the area itself and the conditions under which interaction occurs. This chapter will describe the geography, history and demography of the area, and the characteristics and origins of its Italian migrants. Finally it will consider some of its general sociological characteristics.

As a preliminary, it is necessary to consider the implications of the kind of description which is attempted here, for it includes some of the features regarded as appropriate to a community study.

Simpson\(^1\) has commented on the development of three distinct types of community study:-

(a) Studies of life as it is affected by community settings (for example, studies of juvenile delinquency or racial segregation);

(b) Studies concerned with samples of individuals within the community rather than with the community itself; and

(c) Studies in which the community itself is the object of the study.

---

In so far as the description of the Ovens Valley area presented here resembles a community study, it is a study of the first kind. It naturally involves somewhat different considerations from the study of a community in itself, for here only those aspects of the community which are directly relevant to the purpose in hand are considered.

The study of migrants within a community setting is not novel, though few studies have adopted such an approach in Australia. In England, Rex and Moore have approached the question of race relations through a form of community study, and Eisenstadt has used a similar approach in a study of migrants in Israel.

In this study, only the areas of life which either provide opportunities for interaction between hosts and migrants or discourage such interaction will be discussed in any detail. A few general observations on social life in the region will be made, in order to sketch in the background against which migrant-host interaction takes place, but all the description of the area offered in this thesis is presented from the point of view of its effect on relations between hosts and migrants. The view of the 'community' which is presented is therefore piecemeal. No attempt is made to examine the social structure of the area in terms of its own consistency and modes of operation. Although relations between hosts and migrants are discussed here with constant reference to the social setting in which they take place, it is not a central concern of this thesis to analyse that setting in itself.

1 Two studies, Zubrzycki: _Settlers of the Latrobe Valley_, 1964, and Mapstone: _The Greek Macedonians of Shepparton_, 1966, have adopted such an approach.

2 Rex and Moore: _Race, Community and Conflict_, 1967.

Moreover, the data which has been collected are not sufficient to allow an exhaustive analysis of the social structure of the area. The survey which was carried out was concerned with tobacco growers, not with the population as a whole; and most of the participant observation that took place was concerned with the local organisations that affected the tobacco growers and the Italians. More attention was paid to the local Catholic Church, the local Italian club, and the tobacco growers' associations than to such organisations as the local shire council and the Rotary Club.

Since it is neither relevant nor practicable to offer a complete analysis of the social structure of the area, many topics of general sociological interest are only dealt with partially, if at all, in this thesis. For example, very little is said about social conflict in the area, and the means by which it is regulated, though the presence and general nature of such conflict is indicated. Similarly, there is very little discussion of the various measures of social status employed by the inhabitants of the area. Moreover, the Ovens Valley area is compared with other rural areas described in the sociological literature only in the most general terms.

This is not, therefore, a community study in the usual sense. It is probable, in addition, that the Ovens Valley area is hardly a community as the word is often used in the literature on rural sociology. Many writers, particularly those concerned with the sociology of rural areas, argue that a community is a particular kind of society, possessing elements that make for social cohesion which are lacking in other kinds of society.¹ Writers in this vein frequently

¹ This concept of community derives from Tönnies: Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft (Community and Society), 1887, and has been developed in different ways by various writers, in works such as McIver: Community: a Sociological Study, 1924; Redfield: The Little Community, 1955; and Parsons: Structure and Process in Modern Societies, 1960.
assume that rural societies are more likely to be communities than urban ones, and that small societies are more likely to be communities than large ones. This assumption has to be empirically tested, and in Australia a number of studies have been carried out in order to ascertain to what extent certain rural and urban areas of New South Wales may be regarded as socially integrated communities. The conclusion that may be drawn from these studies is that cohesion may exist to some degree in a wide variety of settings, and that many small rural communities may exhibit only small degrees of cohesion.

It will appear from the description of the Ovens Valley area given in this chapter that, like several other rural areas, it exhibits a low degree of social integration. The area should probably be regarded as a territorial segment of a 'metropolitan' community based upon Melbourne, co-extensive with the entire State of Victoria and perhaps extending into southern New South Wales. The concept of a 'metropolitan community', which includes within itself a range of rural and urban communities is not in line with the older view of community; and the study of a segment of such a community is not a community study at all in the traditional sense.

The Ovens Valley area is not unusual among rural areas in exhibiting considerable involvement with the metropolis, and extensive changes in its population. Schnore draws attention to the contemporary rarity of communities which can be said to be independent of others for more than a small

---

1 See, for example, Bell: A Provincial Urban Community in Close Proximity to the Metropolis of Sydney, 1954; Craig: Some Aspects of Life in Selected Areas of Rural New South Wales, 1945; and Hole: Contiguity as a Force in Social Cohesion, 1947.

proportion of their needs, and several writers have drawn attention to the presence of newcomers and the departure of 'natives' in small towns and rural areas that are in other respects stable and long-established entities. Nalson points out that any rural population which is studied at any given point in time is the residual population from a previous point in time, plus any new entrants.

Gruen writes that both social and cultural differences between town and country are probably smaller in Australia than in most western countries. Rural-urban income differentials are much smaller than overseas; historically Australian farmers have always produced largely for the market rather than for their own consumption. Technical change in the farming industries has been rapid.

Although rural-urban differences persist, particularly in the areas of kinship and family life, much of rural Australia is closely in touch with, and strongly influenced by, urban life. It appears then that the Ovens Valley area is by no means atypical of rural areas, particularly in Australia. Moreover, at least according to Simpson and Schnore, it would be possible to justify the use of the term 'community' in reference to it, although it is not a community as some writers have understood the term. However, in this thesis the term 'community' will be avoided in referring to the Ovens Valley area, so as to

2 See, for example, Stacey: Tradition and Change: a Study of Banbury, 1960; and Frankenberg: Village on the Border, 1957.
3 Nalson: 'Spatial and Occupational Mobility of Farm People', 1967.
discourage the expectation that a rural area with a population of a few thousand people will necessarily exhibit the characteristics of a stable and cohesive social entity.

The fact that the Ovens Valley contains an Australian population which is heterogeneous with regard to many characteristics (for example, occupation, length of experience of rural life, and extent of contact with urban life) creates something of a problem from the point of view of migrant assimilation. Which section of the heterogeneous host population may the migrants be conceived as becoming assimilated to? The operational answer for the purposes of this thesis is: each migrant is in the process of adjusting to the attitudes and behaviour patterns of the members of the host population with whom he interacts. It is true that each migrant may interact with a wide range of hosts whose attitudes and behaviour are not identical, and two different migrants may interact with quite dissimilar members of the host population. As a result the learning process involved in assimilation may be dissipated and confused. However, the Australian population of the Ovens Valley area is sufficiently homogeneous for several widely distributed (though not universal) characteristics to be identified, and the attitudes and behaviour patterns which migrants adopt as a result of their interaction with some members of the host society are usually familiar and acceptable to other hosts, even if they are not identical with their own.

The Physical Features of the Ovens Valley Area

The area with which this thesis is concerned comprises the fifty-mile stretch of the Ovens Valley from Bright to Wangaratta, together with the valleys of the tributaries of

---

See Maps I(a) and I(b), pp.55-6 for details of the Ovens Valley area.
Sources: Australian Survey Corps Maps of Wangaratta, Victoria (J.55/2) and of Tallangatta, Victoria (J.55/3), no date.
MAP I(b)

SKETCH MAP OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS WHICH INCLUDE THE OVENS VALLEY AREA

the Ovens River and the valley of the Kiewa River. The most important tributaries of the Ovens in this part of its course are the King River (which joins the Ovens at Wangaratta), and the Buffalo River, Buffalo Creek, Barwidgee Creek, and Happy Valley Creek (all of which join the Ovens at or near Myrtleford).

The Ovens River runs from the Snowy Mountains to join the Murray near Yarrawonga. Upstream the Ovens and its tributaries run through narrow valleys; the hilltops overlook areas of dense woodland, and beyond the shoulders of the hills the ranges of the Snowy Mountains can be seen. As the Ovens approaches Wangaratta, the valley opens out to form a plain, and the river runs across open country to the Murray.

The district is normally a very green part of Australia. Lying on the flanks of the mountains, it has a heavy rainfall, and at the end of the winter the rivers are swollen by melted snow. During the winter, ski slopes on Mount Buffalo (near Bright) and higher ones on Mount Feathertop and Mount Hotham can be reached fairly easily from the Ovens Valley. The Valley itself is comparatively sheltered from the frost, however. During the summer, the Ovens Valley acts as a sun trap, particularly in its lower reaches, where it widens out to form a bowl, sheltered from the wind by the surrounding hills. The area usually has a wet, cold winter and a very hot and humid summer.

The river system provides the clearest definition of the area in which this study is set. Wangaratta and the small towns further upstream are all situated in the river valleys, usually at the junctions of streams. Along the valleys the predominant forms of agriculture are mixed farming, fairly intensive livestock farming (such as dairying), and above all tobacco growing. The hills are mainly given over to grazing (beef cattle) and pine plantations. This thesis is concerned with the residents of the tobacco growing areas.
Most tobacco farms are fairly small. Inspection of the list of Victorian holders of Excise licences to grow tobacco, 1965-66, indicates that the average area per farm planted with tobacco is 23.5 acres. Over half of the 105 tobacco growers interviewed in the course of this study owned or worked on farms on which other forms of farming were carried on alongside tobacco growing, so the average size of a single farm in the Ovens Valley area can be assumed to be rather more than 23.5 acres, but the farms are still small by usual Australian standards. Of the 105 informants, 87 lived on the tobacco farms which they owned, or where they worked. This pattern makes the general appearance of the Ovens Valley area (where so many farms are tobacco growing concerns) that of a densely settled district. Most of the farms lie along the roads that run alongside the rivers. Almost every farm house has a group of tobacco kilns beside it; distinctive tall, narrow structures in corrugated iron. There is often a cluster of sharemen's cottages on the property, making the farm look like a small colony. Every few miles there is a country post office, usually in a farm house, open for only a few hours a day. Near this there is often a hotel, a service station or a general store. There is continuum from isolated post offices (such as that at Eurobin) which have no 'centres' clustered round them to those (such as those at Whorouly and Porepunkah) which are situated in complete hamlets. Whorouly has a primary school and two brick churches as well as a variety of shops. Porepunkah has a motel and a

---

1 This list is summarised in Table I, below p.59.
2 For discussion of the construction of the sample, and of the interview schedules, see below, Appendix I, pp.390-429.
3 A few very modern kilns are low, long, concrete structures, using a different heating method from that of the tall, iron ones.
### TABLE I

**ANALYSIS OF HOLDERS OF EXCISE LICENCES TO GROW TOBACCO, 1965-66,**  
BY AREA PLANTED WITH TOBACCO AND TYPE OF SURNAME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA PLANTED WITH TOBACCO: ACRES</th>
<th>AVERAGE AREA PLANTED WITH TOBACCO: ACRES</th>
<th>NUMBERS OF FARMS</th>
<th>TYPE OF SURNAME OF OWNER(S)</th>
<th><strong>TOTAL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ITALIAN</td>
<td>AUSTRALIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 100</td>
<td>144.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Known Acreage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>233</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown Acreage</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>233</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

service station with a large new restaurant. The largest settlements in the area (apart from the City of Wangaratta) are Bright, Mount Beauty, Myrtleford and Beechworth, which, in 1966, had populations of 747, 1,566, 2,544 and 3,555 respectively.¹ Myrtleford and Beechworth both have State Secondary Schools as well as State Consolidated Primary Schools and Catholic Primary Schools. Bright has a State Secondary School which takes pupils up to Fourth Grade.

The tobacco growing region of the Ovens Valley area is sub-divided by the administrators of the tobacco growers' associations and the Victorian Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board into a number of districts. These districts are: Whorouly and Gapsted (both downstream from Myrtleford); Buffalo River (south of Myrtleford); Myrtleford itself; Ovens (upstream from Myrtleford); Upper Ovens (which includes the Kiewa Valley as well as the area of the Ovens Valley round Bright); Cheshunt (in the King Valley); and Markwood and Wangaratta (both near the City of Wangaratta). There are also still some growers in the Gunbower area in the north of Victoria, and a few in other outlying areas.

These tobacco growing areas do not coincide with the boundaries of the local government areas in the district. Growers in the Whorouly area are in Oxley shire; the Gapsted area includes parts of Oxley, Beechworth and Myrtleford shires; the Myrtleford and Buffalo River areas are both in Myrtleford shire; the Ovens area is in both Myrtleford and Bright shires; and though most of the Upper Ovens area is in Bright shire, some of the growers furthest down the Kiewa Valley are in Yackandandah shire.

Table II¹ illustrates the distribution of tobacco farms in Victoria during the 1965-66 season. Myrtleford, Upper

¹ See Census, 1966.
² See below, p.61.
### TABLE II

**DISTRIBUTION OF TOBACCO FARMS IN VICTORIA, 1965-66, BY AREA AND BY NUMBER OF SHAREFARMERS ON EACH FARM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Number of Farms</th>
<th>Number of sharefarmers per farm</th>
<th>Total number of farms</th>
<th>Average number of sharefarmers per farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markwood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshunt</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Whorouly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gapsted</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Buffalo River</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Myrtleford</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ovens</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Upper Ovens</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer districts and Nathalia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunbower</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1 Only the areas marked '*' are included in the sample survey of tobacco growers carried out in the course of this study; see discussion of the sample below, Appendix I, pp.390-401.

2 These are three farms employing a sharefarming company; see discussion below, Appendix III, pp.473-4.
Ovens and Cheshunt districts had the largest numbers of farms, and Whorouly, Wangaratta and the Outer districts the fewest. The farms in Gunbower, Wangaratta and the Outer districts were generally smaller than those in other areas, having averages of only 1.2, 0.7 and 1.0 sharefarmers each, respectively. The farms in the Buffalo River area were the largest, having an average of 3.7 sharefarmers each. The largest number of sharefarmers on a single farm in 1965-66 was 16.

General History of the Area

The explanation of many of the characteristics of the Ovens Valley area lies in the history of the region as much as in its geography. Today the most noticeable symbol of an important period in the area's history is Beechworth, the only major settlement that is not in a valley. It was established on the plateau between the Ovens and Kiewa Rivers during the Gold Rush of the nineteenth century. It was the administrative centre of the gold fields which surrounded it. At one time it was expected to become the 'capital of the north-east' (that is, of north-east Victoria). The end of the Gold Rush left it without a raison d'être, but it was preserved by government action. A number of State institutions were established there; in particular, the gaol and the mental hospital which serve north-east Victoria. Its population is not expanding as rapidly as those of the other centres in the area, and in general its residents are older than those of the other centres. It was laid out to provide for a much larger population than it has now. It contains many dignified buildings of dressed, golden stone, and various reminders of the Gold Rush and of the years when gold diggers were succeeded by squatters and bush rangers; for Beechworth is in the Ned Kelly country. Now, remote from the increasing prosperity of the Ovens Valley, it tries to attract tourists from the beaten tracks of the valleys up to
its plains to inspect its historic buildings and its museum. Though the town of Beechworth is outside the Ovens Valley area proper, Beechworth shire runs down to the Ovens River, and includes a good deal of tobacco land.

In the mid-nineteenth century, alluvial gold was panned or mined along the Ovens River and in the Buckland Valley as well as in the immediate region of Beechworth. Many small towns in the area (such as Bright) trace their foundation to this period. Some local families trace their origins back to the gold miners, who settled on the land when the Gold Rush ended. For example, one ramifying family near Whorouly is headed by an ex-gold miner, whose grandchildren and great-grandchildren are farming the land now. Many of the gold miners were Chinese. A Chinese cemetery lies neglected in the Buckland Valley. Animosity between the Chinese and the European gold miners was demonstrated by such incidents as the Buckland Riot in the middle of the nineteenth century. The end of the Gold Rush and government action restricting Chinese immigration (by various Colonial restrictive Acts during the nineteenth century, virtually summed up by the Commonwealth Immigration Restriction Act of 1901) reduced the Chinese population of north-east Victoria to almost nil by the mid-1920s, ¹ but a few families in the area can claim descent from Chinese gold miners. One local figure, who died in 1965, was the son of a Chinese gold miner and an Irish woman, and became one of the most successful hop growers in the area. He was also one of the first residents of the area to grow tobacco on a commercial scale. His property (a large tobacco and hop growing enterprise) is now a limited company, still bearing his name.²

² For an outline of the history of the Victorian gold fields and a discussion of the tension between the Chinese and the Europeans during the late nineteenth century, see Miller: Australia: a cursory history, 1966.
After the Gold Rush the area became an agricultural one. By the standards of those days, it was probably fairly heavily populated for a rural area. However, the older residents tell amazing stories of the distances their parents used to travel (often on foot) to attend church services or visit friends. Those who had to travel furthest were the residents of the hill country, upstream from Bright. One woman (herself about 80 years old) had been told how her mother had regularly walked about 30 miles through the night from Freeburgh to Myrtleford to attend Sunday Mass. She had walked in bare feet almost the whole way, so as not to spoil her boots, which she put on just before she reached the church.

In the valleys numerous pioneers set up small, mixed farms when the Gold Rush ended. Many of these settlers came from Ireland, and a large proportion of the rest were Scots. Almost all the remainder were English or Welsh. These origins are reflected in the current religious affiliations of the residents of the area. The descendants of the Northern Irish and the Scottish settlers are almost invariably Presbyterian (and the men among them are often Freemasons). The descendants of the Southern Irish are almost invariably Catholic. The Catholic presbytery in Myrtleford was built in 1880, and at that time the parish extended over an area at least three times its present size. The parish of Bright has been carved out from it in recent years. When Beechworth was in its heyday, a Catholic cathedral was planned for the 'capital of the north-east', but the Gold Rush ended before the building was completed. Only a corner of it was erected, and this is now used as the Catholic parish church for the town.

1 Throughout this thesis, in relation to the Ovens Valley area, the term 'Australian' refers principally to the descendants of these settlers from the British Isles.

2 The religious affiliations of the area are discussed below, Chapter 4, pp.144-61.
The post-Gold Rush population of the area does not seem ever to have consisted completely of subsistence farmers. There were large-scale graziers in the hillier parts of the area, and in the valleys the farmers carried on various small-scale ventures in commercial farming. Some were dairy farmers, providing milk for the larger towns and cream for the butter factory in Myrtleford. At least one property grew tomatoes for the Melbourne market between the two World Wars. There are apple orchards on the hillsides near Beechworth and in the area round Whitfield, and there is a vineyard at Milawa. There are a number of hop gardens; and though hop growing is less important now than it was in the past, it still provides part of the backing for Myrtleford's annual Tobacco and Hops Festival. During the Depression in the 1930s, numbers of unemployed men were put to work by the Forestry Commission planting pines on all the higher slopes of the Ovens Valley, and today there are two saw mills in the Valley to process the timber.

The distribution of the male workforce between different industries in the Ovens Valley area, which is shown in Table III¹ indicates the variation which is to be found in the district. Beechworth town is notable for the large proportion of its male workforce engaged in neither primary production nor manufacturing; this reflects the role of the prison and the mental hospital in providing employment there. The town of Mount Beauty has an even higher proportion of its male workforce engaged in industries other than primary production or manufacturing; generally speaking, these are employees of the State Electricity Commission, which has established a hydro-electric plant at Mount Beauty. Throughout the Ovens Valley area, a small number of people are employed by the Victorian Forestry Department, for much

¹ See below, pp.66-7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government Area</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rural Industry</th>
<th>Forestry</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total in male workforce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta City</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>3,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>2,384</td>
<td>3,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>4,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta Shire</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not including</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta City)</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechworth N.M.¹</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.M.</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.C.²</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechworth Shire</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(less Beechworth Town)</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtleford N.M.</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.M.</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.C.</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
TABLE III (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government Area</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary Industry</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total in male workforce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Industry</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtleford Shire</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(less Myrtleford Town)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright U.C.</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Beauty N.M.</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Shire, 1961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definition (less</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>towns singled out)</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Shire, 1954</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definition (less</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtleford Town)</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxley Shire</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yackandandah Shire</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AREA</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>4,029</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>3,730</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3,928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1 'N.M.' = 'Non-Municipal Town'.
2 'U.C.' = 'Urban Centre'.

of the hilly land has been planted with pines. In addition the pine plantations support two timber mills, which employ people in the 'manufacturing' category. Various factories in the City of Wangaratta (in particular, the two textile mills there) also support large numbers of people in the 'manufacturing' category of the male workforce.

In spite of this diversity, the industry which has had most effect on the recent development of the area is that of tobacco growing.

**History of Tobacco Growing in the Ovens Valley Area**

It is said that the Chinese gold miners grew tobacco in the Ovens Valley area for their own consumption during the second half of the nineteenth century. One Australian tobacco grower (a man in his sixties, whose father had grown tobacco in the area) remembers Chinese sharefarmers being employed to cultivate the crop commercially before the First World War. The same man recounts that when Chinese labour became hard to obtain, his father incurred the disapproval of his neighbours by introducing Italian sharefarmers on his tobacco farm. Traces of both tobacco growing and Italian migration to the area can be found as far back as the nineteenth century, but neither was really important until the 1930s; and both increased phenomenally during the 1950s.

In 1931, the Scullin Government imposed tariffs on imported tobacco, thus encouraging domestic cultivation of the crop. The growers in the Ovens Valley area immediately increased in numbers, but many of the new arrivals (several of them Italian migrants) had to find other employment in the following season, when the tariffs were removed by Scullin's successors. The tobacco growing industry struggled on, though it suffered many reversals because of the Depression. Floods, droughts, frosts and crop diseases also created
difficulties. The most frequent disease, and the one most difficult to control, was the fungus disease known as Blue Mould. Until the 1950s, there were two centres for tobacco growing in Victoria; the Ovens Valley area and the Echuca and Gunbower area in the north of the State. The northern centre is less humid than the Ovens Valley area, and so the crops are less subject to Blue Mould. On the other hand, the Ovens Valley area has a better water supply and good access to the market in Melbourne. When Blue Mould was brought under control by fungicides after the Second World War, the advantages of growing in the Ovens Valley area encouraged the northern growers to move south and by 1965 most of them had done so.

Table IV\(^1\) shows the development of tobacco growing in Victoria since 1850, and Table V\(^2\) illustrates the importance of Victoria-grown tobacco in relation to Australian production as a whole. The development of the industry has been strongly influenced by Government action at both Federal and State levels, and local conditions need to be viewed in the context of this action.

In 1946, the Federal government took fiscal action to encourage the development of the Australian tobacco growing industry. Manufacturers of Australian cigarettes and tobacco were granted a lower rate of duty on imported tobacco leaf provided it was blended with a prescribed minimum percentage of Australian leaf. This minimum percentage has been increased from time to time, as shown in Table VI.\(^3\)

1 See below, p.70.
2 See below, p.71.
3 See below, p.72.
### TABLE IV
**DEVELOPMENT OF THE TOBACCO GROWING INDUSTRY IN VICTORIA SINCE 1850**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Total production cwt. tobacco (dry)</th>
<th>Production per acre cwt. tobacco (dry)</th>
<th>Value £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850-55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-61</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-71</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-81</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>17,333</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-91</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-01</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-11</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-21</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-31</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>11,335</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935-36</td>
<td>5,840</td>
<td>25,706</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-41</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>10,689</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-46</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>3,844</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-51</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>8,138</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>12,329</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>13,142</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>19,237</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-55</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>7,751</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-56</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>10,134</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-57</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>24,470</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>3,252</td>
<td>32,884</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-59</td>
<td>4,248</td>
<td>43,617</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>6,424</td>
<td>66,080</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>9,932</td>
<td>86,854</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>9,286</td>
<td>58,168</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-63</td>
<td>9,844</td>
<td>84,351</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>10,519</td>
<td>129,096</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>9,720</td>
<td>107,855</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>9,230</td>
<td>98,953</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derived from: Victorian Year Books.
### TABLE V

**TOBACCO PRODUCTION IN AUSTRALIA, 1936-7 to 1965-6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>New South Wales</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>South Australia</th>
<th>Western Australia</th>
<th>Tasmania</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average for 3 yrs ended:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938-9</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>1,603</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-9</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-9</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>3,770</td>
<td>5,563</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1</td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td>9,728</td>
<td>15,308</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-2</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>6,515</td>
<td>12,751</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-3</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>9,447</td>
<td>14,787</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-4</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>14,459</td>
<td>17,231</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-5</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>12,080</td>
<td>10,675</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-6</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>11,083</td>
<td>14,580</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derived from: *Official Year Books of the Commonwealth of Australia*
TABLE VI
MINIMUM PERCENTAGE OF AUSTRALIAN GROWN TOBACCO TO BE USED IN AUSTRALIAN MANUFACTURED CIGARETTES AND TOBACCO, 1946-66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Cigarettes</th>
<th>Tobacco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 1946</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1962</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cigarettes and Tobacco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1963</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1964</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased quarterly from April 1965 to January 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Cigarettes and Tobacco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1966</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derived from: Official Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia.

In 1950 the Australian Agricultural Council set up a Standing Advisory Committee on Tobacco. In 1956 this Committee initiated a programme of extension work and research financed jointly by the Commonwealth Government and the tobacco growers. In the 1961-62 season there was a crisis in the tobacco growing industry, due to over-production, and in 1965 the Tobacco Marketing Act was enacted, setting up an Australian Tobacco Board to administer a stabilisation plan. This plan was to operate initially for four years, from the 1965 selling season. It was agreed that there should be an annual quota of 26 million lbs (greenweight) leaf for the whole of Australia, to be divided between the three States still growing tobacco. Queensland was allotted 13 million lbs, Victoria 10.6 million, and New South Wales 2.4 million. This quota was to be sold under an agreed price and grade.
schedule. In the 1966 and 1967 selling seasons, the average minimum price agreed under this scheme was 109.4 cents per lb.¹

In 1965-66, 49 million lb. of cured lead was used in tobacco factories in Australia. Of this, 23 million lb. was produced in Australia, and the rest was imported mainly from the United States of America and from Rhodesia.² The area of land under tobacco in 1965-66 was 9,230 acres (20.1% below the record area established in 1962-3). The total Australian production of dried leaf was 27,361,000 lb. (20.3% below the record established in 1963-64).³

At the State level, the Victorian crop is marketed through the Victorian Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board, which was set up in 1964. The State quota is apportioned between individual growers by a Quota Committee consisting of elected tobacco growers and appointed members of the Victorian Department of Agriculture. The Department also maintains a Tobacco Research Station in the Ovens Valley area (at Ovens), and a sub-station in the tobacco growing area in the north of Victoria (at Gunbower).

Tobacco growers in Australia almost all grow the Hicks variety of tobacco, and the crop is flue-cured before sale. In spite of this uniformity, the leaf produced varies considerably, according to the soil it is planted in and the conditions it encounters during the growing season. Until the

1 The effects of the stabilisation plan in the Ovens Valley area will be discussed below, Chapter 4, pp.179-88.
2 Sales of Australian tobacco in 1966 and in 1967 were favourably affected by the ban on trade with Rhodesia, which followed Rhodesia's declaration of independence from the British Crown in 1965.
3 Commonwealth Government action in relation to the Australian tobacco growing industry is outlined in the Official Year Books of the Commonwealth of Australia.
mid-1950s, the buyers wanted a type of leaf which was produced most easily in the fairly flat land between Wangaratta and Myrtleford. The soil in that area tends to produce a light tobacco. When the tobacco manufacturers and their consumers turned to filter-tipped cigarettes, the growers were asked for a coarser, stronger tobacco, which could be tasted through the filter. This type of leaf is produced most easily upstream from Myrtleford, and the last few years have seen a great expansion of tobacco growing round Bright and Mount Beauty. However, it is difficult to obtain marketing quotas for the new farms commensurate with their size, for each farm's quota is fixed with reference to its production in the years immediately before the introduction of the stabilisation scheme, and many of the new farms were not fully productive then. The upstream farmers, who believe they could sell more tobacco than their quotas allow, tend to oppose the stabilisation scheme. The downstream farmers generally support the scheme, knowing that it guarantees that their crops will be sold in spite of the buyers' preferences.

In spite of the quota system, tobacco growing is declining in the downstream areas of Gapsted, Whorouly, Wangaratta and Markwood. During the period of this study, interviewees in these areas were consciously searching for cash crops to take the place of tobacco. They were taking up market gardening activities such as growing beans and growing flowers for seed companies. They were also experimenting with small scale stock keeping, such as fattening vealers. Most of their farms are too small for large-scale stock activities such as grazing or sheep rearing.

By contrast, upstream, particularly in the Upper Ovens area (which includes the Kiewa Valley), a number of newly established tobacco farms are to be found, and several established dairy farms and graziers have recently taken up
tobacco growing. In these areas tobacco growing is an expanding industry, and dairying is a declining one.

In addition to the movement upstream, there have recently been two other major displacements of the tobacco growing population. First, some growers have come into the Ovens Valley area from the Gunbower region, where production is falling off, and from Western Australia, which stopped producing tobacco in 1963. Second, the Buffalo Dam Scheme has forced several growers to find new land. This Scheme is a major irrigation project, administered by the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission. It involves damming the Buffalo River so that its water may be conserved for the irrigation of the farms in the Ovens and Murray Valleys. The first stage of this dam was completed before this study was begun in 1965, and a number of farms at the head of the river had already been flooded. Several more had been purchased by the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission in preparation for the second, and more ambitious, stage of the scheme. Their owners had received compensation, and most of them had used it to set up new farms elsewhere in the Ovens Valley area, where they were growing tobacco to be sold on quotas calculated on the yield of their former properties. However, the unflooded farms would be usable until the completion of second stage of the Buffalo Dam Scheme (probably about 1970), and the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission leased them to short-term tenants, though they no longer had any quotas attached to them. Some leases were taken up by

1 Following the development of methods of controlling Blue Mould, discussed above, p.69.
2 See Table V, above, p.71.
3 As far as tobacco growers are concerned, at least, this water will not be used for canal irrigation. Each tobacco grower pays a fee for water rights, and pumps water out of the river to spray his crops.
established local tobacco growers, or incomers from the Gunbower area, who could sell the tobacco grown on this exceptionally good land on the quotas from their other farms. Others were taken up by incomers from Western Australia who hoped to persuade the Quota Committee to grant them additional quotas eventually.

Some Effects of the Development of Tobacco Growing in the Ovens Valley Area

The development of the tobacco growing industry had a marked effect on the size and the composition of the population of the Ovens Valley area, particularly after the 1950s. However, this effect is somewhat muffled in the Census figures for the Local Government Areas concerned, because the tobacco growing region is not co-terminous with the Local Government Areas which are represented in the Ovens Valley Area. The City of Wangaratta, the urban centres of Beechworth, Myrtleford, Mount Beauty and Bright, and the shires of Beechworth, Bright, Myrtleford, Oxley, Wangaratta and Yackandandah all include some tobacco growing land, and varying amounts of other kinds of land as well. The rivers and streams of the area are often the boundaries of Local

---

1 These did not have quotas from their former farms, as incomers from the Gunbower area did, since Western Australia stopped growing tobacco before the stabilisation scheme was introduced.

2 In 1966, the Census substituted the category 'urban centre' for that of 'non-municipal town' which had been used in previous Censuses. In the Ovens Valley area, only the former non-municipal town of Myrtleford and the rest of Myrtleford shire are affected by this change. In 1961, the total population of Myrtleford non-municipal town was 2,123; according to the new definition, the total population of the urban centre in that year would have been 2,163, an increase of 1.9%. Correspondingly the population of the rest of the shire in 1961 would have comprised 40 fewer individuals if the 1966 definition had been used, a decrease of 2.4%. See details in Table VII, below, pp.77-8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Murrindindi Shire:</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Murrindindi</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Municipal Town</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Centre</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Myrtleford Shire:</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Myrtleford</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Municipal Town</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Centre</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bright Shire:</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Bright</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Municipal Town</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Centre</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brighton Shire:</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Brighton</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Municipal Town</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Centre</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brighton Shire:</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Brighton</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Municipal Town</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Centre</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brighton Shire:</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Brighton</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Municipal Town</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Centre</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brighton Shire:</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Brighton</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Municipal Town</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Centre</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brighton Shire:</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Brighton</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Municipal Town</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Centre</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brighton Shire:</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Brighton</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Municipal Town</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Centre</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brighton Shire:</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Brighton</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Municipal Town</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Centre</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brighton Shire:</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Brighton</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Municipal Town</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Centre</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brighton Shire:</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Brighton</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Municipal Town</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Centre</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brighton Shire:</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Brighton</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Municipal Town</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Centre</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brighton Shire:</strong></td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Brighton</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
<td>coerce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VII (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government Area</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Population as percentage of that of 1961</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bright Shire (less Myrtleford Town): 1954 definition</td>
<td>6,522</td>
<td>5,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Corrected for 1966)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxley Shire</td>
<td>4,393</td>
<td>5,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yackandandah Shire</td>
<td>3,131</td>
<td>3,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AREA</td>
<td>32,983</td>
<td>37,192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1 The category of 'urban centre' was substituted for that of 'non-municipal town' in 1966; in this table, the 1961 figures are given according to both 1961 and 1966 definitions.

2 In 1954, Bright Shire comprised what had become, by 1961, Myrtleford and Bright Shires, and the non-municipal towns (later urban centres) of Bright and Mount Beauty.
Government Areas, and tobacco is usually grown on both sides of these boundaries; at the same time, each shire includes areas of hilly country which are unsuitable for growing tobacco. In spite of the inevitable distortion, however, the Census figures do demonstrate some of the changes that have taken place in the area. For example, Table VII\(^1\) demonstrates the way in which the population of the area increased between 1954 and 1966.

The most dramatic increase in population is that of the non-municipal town, or urban centre, of Myrtleford, which is the centre of the tobacco growing area. Its population increased by 38.0% between 1954 and 1961,\(^2\) and 17.6% between 1961 and 1966.\(^3\) Wangaratta City showed almost as great a proportional increase, but this was due to industrial development in the city rather than to tobacco growing on its outskirts. The shires in which there is most tobacco growing (Oxley, Myrtleford and Bright) have shown the greatest increases in population, whereas the parts of the district in which there is least tobacco growing (the shires of Wangaratta, Beechworth and Yackandandah) have declined in population. Incidentally, the shire of Oxley, which lies between Myrtleford and Wangaratta, increased its population at a much slower rate between 1961 and 1966 than between 1954 and 1961, reflecting the shift of the tobacco growing industry towards upstream land such as that in the shire of Bright. Bright shire itself actually decreased in population between 1954 and 1961, but increased between 1961 and 1966 (according to the 1954 definition of the shire).

---

\(^{1}\) See above, pp. 77-8.

\(^{2}\) That is, the population of the 'non-municipal town'; see above, p. 76, fn. 2.

\(^{3}\) That is, the population of the 'urban centre'; see above, p. 76, fn. 2.
The altered definition of the shire of Bright in the 1961 Census is another indication of the effect of the tobacco growing industry on the area. In 1961, the area that had been the shire of Bright was divided into the shire of Bright and the shire of Myrtleford. In the same year, Mount Beauty was singled out as a non-municipal town for the first time, and in 1966 both Mount Beauty and Bright were singled out as urban centres. The new shire of Myrtleford is somewhat resented by its neighbours, and in 1966 there were still a number of unsettled boundary disputes between it and the older shires.

The prosperity of the Ovens Valley area has led to its pattern of population increase being slightly different from that of Victoria as a whole. Table VIII compares the increase in the population of the area between 1961 and 1966 with the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Victoria</th>
<th>North-East Victoria</th>
<th>Ovens Valley Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>+13.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Urban</td>
<td>+10.8</td>
<td>+8.0</td>
<td>+8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>+9.8</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
<td>+5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

increase for the State as a whole and for the North-East Statistical Division of Victoria. In the Ovens Valley area there has been a slight increase in the rural population, though there was a fall in the rural population of the State as a whole; while the urban population of the Ovens Valley area has increased rather less than the urban population of Victoria as a whole. Overall, the population of the Ovens Valley area has increased faster than that of the statistical division of North-East Victoria which includes the Ovens Valley area; but it has not increased as fast as the population of the whole State. The increase in population in Victoria has been mainly an increase in the metropolitan population, and there are no metropolitan centres in either the Ovens Valley itself or the North-East Statistical Division.

The direct influence of the tobacco growing industry on the increase in the population of the Ovens Valley area was more marked between 1954 and 1961 than it was between 1961 and 1966. Between 1954 and 1961, the number of men employed in the category of 'rural industries' (which includes farming of all kinds) increased both absolutely and as a percentage of the total male workforce. This increase was entirely an increase in the 'agriculture and mixed farming' sub-division of the 'rural industry' category; that is, the sub-division which includes tobacco growing. Between 1954 and 1961 this sub-division increased its share of the total male workforce from 12.9% to 18.4%.\(^1\) Over the same period the percentage of the male workforce engaged in the 'grazing' sub-division of 'rural industries' remained stationary at 5.0%, and the percentage engaged in the remaining sub-division of 'dairying, pig and poultry farming and beekeeping' fell

\(^1\) See Table III, above, pp.66-7.
from 15.5% to 13.1%. Comparable figures are not yet available for 1966.  

It is likely that the fall in the numbers of men engaged in rural industries between 1961 and 1966 is largely due to a continuation of the fall in the numbers of men engaged in dairying and allied occupations. In 1966 the butter factory in Myrtleford closed, leaving Wangaratta as the nearest processing centre for the products of dairy farms in the Ovens Valley area. During the period of this study dairying firms were increasingly reluctant to freight the products of dairy farms over long distances for processing. However, the numbers of men employed in tobacco growing may also have fallen slightly, as over-production difficulties and the introduction of the tobacco stabilisation scheme braked the expansion of the tobacco growing industry.

The slight fall in the numbers of men engaged in rural industries between 1961 and 1966 is offset by an increase in the numbers engaged in manufacturing and other occupations. It seems that the prosperity of the area is such as to attract increasing numbers of people to service trades of various kinds (particularly in the City of Wangaratta and the town of Myrtleford) although the agricultural base of the area is no longer expanding.

Some General Demographic Characteristics of the Ovens Valley Area

The increase in prosperity in the area between 1954 and 1961, and the continuing but slower increase between 1961 and 1966, are reflected in some general demographic measures of the population. In general it appears to be a young and fertile population.

---

2 That is, up to May 1970.
The marriage ratios\(^1\) for both men and women in the Ovens Valley area went up between 1954 and 1961, and fell slightly between 1961 and 1966. In 1954 the ratios were 65.9 and 76.7 for men and women, respectively; in 1961 they were 66.2 and 77.8; and in 1966 they were 61.2 and 65.0. The last figures can be compared with those of 64.1 for men, and 62.9 for women, in the whole State of Victoria in 1966. The lower proportion of married men and the higher proportion of married women in the population of the Ovens Valley area, compared with the State as a whole, is probably related to the difference between the masculinity ratios of the State and of the Ovens Valley area in 1966. The masculinity ratio for the State was 100.5 compared with 106.1 for the Ovens Valley area. Like other demographic indices, the marriage ratios suggest that the Ovens Valley area was very prosperous between 1954 and 1961, and that the rate of growth slowed considerably between 1961 and 1966, though it still continued.

A similar pattern is shown by the age distribution of the population in 1954, 1961 and 1966. Table IX\(^2\) shows that the proportion of the population under 15 years of age rose from 31.7% in 1954 to 33.3% in 1961, but fell to 32.5% in 1966. This compares with 29.2% of the population of Victoria as a whole which was under 15 years of age in 1966. The high proportion of children in the population can be related to the rural nature of most of the area\(^3\) and to the special conditions of tobacco growing which make it fairly

\(^1\) That is, the number of currently married men or women expressed as a percentage of the number of men or women over 15 years of age in the population.

\(^2\) See below, pp.84-5.

\(^3\) In fact, in 1966 the proportion of children under 15 in the population of the Ovens Valley area was slightly lower than that of non-metropolitan Victoria, which was 32.7%; see Table X, below, p.87.
### Table IX

**Age Distribution of the Population of the Local Government Areas Which Include the Ovens Valley Area, 1954, 1961 and 1966**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>AGE IN YEARS</th>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>15-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta City</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta Shire</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not including Wangaratta City)</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechworth N.M.</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.M.</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.C.</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechworth Shire</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(less Beechworth town)</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtleford N.M.</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.M.</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.C.</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>AGE IN YEARS</th>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>15-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtleford Shire (less Myrtleford Town)</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright U.C.</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Beauty N.M. U.C.</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Shire, 1961 definition (less towns singled out)</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Shire, 1954 definition (less Myrtleford Town)</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxley Shire</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yackandandah Shire</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AREA</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1 'N.M.' = 'non-municipal town'.
2 'U.C.' = 'urban centre'.
easy for members of the workforce to provide for comparatively large families.¹

A further indication of the demographic nature of the area is the fertility ratio.² In 1954 this was 62.2, and in 1961 it had fallen very slightly to 61.6. In 1966 it fell still further, to 56.9. This was still considerably higher than the ratio for the whole of Victoria, which was 48.2 in 1966.³

In spite of the slight rise in the proportion of children under 15 in the population of the Ovens Valley area between 1954 and 1961, the dependency ratio⁴ for the area declined from 199.4 in 1954 to 169.0 in 1961. In 1966 it declined still further, to 156.9, but between 1961 and 1966, the proportion of children under 15 in the population also declined. The dependency ratio for Victoria as a whole was 133.8 in 1966. It seems that the rather high proportion of children under the age of 15 in the Ovens Valley area was the factor that kept the dependency ratio high, for the percentage of the population over working age⁵ in 1966 was comparatively low.⁶

¹ Conditions of life on tobacco farms will be discussed in Chapter 4, below, pp.176-8; and the family life of tobacco growers in Chapter 6, below, pp.279-333.
² That is, the number of children under 5 years of age expressed as a percentage of the number of women between 15 and 44 years of age in the population.
³ In 1966 the fertility ratio for the Ovens Valley area was less than that of non-metropolitan Victoria which was 57.4%; see Table X, below, p.87.
⁴ That is, the population not in the workforce expressed as a proportion of the workforce.
⁵ That is, the percentage of the population composed of males of 65 years of age and over and of females of 60 years of age and over.
⁶ See Table X, below, p.87.
TABLE X
COMPARISON OF SOME CENSUS FIGURES RELATING TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS WHICH INCLUDE THE
OVENS VALLEY AREA WITH THOSE FOR VICTORIA AS A WHOLE, 1961 AND 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Wangaratta City</th>
<th>Ovens Valley Area, other than Wangaratta City</th>
<th>Total Ovens Valley Area</th>
<th>Victoria (other than metropolitan)</th>
<th>Total Victoria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of population over working age</strong></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of population under 15</strong></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependency ratio</strong></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>165.5</td>
<td>170.1</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td>168.6</td>
<td>142.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>151.7</td>
<td>160.2</td>
<td>156.9</td>
<td>157.9</td>
<td>133.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculinity ratio</strong></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>112.2</td>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>101.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>110.7</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>100.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Working ratio</strong></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>103.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female working ratio</strong></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male marriage ratio</strong></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female marriage ratio</strong></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fertility ratio</strong></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The male working ratio\(^1\) in the Ovens Valley area was 94.7 in 1961 and 90.4 in 1966, compared with a ratio of 93.2 for Victoria as a whole in 1966.\(^2\) The metropolis affects the State figure to a remarkable extent. For Victoria less the metropolitan area, the ratio was 93.7 in 1966. The female working ratio\(^3\) in the Ovens Valley area was 29.7 in 1961 and 40.0 in 1966. The figure for the State was 46.4 in 1966, and for Victoria less the metropolitan area it was 38.4. These figures reflect the lack of opportunity for paid employment for women outside the metropolitan area. In the Ovens Valley area, women are only employed in any numbers in Wangaratta City, where there are textile mills. Even there the working ratio for women was only 45.2 in 1966. The wives of tobacco growers often work on the farms with their husbands, at least for part of the year; but this work is not recorded in the Census figures of working women.\(^4\)

When the Census figures for the Ovens Valley area are systematically compared with those for Victoria as a whole,\(^5\) a pattern emerges which suggests that this part of Victoria differs in some respects from the rest of non-metropolitan Victoria.

\(^1\) That is, the number of men in the workforce expressed as a percentage of the number of men between 15 and 64 years of age in the population.

\(^2\) For all figures in this paragraph, see Table X, above, p.87.

\(^3\) That is, the number of women in the workforce expressed as a percentage of the number of women between 15 and 59 years of age in the population.

\(^4\) Work on the farms, and the division of labour between men and women amongst Italians and Australians is discussed below, Chapter 4, pp.166-75, and Chapter 6, pp.305-9.

\(^5\) See Table X, above, p.87.
Tobacco growers have a distinctive style of life which affects the demographic characteristics of the Ovens Valley area as a whole. They are generally married, and live on the farms where they work; often they have young families.\(^1\) They have low masculinity ratios, high dependency ratios and a high percentage of children under 15 in their population.

The demographic structure of the Ovens Valley area is also affected by the religious composition of the population. In 1966, 34.0% of the population of the Ovens Valley area was Catholic, compared with 27.6% of the population of Victoria as a whole.\(^2\) Day has pointed out that in Australia, as in most other countries, rural dwellers have more children than city dwellers, and Catholics more than non-Catholics.\(^3\) Since the Ovens Valley area is a predominantly rural district, with a higher proportion of Catholics in its population than that in the population of the State as a whole, it may be expected to have comparatively high fertility ratios.\(^4\)

**Italian Migrants in the Ovens Valley Area**

The increasing prosperity of the tobacco growing industry in the Ovens Valley area has attracted large numbers of migrants, and the majority of the migrants are Italian.

The influx of migrants has been encouraged by the fact that tobacco is a labour-intensive crop. According to the

---

\(^1\) See discussion of the demographic characteristics of the sample of tobacco growers, below, Appendix I, pp.397-401.

\(^2\) The figures given in this paragraph are derived from Census, 1966.


\(^4\) However, see the discussion of the fertility of the wives of tobacco growers in the sample, below, Chapter 6, pp.300-5.
Victorian Year Book, each acre of tobacco is estimated to absorb five or six hundred man-hours during the growing season. One man can handle about seven acres of tobacco while it is growing, but requires extra assistance at peak periods such as transplanting and harvesting.\(^1\) In Victoria, the Year Book reports, the bulk of the necessary labour is provided by sharefarmers, and 'only in rare instances is hired labour the sole productive force'.\(^2\)

The labour involved in growing tobacco is often hard and unpleasant, and in spite of the very good returns which a sharefarmer can obtain in a good season only the less privileged sections of the workforce normally think of becoming tobacco sharefarmers. The necessary labour force has been mainly recruited from migrants, and in particular from Italians. By the time this study was undertaken, there were many Australian-born adults of Italian origin in the area, in addition to the Italian-born residents. A complex settlement of people from various parts of Italy, together with their Australian-born children, had developed at the side of the long-established Australian settlement in the area; and both were being joined by newer settlements composed of people of various other ethnic origins.

Table XI\(^3\) shows the types of surnames of all tobacco growers (owners as well as sharefarmers) in Victoria, according to the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board List of 1965-66.

---

1 The tobacco growing agricultural year is outlined below, Chapter 4, pp.166-75.
3 See below, p.91.
This table shows that 460 (or 53.5%) of the 860 sharefarmers had Italian-sounding surnames.

**TABLE XI**

**TYPE OF SURNAMES OF ALL OWNERS AND SHAREFARMERS OF TOBACCO FARMS IN VICTORIA, (MALES AND FEMALES), 1965-66**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SURNAME</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GROWERS</th>
<th>OWNERS AND SHAREFARMERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>Sharefarmers</td>
<td>Owners and Sharefarmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>638&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>45&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


However, it appears that the proportion of Italians in the tobacco growing population declined between 1961 and 1966. Even if all the growers whose origin is unknown were of Italian origin, the percentage of all tobacco growers of Italian origin in 1965-66, as shown in Table XI would only be 65.8% of the total. This is considerably less than the percentage of Italian-born males amongst the Victorian tobacco growers, as shown by analysis of the 1961 Census, given in Table XII,<sup>2</sup> although in absolute numbers it represents 874 (or, at the most, 1,016) persons, compared with 793 in 1961. The discrepancy is more remarkable still in that the

---

<sup>1</sup>The total number of owners shown in this Table is not equal to the number of farms shown in Table II above, p.61 and Tables XIV and XXV below, pp.96 and 167,because a number of farms have two or more owners each.

<sup>2</sup>See below, p.92.
### TABLE XII

MALE TOBACCO GROWERS IN VICTORIA IN 1961, ACCORDING TO BIRTHPLACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Number of growers</th>
<th>Number of growers as percentage of total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Foreign</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Foreign</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derived from: Australian National University Occupational Analysis of the 1961 Census Data

1965-66 figure includes people born in Australia of Italian origin, as well as those of Italian birth. It may be accounted for, however, if it is remembered that: (i) the list of registered tobacco growers does not include all the tobacco growers in Victoria (it includes farm owners and sharefarmers, but not casual labourers or people on day wages); (ii) people on the list with obviously Italian surnames do not include all the people of Italian birth on the list (some tobacco growers have Slavonic, German, French or Spanish surnames because they were born in parts of Italy where one or another of these influences is strong); and (iii) the size and composition of the tobacco growing population of Victoria changed considerably between 1961 and 1966. Between the two Census years, large numbers of Greek, Yugoslavian and Spanish migrants joined the Italians in the tobacco growing industry, and so reduced the percentage of Italian-born growers, and of Italian-born residents of the Ovens Valley area as a whole, though the numbers of Italians...
in the area have not declined in absolute terms. Table XIII\(^1\) shows the changes that have taken place in the ethnic composition of the population of the Ovens Valley area over the three Census years of 1954, 1961 and 1966.

Once established, migrant settlements attracted more migrants, partly by chain migration,\(^2\) and partly by attracting migrants from Melbourne and from the migrant camp at Bonegilla (which is about 50 miles by road from Wangaratta). Many migrants made their first contact with the area as casual labour hired for hop or tobacco picking. In the last few years the Ovens Valley area has attracted large numbers of migrants from parts of Italy that were not represented in the area before, and from countries such as Yugoslavia and Spain.

Many of the migrants who first entered the tobacco growing industry as sharefarmers later bought farms of their own with the profits they made. Seventy-one of the 80 men of Italian origin in the sample were or had been sharefarmers, and 25 of these were owners or part-owners of farms when they were interviewed.

Table XIV\(^3\) shows that out of a total of 398 tobacco farms in Victoria in 1965-66, 223 (that is, 56.0%) were owned by people with Italian sounding surnames. Table I\(^4\) shows that out of a total of 425 Excise licences to grow tobacco issued in 1965-66, 233 (or 54.8%) were issued to farm owners with Italian sounding surnames.\(^5\) Calculations from this table

---

1. See below, pp.94-5.
2. See discussion of chain migration, below, pp.120-6.
3. See below, p.96.
4. See above, p.59.
5. The total number of licences, the total number of farms, and the total number of farm owners do not coincide because (a) many farm owners who were not growing tobacco in 1965-66 still had licences; and (b) many farms had two or more owners.
### TABLE XIII
TOTAL POPULATION OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS WHICH INCLUDE THE OVENS VALLEY AREA, IN 1954, 1961 AND 1966, ACCORDING TO PLACE OF BIRTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>Population as percentage of 1961 figure</th>
<th>Population as percentage of total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>28,765</td>
<td>31,568</td>
<td>33,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Australasia</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom and Eire</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>1,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td>2,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europe</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>Population as percentage of 1961 figure</th>
<th>Population as percentage of total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Europe plus Spain</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Europe</td>
<td>4,001</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>5,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other than Europe or Australasia</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POPULATION</td>
<td>32,983</td>
<td>37,192</td>
<td>39,211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XIV

**DISTRIBUTION OF TOBACCO FARMS IN VICTORIA, 1965-66, BY AREA AND BY TYPE OF SURNAME OF OWNER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Number of farms</th>
<th>Farms owned by growers with Italian-sounding surnames as a percentage of the total number of farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of surname of owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markwood</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshunt</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Whorouly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gapsted</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Buffalo River</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Myrtleford</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ovens</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Upper Ovens</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer districts and Nathalia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunbower</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1 Only the areas marked '*' are included in the sample survey of tobacco growers carried out in the course of this study; see discussion of the sample below, Appendix I, pp.390-401.

2 These names are mainly of British origin, but a few might be German.

3 This figure includes two farms maintained by the Victorian Department of Agriculture for research purposes.
suggest that if each owner actually grew just as much tobacco as his licence would allow, owners of Italian origin grew 49.8% of the total acreage of tobacco in Victoria in 1965-66. In fact, by 1966 the proportion of owners of Italian origin was even higher than the proportion of sharemen of Italian origin. Table XI shows that in 1965-66, 414 out of 683 farm owners (that is, 66.1%) had Italian sounding surnames, compared with 460 out of 860 sharefarmers (that is, 53.5%). All in all, owners of Italian origin appear to own over half the tobacco farms, to hold over half the licences to grow tobacco, and to grow nearly half the acreage of tobacco in Victoria.

Table XV shows that of the men of Italian birth interviewed, those who arrived in the Ovens Valley area earliest were the most likely to have become farm-owners by 1966-67, when the interviews were carried out.

Table I demonstrates that at the time of this study people of Italian origin were to be found in all strata of tobacco farm owners, from the owners of farms of under 10 acres to those of farms of over 80 acres. In 1966, during

---

1. See above, p.91.
2. In these calculations, people who are both owners and sharefarmers have been counted as owners, therefore there are 377 + 37 (= 414) Italian named owners, and 638 + 45 (= 683) owners in total.
3. See below, p.98.
4. Of the 42 informants who arrived in the area after 1955, 9.5% had become farm-owners by 1966-67, compared with 71.0% of the 31 migrants who arrived in the area before that date. The difference between these two percentages is statistically significant at the 0.1% level.
5. See above, p.59.
TABLE XV

DISTRIBUTION OF ITALIAN-BORN FARM OWNERS AND NON-FARM OWNERS IN THE SAMPLE BY DATE OF ARRIVAL IN THE OVENS VALLEY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of arrival in the Ovens Valley area</th>
<th>Non-farm Owners</th>
<th>Farm Owners</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrived Pre-World War II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrived 1947-54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrived 1955-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derived from: Sample survey of tobacco growers; see Appendix I, below, pp.390-401.

In the period of this study, one Italian sharefarmer bought one of the two 100-acre farms in the area. He was apparently the first Italian in the area to grow tobacco on this scale.

Table XVI\(^1\) shows the distribution of tobacco growers (owners and sharefarmers) in different parts of Victoria in 1965-66, according to type of surname. Only in the Gapsted area are growers of Italian origin outnumbered by growers of Australian origin,\(^2\) and even here the Australians are in a minority compared with all growers of foreign origin.

The Italians and other migrants in the Ovens Valley area are not exclusively associated with tobacco growing, however. A number of migrant tobacco growers, having done well out of the industry, have sold out and transferred their capital to other enterprises. At least two of the cafes and two of the

---

\(^1\) See below, p.99.

\(^2\) The probable reason for this is discussed below, pp.142-3.
TABLE XVI

DISTRIBUTION OF TOBACCO GROWERS (OWNERS AND SHAREFARMERS) IN VICTORIA, 1965-66, BY AREA AND TYPE OF SURNAME (MALES ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA 1</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GROWERS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of growers in area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markwood</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshunt</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Whorouly</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gapsted</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Buffalo River</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Myrtleford</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ovens</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Upper Ovens</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Districts and Nathalia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunbower</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1 Only the areas marked '*' are included in the sample survey of tobacco growers carried out in the course of this study; see discussion of the sample below, Appendix I, pp.390-401.
petrol stations in Myrtleford, as well as the film theatre there, have been financed with money from tobacco growing; and the names associated with these enterprises are all Italian ones.

In addition to Italian firms founded on capital acquired by tobacco growing, there are a few other local enterprises which are owned by Italians or which use Italian labour. Several retail shops (selling for example clothes or groceries) are Italian-owned; and so are several building contracting firms. Employers such as bush clearing contractors who require unskilled labour are often the first employers of Italians arriving in the area, and many Italians take up this kind of employment while waiting for openings as tobacco sharemen.

The Effects of Migrants on the Demographic Characteristics of the Area

Table XVII summarises the composition of the population of the various local government areas in the Ovens Valley region. It shows that between 1954 and 1961 the Italian-born residents of the area increased their proportional share in the population as a whole by nearly two-thirds. By 1961 they were the largest single category of foreign-born residents in the area. The proportions of Italian-born residents increased particularly in the shires of Wangaratta, Oxley, Beechworth and Bright. The town of Myrtleford had the highest percentage of Italian-born residents of any town in the area, and this percentage also showed a marked increase between 1954 and 1961. There were no such increases in the Italian-born population between 1961 and 1966, although it continued to be the largest single foreign-born category in

---

1 See below, pp.101-2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA</th>
<th>1954 United Kingdom &amp; Eire</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1954 Other</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1954 Foreign</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1954 Australia</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL 1954</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>1961 United Kingdom &amp; Eire</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1961 Other</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1961 Foreign</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1961 Australia</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>TOTAL 1961</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Table XVII continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PLACE OF BIRTH</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United Kingdom &amp; Eire</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Other Europe</td>
<td>Other Foreign</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtleford Shire (less Myrtleford Town)</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright U.C.</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Beauty N.M. U.C.</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Shire, 1961 definition (less towns singled out)</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Shire, 1954 definition (less Myrtleford town)</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxley Shire</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yackandandah Shire</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AREA</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1 'N.M.' = 'non-municipal town'. 2 'U.C.' = 'urban centre'.

TABLE XVII (continued)
the area. In both 1961 and 1966 the part of the area with the highest proportion of Italian-born residents was the shire of Myrtleford.

The areas in which the Italian-born population increased most between 1954 and 1961 are also the areas in which the proportion of European-born (other than Italian- or British-born) increased most, with the exception of the City of Wangaratta, where the proportions of British- and Italian-born declined but the proportion of 'other European'-born increased. In many instances the proportion of 'other European'-born continued to increase between 1961 and 1966, while that of Italian-born declined. For the area as a whole, the Italian-born share in the total foreign-born population rose from 28.9% in 1954 to 41.1% in 1961 (mainly at the expense of the British-born, whose share fell from 32.8% in 1954 to 22.5% in 1961); but the Italian-born share in the foreign-born population fell to 38.7% in 1966 (while the British-born share continued to fall and the difference was made up by the 'other European'-born, whose share increased from 34.4% in 1961 to 37.4% in 1966). The increasing importance of 'other European'-born residents in the area, although the Italian-born remain the largest single category of migrants, is also shown in Table XIII.¹

The total population of the local government areas which include the Ovens Valley region increased by 12.8% between 1954 and 1961, and again by 5.4% between 1961 and 1966.² Foreign-born residents of the area comprised 12.8% of the total population in 1954, 15.1% in 1961 and 15.5% in 1966. Between 1954 and 1961, the increase in the foreign-born

¹ See above, pp.94-5.
² The figures given in this paragraph are all derived from those shown above, in Table VII, pp.77-8 and Table XVII, pp.101-2.
population represented 33.2% of the overall increase in population. The parts of the Ovens Valley where most tobacco-growing is carried on had the largest increases in their foreign-born populations. The town with the largest increase in its foreign-born population was Myrtleford, the centre of the tobacco-growing region, where the increase in foreign-born residents represented 29.9% of the total increase in population. Between 1961 and 1966, the increase in the foreign-born population in the Ovens Valley area as a whole was only 2.5% of the total increase in population, and it seems that migration was a less important demographic factor in the area over that period than it had been earlier.

Table XVIII analyses the foreign-born population of the area in 1966 according to length of residence in Australia. The areas in which most tobacco is grown (the shires of Bright, Myrtleford and Oxley) stand out as having the highest proportions of new arrivals in their foreign-born populations. At the same time, many areas (for example, the town of Myrtleford) have both a high proportion of new arrivals and a high proportion of long standing residents in Australia amongst their foreign-born populations.

Comparison of the 1966 figures for length of residence in Australia with those of earlier Censuses indicates that there has been some movement of the foreign-born population out of the Ovens Valley area, as well as into it. In 1954, 2,933 residents of the area were stated to have arrived in Australia since 1947. In 1961, 2,150 residents of the Ovens Valley area were stated to have arrived in Australia between 1947 and 1953 but the migrant population as a whole only increased from 4,227 people in 1954 to 5,624 in 1961. There was a nett loss of 783 people. In 1966, 1,789 residents of

---

1 See below, p.105.
TABLE XVIII

DISTRIBUTION OF THE MIGRANT POPULATION OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS WHICH INCLUDE THE OVENS VALLEY AREA, 1966, BY PERIOD OF RESIDENCE IN AUSTRALIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA</th>
<th>PERIOD OF RESIDENCE IN AUSTRALIA</th>
<th>TOTAL MIGRANT POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 7 yrs</td>
<td>7-11 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechworth U.C. ¹</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechworth R. ²</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright U.C.</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Beauty U.C.</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright R.</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtleford U.C.</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtleford R.</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxley R.</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta City</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta R.</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yackandandah R.</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AREA</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


¹ 'U.C.' = 'urban centre'.

² 'R' = 'rural'; the shire less any urban centres contained in it.
the Ovens Valley area were stated to have arrived in Australia between 1947 and 1953, although the total foreign-born population of the area only increased to 6,125 in 1966. There had been a further nett loss of 361 persons.\(^1\) Losses of this magnitude are unlikely to be due entirely to deaths within the migrant population, for the migrants in the area are comparatively young.

Although, as Table XVIII shows,\(^2\) a high proportion of the foreign-born residents of the Ovens Valley area have been in Australia for over seven years, most of the foreign-born residents of the area have retained their original nationalities. Table XIX\(^3\) shows the naturalisation ratios\(^4\) of the major non-British migrant groups in the area. These are only crude indicators of the attitudes of the migrants in question towards Australia, however. Zubrzycki has pointed out that naturalisation ratios do not seem to be directly related to the degree of participation in Australian life.\(^5\)

Incidentally, the figures shown here are strikingly different from those given by Zubrzycki for a sample of migrants in the Latrobe Valley area in 1960-61,\(^6\) but Zubrzycki considered only


\(^2\) See above, p.105.

\(^3\) See below, p.107.

\(^4\) The naturalisation ratios were calculated as follows:

\[
\frac{\text{number of people born in 'x' country} - \text{number of people of 'x' nationality}}{\text{number of people born in 'x' country}} \times 100
\]

The fewer people there are of a given nationality, and the more who have adopted Australian nationality, the higher the naturalisation ratio should be.


\(^6\) Zubrzycki found that 45% of the eligible migrants in his sample had been naturalised; 64% of the Dutch-born; 20% of the German-born; 50% of the Greek- and Italian-born (taken as a single group); 25% of the Polish-born; and 52% of the Yugoslavian-born: see Zubrzycki: Settlers in the Latrobe Valley, 1964, p.157.
### TABLE XIX


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Naturalisation Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain(^1)</td>
<td>no figures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


those migrants eligible for naturalisation whereas these figures (derived from the Census) make no distinction between migrants who have been in Australia long enough to be eligible for naturalisation and those who have not. In addition, Zubrzycki's sample consisted only of adults, and the Census figures used here include the entire population, of all ages.

Comparison of the masculinity ratios\(^2\) of different parts of the migrant population (shown in Table XX\(^3\)) at different times is a better indication of the degree to which the migrant population settled down in the area after 1954 than

---

\(^1\) The ratio for Spain in 1961 is misleading, since there were only 13 individuals of Spanish birth in the area at that date.

\(^2\) That is, the male population expressed as a percentage of the corresponding female population.

\(^3\) See below, p.108.
TABLE XX


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Masculinity Ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>189.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Europe (including Italy)</td>
<td>154.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Foreign (including Europe)</td>
<td>153.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>102.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>108.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


comparison of the naturalisation ratios. The fall to a ratio of 134.5 amongst the Italian-born, and 130.5 amongst the foreign-born as a whole, by 1966 shows how many of the single migrants or grass widowers who came to the area alone had been joined by their wives and families by the last Census.

Some Characteristics of the Italian Migrants of the Ovens Valley Area

The Italians of the Ovens Valley area definitely fall into the category of voluntary migrants. 1 Of the 73 migrants interviewed 56 said they had come to Australia in order to improve their economic prospects, or in order to join their families or their relatives. Only 2 informants gave might be regarded as a political reason for their migration: that

---

1

See comments on refugee migrants in Martin: Refugee Settlers, 1965; and in Zubrzycki: 'Naturalization and the Immigrant', 1967.
there were no signori in Australia to impede the advancement of men who wanted to make good. Even this observation carried stronger economic overtones than political ones.  

Usually the migrants in the sample were clearer about their reasons for choosing Australia rather than any other country than about their reasons for migrating at all. Of the 73 migrants interviewed 14 came to Australia because it was easier to obtain a visa for this country than (for example) for the United States; 47 came to Australia because they already had relatives here who encouraged them to migrate and acted as sponsors for them.  

Most of the Italian-born informants in the sample expressed themselves satisfied with life in Australia. Only 4 out of the 73 migrants interviewed said they were less than satisfied; 7 were undecided or indifferent, indicating they were at least as satisfied with life in Australia as they had been with life in Italy. The majority (53) stated that they intended to remain in Australia indefinitely or for the rest of their lives. Of the rest, 3 certainly intended to remain for at least a few more years, and 7 were undecided but would probably remain; 6 were unable to say what their plans were, but only 3 thought they would probably return to Italy soon and only one had definite plans to return in the near future. The migrants interviewed in this survey were the more settled and economically successful members of the Italian population.

1 That is, 'gentlemen', but in this context it carried the implication of 'feudal lords'.

2 The remaining 15 individuals were not clear about their reasons for emigrating.

3 The remaining 12 informants were not clear about their reasons for choosing Australia.

4 See discussion of sponsorship below, pp.126-8.
of the Ovens Valley area, but a fairly high level of satisfaction with life in Australia seemed to exist throughout the Italian population of the area, apart from complaints that life in the country was rather dull. However, in view of the comparative high return rates of Italian migrants, and the indications that several migrants living in the Ovens Valley area have left it, it cannot be assumed that general satisfaction with the new country is enough to ensure that all migrants settle permanently.

Most Italian migrants to Australia come from rural areas, and most of the Italian migrants in the sample had had rural occupations in Italy. Of the 63 migrants interviewed who had worked in Italy before migration 38 had been in agricultural occupations, usually as agricultural labourers or on their family holdings. Most of the others had lived in rural areas though their occupations (for example, shop assistant) could have been carried on in towns. Of the migrants in the sample, 11 had received some vocational training, or had been employed in skilled or clerical jobs before migration. Although they

---

1 See discussion of the sample below, Appendix I, pp.390-401.
2 See discussion above, Chapter 1, p.7.
3 See above, pp.104-6.
4 For discussion of the agriculture carried on in different parts of Italy, see Foerster: The Italian Emigration of Our Times, 1919; McDonald: 'Italy's Rural Social Structure and Emigration' in Occidente, Vol.XII, No.5, Sept.-Oct., 1956; and McDonald: Migration from Italy to Australia, with Special Reference to Selected Groups, 1958. For discussion of the regional composition of Italian migration to Australia (which is summarised above, Chapter 1, pp.3-6), see Jones: 'The Territorial Composition of Italian Emigration to Australia, 1876 to 1962', 1964; Price: Southern Europeans in Australia, 1963; and Price: The Method and Statistics of 'Southern Europeans in Australia', 1963.
came predominantly from rural backgrounds, therefore, the Italian-born individuals in the sample were not occupationall homogeneous.

Although they had rural backgrounds, the Italians in the Ovens Valley area had not settled there because they had any particular knowledge of tobacco growing or any particular desire for rural life. Only two informants in the sample came from a tobacco growing region of Italy, and the methods of cultivation and curing used there differed considerably from those used in the Ovens Valley area. Moreover, many Italians (particularly those from the southern parts of the country) rather dislike rural life, in spite of being born in rural areas.¹ The attraction of the Ovens Valley area for Italian migrants seems to be based almost entirely on the economic opportunities it offers.

Of the migrants who had worked in Italy before migration 38 had only had one type of occupation, and only 5 had changed their jobs more than once. There are no statistically significant differences between migrants from one region of Italy and those from others with respect to job changes before migration. On arriving in Australia, 19 of the 73 migrants in the sample began work on tobacco farms straight away, as employees though not necessarily as sharefarmers; 18 more began work in some other rural occupation; and 33 found urban employment.² Migrants from Vicenza included a larger proportion of people who began their lives in Australia in urban occupations than any other regional group of migrants.

¹ See comments on this in Banfield: *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*, 1958; and Jones: 'Italians in the Carlton Area: the growth of an ethnic concentration', 1964, p.91, fn.
² The remaining three informants did not state their first occupations in Australia.
In almost all the other groups the majority began work in Australia in rural occupations.¹

The first occupations of the migrants can be compared with those of the 25 Australians and the 7 Italo-Australians in the sample. All the latter were the sons of tobacco growers and had been growing tobacco all their working lives; and 13 of the Australians were in a similar position. Of the other Australians, 4 were farmers' sons (though their fathers did not grow tobacco) and had been in rural occupations all their lives; 3 began their working lives with clerical or vocational occupations, another had entered the army on leaving school (becoming a pay clerk); and 2 began their working lives as sharefarmers, one on a wheat farm and one on tobacco.²

Comparison of the occupations of the Australians with those of the migrants who worked in Italy seems to indicate that the migrants had slightly more experience of urban employment than the Australians, but that both groups had equivalent proportions of members who had clerical or vocational employment before coming into tobacco growing. In general, however, there is remarkably little evidence of a disposition to move from one job to another amongst either Italians or Australians.

If a similar investigation of the first jobs held in the Ovens Valley area is carried out, it is clear that the

¹ The only exception to this is the part of the sample which consists of 12 individuals from three provinces in Central and Southern Italy, Ascoli Piceno, Benevento and Reggio Calabria; see discussion of the regional origin of the migrants in the sample below, pp.113-9. Seven out of the 12 began their careers in Australia in urban occupations; one began as a tobacco grower; and two others began in other rural employment. The remaining two did not state their first occupations in Australia.

² The other two informants did not state their first occupations.
overwhelming majority of the sample (85 out of 104)\(^1\) had grown tobacco as long as they had been working in the Ovens Valley area. Out of the 73 Italian-born informants 61 had done so, all but two of them beginning as sharefarmers or as wage labourers on tobacco farms. Out of the 31 Australian-born, 24 had always been tobacco growers, but only 5 of them began as sharemen: the rest were born into farm-owning families. Not surprisingly, since this is a rural area, all but 5 informants (2 Australian-born and 3 Italian-born)\(^2\) commenced their careers in the area in rural employment of some kind. All but 10 began as tobacco growers. Four Australians inherited, or joined their fathers in operating, farms that were not tobacco growing concerns; 3 Italian-born informants found employment as labourers for the Forestry Commission or for one of the bush-cutting contractors in the area; and 3 more of the Italian-born worked in hop-gardens as wage labourers until they had the opportunity to become tobacco sharemen.

Regional Origins of Migrants in the Sample

The Italian population is by no means homogeneous, particularly with regard to regional origin. The various regional origins of the Italian migrants in the sample indicate the range of backgrounds from which the migrants in the area have come. Table XXI\(^3\) presents an analysis of the

---

\(^1\) For the purposes of this part of the discussion, one informant was not counted as being in the Ovens Valley area, as he still lived on his farm in Echuca; however he had been a tobacco grower all his working life, and his interest in the Ovens Valley area began with the purchase of a tobacco farm in the area.

\(^2\) These informants began work in the area in such occupations as bank clerk, shop assistant, accountant, and so on.

\(^3\) See below, p.114.
TABLE XXI

SAMPLE OF TOBACCO GROWERS (OWNERS AND SHAREFARMERS)
ACCORDING TO REGION OF ORIGIN AND YEAR OF ARRIVAL IN OVENS' VALLEY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR OF ARRIVAL IN OVENS VALLEY AREA</th>
<th>PLACE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Italy</td>
<td>South Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veneto Other</td>
<td>Catanzaro Sicily Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable¹</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Ovens Valley Area</td>
<td>4 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Second World War</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Second World War</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>5 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-1951</td>
<td>4 2</td>
<td>5 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-1956</td>
<td>9 2</td>
<td>4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-1967</td>
<td>6 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1 -</td>
<td>1 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>28 9</td>
<td>17 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derived from: Sample survey of tobacco growers; see Appendix I, below, pp. 390-401.

¹ This informant still lives in Echuca, though he is part-owner of a farm in the Ovens Valley area.
tobacco growers interviewed according to region of origin and
year of arrival in the Ovens Valley area.

For the purposes of this thesis, a somewhat arbitrary
division has been made between northern and southern Italy.
Official Italian statistics\(^1\) divide Italy into four areas:

1: Italia Settentrionale; 'Northern Italy';
2: Italia Centrale; 'Central Italy';
3: Italia Meridionale; 'Southern Italy';
and 4: Italia Insulare; 'Island Italy'.\(^2\)

Each of these four areas is represented in the sample,
but only a few regions within each area are represented.
These regions are:

1: In Italia Settentrionale: Piemonte, Lomdardia,
   Trentino-Alto Adige, and Veneto;
2: In Italia Centrale: Toscana and Marche;
3: In Italia Meridionale: Campania and Calabria;
and 4: In Italia Insulare: Sicilia.

For the purposes of this study informants from Toscana have
been grouped with those from Italia Settentrionale as
'northern Italians', and those from Marche and Sicilia with
those from Italia Meridionale as 'southern Italians'. This
divides the 73 migrants in the sample into 37 northerners
(2 from Toscana) and 36 southerners (6 from Marche and 7 from
Sicilia).

The sample is like the population described by Price
for the Griffith area\(^3\) and the sample which Jones took in

---
\(^1\) See, for example, Nuovo Dizionario die Comuni e Frazioni di
Comune con le Circonscrizioni Amministrative ('New Dictionary
of Communes and Fractions of Communes, with their administrative
circumstances') (Comuni e Frazioni), 1964.
\(^2\) See Map II, below, p.116, and Table XXII, below, pp.117-8, for
details of the composition of these regions of Italy.
Source: Comuni e Frazioni, 1964.
The numbers refer to the provinces listed in Table XXII; see below, pp.117-8.
TABLE XXI
LIST OF PROVINCES AND REGIONS OF ITALY SHOWN IN MAP II

Regions are numbered with Roman numerals, provinces with Arabic numerals, and the Arabic numerals correspond to the numerals shown on Map II, p. 116.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITALIA SETTENTRIONALE (Northern Italy)</th>
<th>VI. Veneto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Piemonte</td>
<td>23. Belluno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Alessandria</td>
<td>24. Padova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asti</td>
<td>25. Rovigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cuneo</td>
<td>26. Treviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Novara</td>
<td>27. Venezia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Torino</td>
<td>28. Verona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vercelli</td>
<td>29. Vicenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Val D'Aosta</td>
<td>VII. Friuli-Venezia Giulia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Aosta</td>
<td>30. Udine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. Trieste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Liguria</td>
<td>VIII. Emilia-Romagna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Genova</td>
<td>32. Bologna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Imperia</td>
<td>33. Ferrara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. La Spezia</td>
<td>34. Forlì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Savona</td>
<td>35. Modena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36. Parma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37. Piacenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38. Ravenna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Lombardia</td>
<td>39. Reggio Emilia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Bergamo</td>
<td>ITALIA CENTRALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Brescia</td>
<td>(Central Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Como</td>
<td>IX. Toscana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Cremona</td>
<td>40. Massa-Carrara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mantova</td>
<td>41. Arezzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Milano</td>
<td>42. Firenze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Pavia</td>
<td>43. Grosseto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Sondrio</td>
<td>44. Livorno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Varese</td>
<td>45. Lucca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Trentino-Alto Adige</td>
<td>46. Pisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Bolzano</td>
<td>47. Pistoia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Trento</td>
<td>48. Siena</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. Marche</th>
<th>XV. Puglia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49. Ancona</td>
<td>70. Bari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Ascoli Piceno</td>
<td>71. Brindisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Macerata</td>
<td>72. Foggia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Pesaro-Urbino</td>
<td>73. Lecce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74. Taranto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Umbria</td>
<td>XVI. Basilicata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Perugia</td>
<td>75. Matera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Terni</td>
<td>76. Potenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. Lazio</td>
<td>XVII. Calabria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Frosinone</td>
<td>77. Catanzaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Latina</td>
<td>78. Cosenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Rieti</td>
<td>79. Reggio Calabria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Roma</td>
<td>ITALIA INSULARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Viterbo</td>
<td>(Island Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XVIII. Sicilia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALIA MERIDIONALE</td>
<td>80. Agrigento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Southern Italy)</td>
<td>81. Caltanissetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. Molise</td>
<td>82. Catania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Campobasso</td>
<td>83. Enna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII(a). Abruzzi</td>
<td>84. Messina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Chieti</td>
<td>85. Palermo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. L'Aquila</td>
<td>86. Ragusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Pescara</td>
<td>87. Siracusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Teramo</td>
<td>88. Trapani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. Campania</td>
<td>XIX. Sardegna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Avellino</td>
<td>89. Cagliari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Benevento</td>
<td>90. Nuoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Caserta</td>
<td>91. Sassari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Napoli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Salerno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carlton, Melbourne, in that it is composed largely of Veneti (28 individuals) and Calabresi (21 individuals); but the comuni which these migrants represent, and often the provinces within the regions of Veneto and Calabria from which they have come, are different from those from which either Price's or Jones's populations originated.

Table XXI shows that the Veneti have formed a considerable proportion of the migrants in the Ovens Valley area at least since the inter-war period, while the Catanzariti arrived mainly in the ten years immediately after the War. The small group of Sicilians arrived gradually throughout the period, and the non-Veneti northern Italians did the same. The most marked change in the pattern of migration during the period is the appearance of non-Catanzariti southern Italians during the late 1950s. This category is made up of 12 individuals, 6 from Ascoli Piceno, 2 from Benevento and 4 from Reggio Calabria.

1 See Jones: The Italian Population of Carlton, 1962.
2 A comune (pl. comuni) is the basic unit of Italian internal administration; often a village or a small town, it may be as large as Rome, which had a population of over 2 million in 1961. A comune may be sub-divided into semi-autonomous frazioni, or 'fractions'.
3 See Appendix II, below, pp.430-54, for comuni of origin of the migrants in the sample.
4 See above, p.114.
5 The long tradition of migration from Veneto to the Ovens Valley area is particularly evident from the fact that of the 7 Italo-Australians in the sample, six were the sons of migrants from the Vicenza province of Veneto, and five of these were born in the Ovens Valley area.
6 See Map II, p.116, and Table XXII, pp.117-8, for the location of these provinces in Italy.
Chain Migration

When comuni of origin are examined, rather than provinces or larger regions, it appears that several migration chains are represented in the sample, indicating the existence of a further degree of heterogeneity in the Italian population. The 73 Italian-born individuals in the sample have come from 46 different comuni in various parts of Italy.\(^1\) The comune with the largest representation in the sample is Decollatura, in Catanzaro from which 10 informants originated.\(^2\)

The phenomenon of chain migration has been examined in detail by Price,\(^3\) and discussed by several other writers.\(^4\) It does not occur only amongst Italians, but most of the discussion of the phenomenon has been carried on in relation to Italians and other southern Europeans. Briefly, chain migration is the process by which a migrant helps or encourages further migrants to migrate to join him; these then encourage the migration of further individuals, so that eventually a settlement of migrants is built up in the host country. Usually the links between members of the chain include kinship as well as origin in the same comune. However, the migrants from a given comune do not necessarily all form part of a single migration chain; and a chain from one comune is not necessarily independent of those from other comuni. Moreover, it seems that a migration chain that has become established in the host country tends to merge with other chains from the same general area of the migrant

---

\(^1\) See location of the various comuni of origin of the migrants in the sample marked on Map II, p.116.

\(^2\) These are informants 49-58; see below, Appendix II, pp.445-9.

\(^3\) See Price: Southern Europeans in Australia, 1963.

\(^4\) See, for example, Jones: The Italian Population of Carlton, 1962.
country as itself, which were originally established independently. Before discussing these complexities, however, it will be useful to examine the way in which the migration chains represented in the Ovens Valley area compare with the four stages of chain settlement in Australia which Price distinguishes in his original definition of the concept.¹

According to Price, the first stage of chain migration is that of the pioneers, who migrate alone, probably travel about the country a good deal, and either write letters or return home at least once, spreading the news about the prospects of the new country amongst their relatives and friends. If they have prospered, more migrants are probably encouraged to join them. In the second stage, the pioneer has been joined by some of his compatriots. Fairly large groups of men are found in various places, and they tend to be occupationally and geographically mobile, as the lone pioneers of Stage I were. Very few of them set up permanent homes in their new country. In the third stage, however, migrants bring their wives out to join them, or return home and marry, re-emigrating with their brides. Now they settle permanently in particular areas of their new country, usually in colonies of their compatriots. They seek jobs that offer permanence and security rather than the freedom and quick returns of the work they were doing in the second stage. In the fourth stage, the second generation has grown to maturity, and there are adults in the migrant population who were either brought to the new country by their parents when they were infants, or who were born there. The migrant colony begins to scatter, and the migrant population begins to merge into that of the host society.

There is no standard rate at which a given migrant population will go through these stages, as a number of factors may affect its progress from one stage to another. In particular, progress will be affected by the degree of prosperity of the new country at a given time. Nor does the fact that different stages can be distinguished mean that everyone in a given migrant population is going through the same stage at the same time. For example, a number of men may remain single and mobile (the characteristics associated with Stage II) long after their compatriots have married and raised children in their new country (that is, when the migrant population as a whole has reached Stage IV).

Price's scheme was drawn up mainly from the examination of naturalisation records and other information relating to the migration of Southern Europeans to Australia as a whole. The latest records he examined referred to 1947, and he studied migration rather than settlement. Investigation of the settled population of the Ovens Valley area in 1966, where no migration chains were found which began earlier than 1920, presents a slightly different picture.

Since the Ovens Valley area has been a centre for Italian settlement in Australia for some time, there is naturally little evidence in the area of the first two, nomadic, stages of chain settlement. However, the pioneers of some of the migration chains in the area moved from place to place during their first years in Australia, before they settled down and brought their wives and children out to join them. Amongst members of the sample, there were only a few individuals who seemed to be still experimenting with migration as lone pioneers from comuni that were not already represented in the area when they migrated; and Stage II seems to have been bypassed altogether. There were some groups of single men in the area, but most of the individuals concerned intended to marry at the earliest opportunity and
settle down as sharefarmers. Lone migrants usually brought their wives out to join them, or returned to Italy to find brides, before they brought male relatives or friends to Australia. Even the Spaniards, who were newcomers to the area, usually had wives and children with them. The Australian Department of Immigration has had a post-war policy of making it easier for husbands, wives and children to emigrate together, or to reunite as soon as possible if they have been separated by migration. In addition, improved conditions in Italy and general prosperity in Australia have made it much easier for migrants to find the passage money for the migration of their families. Moreover, sharefarmers find that wives are practically economic necessities. All these factors reduced the importance of Stages I and II of settlement for the migrants in the Ovens Valley area.

Many of the migration chains in the area were at Stage III of settlement. One chain, that from Arquata del Tronto in Ascoli Piceno had reached this stage with remarkable rapidity. The migration chain was begun in 1952, when one man, without friends or relatives in Australia, arrived in Melbourne on an assisted passage scheme. Three years later he married (by proxy) a girl he had known in Italy, from his own comune. A year later her eldest brother joined them, and he brought out two of his younger brothers; the eldest brother was also married by 1966. In 1956, the original migrant's wife's sister came to Australia, and two more

---

1 See below, Chapter 6, pp.281 and 305-9.
2 The average time that elapsed between the migration of married men in sample and that of their wives was 3.7 years; compare this with the pre-war figures for southern Europeans as a whole given in Price: Southern Europeans in Australia, 1963, cited below, Chapter 6, p.303, fn. 2.
3 See Appendix II, below, pp.442-3. The original migrant is Informant 39.
sisters came in 1960; all the sisters were married by 1966. In 1960 the original migrant moved from Melbourne to the Ovens Valley area, where, after some time as a sharefarmer, he bought a farm. His wife's brothers, sisters and sisters' husbands all followed him to the area, where they were all growing tobacco at the time of this study.

Other migration chains in the Ovens Valley area were well into the fourth stage of settlement. For example, the large, ramifying chain from Decollatura, in Catanzaro, had reached this stage, though new subsidiary chains were still being grafted onto it. A similar, but smaller, chain was that from Confiente, in Catanzaro. The original migrant came to Australia in 1926. He came to the Ovens Valley area in 1927, and set himself up as a greengrocer, with his own market garden; later he added tobacco growing to his activities. In 1929 he brought out his wife and son, and three daughters were born in Myrtleford. His son was still single in 1966, but his daughters had all married into the Italian population in the Ovens Valley area. The original migrant had eventually given up tobacco growing to run a construction firm in Myrtleford. At the time of this study

1 See discussion of this chain below, p.130
2 See Appendix II, below, pp.444-5.
3 This migrant is not included in the sample, or even in the original sampling frame, as he is no longer listed as a tobacco grower; however, one of his daughters is the wife of informant 30: see Appendix II, below, p.439.
4 Catanzaro migrants seem particularly likely to diversify their interests in this way. Another senior migrant from Confiente owned Myrtleford's cinema and one of its many service stations, as well as renting one of the town's two cafes from a migrant from Decollatura who himself owned service station and had numerous commercial interests. The (footnote continued p.125)
he had retired but was still casting ornamental concrete as a hobby.

It seems likely that where a migration chain is large and continually replenished by new arrivals from the region of origin (as many of the migration chains in the Ovens Valley area were), a fifth stage of settlement must be postulated. In this stage, although the Australian-born children of migrants have reached maturity, the foreign-origin population of the area retains a number of distinguishing characteristics. This stage is marked by a merging of migration chains through intermarriage, and by the diversification of the economic activities of the foreign-origin population beyond the industry which first brought migrants to the area.

Even in earlier stages of settlement many migrants married into settlement chains other than their own. Some married women whom they met in Australia, originating from comuni near their own. A few married girls originating from very different parts of Italy. Others married people from comuni other than their own before migrating, and later assisted their wives' relatives to migrate, so that a chain from one comune led to the foundation of one from another. Yet others had parents who originated from two different comuni, and they arrived in Australia as part of migration chains from either their maternal or their paternal comune. As a result

(Footnote 4 continued from p.124)
Decollatura migrant, and the two Confiente migrants already mentioned, all had relatives growing tobacco, and had themselves grown tobacco in the past. Similar diversification had taken place in some of the long-established Veneto families in the area, and with them, also, so far at least one branch of each family had retained its interest in tobacco growing.

Gans describes an Italo-American community in Boston which has actually ceased to replenish itself by migration from Italy, but which still has characteristics which he believes to be Italian in origin; see Gans: The Urban Villagers, 1962.
of these various inter-marriages between comuni, some migration chains from Italy have spawned others; and a number of chains established in Australia have merged into one another.

Sponsorship

The spawning of migration chains is encouraged by the sponsorship system, according to which a migrant already settled in Australia guarantees that he will provide shelter, and if necessary keep, for a newly arrived migrant. Since very few Italian migrants have come to Australia recently on assisted passage schemes,\(^1\) the bulk of Italians have needed sponsors, for without a sponsor it is almost impossible for an intending Italian un-assisted migrant to obtain an immigration permit. The system is regulated by the Australian Immigration Department, which states which kinds of relatives may be sponsored by established migrants; but many factors operate to enable the system to breed migration chains.

One such factor is that it is not always clear exactly who is the sponsor for a given migrant. In many cases there is both a 'de jure' and a 'de facto' sponsor. For example, the 'de facto' sponsor may be the migrant's sister, but it may be the sister's husband who takes on the legal responsibilities of acting as guarantor. Of the 58 Italian-born wives of men in the sample interviewed in this study, only 6 had sponsored any migrants at all; but 52 out of the 73 male tobacco growers interviewed had acted as sponsors. Of these, 3 had sponsored the migration of their wives' brothers, one had sponsored that of his wife's sister, another (in conjunction with his son) had sponsored the migration of his wife's widowed sister (together with three of her sons and her youngest daughter)

\(^1\) See discussion above, Chapter 1, pp.6-7.
and one had sponsored the migration of his own sister's husband. Another was anxious to sponsor the migration of his wife's brother and her father, but the Australian immigration authorities would not admit them because the father had a police record.

The relationship of sponsor to migrant is further confused by the tendency for people to ask better established migrants than themselves to sign the forms for their relatives to come to Australia. Two men in the sample stated explicitly: "X" actually signed the papers, but my relative "Y" was my real sponsor'. Altogether, 8 men were officially sponsored by people they did not know. Generally the guarantors were paesani\(^1\) of the men they sponsored, but the effective link between migrant and sponsor was a relative of the intending migrant, who was a friend (or rather, a 'client')\(^2\) of the sponsor.

In some cases well-established migrants acted as sponsors for the relatives of poorer ones for the sake of the increased labour force which this put at their disposal. Migrants often started their careers in Australia by working for their 'de jure' sponsors alongside the relatives who were their 'de facto' sponsors.

An extension of the same process is the direct recruitment of labour in Italy by Italian tobacco growers, or other employers. Of the men in the sample, 3 were brought to Australia by their prospective employers on a commercial, contract basis. However, this method of migration was

---

\(^1\) Paesano (paesana, f.; paesani, m. pl.; paesane, f.pl.) means someone from the same paese ('town' or 'district') as oneself.

\(^2\) See discussion of 'clientship' below, Chapter 5, pp. 222-3.
commoner in the pre-war years than in the post-war period. It is likely that the pattern of sponsorship is changing, as the existence of a number of flourishing migrant settlements in Australia makes it easier for intending migrants to learn about conditions here before they decide whether to migrate, and as the economic opportunities available to migrants make it easier for more people to achieve sufficient prosperity to be acceptable guarantors. Out of the 42 migrants in the sample who sponsored other migrants, 24 brought out close relatives on their own account, 13 brought out more distant relatives (and in some cases may have been acting on behalf of 'clients' more closely related to the new migrants), and only 5 brought out non-relatives (almost certainly acting as 'de jure' guarantors of people with other 'de factor' sponsors).

Patterns of Settlement of Italians in the Ovens Valley Area

Chain-migration, combined with the spawning of migration chains in Italy and with intermarriage between chains after migration, produced different patterns of settlement amongst different sections of the Italian population of the Ovens Valley area. In particular, distinctive patterns were exhibited by migrants from Vicenza compared with those from Catanzaro.

Altogether, 16 men in the sample came from Vicenza, from 12 different comuni. The comune which was most strongly represented was Valli del Pasubio, which had a population of 4,698 persons in 1961, and in which 3 informant were born. The various comuni are within reasonable distance of one another but not very close.

1 These are informants 20-35; see below, Appendix II, pp.436-41.
together. Of the migrants from Vicenza, 4 were unmarried; 3 were married before they left Italy, (2 to women from the same comuni as themselves, and one to a woman from the neighbouring province of Trento); one was engaged to a girl in the same comune as himself when he migrated, and she eventually joined him in Australia and married him; and one returned to Italy after some time in Australia, and met and married a girl from a comune in Vicenza different from his own. The other 7 married women born in Italy or of Italian origin whom they met in Australia; of these, 2 married women from Vicenza comuni other than their own, 2 married women from Trento, one married a woman from Treviso, and 2 married women from Calabria (one from Catanzaro and one from Reggio Calabria). The 3 Vicenza men who married women from comuni in Vicenza other than their own married women from comuni which were not otherwise represented in the sample, so that the 16 men from Vicenza, together with their 12 wives, represented a total of 15 comuni in Vicenza and 6 others in different provinces.

The connections of the pioneer migrant from Valli del Pasubio demonstrate how a number of small chains from Vicenza spawned others in Italy and became intertwined in Australia. He came to Australia with seven other men from the same comune as himself in 1922. He was already married to a woman from the same comune, and one of her sisters had married and gone to live in the neighbouring comune of Villaverla, where she had a large family. When this sister was widowed, the original migrant from Valli del Pasubio sponsored her migration, together with that of a number of her adult children (all unmarried). The original migrant himself had two sons. One married an Australian girl; the other married into a family from Asiago, Vicenza, growing tobacco in Echuca. There were three brothers in this family; one married a German girl, one recently married an Italian girl whose acquaintance he made through a pen-friendship; and the other (who lived in
Myrtleford) married a girl from Valdagno, who had a sister married to an Australian and a cousin married into a Decollatura family.

The links between the Vicenca migrants formed an 'open' network very different from the 'closed' one linking the Catanzaro migrants.

There were 17 men in the sample from Catanzaro, from only 4 different comuni. The comune which was most strongly represented was Decollatura, which had a population of 5,054 in 1961, and in which 10 informants were born. The other Catanzaro comuni represented in the sample are very close to Decollatura. Only one of the informants from Catanzaro was unmarried at the time of this study. Five were married to women from the same comuni as themselves before they left Italy. Two went back to Italy after some time in Australia and re-migrated with brides from their own comuni. Another married a girl born in his own comune (whom he had known in Italy) after meeting her again in Australia. Three others married women from the same comuni as themselves whom they met for the first time in Australia. Four married women from Catanzaro comuni other than their own (though still from one of the 4 comuni already represented in the sample). Only one married outside Catanzaro, into neighbouring Reggio Calabria. Altogether these 17 men and their 16 wives represented only 4 comuni in Catanzaro and one in another province.

This detailed examination of chain settlement in the Ovens Valley area demonstrates the differences that may exist between migrant settlement patterns, and the ways in which links between different chains may develop.

1 These are informants 46-62, see below, Appendix II, pp.444-50.
The sample shows that some of the Australians in the Ovens Valley area were migrants from other regions.\(^1\) However, since the conditions of their migration were not constrained by their distance from their birth-places, or by any need for sponsors, they did not exhibit any particular settlement pattern of their own.

Many Australian natives of the area were themselves the children or grandchildren of the original pioneers from the British Isles. It is likely that the original settlements in the area had distinctive patterns of their own, but the effects of this were not clearly discernable by the time of this study.

Some Sociological Characteristics of the Ovens Valley Area

It is clear from the geography, history and demography of the Ovens Valley area described in this chapter that the region is far from being an isolated rural area, that it has undergone considerable social change, and that its population is heterogeneous with regard to occupation and ethnic origin. In this section, some of the sociological implications of these facts will be considered.

The points that will be discussed are: the effects of social change, the social status system, the implications of involvement in the 'metropolitan' area, and the nature of social conflict.

Social change was brought about mainly through the increased prosperity and importance of the tobacco growing industry. This led to some changes in the relative wealth of different sections of the population, and alterations in the relative socio-economic and reputational status of some long-established families in the area. It also led to the large-scale influx of migrants. It made the social

\(^1\) See below, Appendix II, pp.461-4.
stratification of the area less stable, involved the area increasingly in the 'metropolitan' region, and led to alterations in the composition of the various interest groups in the area. It also had certain direct implications for interaction between Italians and Australians. Some of the situations in which the Australians found themselves were as new to them as they were to the Italian migrants. The patterns of interaction, and the expectations they reflected, were therefore not invariably long-established or generally held by the host population as a whole. They were sometimes idiosyncratic and temporary responses to a novel situation. The Australian attitudes which the migrants encountered were therefore sometimes inconsistent, and the socialisation of Italians as a result of their interaction with Australians was probably confused and incomplete on some topics.

The other three sociological characteristics to be discussed here were all considerably affected by the rate of social change in the area. However, the situation was sufficiently stable for some general observations to be made.

**Social Status.** Since a number of rural industries were carried on in the Ovens Valley area, there was no single economic class structure. It was difficult to decide, for example, whether a grazier was the economic equal of a tobacco farm owner, either in terms of income or in terms of the amount of land, labour and capital which he controlled. Because of this, the residents of the area found it difficult to agree on a single status hierarchy, especially one that would take into account not only economic position but also local reputation, descent, length of settlement in the area, and so on. In fact, the economic and social standing of neighbours was a common topic of conversation amongst both migrants and hosts. Apparently, in the absence of a commonly accepted status hierarchy, people found it necessary to attempt to
evaluate at least their own positions in relation to their immediate acquaintances. This evaluation had to be constantly renewed as new arrivals in the area were fitted into the scheme, and as ups and downs of individual prosperity took place within the overall expansion of the local economy.

However, there was agreement on two broad principles. First, it was assumed (by both Italians and Australians) that most Australians had higher social status than most Italians. This was particularly apparent in the fact that Italians generally regarded an Italo-Australian marriage as a success for the Italian (though one fraught with domestic problems), while Australians generally regarded such a marriage as a come-down for the Australian. In this ranking of ethnic categories, British and other Northern Europeans (such as Dutch and German) tended to be merged into the Australian category. It was assumed, however, that East Europeans and non-Italian Southern Europeans were on the whole socially inferior to Italians. For example, Yugoslavs and Spaniards were somewhat less welcome than Italians at local social functions, and were generally regarded as less reliable workers than Italians and as more likely to make trouble in various ways.

The assumption of a descending hierarchy of status from Australians through Italians to other Southern and Eastern Europeans was apparently related to the number of years Australians and Italians had lived side by side in the area, and to the comparatively recent arrival of the other ethnic categories. Even the Australians who disliked Italians had learnt what to expect from them as neighbours and as workers, whereas the other ethnic categories were still somewhat unknown quantities.

---

1 See discussion of intermarriage below, Chapter 6, pp.282-91.
Second, it was generally assumed that farm owners (even if they did all the work on their own farm themselves) had higher social status than sharemen. Asked about their neighbours, sharemen would provide information about other sharemen, but regarded neighbouring 'bosses' as beings in another social sphere, even if they were of the same ethnic category as themselves. Farm owners were often hardly aware of the names or marital affiliations of their own sharemen, though full of detailed information about the lives of their farm-owning neighbours. Owners sometimes stated their resentment of the fact that sharemen had votes in the election of the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board, and social interaction between owners and sharemen was uncommon unless they happened to be related to one another.

The difference of social status is largely accounted for by the different economic status of owners and sharemen. Owners generally had higher incomes than sharemen, and lived in brick or brick-veneer homes, which they owned, while sharemen generally lived in weatherboard cottages owned by their employers. Sharemen usually owned only their own labour, while owners owned both land and a good deal of expensive capital equipment.

These two very broad assumptions about social status in the Ovens Valley area are shown to be fairly closely related to one another by Table XXIII. This Table shows the ethnic

1 See discussion of these elections below, Chapter 4, pp. 179-88.
2 See discussion of life on the tobacco farms below, Chapter 4, pp. 176-8 and of kinship relations between owners and sharemen below, Chapter 6, pp. 265-7.
3 See discussion of life and work on the tobacco farms below, Chapter 4, pp. 166-78.
4 See below, p. 135.
TABLE XXII
ETHNIC ORIGIN OF OWNERS AND SHAREFARMERS ON THE
TOBACCO FARMS WITH WHICH A SAMPLE OF TOBACCO GROWERS
(OWNERS AND SHAREFARMERS) WERE ASSOCIATED, 1966-67

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin of Sharefarmers</th>
<th>Number of informants associated with each type of farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic origin of farm owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian only</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian only</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other than Australian or Italian</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian and Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian and other than Italian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian and other than Australian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian, Italian and other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derived from: Sample survey of tobacco growers; see below, Appendix I, pp. 390-7.

1 Informants no longer associated with tobacco farms, or associated with farms without sharemen, have been omitted from this table.
origins of the owners and the sharemen on the farms with which the informants in the sample were associated. Almost all the Australian tobacco growers in the sample were farm owners. Italian growers were divided almost equally between owners and sharefarmers. Almost all the members of the other ethnic categories (mainly Yugoslav, Greek and Spanish) were sharemen. This distribution appears to reflect the broad status rankings of both economic and ethnic categories generally accepted by residents of the Ovens Valley area. The fact that Italians owned half the tobacco growing land in the Ovens Valley area had not made them the social equals of Australians, because Australian farm owners were likely to employ Italians, whereas Italian farm owners did not employ Australians.

An incidental aspect of the local status ranking was that most Australians distinguished between northern and southern Italians, and accorded higher status to those they believed to be northerners. They were encouraged in this by the attitudes of northern Italians to southerners, and the distinction was not openly challenged by the southern Italians. In fact, many southerners accepted the distinction themselves, and sought to improve their standing by claiming that they came from further north than they actually did. In interviewing, several people who claimed to Australians that they came from 'near Rome' were found to originate from Catanzaro or other provinces far to the south.

1 See discussion above, pp.93-7.
2 This claim was not made simply in order to give enquiring Australians the nearest well-known city as a reference point. Naples is nearer to Catanzaro than Rome is: but Naples is in Italia Meridionale, whereas Rome is in Italia Centrale and is not always regarded as a southern Italian city.
The differences between the social status of Australians and Italians, and of farm owners and sharemen, affected interaction between Italians and Australians, for it meant that the interaction between Australian farm owners and Italian sharemen, though extensive, was largely categorical, and that even interaction between Italian farm owners and Australians was often confined to the more categorical aspects of the relationships in which they were involved.

Involvement in the 'metropolitan' region affected the Ovens Valley area in three ways. First, the metropolitan area was available as a field in which people born in the Ovens Valley area might fulfil their ambitions. Second, many people entered the Ovens Valley area from the wider metropolitan region. Third, the values and behaviour patterns of the metropolitan region were known to the residents of the area and were sometimes accepted as alternatives to local values and behaviour patterns. It was therefore possible for a resident of the Ovens Valley area to choose between aiming for success in local terms and aiming for success in metropolitan terms. Incidentally, the possibility of a status hierarchy based upon metropolitan values, and differing from one based upon local values, was an additional reason for the difficulty of reaching agreement on the relative status position of residents of the Ovens Valley area.

The status hierarchy already discussed was part of the local value system, which determined social standing in terms of economic class and income, and also in terms of descent and local reputation. Status in metropolitan terms, on the other hand, was determined by the income and prestige attached to the job for which one was qualified by education.

1 See discussion below, Chapter 4, pp.175 and 190.
2 See comments above, Chapter 2, p.44.
In the local value system, inheritance of farms and family businesses was an important factor. It was expected that a farmer's sons would spend all their lives on the family farm, learning their trade by working alongside their fathers, and eventually inheriting the land and rearing their own sons there.

However, only 12 of the 49 farm owners interviewed in the course of this study had inherited their farms; and even those who had sometimes rejected the local value system. Two farm owners in the sample indicated that they would have preferred to have had an education that would have opened metropolitan careers to them, but that they had been prevented from leaving the land by their fathers. The local value system was sometimes more wholeheartedly adopted by new arrivals in the area, who purchased farms with the intention of handing them on to their sons. However, even farm owners who had bought property with this intention remained aware of the possibilities of metropolitan careers for their children. Sometimes the farm was destined to pass to one son, while others were educated for metropolitan careers.

The alternatives of local or metropolitan success were present for the sharefarmers as well. They often had to decide between using the family earnings to save for a farm and using them to pay for the education of their sons.

The choice between aiming for local success (which meant primarily farm owning) and metropolitan success (in commerce, through vocational training or through academic education) was not generally present to the residents of the Ovens Valley area as a clear-cut decision. However, representatives of success in metropolitan terms were present in the area, as
school teachers, business men, bankers, doctors, and so on, and many residents of the area regarded their social standing as the equivalent of that of established farm owning families.

The achievement of either metropolitan or local success depended on other factors as well as individual decision, however. There were difficulties in the way of both forms of achievement; and it was difficult for a family to arrange things so that both avenues remained open. The attempt to acquire or maintain a farm might lead to the loss of educational or training opportunities; expenditure on education might mean that a farm had to be sold, or that the family was unable to buy one.

Many farmers regarded their farms as business enterprises rather than as opportunities to achieve standing in their neighbours' eyes by building up a social reputation over generations. These farmers included both men who had bought their farms and men who had inherited them from pioneers in the district. Although these farmers behaved as though they shared the local value system, their attitudes were closer to those of the metropolis. In interviews they were more apt to discuss the economics of farming and their plans for future expansion than the past history of their families and the local standing of their neighbours, which were favourite topics of farmers who were more locally oriented. Not everyone discussed his farm entirely in terms of one or the other set of values, however. Many people used terms that showed some mixture of local and metropolitan values.

For some people the tension between local and metropolitan attitudes was hardly relevant. These individuals either had little ambition in terms of either set of attitudes, or believed they had no opportunities for achieving any kind of success. Several Australians were included in this category.
They were usually wage labourers, and the sons of wage labourers, and expected their children to follow in their footsteps. Many migrants were also in this category. However, it was uncommon to find migrants who lacked ambition for themselves or their children. The usual reason given for migration from Italy was a desire to improve economic opportunities.\(^1\) If migrants were not attempting to improve their position according to either local or metropolitan values it was usually because they had become disheartened by the set-backs they had encountered.

The existence of alternative sets of values in the Ovens Valley area probably had the effect of reducing the consistency and coherence of the attitudes the migrants adopted as a result of their interaction with Australians, but many migrants showed a pre-disposition toward one set of values or the other, and accordingly adopted it with some tenacity. The interviews gave the impression that migrants from the Veneto were particularly likely to adopt local values, while migrants from Catanzaro were more likely to adopt metropolitan values.\(^2\) It is likely that in the Italian population as a whole, there was a tendency for the newer arrivals to adopt metropolitan values rather than local ones, for such metropolitan figures as school teachers had more opportunity to make their attitudes known to them (through the children attending school) than such local figures as farm owners, with whom contact was mainly confined to categorical interaction related to the running of the farms. However, migrants who had lived in the area longest and who had established some forms of non-categorical interaction with local Australians were likely to have come into contact with local Australian values.\(^3\)

\(^1\) See above, pp.108-9.

\(^2\) See comment above on the tendency of southern Italians to dislike rural life, p.111.

\(^3\) See discussion of the effects of the existence of alternative definitions of success on inter-generational relations below, Chapter 6, pp.329-33.
The last topic to be discussed here is that of **social conflict**. The population of the Ovens Valley area has already been shown to contain employers and employees, different industrial categories, and Australians and migrants. Following chapters will also show that the population was divided according to religious denomination, political affiliation, and several other factors. Several categories of the population were further subdivided: Italians into 'northerners' and 'southerners', farm owners into the owners of large farms and the owners of small ones, and so on. In addition there were possibilities of economic and political competition between rival groups and individuals, and considerable scope for dissention over such competing value systems as those of local and metropolitan orientation.

Many of the possibilities for overt social conflict in the Ovens Valley area were realised. There was conflict of varying degrees between rival groups of tobacco growers, between Catholics and Protestants, and between hosts and migrants. However, the conflict involved in each of these fields was generally expressed only in specific contexts, and did not lead to the formation of permanent interest groups which operated with a wider frame of reference.

None of the divisions between people in the area coincided at all closely with any of the others. Catholics were to be found in the Australian population as well as in the migrant one. Italians were to be found amongst the owners of large tobacco farms as well as amongst the owners of small ones. Both Italians and Australians were to be found amongst the supporters of the rural tobacco growers' associations, and amongst both tobacco growers and non-tobacco growers. The

---

1 See discussion of religious affiliation below, Chapter 4, pp.144-61, and of political affiliation below, Chapter 4, pp.179-88 and Chapter 5, pp.192-203.
situation was apparently one in which, in Coser's words, 'multiple conflicts crisscross each other and thereby prevent basic cleavages along one axis... segmental participation in a multiplicity of conflicts constitutes a balancing mechanism within the structure'. Consequently, although conflicting interests were apparent, and frequently expressed, most of them were unlikely to lead to social change. The conflict between the rival tobacco growers' associations was the most notable exception. Even this conflict was itself the product and the expression of economically-generated social change, rather than a source of social change in itself.

Such open conflict as existed between hosts and migrants deserves some additional consideration, however. Though many Australians occasionally expressed hostility towards Italians they usually counteracted it themselves by remarking favourably on the Italians' willingness to work, their contribution to local prosperity, and their generally good social behaviour. Only a few Australians were consistently hostile towards Italians. The only organised opposition to Italians came from a distinctive kin-group of tobacco growers who all farmed in the Gapsted area, downstream from Myrtleford. They were all related to one of the early pioneers, and had formerly enjoyed high social status in the district. However, both the value of their farm land and their incomes were decreasing because they were not well placed for growing the kind of tobacco currently demanded by the manufacturers. They found that many Italians had become

---

2 Similar situations are discussed in Gluckman: Custom and Conflict in Africa, 1959, pp.1-26; and Colson: The Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia, 1962, pp.102-21.
3 See below, Chapter 4, pp.179-88.
4 See discussion above, pp.73-5.
considerably more prosperous than themselves. They refused to employ Italian sharemen, and banded together to buy a neighbouring farm in order to prevent it being sold to an Italian. However, they had not succeeded in preventing infiltration completely. One failing farm in 'their' area was owned by an Italian in 1966, and a neighbour related to them by marriage was employing Italian sharemen for the first time that season.

The hostility of this group towards Italians certainly reduced migrant-host interaction to some extent, but their influence should not be over-emphasised. Even this kin-group had been led by its economic interests to support the Victorian Tobacco Growers' Association, which included a large number of Italian members.¹ Some of the younger members of the kin-group included Italians of their own age amongst their acquaintances, and one of the girls had an Italian boyfriend.

Conclusion

This descriptive chapter has dealt with the setting in which the Australians and the Italians of the Ovens Valley area interacted with one another. It has also discussed the origins and characteristics of the Italian population of the area, and some general sociological considerations relevant to the interaction of Italians and Australians.

The three following chapters will discuss the behaviour of migrants and hosts in three stages: first, in relation to the areas of life in which interaction between them was deemed necessary, next in relation to the areas in which interaction was voluntary, and finally in relation to the areas in which it was unlikely.

¹ See discussion of this association below, Chapter 4, pp. 179-84.
CHAPTER 4

AREAS IN WHICH INTERACTION WAS NECESSARY

This chapter will examine the amount and type of interaction between Italians and Australians in the Ovens Valley area in those areas of life in which interaction between them may be regarded as, in some sense, necessary. These areas are: religion (since the Italians did not have a national church, and therefore carried on their religious observances in Australia in religious organisations which were also used by Australians); education (since Italians were bound by Australian law to send their children to school, and they did not provide a migrant school system of their own); and the various industries, particularly the tobacco growing industry, in which the Italian residents of the area were employed. Religion and education will be discussed first, and then the tobacco growing industry and other occupational situations will be examined.

PART I: RELIGION

Almost all the Italians in the Ovens Valley area were Catholics; the Australians were divided between Catholic, Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian. The 1966 Census shows that in the Local Government Areas which include the Ovens Valley area, 34.0% of the population were 'Catholic' or 'Roman Catholic', 27.2% were members of the Church of English, 13.5% were Presbyterians, and 8.1% were Methodists. Altogether 90.7% of the population claimed religious affiliation to one or another Christian denomination.¹

¹ See Census, 1966.
The 105 tobacco growers interviewed in the course of this study reflect the religious affiliations of the population of the area as a whole. Of the 73 Italian-born men in the sample, 71 were Catholics, and the other 2 were Jehovah's Witnesses. All 7 of the Australian-born informants of Italian origin were Catholics. Of the 25 Australians in the sample, 9 were Catholics, 6 were Anglicans, 4 were Presbyterians, 5 were Methodists and only one claimed to have no religion. Of the 86 married men in the sample, only 3 were married to women of a different religious affiliation from themselves.\footnote{1} A few non-Italian women married to Italians had originally belonged to Protestant denominations, but had converted to Catholicism; and the wives of the Italian Jehovah's Witnesses had converted to that sect along with their husbands.

The discussion which follows will consider first the relations between Italians and Australians within the Catholic Church in the area, then the relations between Catholics (including Italians) and people belonging to the non-Catholic Churches, and finally the position of Italians who had been converted from Catholicism to membership of the Jehovah's Witnesses.

In terms of numbers the presence of the Italian migrants had a marked effect on the Catholic Church in the Ovens Valley area. In 1966 approximately one-fifth of the Catholic population of the area was Italian born,\footnote{2} compared

\footnote{1}{One of these men was an Italian Catholic married to an Australian Presbyterian, another was an Australian Presbyterian married to an Australian Anglican, and the last was the man who stated he had no religion, whose wife was an Australian Anglican.}

\footnote{2}{In 1966, the Census shows that 6.0% of the population of the Ovens Valley area was Italian-born, while 34.0% of the population was Catholic. Since virtually all the Italians were Catholic, approximately 17.5% of the Catholic population was born in Italy.}
with approximately one-eighth of the Catholic population of the State of Victoria as a whole.\textsuperscript{1} The quantitative effect of Italians on the Catholic parish of Myrtleford was particularly marked, for there apparently over a quarter of the parish was Italian-born.\textsuperscript{2} The proportion of people of Italian origin was even higher, particularly amongst school age children. The Catholic parochial schools had to teach approximately one-third of their pupils to speak English before they could teach them anything else. At the Catholic parish church in Myrtleford, one of the three Sunday Masses was said in Italian every week, and the sermon was usually given in Italian at all three Masses. At the Catholic youth club, and at the dances which it held every Sunday night throughout most of the year, the children of Italians and Australians mixed more readily than they were able to do at many other social functions. It was believed by members of the Church that almost all the marriages that took place between Italians and Australians in the area took place between Catholics.\textsuperscript{3} In addition, a high

\textsuperscript{1} In 1966 the Census states that 3.4\% of the population of the State of Victoria was Italian-born, and 27.6\% of the population was Catholic; thus, approximately 12.0\% of the Catholic population was born in Italy.

\textsuperscript{2} In 1966 the Census shows that, in the Local Government Areas which included the bulk of the parish of Myrtleford (the town and shire of Myrtleford, and the shires of Oxley and Yackandandah) 39.6\% of the population was Catholic, and 10.8\% of the population was born in Italy; thus, approximately 27.5\% of the Catholic population was Italian-born.

\textsuperscript{3} Examination of the few Italian-Australian marriages included in the sample suggests that this was not the case; see below, Chapter 6, pp. 286-8. Unfortunately, the parish marriage records were bad indicators of the effects of Church-sponsored interaction on marriages between Italians and Catholic Australians. Brides who entered the Church just before their marriages to Italians were not distinguished in the records from life-long Catholics who met their husbands at Church functions.
proportion of the priests' time was taken up with advising migrants on their problems and acting as migrants' welfare officers.

The influence of the Italians on the affairs of the Catholic Church in the Ovens Valley area was far less than their numerical significance might lead one to expect. The Church found the leadership for its lay organisations principally among its Australian parishioners.

The Italian-born informants in the sample who had detailed memories of the Church in Italy remarked on the differences between it and the Church in Australia. They complained that the churches in Australia were smaller and plainer than the ones in Italy, and that on Sundays they were usually overcrowded.\(^1\) In addition they missed the festivals in honour of local patron saints and the public enactment of the liturgical cycle which took place in Italian towns. Also, many of them were confused by the liturgical changes which had taken place as a result of the Second Vatican Council; for example, having Mass said in the vernacular. Some Italians believed these features were peculiar to the Church in Australia, and stated earnestly that in Italy Mass was always said in Latin. Because, they were accustomed to a 'spectator Mass' in which the congregation listened to the priest saying Mass in an unknown language, unable to join in themselves, neither English-speaking nor Italian-speaking Catholics in the Ovens Valley area were particularly concerned about whether they attended the Italian Mass on Sunday evenings or one of

\(^{1}\) This was a result of the increasing population of the area, rather than religious fervour; by no means all the Catholic population attended Mass every week, though Catholics attended church more regularly than Protestants: see discussion of church attendance below, pp.152-4.
the English ones in the morning, and both Italians and Australians attended at whatever time was most convenient, regardless of language. Both categories liked to understand the sermon, however, and sometimes became restless when it was repeated in a second language.

Although they missed many of the features of the Church in Italy, most of the Italian-born residents of the Ovens Valley area were favourably impressed by some aspects of the Church in Australia. In particular, they commented on the devotion displayed by Australian men in church, and on the degree of attention and respect displayed by the congregation as a whole during Mass. Generally they compared the Australian clergy favourably with the Italian clergy, preferring the less formal manners of Australian priests and the amount of help they received from them in dealing with their problems. They particularly appreciated the fact that some priests (and some of the nuns teaching in the parochial schools) had taken the trouble to learn Italian. Many of them were impressed by the role of the Church in the social life of the parish. It was the Catholic Church that sponsored many of the dances and other social activities in the district. Some Italians were surprised that the Church encouraged dancing, instead of frowning on it, as it did in some parts of Italy.

Two streams of thought seemed to be present in the attitudes of the Italian-born Catholics towards the Church in Australia. First, the anti-clericalism which most Italians (particularly Italian men) felt was somewhat disarmed by the relaxed manner of Australian religious and clergy, and by the generally good relations between clergy and laity; though a few of the more devout, traditionally-minded Italians regretted the lack of a clear-cut authoritarian relationship. Second, the
austerity and simplicity of Catholic life in Australia was often compared unfavourably with the visual, musical and emotional richness of liturgical observance in Italy; but this was offset by the effect of the individual devoutness of the majority of Australian Catholics, particularly by that of the men.

One of the most Italian aspects of the life of the Catholic Church in the Ovens Valley area was the use of the church grounds as a social centre before and after Sunday Mass. People dressed in their best clothes and met and gossiped with all their friends. This was also typical of Australians at rural church services; but it was particularly noticeable in the case of the Italians. Often Italian men came to church on Sundays only to meet their friends; they waited outside the building with them while their wives heard Mass inside.\(^1\)

One of the least Italian aspects of the behaviour of Italians in relations to the Church in the Ovens Valley area was the extent to which they, like the Australians, sent their children to the parochial schools (where they had to pay fees) rather than to the State schools. Even the least religious and most bitterly anti-clerical Italian families did this.\(^2\) It is hard to see why parents who ignored the Church's ruling that every Catholic is obliged

\(^1\) This behaviour was similar to that reported for men in Italy; see, for example, Banfield: The Moral Basis of a Backward Society, 1958.

\(^2\) This contrasts with Day's observation that in Australia in general 'children of Italian immigrants attend church schools much less than local or British-born Catholic children'; see Lincoln H. Day: 'Family Size and Fertility' in Davies & Ensel: Australian Society: a Sociological Introduction, 1965, p.166.
to hear Mass every Sunday should have accepted the exhortations of the Australian clergy to send their children to Catholic schools.\(^1\) All the Catholic parents in the sample, both Australian and Italian, sent their children to parochial schools if they were available. Some even sent their older children, at considerable expense, to the Christian Brothers' College in Wangaratta or to Catholic boarding schools even further away. The motive for this was sometimes simply ambition for the children's academic future. In other cases, the parents believed that a year or so in a boarding school run by a religious order was a good discipline for their children, especially for adolescents who were prone to be unmanageable at home. None of the informants suggested that the religious or spiritual life of their children might be enriched or strengthened by the experience.\(^2\)

---

1 Perhaps the reason was that the Catholic schools were accustomed to the language difficulties of Italian children, even though they had not developed any particular machinery for dealing with them; perhaps the parents believed that all Catholic children had to go to Catholic schools in Australia; or perhaps it was regarded as a form of spiritual insurance, of the same kind as the prayers of the wives of irreligious or anti-clerical men.

2 One informant, of Italian origin (though his father was born in Australia), who had recently left a Catholic boarding school, stated that he believed he had been put off religion forever by his experiences there. On the other hand, an Australian man from a family of mixed religious affiliation and considerable religious indifference, stated that he became a Catholic as a result of the accident that made his family choose Xavier College in Melbourne for his education, while sending his sister to Melbourne Methodist Ladies' College.
The feeling amongst Italian-born residents of the Ovens Valley area that the Catholic Church in Australia was radically different from the Church in Italy, combined with the fact that both the lay and the religious activities of the Church were run by Australians rather than Italians, might have led migrant Italians to reduce their participation in religious affairs even below the level of their participation in Italy.\(^1\) In any case, as Mol has pointed out, the process of migration itself, with its various unsettling psychological effects 'often has a negative effect on religious interest in general and church going in particular.'\(^2\) On the other hand, anticlericalism and religious indifference are marked in Italy, particularly amongst the male population, and observers there have pointed out that the level of religious participation amongst women is higher than that amongst men.\(^3\) The level of religious participation amongst Australian men, and the good relations between clergy and laity in Australia, might have encouraged some Italian-born Catholic men to participate in the life of the Church in Australia more than they did in Italy.

---

\(^1\) See summary of religious participation in Italy in S.S. Acquaviva: 'Italy' in Mol: Religions in the Western World (provisional title), not yet published.


The informants in the sample almost certainly exaggerated the frequency of their attendance at church, but comparison of the numbers of informants in various categories who claimed to attend church services once a month or more (shown in Table XXIV\(^1\)) indicates that Catholics attended church more regularly than Protestants,\(^2\) women more regularly than men,\(^3\) and Australian Catholics more regularly than Italian Catholics;\(^4\) but that Italians in general (because so many of them were Catholics) attended church more regularly than Australians in general (because so many of them were Protestants).\(^5\) All tobacco growers claimed that there were some seasons in the year when they did not have time to go to church every week. Frequency of attendance at Mass did not vary significantly according to length of residence in Australia, but pre-war migrants and the Australian-born Italians stated that they always attended Mass in English, while only 9 (14.3%) of the 63 post-war migrants in the sample made such a statement.

\(^1\) See below, p.153.

\(^2\) The difference between the proportions of Catholic men and women and Protestant men and women in the sample stating that they attended church once a month or more is statistically significant at the 5.0% level.

\(^3\) The difference between the proportions of men and their wives in the sample stating that they attended church services once a month or more is statistically significant at the 10.0% level.

\(^4\) However, the difference between the proportion of Italian-born Catholic men and women and the proportion of Australian-born Catholic men and women in the sample stating that they attended church services once a month or more is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.

\(^5\) The difference between the proportions of Italian-born men and women and Australian-born men and women stating that they attended church services once a month or more is statistically significant at the 10.0% level.
TABLE XXIV

PROPORTIONS OF A SAMPLE OF TOBACCO GROWERS (OWNERS AND SHAREFARMERS) AND THEIR WIVES WHO STATED THAT THEY ATTENDED CHURCH SERVICES ONCE A MONTH OR MORE, ACCORDING TO VARIOUS CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Non-Catholic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian-born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian-born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derived from: Sample survey of tobacco growers; see below: Appendix I, pp.390-401.

1 Italian-born non-Catholics were Jehovah's Witnesses; Australian-born non-Catholics were Church of England, Presbyterian and Methodist.

2 This figure excludes the Australian man in the sample who stated that he had no religion.
Incidentally, there were no differences between the religious behaviour of northern Italians and southern Italians that are statistically significant, though the proportion of male informants born in southern Italy who claimed that they attended Mass once a month or more is slightly higher than the proportion of northern Italians making the same claim. The proportion of informants' wives born in northern and southern Italy who claimed to attend Mass once a month or more are almost identical.

It appears from the foregoing discussion that, although the Italians in the Ovens Valley area were rather less punctilious in their religious observances than the Australian Catholics, their religious affiliation provided opportunities for considerable interaction with Australians. However, this interaction was mainly of a categorical kind. They worshipped alongside Australians and had contacts with the priests both as pastors and as advisors in their practical difficulties, but (for adult migrants at least) the Church did not usually enable them to develop non-categorical relationships with Australians. Non-categorical relationships between adolescent Italians and Australians were possible through the Catholic youth club, however; and the parochial schools enabled Italian and Australian children to get to know one another better than their adult counterparts did.¹

Their membership of the Catholic Church enabled Italians to interact with Catholic Australians at least on a categorical basis; but it tended to cut them off from many forms of social contact with Protestant Australians. Relations between Catholics and Protestants in the Ovens Valley area were conditioned by the attitudes of Australian

¹ See discussion of education in the Ovens Valley area below, pp. 161-4.
Catholics and Protestants towards one another, and these in turn were influenced by the origins of the pioneer settlers in the area.

Most of the Australian Catholics in the area were descended from migrants from Southern Ireland, and many of the Presbyterians were descended from migrants from Northern Ireland. Many of the Presbyterians were Freemasons and somewhat anti-Catholic, but the attitudes of members of each denomination towards other denominations were difficult to ascertain by observation, as people were careful not to give offence to members of other denominations by expressing their religious opinions in public or to strangers. One Presbyterian tobacco grower (of Northern Irish origin) remarked in the course of the interview that he had done his best to prevent his niece marrying an Italian because of his religion; and there was certainly some wariness in relations between Catholics and Protestants, if not between members of different Protestant denominations. This was related to the importance of both school friendships and attendance at the same church in determining friendships and attendance at the same church in determining friendships. Since many Catholics attended Catholic schools, as well as Catholic religious functions, they had comparatively little opportunity to make friends with Protestants.

---

1 Throughout this discussion 'Protestant' indicates members of the Church of England, Presbyterians, Methodists, etc., but not members of sects such as Jehovah's Witnesses.

2 See discussion of the educational system below, pp.161-4 and of friendship in the area below, Chapter 5, pp.220-4.
There was, however, a certain amount of neighbourliness between the members of different churches.¹ The various priests and ministers in the area were generally on good terms with one another informally, though there was no formal co-operation between them in the way of inter-denominational services. However, in some parts of the area, where the population was sparse, ministers of various denominations used the same 'unity hall' as a church on alternate Sundays, or at different times during the day. For example, at Porepunkah the Presbyterians and the Methodists used the same hall on alternate Sundays; and at Everton, where there was no Catholic Church, a priest came from Wangaratta every Sunday to say Mass in the community hall, which was also used for Protestant services.

The co-operation which existed between some members of different denominations was not enough to off-set the effects of the fact that a good deal of the social life of the Ovens Valley area consisted of intra-denominational activities. The existence of ancilliary Church organisations such as Ladies' Guilds, sports clubs and youth clubs tended to reduce the opportunities which members of each denomination had for interacting with members of other denominations; and while Protestants of one denomination might belong to church-based organisations associated with another, it was rare for Catholics and Protestants to belong to one another's associations. In 1967, a Presbyterian minister in the area lamented that

¹ For example, Catholics and Protestants often lived side by side, belonged to the same clubs and associations, and attended one another's Church fetes. In 1967 they shared the same (Presbyterian) organist, who also (with her lapsed Catholic husband) played in a two-piece band at many of the social functions in the area, whichever denomination or other organisation sponsored them.
he was afraid the members of his congregation were coming to regard their church as a safe refuge in which they could continue to act as their fathers had, and forget the problems of living in a polyglot, rapidly developing area.

Thus, while the Catholic Church provided Australian and Italian Catholics with opportunities for categorical interaction with one another, relations between Catholic and Protestant Churches were such that Italians had few opportunities provided by religion for interaction of any kind with Australian Protestants.

The few Italians who had been converted to the Jehovah's Witnesses were in quite a different position from their Catholic co-ethnics, however. Their conversion gave them opportunities for intense interaction with the Australian Witnesses in the area, though it minimised their chances of interacting with Australians outside the sect, and also reduced their interaction with other Italians. There were no Australian Witnesses in the sample, but two of the Italian informants were converts to the sect, along with their Italian wives.

They were all converted at the same time, about a year before the period of this study. At the time of their conversion, one was co-owner of a small tobacco farm in Whorouly with his brother, and the other was their shareman. The shareman's wife was the sister of the wife of the other partner in the farm. The partner and his wife remained Catholic, in spite of the conversion of the brother of one and the sister of the other. There was a family quarrel as a result of the conversion, and the brothers divided the farm between them. The owner Witness then employed the shareman Witness on his part of the farm, and the two brothers lived next-door to one another on their separate properties. There was little contact between them,
but the Witness shareman's wife still visited her Catholic sister on the next-door farm. The farm owner Witness had four children, two of school age: they were converted along with their parents. The schoolchildren were removed from the Catholic parish school, at the headmistress's request, after they attempted to prosyletise amongst the other pupils. At the time of the interview they attended the State primary school at Whorouly. The shareman Witness had only one child, aged two years.

The male converts, and the wife of the shareman, were all from Soveria Manelli in Catanzaro. They had a large number of relatives in the Ovens Valley area, who treated their conversion as a shameful family secret. The convert's farm owning brother and ex-partner was scornful of his brother's defection, however, and publicly emphasised his own loyalty to the Catholic Church (which, as a matter of fact, he hardly ever attended).

The converts stated emphatically that the Catholic Church did not tell them the truth about what is in the Bible, and that it had misled them by putting false interpretations on the contents it did reveal. The extreme literalism of the Witnesses' interpretation of the Bible probably appealed to them partly because they had a low standard of formal education. In addition, the intensive, though unscholarly, training in Biblical studies which Witnesses carry out had the appeal of making learning seem to be within the reach of the comparatively uneducated. The converts' lack of knowledge of Catholicism probably made them additionally vulnerable. They had not simply ceased to be convinced by the arguments of the Catholic Church; they had only had the slightest idea of what those arguments might be. Their faith in Catholicism probably only survived by habit and social pressure in Italy, and in the migrant situation
habits are often re-formed and social pressure is often re-directed, reduced or even removed.

A number of writers on the sociology of religion have commented on the attractions which sects have for migrants. Mol remarks: 'In the early stages of the integration process there is tendency among immigrants who feel disinherrited and who are not inhibited by Old World traditions to emphasize escapist themes... When immigrant groups feel rejected by the absorbing society, their beliefs will tend to emphasize a devaluation of that society.'¹ He points out that such an emphasis is typical for sects such as Jehovah's Witnesses.

Another factor that may have been operative in bringing about the conversion of these Witnesses was that the life of the sect gave them an opportunity to be closely associated with people of higher social status than themselves; that is, with Australians. The Jehovah's Witnesses formed a small group which was almost entirely composed of Australians. The life of the sect was intense and time-consuming, and gave its members a very strong sense of community solidarity. They held meetings three times a week. The difference between their ideas and those of the population at large tended to cut them off from the outside world and concentrate their lives within their own group. For example, they celebrated Christmas at a different time of the year from other Christians. They were eager for converts, however, and the converts in the sample were clearly practiced in presenting the sect's case to unbelievers. They themselves were probably converted by missionaries speaking English: the husband in the sharefarming couple and the wife in the owner couple both spoke English well enough to discuss simple theology.

Each couple operated most smoothly in Italian, however, since one partner in each could only speak a little English. Since Witnesses are adjured to spend a certain number of hours a week spreading knowledge of 'the Truth', they were probably in the habit of visiting Italian homes in the area in the same way as Australian teams regularly visited Australian homes. The incorporation of these converts into all aspects of the life of the sect meant that, once included, they were unlikely to break away.

Though the conversion of two Italians in the sample to the beliefs of the Jehovah's Witnesses was easily understandable, there was no sign that there was likely to be any conversion of migrants on a large scale. Most Italians took it for granted that to be of Italian origin was to be a Catholic. Almost all the Italians in the sample retained at least a nominal affiliation to the Church, even if this was combined with strong anti-clericalism. The Protestant Churches were too polite to attempt to make converts amongst them. To persuade even a few Italians to make a formal break with what they still regarded in some sense as 'the Italian Church', determined efforts were necessary by a sect uninhibited by the gentlemen's agreement between Churches not to poach members from one another.

To sum up this section, it may be said that Australian and Italian Catholics had many opportunities for categorical interaction with one another, but that non-categorical interaction was difficult for all but children and adolescents. Relations between Catholic and Protestants in the Ovens Valley area were such as to discourage interaction between Italians and Australian Protestants. The only adult Italians with opportunities for non-categorical interaction with Australians through religious activities were the converts who had become Jehovah's
Witnesses, though their conversion cut them off from non-Witness Australians and from many Italians as well.

PART II: EDUCATION

The term 'education' covers two areas of necessary interaction between migrants and hosts. First, since the migrants were obliged to send their children to school, the educational system forced migrant and host children to interact with one another; second, since most migrants found it necessary to learn some English, any classes in English for adult migrants offered opportunities for them to interact with at least the members of the host society who are their teachers. This section will consider first the interaction between host and migrant children at school, and second the opportunities for learning English which were offered to adult migrants.

In the Ovens Valley area, as in other parts of Australia, a Catholic school system existed side by side with the State one, though it was not as complete as the State system. In some parts of the area (for example, in Bright and Mount Beauty) there was no local Catholic school, and parents there usually sent their children to the local State primary schools. In Myrtleford, though the Catholic system provided primary education, it provided secondary education for girls only. In Wangaratta, however, both boys and girls could obtain a Catholic education up to school leaving age. Some Catholic families in the area (including a few Italian ones) obtained a complete Catholic education for their sons by sending them as boarders to the Christian Brothers' College in Wangaratta or to Catholic colleges even further away. However, most Catholic boys in the area obtained their secondary education in the State schools.
Because the Catholic system was not able to provide such a comprehensive service as the State schools in the area, there was considerable contact between Italian children and Australian children of all religious denominations, even though the existence of the Catholic system in itself tended to encourage the polarisation of the population into 'Catholic' and 'other' 1.

Migrant and Australian children generally got on together fairly well at school 2, though sometimes Australian children were heard to make disparaging remarks about migrants between themselves, especially if their parents were in the habit of doing the same thing. Children with Italian names were well represented on school sports teams, and on the boards of honour listing the children who were Dux of the schools in previous years. Friendships between Italians and Australians in the area usually had their origins in the fact that they had originally attended school together 3.

Many teachers in the area commented that particular Italian children were amongst the most intelligent and hardworking of their pupils, and a high proportion of academic prizes were won by migrant children during the period of fieldwork. However, very little was being done by either State or Catholic schools to overcome the special educational difficulties of non-English speaking children, and this encouraged the persistence of the anomaly by which

---

1 This polarisation is discussed above, pp 154-7.
2 These comments are based on the observations of a number of teachers in the Catholic and State schools in Myrtleford, and on the remarks of pupils and ex-pupils of the schools.
3 See discussion of friendship in the Ovens Valley area below, Chapter 5, pp 220-4.
the children of migrants who usually had comparatively high aspirations for their educational achievement often had bad educational records.¹

Italian language and literature were not taught in either the State or the Catholic schools in the area. However, during 1966 some teachers in the Catholic schools in Wangaratta and Myrtleford, and some of the secondary State school teachers in Myrtleford, were considering the establishment of Italian as a second, optional foreign language in their schools, after French.

Whatever their shortcomings, however, the schools in the area provided both the migrants and the host children who attended them with opportunities for both categorical and non-categorical interaction with one another, and in many cases friendships between migrants and hosts were established which lasted beyond their school days. Attempts to educate the adult migrant population in English did not have equivalent effects.

Evening classes in English had been offered to the migrant population for some years, organised and staffed by the local school teachers. In most areas they were very poorly attended; most migrants were tobacco growers, and they objected that their work did not leave them time to attend classes regularly.² A small class in Whorouly, run

¹ See discussion of this point below, Chapter 6, pp. 329-33.
² Of the 73 Italian-born informants in the sample, 39 had learnt some English without the assistance of any formal teaching, 19 had had formal teaching of some kind for a few months on first arriving in Australia, 5 had arrived in Australia during their school days and had attended Australian schools, 2 had attended evening classes at some time, and one had taken a correspondence course. Only 3 were taking formal courses in English at the time of the interview (one at Whorouly and the others through the Dante Alighieri Society). The remainder had not learnt any English since their arrival in Australia.
by a teacher who provided transport for her class to and from school, seemed to be more successful.¹ The Dante Alighieri Society, which was started in Myrtleford in 1966, had plans to organise evening and private classes for adults in English (for Italians) and in Italian (for Australians),² and its initial efforts appeared to be more successful than those organised by the schools. It is likely that learning in a fairly informal 'club'-like atmosphere was more attractive to the adults in the area than formal classes which were like 'going back to school'. If this was so, it suggests that the learning of English could best be carried on when some interaction between migrants and hosts was already established through the social activities of the society, rather than through formal instruction in which migrant-host interaction, if it occurred at all, was merely a by-product of the teaching situation.

PART III: THE TOBACCO GROWING INDUSTRY³

The third area of necessary interaction between migrants and hosts was that of economic life. The migrants

¹ The advantage of providing transport was that (a) the teacher's arrival to collect her pupils put them under more obligation to attend the class than leaving them to find their own way there would have done; and (b) it made it possible for those who owned no cars or who didn't have a driving licence (particularly women) to attend the class; see discussion of the position of migrant women below, Chapter 6, pp.310-6.

² See further discussion of the Dante Alighieri Society below, Chapter 5, pp.209-11.

³ The information about the tobacco growing industry given in this thesis was collected mainly in discussions with officials of the Tobacco Research Station conducted by the Victorian Department of Agriculture at Ovens; officials (footnote continued on p.165)
had to earn livings for themselves and their families; and in the Ovens Valley area the majority of them did so by finding employment in the tobacco growing industry. This section will examine the amount and kind of interaction between migrants and hosts which this employment encouraged.

Table XXV\(^1\) shows that on at least 38.0\% of the tobacco farms in Victoria in 1965-66 there were people of two or more different ethnic categories amongst the owners and sharefarmers, and on 18.4\% of farms Italians and Australians were both represented. As the following descriptions will show, owners and sharemen generally lived and worked alongside one another on the same farms, so the presence of Italians and Australians on the same farms led to considerable interaction (though this was usually of the categorical rather than the non-categorical kind). Moreover, the common interest of all tobacco growers (both owners and sharemen) in the fortunes of the industry led to the involvement of both Australians

\(^1\) See below, p.167.
and Italians in the various tobacco growers' associations. The sections which follow will describe first the tobacco growers' agricultural year (to demonstrate the extent to which Australians and Italians worked together when Italians were sharemen for Australian farm owners); second the residential arrangements on tobacco farms (to demonstrate the lack of residential segregation between hosts and migrants in the Ovens Valley area); and finally the 'political' organisations of the tobacco growing industry (to demonstrate the extent to which Italian and Australian tobacco growers co-operated with one another in organisational matters).

Tobacco Cultivation

Tobacco, the growers say, is a fourteen-month crop. For two or three months of the year (roughly during July and August) last season's crop is being sold while the coming season's is being nurtured in the seedbeds. The next months, September and October, are the most relaxed ones for tobacco growers, and the months in which they take their holidays. A few growers buy their seedlings from nurseries when they are ready to plant them out at the end of October, rather than trouble to grow their own. Others leave their seedbeds in the care of a friend, or of one of their sharemen, while they take a few weeks' holiday. Growers may combine a few days' holiday with a visit to the tobacco sales in Melbourne (which begin in June and continue until the end of August).

---

1 Since the tobacco growing industry is somewhat unusually organised, some details of its financial and marketing arrangements are appended to this thesis; see below, Appendix III, pp. 465-79.

2 Out of 105 tobacco growers interviewed, 17 had never left their farms for a holiday at all, and 28 had only gone away for a day or so at a time, usually during the off-season between August and October, before planting out the new season's crop. Only 10 informants took regular annual holidays.
TABLE XXV

ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF SURNAMES
ON TOBACCO FARMS IN VICTORIA, 1965-66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of surname of growers (owners and sharefarmers)</th>
<th>Number of farms</th>
<th>Percentage of total number of farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian only</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian only</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian and Italian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian and other (not Australian)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian and other (not Italian)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian, Australian and other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain; at least two types of surname</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain; types of surname may or may not be mixed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms owned and run by the Victorian Department of Agriculture for research purposes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Growers begin to prepare the ground for the next crop in June, almost as soon as the picking of the old crop is finished. Preparation mainly consists of ploughing, though fertilisers may be added at this stage, and in some parts of the area growers plant pea seedlings in their paddocks to restore nitrogen to the soil during the winter.

1 'Australian' surnames here include some which might be of German origin.
Almost invariably the owner prepares the ground himself, since this can be done by one man with a tractor, and owners are usually reluctant to allow their sharemen to operate the farm machinery.

During August, growers plant tobacco seeds in their seedbeds, if they intend to cultivate their seedlings themselves. Some growers have their own strain of seeds from earlier tobacco crops, and some buy seeds from private nurseries; but most buy them at a low cost from the Tobacco Research Station which the Victorian Department of Agriculture maintains at Ovens. The seedbeds are long shallow trays, out of doors, and usually close by the farm-owner's house. Even the seedbeds for a large farm can be looked after by only one or two men. They have only to be covered at night and when there is heavy rain, fumigated regularly with benzol, and generally cared for and weeded until it is time to plant the seedlings out in the paddocks. Growers who prefer to buy seedlings ready for planting out, and growers whose seedlings have not come up to expectations buy plants from nurseries when planting-out begins.

Planting out usually starts at the end of October. At this point growers who have been away from the area reappear, and sharemen who are transferring from one farm to another move into their new homes in time to plant out

1 Many growers consider that fumigation protects the seedlings against Blue Mould but others disagree. Officials at the Tobacco Research Station state that Blue Mould is counteracted by proper preparation and treatment of the soil, and by spraying the growing crop with fungicide later in the year when it is out in the paddocks; benzol fumigation of the seedlings is merely a general insecticide and a guard against excessive humidity which would hamper the growth of the seedlings.
the crop with their bosses and their colleagues for the coming season.

Planting out is done semi-mechanically. The boss (the farm-owner or his manager) drives the tractor and two sharemen sit on a carrier behind the machine and place the seedlings in holes dibbled by the planter attached to the tractor. It is a slow, laborious job, usually carried out in the first heat of summer. The tractor must be driven very slowly and dead straight, and the men on the carrier spend all day bent double to reach down and plant the seedlings. The standard planting team consists of three men; men working farms on their own, or with only one shareman, make up their planting teams with friends or relations, or hire labour to help them. On large farms the sharemen join up in pairs to plant the paddocks farmed by both men. While the men are planting out, women, children and old people pull the seedlings out of the seedbeds so they can be replanted in the paddocks.\(^1\)

Planting out is usually finished by the middle of

---

\(^1\) Seedlings have to be planted soon after they are pulled out of the seedbeds if they are not to wilt. Before techniques for combating Blue Mould were developed, seedlings were almost invariably grown in nurseries in the Echuca area, where the drier atmosphere inhibited the development of the disease. Many Ovens Valley growers drove (overnight) to Echuca, pulled the seedlings and packed them during the day, returned (again overnight) to the Ovens Valley area, and spent the next day planting the seedlings out. Nowadays this only happens as an emergency measure, for example when a grower's own seedlings have failed to come up to expectations.
November but as long as it lasts almost everyone connected with the tobacco growers is included in the labour force.

During November, December and January, the growers have to look after the plants in the paddocks. Weeds have to be hoed out two or three times during this period, and many growers are helped in this job by their wives. Some, who have only small acreages to manage, do all the hoeing themselves, and others, who prefer not to see women working in the paddocks, hire casual labour to help with the hoeing; but the migrant sharefarmers in particular argue that there would be distinct economic hardship if they could not rely on the unpaid labour of their wives at this stage of cultivation. Out of the 86 married informants in the sample, 23 stated that their wives heded the tobacco with them regularly, but from the numbers of women to be seen in the paddocks during the growing season it is likely that the actual proportion of women hoeing is higher than this figure indicates. Owners leave the hoeing to their sharemen, unless a mechanical scarifier is used. Then, as in other operations in which the farm's machinery is being used, owners and sharemen work together. The scarifier is towed along the rows of growing tobacco by a

\[1\] In 1966 the planting season finished very late because it was interrupted by heavy rains and eventually by floods. Some farmers who had already planted their seedlings out saw them become waterlogged, and had to pull them out again when the ground dried and replant with seedlings bought from commercial nurseries. Other growers, who had not planted their seedlings out so soon, were forced to wait a few weeks until the ground dried out before their tractors could manoeuvre again in the paddocks. Meanwhile many of the seedlings in the seedbeds grew too large and choked one another, and had to be replaced with others bought from nurseries.
tractor driven by the owner, with a shareman sitting on the carrier. The scarifier, operated by the shareman, loosens the soil between the tobacco plants and makes the next round of manual hoeing easier.

In the dry months of December and January the crop has to be irrigated, and it also has to be treated with insecticides and fungicides. Usually the two operations are carried out simultaneously, the chemicals being carried in the water which is sprayed over the crop. Owners and sharemen are both involved in spraying operations, which usually involve moving heavy irrigation pipes manually between the rows of growing tobacco. Normally, women only help with this work in cases of emergency.

Recently growers have reverted to the practice of topping the tobacco plants to prevent them seeding. This

---

1 Farms are sited near the rivers, and farm owners pay the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission for water rights; then they pump as much water as they need out of the river for themselves. The Commission does not control the use of water beyond leasing water rights. It has no say in deciding the number of farmers in the area, the size of farms or even the amount of water used. This is not a part of Victoria that is usually short of water; in 1966-7 there were floods.

2 Some owners have invested capital in permanent under-the-surface pipes which irrigate the crops, but most owners are out before dawn in this part of the season directing the placing of pipes by their sharemen; and they supervise the rearrangement of the irrigation pipes at intervals during the day.

3 One Australian informant, growing his crop of tobacco without sharemen, was helped in the 1966-67 season by his adolescent daughters as well as by his sons in all the heavy work of the farm, the more so since, when he was interviewed, his eldest sons had recently been temporarily partially disabled in a fire.
encourages leaf growth; it also encourages the plants to develop suckers, which have to be cut off. Topping and suckering is exclusively the responsibility of the sharemen, who hire labour to help if they cannot manage the job themselves. It is almost exclusively a male job.

By the middle of January, the tobacco plants should be four or five feet high, and some of the leaves should be ready for picking. The leaves are picked off as they ripen, and the harvest starts in January and finishes in April. Irrigation of the paddocks continues during the hottest months of the harvest, while the unpicked leaves ripen. All the available labour in the area is mobilised while the picking season continues, and a great deal of labour is hired (in some competition with the hop gardens which have their picking season at approximately the same time). ¹

The sharefarmer is responsible for seeing the crop picked and stacked in the kilns for curing, so he pays the wages of the labour that is hired to help with the picking. The owner is usually responsible for transporting the picked leaves from the paddocks to the kilns, and for firing the kilns (which are part of his capital stock). The leaves are picked by men on foot between the shoulder-high tobacco plants, and carried by the pickers to the trucks which take the loose leaves to the sheds.² In the

¹ Tobacco picking pays better than hop picking, however; and during the period of this study tobacco was a far more important crop in the Ovens Valley area than hops.

² One or two growers are experimenting with semi-mechanical pickers, which work on the same principle as planters and scarifiers. A tractor pulls a trailer between the rows of tobacco plants, and the men who are picking sit on the trailer and pick the ripe leaves off each plant as they ride by.
sheds the loose leaves are tied onto sticks by women (who are paid piece rates unless they are the wives of the sharemen or farm owners whose crop it is)\(^1\) and then stacked in the kiln.\(^2\) Growers usually calculate on picking a kiln-full of tobacco a day; and the first and most intense stage of curing the tobacco takes place the night it is picked. It remains in the kiln for a few days longer, going through further stages of curing at lower temperatures.

\(^1\) Generally men do not pay their own wives for the labour they do on their farms, because if they did their wives would be separately taxed. The more work a man's wife does, therefore, the lower are the labour costs on the farm, for he would have to hire workers to do the work if she did not do it. Wives who help their husbands in this way do not appear in the workforce in the Census, even in the 'Helper (not on wage or salary)' category. For example, in the 1966 Census, only 1/4 women are stated to be in the 'Helper' category in the rural part of the shire of Myrtleford, though this district has a high percentage of tobacco growers in its population; see Census, 1966.

\(^2\) Each farm has a number of kilns, and uses them in rotation, so that when they are all full the tobacco in the first one to be filled has been completely cured and can be removed to make room for another batch. The leaf is flue-cured, in tall, narrow corrugated-iron kilns heated by oil burners set on the ground. Vents in the roof control the temperature. These small old-fashioned kilns (which growers said cost about $1,000 each to build) are rather inefficient and somewhat dangerous, especially as the curing of tobacco is carried out in the height of summer, when the fire-risk is high. On the most modern farms, which are being set up by growers who have received capital compensation for the farms flooded under the Buffalo River Dam scheme, single, large, concrete down-draft kilns are being built. In these, the hot air is initially forced downwards into the kiln, and as it rises again it circulates through the racks of leaves. The heat is more evenly spread throughout the kiln, and more effective means of controlling the temperature are incorporated than exist in the older type of kiln.
As the curing of each kiln-full of leaf is completed, the sticks of tobacco are stored in the grading sheds until the whole harvest has been picked and cured. Then the owners and the sharemen together grade and bale the cured leaves for sale. This is almost entirely a masculine occupation, and extra labour is not hired for it. It is carried on inside the artificially lit grading sheds, at benches. Though it is a fairly skilled operation, it is a repetitive one. The workers chat and have the radio on during the long hours of grading.

The cured leaves are graded for quality and leaf type according to criteria agreed with the buyers. Grading, baling and selling of leaf continues until the end of August, and by the time it is finished growers have begun to cultivate the next season's seedlings ready for planting out in October.

From this description of the agricultural year on the tobacco farms, it is clear that at planting out and at harvest time, farm owners and sharemen were working together (though with the owner in a supervisory position), and that for the rest of the growing season the sharemen were working under the owner's supervision, though usually without his direct assistance. Absentee farm owners who left their farms in the hands of sharemen are rare. One shareman who was interviewed worked for an owner who was away on a trip to Italy; another had worked the season before the interview on a farm whose owner lived in Melbourne; and another worked for an owner who was too old to take much active part in the running of his farm: but in all these cases the owners had appointed managers to run

---

1 See discussion below, Appendix III, pp. 468-9.
their farms for them. Owners often remarked in the course of interviews that they preferred to handle the capital equipment of their farms (the tractors, the watering pipes and the kilns) themselves whenever it was being used for fear of the damage sharemen might do if it was left to them. A similar consideration applied to grading: few sharemen were regarded by the owners as being sufficiently skilful to grade the cured tobacco leaves by themselves.

The working arrangements of the tobacco growing industry clearly provided opportunities for categorical interaction between hosts and migrants for many Australians and Italians in the Ovens Valley area. However, although many Australian owners employed Italian sharemen, there was a marked tendency for Italian owners to employ co-ethnics as sharemen. It appeared that many Australians would employ Australian sharemen rather than migrants if they were available; and that Italians who had become farm owners preferred to employ co-ethnics rather than face the communication problems involved in employing members of the other migrant categories who presented themselves for employment as sharemen.

1 Since there were very few Australian tobacco growers who were not farm-owners, (and the few Australian sharemen encountered in the course of this study were working for Australian owners), a farm with both Australians and Italians associated with it was almost invariably one on which the owners were Australian and the sharemen Italian.

2 On 41.5% of the farms in Victoria, owners and sharemen were all Italian; see Table XXV above, p. 167, and further discussion of the tendency for Italian owners to employ Italian sharemen below, Chapter 7, pp. 351-3.
Residential Arrangements

Besides having particular characteristics regarding cultivation, the tobacco growing industry had particular residential arrangements that had marked effects on the life of the population as a whole and on the interaction between Australians and migrants.

Usually the owner of a farm and his sharefarmers all lived on the property. Generally speaking, farm owners were conspicuously better housed than their sharefarmers, though the owners of some small farms were badly housed in comparison with the sharemen of the richest and most generous owners. In most cases the owner had a brick-veneer house with ample living rooms, while his sharemen had tiny weatherboard cottages, containing four small rooms, one of which was the living room and kitchen for all the family. The few Australian sharemen, like the Italian and other migrant sharemen, had to make do with the small cottages provided by the owners of the farms, or else buy or build their own houses apart from the farms on which they worked.

Since the accommodation was provided free, along with the job, sharemen had little scope for choice. People with large families, in particular, found themselves in difficulties. One tobacco shareman who was interviewed was living in a household consisting of seven people (himself, his wife, their four children and his unmarried brother). The house was a four-roomed sharemen's

1 Of the 101 informants who were growing tobacco at the time of the interview, 90 (89.1%) lived in houses that were part of the farms which they owned or on which they worked.
Another, a man with five children ranging in age from eighteen years to six months, stayed on his current farm because the house provided was large enough for his family, although he was dissatisfied with his contract with the owners. Another shareman (an Australian) had built himself a house on his own land, rather than have the conditions of his home life dictated by his job. Experienced sharemen whose services were in demand were able to reject work on farms where the housing conditions dissatisfied them (or their wives), but most sharemen were glad of rent-free accommodation near their work, and expected they would be able to afford better housing later.

Bachelor sharefarmers usually boarded with married sharemen (often their relatives) on the same farm.

Living on the farm had many advantages for a tobacco grower, since at some times of the year work in the paddocks started before dawn and went on until after dark. One family of growers who were interviewed lived in Wangaratta, and leased tobacco land at Ovens. They had a 'sleep-out' near the Ovens land where they spent the nights during the busiest seasons. Another informant, a young bachelor grower, spent as many nights boarding with his married partner on his farm in the Kiewa Valley as he did at home with his parents in Myrtleford.

Living on the farm often had disadvantages too, particularly for the wife of a tobacco grower, who was more isolated than her husband (who could drive the car) or her

---

1 Altogether 44 of the 105 informants lived in households containing 5 or more people; the composition of households will be discussed below, Chapter 6, pp. 279-82.

2 See discussion of the financial arrangements between owners and sharemen below, Appendix III, pp. 469-76.
children (who travelled to and from school every day). Although the average tobacco farm was small and the general appearance of the Ovens Valley area was one of dense settlement, some farms were many miles from any of the small centres of population in the area, and some were also some distance away from their nearest neighbours, separated from them by pine plantations or uncleared bush. In this situation, the inhabitants of the tobacco farms were dependent upon their neighbours for company; and every Italian tobacco grower had some Australian neighbours on his own or on nearby farms. The opportunities which this provided for interaction between Australians and Italians were seldom taken up. It was not uncommon to find that Australian farm owners knew remarkably little about the Italians living on their own farms, apart from their names and their reliability as workmen. However, occasionally relationships of a non-categorical kind developed between Australians and Italians on the basis of their residential contiguity; and the scattering of the Italian population throughout the Ovens Valley area as a result of the residential arrangements of the tobacco growing industry at least made several opportunities for interaction available.

---

1 The situation of women on tobacco farms is discussed below, Chapter 6, pp. 305-9.

2 For example, many of the Buffalo River farms were twenty miles or so from Myrtleford, and there were a number of isolated farms upstream from Bright and in the outlying parts of the Kiewa Valley.
Tobacco Politics

During the period of this study, there were two competing tobacco growers' associations in Victoria: the Victorian Tobacco Growers' Association Limited (whose membership included both owners and sharemen) and the Ovens and Murray Tobacco Producers' Organisation (whose membership was only open to owners). To some extent the Victorian Tobacco Producers' Co-operative Society (a co-operative marketing organisation which also admitted only owners to membership) entered the dispute between the other two organisations as a third party.¹

The Victorian Tobacco Growers Association Limited (referred to by tobacco growers as the V.T.G.A.Ltd.) and the Ovens and Murray Tobacco Producers' Association (referred to as a the O.&M.) were struggling for control of the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board and the Quota Committee, which between them administer the production and sale of tobacco in Victoria. The quota system was still in its trial stages, and there had been no election for the Quota Committee. The members of the Tobacco Board which had concluded its two year term in 1966 and had been superseded by the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board were operating in 1967 as an ad hoc Quota Committee, by appointment by the Victorian Department of Agriculture. Elections were held for the new Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board in 1966.

¹ See account of the development of these bodies, and of the disputes between them below, Appendix III, pp.466-7.
The old Tobacco Board which was still acting as a Quota Committee consisted of four Australian tobacco growers (all farm owners, and one of them a Shire Councillor in Myrtleford), all elected, and an appointee of the Victorian Department of Agriculture (a senior employee of the Department). In 1966 the four tobacco growers on this Board all ran for election to the new Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board but in two different teams. Two of them were joined by an Australian and an Italian tobacco grower on an election ticket sponsored by the V.T.G.A. Ltd., and the other two were joined by another Australian grower to contest the election 'independently'.

There was a third team in the contest, consisting of two Italian and two Australian growers sponsored by the O. & M., and it was this team that apparently polled the largest number of votes. However, the defeated candidates (that is, the V.T.G.A.Ltd.) took legal action charging irregularities in the poll. In May 1966 a Supreme Court injunction was issued suspending Board, pending a complete court hearing to determine the validity of the election. A temporary manager of the Board was appointed by Act of the Victorian Parliament. The O.&M. (which had apparently won the election but had been prevented from taking control by the Court) retaliated by attempting to have some

---

1 The Independents campaigned on a 'unify the industry' policy, and advocated that the small tobacco growers' Co-operative society should be expanded to include all growers, so that the Victorian industry could be run on co-operative lines in the same way as that of Queensland.

2 See The Myrtleford Times, 5th April, 26th April and 3rd May, 1966, for the details given here.
of the actions of this manager declared invalid, but he was still acting as manager in 1967.

All registered tobacco growers, both farm owners and sharemen, were eligible to vote in the election. One of the grounds on which the election result was contested was that a large number of the people who had voted were incorrectly registered; for example, that they were actually the wives or sons of sharemen, rather than sharefarmers themselves. A number of factors combined to make the list of registered growers somewhat inaccurate: and an example of its inaccuracy is that the name of one of the V.T.G.A. Ltd. candidates in the election does not appear on it.

Apart from the difficulty of settling exactly whether an individual was a tobacco grower, some owners objected to the fact that sharefarmers had equal voting rights with themselves. Most of these objections came from members of the O. & M., which only admits a few people to its membership, all owners of large farms, though during the Marketing Board elections it canvassed for support amongst sharefarmers and amongst farm owners other than its own members. There were suggestions amongst V.T.G.A. Ltd., supporters that the O. & M. had won the election by coercion of the sharemen who worked for its members and bribery of some small tobacco farm owners. However, in a rural context it is difficult to distinguish outright coercion from a sense of obligation between a shareman and a good 'boss' (farm owner), or bribery from a sense of

---

1 The various inadequacies of the registered list of tobacco growers, which was used as a sampling frame in this study for lack of any other, are discussed below, Appendix I, pp.392-4.
obligation between friends. A number of sharemen interviewed in the course of this study said they supported the O. & M. because their bosses did, and they felt loyal to them. A few small farm owners who had businesses as well implied that they expected to receive business as tokens of friendship from members of the O. & M., which they had supported in the election.

The Ovens and Murray Tobacco Producers' Organisation had both Australians and Italians amongst its members and supporters. Its Italian members were almost without exception men who had grown up in Australia, or who were born here. It had no offices and little formal organisation. It only needed translators to communicate with non-English speakers when it was campaigning for support amongst non-members of the organisation. It did not hold public meetings except during election campaigns.

Generally the supporters of the O. & M. were opposed to the Marketing Board and to the quota system. They included the growers who established large upstream farms just before the quota system was introduced. They could not obtain quotas large enough for the full capacity of their farms because the quotas were fixed on yield in the years before their farms were fully productive. They argued that the quota system prevented the expansion of the industry, discouraged growers from realising economies of scale, maintained worn-out land in production and discouraged the development of new areas. Also it prevented them from making the profits from their heavy investments which they had expected.

---

1 See discussion above, Chapter 3, p.74.
The Victorian Tobacco Growers Association Limited performed many of the functions of a welfare society for its members,¹ and sent out all its literature in both English and Italian. In the election campaign one of its four candidates was a long-established, Italian-born tobacco grower. Up to December, 1966, it had two Australian directors and two Italian ones, all substantial tobacco growers. In December 1966 one of the Australians did not stand for re-election, and was replaced by an Italian-born man who had been acting as a liaison officer for the Association for some years. He no longer grew tobacco himself though he had done so as a sharefarmer in the past.² Whenever the Association held a meeting the proceedings were translated into Italian for the benefit of the non-English speakers; and the receptionist at the Association's offices in Myrtleford was bi-lingual.

Supporters of the V.T.G.A. Ltd. included the downstream growers whose farms tended to produce tobacco of a type less attractive to the buyers than that produced upstream.³

¹ The Association provided Italian-English interpreters ('liaison officers'), insured tobacco growers against fire, acted as the spokesman for growers with the Government (for example in demanding compensation for the floods in 1966-67), and had recently begun to provide an accountancy service for growers. However, the Association was not a migrant organisation, and did not perform its services only for migrants, so it is not comparable with the migrant welfare associations discussed, for example, in Thomas & Znaniecki: The Polish Peasant in Europe and America, 1927, pp.1467-1644.


³ See discussion above, Chapter 3, p.74.
They supported the quota system, which ensured that they would be able to sell as much tobacco as in the early 1960s. The argued that it was much fairer than unbridled competition, which would favour the larger, richer growers, and those with good social contacts with the buyers. The quota system, they said, enabled the industry to stabilise its output and its prices, and it gave growers a voice in running the industry through the election of growers' representatives to the Marketing Board and the Quota Committee. They pointed out that Government backing for the growers enabled them to overcome their weak bargaining position vis-a-vis the four companies who were their customers.

Both sides grumbled about individual decisions of the Quota Committee, and both claimed that the Victorian share of the Commonwealth quota was too low. Disagreements between the two groups were far more marked than their areas of agreement, however.

The third party in the Marketing Board elections of 1966 was strongly connected with the Victorian Tobacco Producers' Co-operative Society. The Co-operative included members of both the other growers' associations (the V.T.G.A. Ltd. and the O. & M.), which put it in a very good position to press for unity between them. Throughout the period of this study it sponsored meetings between the representatives of the other associations to discuss means of re-unifying the industry. Its leadership was drawn from the Australian tobacco farm owners, supported by a few of the best established Italian ones. It conducted its own business in English, but at a public meeting of tobacco growers, held by the Co-operative to campaign for the 'independent' candidates in the 1966 election for the Marketing Board, an Italian translation was provided for
the non-English speaking members of the audience by an Italian-born resident of Myrtleford (not a tobacco grower).¹

The leadership of the various tobacco growers' associations reflected the ethnic composition of the population of tobacco farm owners, though not of the sharemen. Only Italians and Australians were represented, and other ethnic categories (such as Spanish, Greek and Yugoslav) who were represented only amongst the sharemen in the area did not even have the transactions of the various associations translated to them.²

Looking at the representation more closely, however, it appears that southern Italians were under-represented, even though Italians as a whole were not. Almost all the Italian leaders were northern Italians or the Australian-born sons of northerners.

Of the Italian-born informants interviewed, 28 (38.4%) supported the V.T.G.A.Ltd., compared with 11 (34.4%) of the Australian-born (including those born in Australia of Italian origin).³ Supporters of the O. & M. comprised 6 (8.2%) of the Italian-born informants and 10 (31.2%) of the Australian-born.⁴ In other words, the Australian-born (who are almost all farm owners) were almost evenly divided between the two associations, and the Italian-born (who include a large number of sharefarmers) tended to support

¹ See The Myrtleford Times, 5th April, 1966.
² See discussion of the ethnic composition of the tobacco growing population above, Chapter 3, pp.89-108 and 133-6.
³ The difference between these two proportions is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.
⁴ The difference between these two proportions is statistically significant, at the 1.0% level.
the V.T.G.A.Ltd. It seems that the affiliations of tobacco growers were more closely related to their economic status in the industry than to their ethnic origin. However, these statistics are incomplete, because of the difficulty of obtaining exact information about tobacco politics while they were undergoing a crisis. People were reluctant to state their loyalties for fear a kinsman, an employer or a customer might hear about them and be offended. 53.4% of the Italian-born informants did not state where their loyalties lay, and 34.4% of the Australian-born were similarly reluctant.\footnote{The difference between these two proportions is statistically significant at the 5.0% level.} There did not seem to be any marked differences between informants born in northern Italy and those born in the south regarding any aspect of the politics of the tobacco industry.\footnote{There are no differences which are statistically significant even at the 10.0% level between the proportions of northern and southern Italian-born individuals in the sample supporting either the V.T.G.A. Ltd. or the O. & M. or between the proportions of each category willing to state their allegiance.} The figures are too sketchy to allow any statement to be made as to whether affiliation in tobacco politics was related to length of residence in the area.

In spite of the intensity with which tobacco politics were conducted and the degree of bitterness expressed by the leaders of each group in talking about the leaders of the other, 47 out of the 105 growers interviewed claimed that they did not have any clear idea of the basis of the dispute between the various associations. Of the remainder, the majority (25) believed that economic problems (overproduction, or the introduction of the quota system, for
example) were at the root of the disagreements; and another 17 gave explanations along similar lines.\(^1\) A small proportion (7 informants) expressed the opinion that the disputes were simply due to personal bickering between individual growers. The Italian-born men in the sample saw the issues in the same way as the Australian-born, and the southern Italians in the same way as the northerners.\(^2\) Though tobacco growers did not agree about the grounds of the quarrel between the V.T.G.A.Ltd. and the O.& M. their differences of opinion did not coincide with their different ethnic origins.

One marked common factor shared by all three tobacco growers' associations was that they all included both Italians and Australians in their membership and amongst their leadership. The Italians who became leaders in the various associations differed somewhat from the majority of their co-ethnics in being the owners of fairly large farms,\(^3\) long-standing and respected residents of the area, well-known to both Italians and Australian tobacco growers, and with a good command of English. They were not necessarily connected with the largest immigration chains represented

---

1 For example: 'It's the big growers against the small ones', or 'It's a question of being fair to everyone'.

2 There are no significant differences between these various categories in relation to the proportions of their members who claimed not to understand the quarrels in the industry, or the proportions suggesting particular explanations of the disagreements between tobacco growers.

3 With one exception, referred to above, p.183. This individual had considerable local standing, however, in spite of the fact that he had never been a farm owner. He had served as an officer in the Italian army, and had been employed for several years by the V.T.G.A.Ltd., in the administrative capacity of 'liaison officer'.
in the area, and it appears that their leadership positions were due to the fact that they were well known to their Australian neighbours, rather than simply to their personal support in the Italian population.  

Although the quarrels between the various tobacco growers' associations reflected and reinforced various dissensions amongst the tobacco growers, the composition of the associations actually discouraged dissension between Italians and Australians. Migrants and hosts worked together within the associations for their common interests in a way that encouraged both categorical and non-categorical interaction between them. However, there was a tendency for interaction even in the associations to remain at a categorical level. From the behaviour of Italians and Australians towards one another in the V.T.G.A. Ltd. offices, it seemed that (probably in order to avoid the possible embarrassments and misunderstandings possible in non-categorical behaviour) Australians often maintained relationships that threatened to become non-categorical at a categorical level by joking with their Italian colleagues about their supposed 'Italian-ness'. In other words, it was made clear to them that there were certain rules of behaviour which they were expected to observe in a specifically 'Italian' way (as defined by Australians), rather than according to their own personal tastes.

---

1 In this they differed from the leaders of the Savoy Club (see below, Chapter 5, pp. 205-9), though several leaders of the tobacco growers' associations had personal followings amongst the Italian population as well as the respect of Australian tobacco growers, and therefore were found amongst the leaders of the Savoy Club as well as amongst the leaders of the tobacco growers' associations.
PART IV: OTHER OCCUPATIONAL SITUATIONS

The minority of Italians in the Ovens Valley area who were not employed in the tobacco growing industry fell into four categories: recent arrivals whose English was not very good and who took labouring jobs with bush clearing contractors or building or construction firms (generally intending to become sharemen on tobacco farms when they had the opportunity); those who had established themselves in their own service businesses (such as butchers, builders or grocers) obtaining their customers mainly from the Italian population; those who had invested money earned by tobacco growing in other enterprises (such as service stations); and those who had been educated in Australia and who took jobs as shop assistants, secretaries, apprentice motor mechanics, and so on, in the general commercial life of the area.

Italians in the first category had very little opportunity for interaction of any kind with Australians. Often both their employers and their co-workers were Italians or other migrants; and their lack of knowledge of English made contact with Australians difficult.

Italians in the second category had very little necessary interaction with Australians, for both their customers and the wholesalers they dealt with were usually migrants. However, most of them had been living in the Ovens Valley area for some years, and their position in the business world made various kinds of social contacts with Australians possible for them.

Italians in the third category were usually well-known to both the Australian and the Italian population. Their initial success in the tobacco growing industry had led them into interaction with Australian tobacco growers; and their businesses usually served both migrants and Australians.
Italians in the fourth category, being Australian educated and often Australian-born, were amongst the most likely of all Italians to have Australian friends, and to interact with Australians in non-categorical as well as categorical relationships. The friendships they had formed at school with Australians still held, and they had practically no language difficulties. In their work situation, they were likely to have Australian employers, workmates and customers.

PART V: CONCLUSION

It appears that the various areas of life in which interaction between hosts and migrants appeared necessary provided ample opportunities for Italians and Australians to establish direct relationships with one another. However, some of the opportunities (such as those provided by the need for Italians to learn English) were largely ignored. Others (such as the necessity for many farm owners to employ sharemen) were sometimes turned into opportunities for Italians to mix with Italians, rather with members of other ethnic categories (for example, when Italians became farm owners they often chose to employ co-ethnics as sharemen).

Whenever interaction between adult hosts and migrants was accepted as a necessity it appeared to be kept at the categorical level as far as possible. Only the Italian children attending school appeared to be in a good position to establish non-categorical relationships with Australians by means of their necessary interaction with them.

The following chapter will discuss interaction in areas of life in which interaction was voluntary, and in which non-categorical relationships were more likely to occur.
CHAPTER 5

AREAS IN WHICH INTERACTION WAS VOLUNTARY

The previous chapter examined the interaction between migrants and hosts in the Ovens Valley area in those areas of life in which some interaction between them was regarded as necessary. It was found that, although a great deal of interaction took place in these areas most of that interaction was of the categorical kind. Through it, migrants learnt how to behave appropriately when dealing with Australians, but they did not make friends with Australians or learn to know them very well.

This chapter will discuss interaction between Italians and Australians in those areas of life in which interaction was voluntary. The amount and kind of interaction between Italians and Australians in the political life of the area, and in the various community, sporting and voluntary associations, will be discussed; and finally the relations between Italians and Australians as neighbours, and the occurrence of friendship between them will be examined. Since the interaction between Italians and Australians described here was voluntary, fewer residents of the Ovens Valley area were involved in it than were involved in the necessary interaction described in the previous chapter. Where appropriate, the ways in which the hosts and migrants involved in the interaction described here differed from the host and migrant populations at large will be indicated.

The interaction described here was voluntary in two senses: first, because it took place in areas of life to which many residents of the Ovens Valley area were able to remain indifferent with no apparent loss to themselves (such
as community and sporting associations); and second because it was largely a matter of choice for the individual whether he participated in these areas alongside members of his own ethnic category, or alongside those of other ethnic categories (for example, there were associations with both Italian and Australian members, and others with all-Italian or all-Australian memberships). In describing voluntary interaction in the Ovens Valley area, therefore, it is necessary to consider the organisations which were available for migrant-migrant interaction, as well as those which were available for migrant-host interaction. In this chapter, the fields of interaction which are discussed have been arranged in an order that progresses from those in which migrants had to interact with hosts if they participated at all (such as Federal and Local politics) to those in which migrants could choose between interaction with hosts and interaction only with other migrants (such as community associations, and neighbourhood and friendship). The matter of migrant-migrant interaction, which becomes increasingly important towards the end of this chapter and which occupies much of the following chapter, will be treated descriptively here; but its relationship to migrant-host interaction will be analysed at some length when the overall pattern of interaction is discussed in Chapter 7.

PART I: POLITICS

Federal and State Politics

In McIntyre's studies of life in rural Victoria,¹ politics are not even mentioned; and Holt's study² of

Victorian rural communities only makes a brief reference to a single political party. This suggests that political life was not an important feature of the areas they examined. The suggestion is borne out by Oeser and Emery's remarks in relation to yet another Victorian rural area. They refer to 'a widespread apathy rooted in a basic political conservatism', and comment on the ban on public expression of political views that operates in rural areas. 'Politics are seen as mainly concerned with national or state issues, not local, and as mainly an activity for parliamentarians or would-be parliamentarians (except for the three-yearly intervention of the electors). Gruen also comments on the conservative voting patterns of rural areas.

The same observations could be made on the political attitudes of the Australians in the Ovens Valley area, except that there was a keen interest in 'pressure group politics' in the State and Federal capitals amongst the tobacco growers. The politics of the tobacco growing industry were not seen as related directly to national party politics, but as a series of issues to be resolved by direct pressure on the Legislature and the Department of Agriculture. Amongst the Australians there was little interest in political debate, and none of the four political parties represented in the area attempted to exploit the conflicts within the tobacco growing industry in their campaigns.

During the period of this study, there was an election for the Federal House of Representatives, and a State-wide

---

1 See Oeser & Emery: *Social Structure and Personality in a Rural Community*, 1954, p.33.
2 Oeser & Emery: *Social Structure and Personality in a Rural Community*, 1954, p.32.
controversy about capital punishment was aroused by the execution of Ryan in 1966. The election was hardly discussed, and there was little overt evidence of it apart from the campaign favours on the candidates' cars. The execution of Ryan was sometimes discussed, informally, between acquaintances, but it was hardly ever seen in political terms. One of the Australians in the sample suggested that this political reticence might have been partly due to a lack of confidence in their abilities in debate amongst farmers who had only had a minimum of formal education.

Of the Australian tobacco growers interviewed, 22 were eligible to vote. Three of these stated that they were not interested in politics, and only four could be said to be more than slightly interested. Of the 19 who were at all interested in politics, 9 stated that they supported the Country Party, one was a Liberal, and 2 supported the Australian Labour Party; the other 7 did not state their political allegiance. The Country Party supporters included owners of small farms as well as owners of large ones, and growers who had no grazing interests as well as those who ran considerable beef herds as well as growing tobacco. They also included Australian sharefarmers. The Liberal and A.L.P. supporters were all farm owners, though the farms they owned were relatively small. It appears, therefore, that support for the Country Party was widespread amongst the Australians of the Ovens Valley area, and that it was by no means confined to the graziers and the owners of the largest farms.

Thirty-two of the Italian-born informants in the sample were eligible to vote in Australia, but 24 of these stated that they took no interest in Australian politics, and only

---

1 However, a local politician (a member of the State Legislative Council) commented that he believed political interests were behind the State-wide agitation against capital punishment.
one appeared to be more than slightly interested. The Jehovah's Witnesses took no interest in secular matters such as politics as a matter of doctrine. Some of the remainder explained their lack of interest by reference to the complicated Australian voting system, and to the long hours involved in tobacco growing which left them no time to keep up with political issues. Remarks such as 'the Government is O.K. - it's democratic' were common, though it was not clear whether the government was being favourably compared with Italian Fascism, with Communism, or with both. A few Italians apparently suspected the Australian Labour Party of Communist leanings. Many seemed to support the A.L.P. line on Vietnam, even though they remained favourably disposed to the Liberal-Country Party governing coalition. Of the 8 Italian-born informants who took any interest in Australian politics, one stated that he supported the Country Party, 2 were Liberals, and the rest did not reveal their political allegiance.

Commentators have remarked on the difficulty many migrants experience in forgetting the political preoccupations of their countries of origin, and becoming concerned about the political issues that are relevant to Australia. However, the political indifference of many of the Italian-born residents of the Ovens Valley area cannot readily be traced to a continuing preoccupation with Italian political issues. Italian tobacco growers seemed indifferent to political issues in general, and to be preoccupied with the day to day business of living in their new country.

1 See, for example, Price: *Southern Europeans in Australia*, 1963, pp.302-6.

2 A similar observation is made by Hempel, discussing the Italians in Queensland; see Hempel: *Italians in Queensland*, 1959.
However, a few Italians, particularly the older ones, were willing to discuss matters of political principle, such as the admission of Asian immigrants into Australian and aid to underdeveloped countries.

Five of the Australian-born men of Italian origin who were interviewed were old enough to vote. Only one of these stated that he had no interest in Australian politics, though the others appeared to be only slightly interested. Those who took an interest were evenly divided between the Liberal Party and the Country Party. Of two Italo-Australians interviewed, both of whom were large-scale tobacco growers and supporters of the O.& M., one supported the Country Party and the other the Liberal Party.

The election results during the period of this study seem to indicate that the Country Party was strongly supported in the Ovens Valley area as a whole, but that the Italians and their descendants tended to support the Liberal Party.

During 1966 and 1967, all the representation of the Ovens Valley area at State and Federal levels was in the hands of the Country Party. In Victoria, it was represented in the State Legislative Council by the Hon. Ivan Archie Swinburne, a tobacco-grower and farmer resident in Myrtleford, and an ex-cabinet minister; and it was represented in the State Legislative Assembly by the Hon Thomas Walter Mitchell.

1 For the purpose of elections to the Victorian Legislative Council, the Ovens Valley Area falls within the North Eastern Province; for elections to the Victorian Legislative Assembly it falls within the District of Benambra; and for elections to the Federal House of Representatives it falls within the Division of Indi. Each of the electoral districts includes a considerably greater area than the Ovens Valley area itself, however.

An election for the Federal House of Representatives was held in 1966, and the Indi Division (which includes the Ovens Valley area) re-elected Rendle McNeilage Holten, a Country Party member who had held the seat since 1958. At that election he received 22,146 first preference votes out of a total of 44,505, that is, 49.8% of the vote. The remainder of the vote was divided between Australian Labour Party, Liberal, and Democratic Labour Party candidates. Table XXVI\(^1\) shows the proportions of the first preference votes going to each of the candidates in the electoral sub-divisions which included the Ovens Valley area, compared with the proportions for the division as a whole.

From this Table it appears that the sub-divisions of Moyhu and Yackandandah were particularly strong Country Party areas; that Wangaratta was as strongly Country Party as the Division as a whole; and that Beechworth and Ovens supported the Country Party less strongly than the neighbouring sub-divisions. However, while in Beechworth it appears that for reasons that are not apparent from the data available here the Australian Labour Party gained at the expense of the Country Party, in Ovens it appears that the Liberal Party gained. In fact, the Ovens sub-division had a higher Liberal vote than the Division as a whole, and all the other sub-divisions which include parts of the Ovens Valley area had a lower Liberal vote than the Division as a whole.

Table XXVII\(^2\) presents an analysis of the proportions of voters with Italian surnames in each of the local government areas which include the Ovens Valley area. This gives some indication of the importance of voters of Italian origin in each of the electoral sub-divisions in the Division of Indi,

---

1. See below, p.198.
2. See below, p.199.
### TABLE XXVI

**PROPORTIONS OF FIRST PREFERENCE VOTES CAST FOR EACH CANDIDATE IN THE DIVISION OF INDI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ELECTION, 26th November 1966, IN THE SUB-DIVISIONS INCLUDING THE OVENS VALLEY AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Division</th>
<th>Party Affiliation of Candidates</th>
<th>Informal Ballot Papers</th>
<th>Total Number of Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.L.P. %</td>
<td>C.P. %</td>
<td>A.L.P. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechworth</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyhu</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovens</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yackandandah</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Division</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Statistical Returns... in relation to the General Elections for the House of Representatives 1966... 1967.

---

1. The Sub-division of Beechworth includes the Local Government Areas of Beechworth Town and Shire; that of Moyhu the Shire of Oxley; that of Ovens, Bright Shire and Mount Beauty Town as well as Myrtleford Town and Shire; that of Wangaratta, Wangaratta City and Wangaratta Shire; and that of Yackandandah, Yackandah Shire. However, comparison of the total number of votes cast in each sub-division with the total numbers of registered electors in the relevant Local Government Areas (shown in Table XXVII, below, p.199) shows that, even if allowance is made for failures to vote and postal votes, the sub-division boundaries do not correspond exactly to the Local Government Area boundaries.

2. The total Division includes 11 additional sub-divisions besides the 5 shown in this Table.
and goes some way towards explaining the voting patterns shown in Table XXVI.

### TABLE XXVII

PERCENTAGE OF VOTERS WITH ITALIAN SURNAMES IN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS WHICH INCLUDE THE OVENs VALLEY AREA, 1966-67

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF VOTERS WITH ITALIAN SURNAMES %</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beechworth Town and Shire</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Shire and Mount Beauty Town</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtleford Town and Shire</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>1,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxley Shire</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta City</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta Shire</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yackandandah Shire</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for the whole area</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,764</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Taking the Local Government Areas of Bright Shire and Mount Beauty Town and Myrtleford Town and Shire together it appears that 10.7% of the voters on the tolls were of Italian origin. Since these Local Government Areas comprised most of the sub-division of Ovens, it therefore appears that that sub-division had a higher proportion of Italians amongst its voters than the other sub-divisions in the Ovens Valley area. This was the principal difference between this sub-division and its neighbours, and it seems that this may be the factor that accounts for the high Liberal vote in the sub-division. Ovens did not contain a particularly high
proportion of 'city' people who might be expected to vote for the 'city' Liberal or Labour Parties as against the Country Party; and it does not appear that tobacco sharemen and small farm owners in the Ovens Valley area voted Liberal rather than Country Party in order to register a protest against the party of the big farmers and graziers. In fact, both Myrtleford and Bright Shires included several large tobacco farms and grazing properties, some owned by Italians. If it was the votes of the Italians that contributed to the Liberal vote in the Ovens sub-division, it was possibly because the Italians there saw themselves as potentially urban rather than rural. On the other hand, it may have been simply a vote for the government in power, which might have been expected from non-politically minded migrants who were pleased with the economic prospects which their country of adoption offered them. However, the government in power was a Liberal-Country Party coalition; and normal political strategy would suggest that the best way to keep the coalition in power, when voting in a Country Party area, was to vote for the Country Party candidate rather than split the vote. Perhaps the Italian voters in Ovens failed to realise this. The fact that the Ovens sub-division had a higher percentage of informal ballot papers than the other sub-divisions which included parts of the Ovens Valley area may be an indication that the Italian voters who were present in such large numbers in that sub-division found it difficult to vote correctly in the comparatively complicated Australian preferential voting system.

1 This possibility is mentioned above, Chapter 3, p.111.
2 See Table XXVI, above, p.198.
It is also worth remarking on the slightly higher than average Democratic Labour Party vote in the Ovens sub-division, which may be accounted for by the size of the Catholic population in the Local Government areas which fell in this sub-division, which in turn was partly due to the numbers of Italians there. However, although the D.L.P. vote in Ovens was slightly higher than elsewhere in the Division, it was not nearly as high as the size of the Catholic population might lead one to expect. It appears that the Italians swelled the Catholic population, but did not, in general, vote D.L.P.

The effect of the presence of a high proportion of Italian voters in the Ovens sub-division does not appear to be repeated in the sub-division of Moyhu. The shire of Oxley, which comprised much of the Moyhu sub-division, had a voter's roll on which 8.4% of the names were Italian; but the sub-division of Moyhu had a Liberal vote lower than that of the Division of Indi as a whole, though not as low as some of its neighbouring sub-divisions. On the other hand, it had an unusually high Country Party vote. One may speculate that either the Italians in this sub-division were voting for the Country wing of the government coalition, or that their Liberal votes had no support from their Australian neighbours.

---

1 In 1966, the Census shows that the proportion of Catholics in the population of the Local Government Areas included in the sub-division of Ovens was 38.7%, compared with 34.0% of the total population of all the Local Government Areas which include the Ovens Valley area. The percentage of the population of Italian birth in the Local Government areas included in the sub-division of Ovens was 10.5%, compared with 6.0% of the total population of all the Local Government Areas which include the Ovens Valley area. It is clear that the additional 4.7% of the population which was Catholic was almost entirely due to the additional 4.5% of the population which was Italian-born.
Whatever the effects of the Italians on the voting patterns in the Ovens Valley area, however, none of the representatives of the area at either State or Federal levels were of Italian origin, and Italians were not active in State or Federal politics in the area.

Local Politics

Local politics in the Ovens Valley area were conducted without apparent reference to national party affiliation. They aroused slightly more public interest and discussion than Federal or State politics, at least amongst the Australians, partly because many of the personalities involved were also leading figures in the disputes within the tobacco growing industry. Although there were many Italians amongst the active disputants in the tobacco growing industry, few Italians were in evidence as active participants in local politics in the Ovens Valley area as a whole, perhaps because the number of Italians who had a vote was fairly low.\(^1\)

In the Local Government Area of Myrtleford, however, 19.2\(\%\) of the voters had Italian names. In 1967, in this shire, a local tobacco grower, born in Australia but of Italian origin, was elected to the Myrtleford Shire Council. He had previously served on the Council from 1960 to 1963.\(^2\)

In addition to being active in local politics and in tobacco politics he was one of the few people of Italian origin to be active in the voluntary associations of the Ovens Valley area.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Taking all the Local Government Areas which included the Ovens Valley area as a whole, only 5.2\(\%\) of the registered voters had Italian surnames; see Table XXVII, above, p.199.


\(^3\) See discussion of Italian participation in voluntary associations below, pp.203-5.
Voting in local government elections was not compulsory in Myrtleford in 1967. In November 1967 the Shire Council of Myrtleford voted five to four in favour of introducing compulsory voting at the 1968 election, in spite of the objections of one of the Australian councillors that 'We have a big population of New Australians here who would not understand'.\(^1\) If this decision leads to larger turn-out of Italian electors in future, it may lead to increased participation by Italians in local politics.

**PART II: VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS**

There was a proliferation of clubs and associations of various kinds in the Ovens Valley area. Every number of *The Myrtleford Times* contained references to several types of organisations: service clubs such as Apex, Rotary and the Jaycees; community associations such as the R.S.L. and the C.W.A.; church and charitable organisations, such as the Presbyterian Ladies' Guild, the Hospital Auxiliary and Legacy; sporting associations; and special interest associations such as the local band, the Chrysanthemum Society and the music club. Most of these activities were carried on without the active support of tobacco growers or their wives because of the heavy demands of work on a tobacco farm at some seasons of the year, and the distances which some farm people would have had to travel to take part in social activities in the small towns of the area. The section of the farming population that was most likely to take an active part in social organisations was that composed of young, unmarried men with transport at their disposal. The sporting associations, in particular, benefitted from their participation. Other organisations

\(^1\) See *The Myrtleford Times*, 28th November, 1967.
drew their personnel almost exclusively from non-farmers. Only a few farmers who were particularly interested in community activities, and who lived in or near one of the towns in the area (such as Myrtleford) managed to participate in social organisations.

These observations applied equally to farm people of Italian origin and to those of Australian origin. Out of the 105 informants in the sample, only 41 (39.0%) stated that they belonged to any social organisation of any kind. Of the 25 informants of Australian origin, 9 (36.0%) stated that they belonged to at least one social organisation. Of the 73 Italian-born informants, 27 (37.0%) made the same statement. Of the 7 informants of Italian origin born in Australia, 5 (71.4%) belonged to at least one social organisation. The last category included a high percentage of bachelors (57.1%, compared with 19.0% for the sample as a whole). It did not seem that farm owners were any more inclined than sharefarmers to become involved in the general social activities of the area. However, the longer Italian informants had lived in the area the more likely they were to belong to one or more of the local associations.¹

The Australian wives of the tobacco growers in the sample were more likely than Italian wives to belong to social organisations of various kinds, though even the Australian women were less involved in social activities than their menfolk. Apparently only 3 (13.0%) of the 23 Australian wives of men in the sample were involved in social organisations, and none of the Italian wives were.

¹ Of the Italian informants, 11 (64.7%) of the 17 who were born in Australia or arrived in the area before the Second World War belonged to one or more local associations; of the 63 post-war migrants, only 21 (33.3%) belonged to any local association. The difference between these two percentages is statistically significant at the 1.0% level.
However, the running of the Tuck Shop in the Catholic School in Myrtleford called on the services of the women who had children at the school. Of the 56 Italian-born Catholic wives of men in the sample, 3 were on the roster to serve in the school Tuck Shop and so was one of the 12 Australian-born Catholic wives.

Though almost the same proportions of Italian and Australian informants were involved in the organisational life of the area, they did not necessarily belong to the same organisations. Examination of the community organisations and the sporting associations of the area will show how far the social activities of the Italians and the Australians were segregated.

Community Associations

Of the 25 Australians in the sample, 3 stated that they belonged to service associations such as Apex or the Jaycees. However, they found it difficult to give as much time to the associations' activities as the rules demanded.

None of the Italians in the sample belonged to any of the service clubs. In fact, Rotary, for example, did have some members of Italian origin and even a few born in Italy; but hardly any of these were actively growing tobacco. Since almost all the Italians in the Ovens Valley area were growing tobacco, it was unlikely that they would be able to take much part in service organisations, even if their Italian origins and customary ways of spending their leisure time did not in themselves militate against their full participation in organisations of the Australian type.

On the other hand, Italians were willing participants in community organisations of a different type. Out of the 73 Italian-born informants in the sample, 22 (30.1%) were members of the Savoy Club, an Italian social club with its
own premises on the outskirts of Myrtleford. It is
difficult to compare the Savoy Club with any Australian
organisation, since it fulfilled a number of functions,
whereas each of the various Australian associations was more
specifically oriented. To some extent it substituted for
the Australian hotel, but the percentages of Italian-born
informants who stated that they made some use of the hotel
is almost as high as the percentage of Australian-born making
the same statement.¹ In many ways, the club was a substitute
for the Italian cafe: but it sold only alcohol and soft
drinks, instead of a range of hot and cold drinks and food.
Women and children were not normally allowed on the premises,
so the club was not a social centre for all the family as the
cafe is in Italy. However, it was still possible for men to
spend the day there, chatting, playing cards, and so on.²
The club sponsored several dances during the year, and
Myrtleford's Association Football team was operated with its
backing. Unlike the service clubs, the Savoy Club made no
specific demands upon its members. Only members of the
Committee had any duties, and ordinary members could come in
and make use of the premises, both during the day and in the
evening, whenever the weather or the season gave them some
free time.

¹ Out of 73 Italian-born informants, 60.3% stated that they
sometimes visited the hotel (64.9% of informants born in
northern Italy and 55.6% of those born in the south). Out
of 32 Australian-born informants, 65.6% stated that they
sometimes visited the hotel. The difference between this
percentage and that of the Italian-born is not statistically
significant, even at the 10.0% level.

² The coffee bars in the area, to which men could take their
families, were not really substitutes for the Italian cafe,
either, since they had no liquor licences and were usually
the preserve of adolescents who used them as clubs where they
could play the latest available American, British and
Italian pop music on the juke-boxes.
Officially, membership of the club was open to anyone who cared to join, whether they were of Italian origin or not, though it was always referred to unofficially as 'the Italian club'. There were a few Australian members but none of the Australians in the sample belonged to it, and only one of the 7 Australian-born informants of Italian origin was a member. Generally the language spoken in the club was Italian, and the games played there were Italian ones.

There was no significant relationship between length of residence in the area and membership of the Savoy Club. However, the club tended to be northern rather than southern Italian in membership. Of the 37 informants born in northern Italy, 16 (43.2%) were members of the club, compared with only 6 (16.7%) of the 36 informants born in southern Italy. The club was founded by northern Italians, and most of the members of its committees were born in the north.

One factor encouraging northerners rather than southerners to join the club was the higher percentage of bachelors amongst northern Italians. Of the northern Italian-born individuals in the sample, 8 (21.6%) were unmarried, compared with 3 (8.3%) of those born in southern Italy. However, even though bachelors made more use of the club's facilities than married men, the different proportions

---

1 Standard Italian was generally used between Italians from different regions, as they could only understand one another's dialects with difficulty.
2 For example, card-games played with the Italian 40-card pack; 'morra' (a competitive gambling game); and boccia, an Italian variety of bowls played on cement runways.
3 The difference between these two proportions is statistically significant at the 5.0% level.
4 The difference between these two proportions is statistically significant at the 10.0% level.
of bachelors in the two categories of Italian-born does not account for the whole of the difference between northern and southern Italians in their use of the club.

Some Australians in the Ovens Valley area argued that the existence of 'the Italian club' hampered the 'assimilation' of the Italians in the area, since it encouraged them to spend their time with people of their own ethnic origin. The sociological literature is divided about the effects of ethnic organisations on the process of assimilation. Some American studies maintain that it is unrealistic to expect migrants to enter completely into the host society and become assimilated as individuals. An essential part of the assimilation process is the formation of migrant associations, combining characteristics of both the migrant and the host cultures. Individual migrants are gradually introduced to the characteristics of the host culture through such an association, and gradually the migrant association itself moves as a whole towards the host society. Meanwhile, at every stage of the assimilation process, the migrant association acts as a vehicle for the better integration of its members with the host society. On the other hand, some Australian writers point out that the immediate effect of such associations is to isolate individual migrants from social contact with members of the host society. The relationship of interaction with other migrants to interaction with hosts, and therefore to assimilation in general, will be discussed at some length later in this thesis. Meanwhile, a few observations about the Savoy Club may be made here.

1 See, for example, Thomas & Znaniecki: The Polish Peasant in Europe and America, 1927, pp.1467-79; and Gordon: Assimilation and American Life, 1964, p.244.

2 See, for example, Zubrzycki: Settlers in the Latrobe Valley, 1964; and Martin: Refugee Settlers, 1965.

3 See below, Chapter 7, pp.362-9.
The Savoy Club was by no means an all-embracing social institution. The migrants who were its members relied on the tobacco growers' associations and the Catholic Church (in both of which they were associated with Australians) for a wide range of welfare services. They frequently used the hotels and cafes along with Australians; and they made use of the services of Australian doctors, solicitors, accountants and banks. Though the club may have reduced their contact with Australians, it did not supersede it completely. In addition, it is likely that having a place of their own which they could use for some purposes increased their sense of emotional security in Australia, and made them more willing to interact with Australians in other situations.

It is interesting to note that the Savoy Club was founded during the 1950's, some twenty years after the arrival of large numbers of Italians in the Ovens Valley area, and that its founder members were men who had achieved considerable success in Australia and who were accustomed to interacting with Australians in business and tobacco growing affairs.¹

Finally, some comments are in order on the few community organisations in which Italians and Australians were present in roughly equal numbers. Branches of the Good Neighbour movement existed in various centres in the area, but these were poorly supported by both Australians and migrants and acted only as occasional advice bureaux for the migrants. However, in 1966 a Dante Alighieri Society was formed in

¹ The implications of this point are discussed further below, Chapter 7, pp.362-9.
Myrtleford. Its leader was a man from the Friuli area of Italy, in the north-east of the country.

A particular task which the Society set itself was to teach English to its Italian-speaking members and Italian to its English-speaking members. It was hoped that later its members would be able to teach English to Italian farm families, particularly to women who were unable to leave the farms, and could not learn the language unless teachers travelled out to them. The society also hoped to develop as an Italian cultural centre, but the local material for this was unpromising. The Italians in the Ovens Valley area showed few signs of pride in their own culture (perhaps because of the economic backwardness and poor military record of Italy during the present century). They concentrated on their economic interests to the exclusion of nearly everything else, and because of their generally low standard of education there were few leaders and still fewer rank-and-file members available to man an Italian cultural organisation.

However, of all the associations in the Ovens Valley area, the Dante Alighieri Society was perhaps the one most willing to tackle an outstanding contemporary problem. The others were generally content to ameliorate long-standing problems by time-honoured methods. The service clubs

1 He was a business man, not a tobacco grower. His interests were centred on Myrtleford, but he was also associated with enterprises in Wangaratta, Melbourne and Canberra. He was a founder of the Soccer Club, which was an offshoot of the Savoy Club, and wrote soccer reports (in English) for The Myrtleford Times, and (in Italian) for La Fiamma (the Italian-language newspaper published in Melbourne). During the first half of the period of this study he was President of the Savoy Soccer Club, and during the second half, of the Savoy Club itself.

2 See location of this area on Map II, above, p.116 and in Table XXII, above, pp.117-8.
usually collected money in various ways and handed it over to deserving causes. Both they and the purely social associations of the area also fulfilled a number of other functions by providing a series of activities in which residents of the area would meet to exchange gossip and information about one another and about other residents of the area. The paucity of organisations which included roughly equal numbers of both Australians and Italians reflects the degree to which the two ethnic categories were segregated socially, and at the same time helped to perpetuate their segregation.

It was notable that neither the Italian secretary of the Good Neighbour Council nor the Italian founder of the Dante Alighieri Society were tobacco growers. They were both business men resident in Myrtleford. They spoke English well, and were both self-educated 'intellectuals', who were rather proud of the learning they had acquired and of their libraries, which were extensive by local standards, consisting of encyclopaedias, text books on economics and business practice, and other non-fiction. The few Italians who joined the Dante Alighieri Society were young men who had recently arrived in the area, who were impressed by the founder's local standing, and wanted to improve their English and their social standing by meeting Australians. The Australians associated with both the Good Neighbour Movement and the Dante Alighieri Society were principally young school teachers, born in metropolitan parts of Victoria, and stationed in the Ovens Valley for a few years by the Victorian Education Department.

Generally speaking, however, both the Italian and the Australian tobacco growers of the Ovens Valley area avoided

---

These young men were 'clients' of the founder; see discussion of clientship below, pp.222-3.
societies that had primarily welfare functions; and the various sporting associations of the area had stronger appeal to most residents (particularly the younger ones) than the community associations.

**Sporting Associations**

There was a bewildering variety of sporting associations in the Ovens Valley area, and they reflected and perpetuated the divisions in the population in much the same way as the service and other community associations did. In fact, they were often closely connected with such associations. For example, service clubs and other organisations sponsored table tennis teams that played one another locally on a tournament basis; and the Savoy Club was the parent of the Myrtleford soccer team.

Of the 105 tobacco growers interviewed, 77 stated that they took some interest in sport of some kind (ranging from individual fishing expeditions to organised team sports). Only 30 were sufficiently interested, or had enough leisure, to participate in sporting activities of any kind themselves. The proportion of Australian-born informants taking an interest in sporting activities was almost identical with the proportion of Italian-born taking such an interest, \(^1\) though more of the Australian-born than of the Italian-born actually participated in sporting activities. \(^2\) Their comparable degrees of enthusiasm did not unite the two

---

1. Of the Italian-born informants in the sample, 71.2% stated that they were interested in sport, compared with 78.1% of the Australian-born; the difference between these two proportions is not statistically significant even at the 10.0% level.

2. Of the Australian-born informants, 43.8% claimed active participation in a sport, compared with 21.9% of the Italian-born; the difference between these two percentages is statistically significant at the 5.0% level.
categories, however, for they were interested in different sports. Men born in Italy usually played Italian games (such as boccia)\(^1\) and took a keen interest in soccer. Those born in Australia were interested in cricket and Australian Rules football. The Australian-educated sons of Italians, who learned to play Australian games at school, followed the Australian pattern of sporting activities rather than the Italian one. They often joined one or more of the local basketball or table tennis teams when they left school. Incidentally, the Australian-educated daughters of Italians often took more interest in sport than their Italian-born counterparts. Sometimes they joined basketball teams after leaving school, as many Australian girls did.

Southern Italians took approximately the same amount of interest in sport as northern Italians did,\(^2\) but they were far less likely to be active participants than the northerners were.\(^3\) This difference was not apparently due to any difference in the age structures of the northern and southern migrant populations,\(^4\) but it is impossible to say on the

---

\(^1\) See above, p.207, fn.2.

\(^2\) Of the northern Italian-born informants in the sample, 73.0% took an interest in sport of one kind or another, compared with 69.4% of the southern Italian-born; the difference is not statistically significant at the 10.0% level.

\(^3\) Only 5.6% of the southern Italian-born in the sample actively participated in a sport, compared with 37.8% of the northern Italian-born; the difference is statistically significant at the 0.01% level.

\(^4\) The age distribution of the northern and southern tobacco growers in the sample was practically identical. Of the northerners, 16.2% were under 30, 64.9% were between 30 and 44, 13.5% between 45 and 59, and 5.4% 60 or over. The comparable figures for southerners are 16.7%, 63.9%, 11.1% and 8.3%. 
available evidence whether it was due to regional differences in attitudes to sport, or merely to the predominantly northern origin of the majority of the leaders of the Savoy Club and the Soccer Club which was its offshoot.

There is no doubt that soccer matches between local teams played a very large part in the lives of most of the migrant tobacco growers in the Ovens Valley area. The local teams (based on Myrtleford, Whorouly, Wangaratta and the King Valley) played in the North-East Victoria Soccer Federation, and they included players born in Britain, Yugoslavia, and Spain, as well as those born in Italy. Players were not recruited exclusively from the localities in which the various teams were situated and each of the teams in the Ovens Valley area tended to be dominated by particular categories of migrants. The Whorouly team was almost entirely composed of men born in Spain, the King Valley team of Yugoslavs, and the Myrtleford team of Italians. The Whorouly and the Myrtleford teams were often referred to in conversations between soccer fans as 'the Spanish team' and 'the Italian team'. This had the effect of turning each match into an international, in which each team was ardently supported by migrants from the country it was held to represent. Several Italians (who supported the Myrtleford team) regarded the Spanish supporters of the Whorouly team as particularly extreme in their partisanship, especially when the 'Spanish' team was playing the 'Italian' one. There were many instances of Spaniards and Italians working together harmoniously, and some Italians in commerce had Spanish partners, but the Spaniards as a whole were recent arrivals in the Ovens Valley area, and were generally held in low esteem compared with the Italians. Soccer, being a kind of mock war, was a particularly good medium for the expression of hostility between migrants of different national origins.
More than simple hostility was involved, however. Almost all the migrants in the area took an interest in soccer, which distinguished them as Europeans, apart from the Australians; and considerable co-operation between people of different national origins was necessary for the season's full complement of matches to be played. Soccer was a unifying factor amongst the migrants, as well as a means of expressing hostility between them. Even for a single team to maintain itself, co-operation between people from different countries was necessary, for none of the local teams was entirely composed of people from a single country. During the 1966 season, the 'Italian' team had a Scottish forward, and the 'Spanish' team had an Italian captain.

Some Australian residents of the Ovens Valley area argued that the preference of migrants for watching soccer on Sunday afternoons, rather than Australian Rules football on Saturday afternoons, was a sign that they did not wish to become assimilated to the Australian way of life. The arguments for and against this point of view are similar to those in the case of the Savoy Club. Migrants could hardly be expected to participate in specifically Australian games on an equal footing with people who had grown up in the country, or to take a great deal of interest in games they were not familiar with. Neither could they feel entirely at home in clubs which were composed mainly of members of the host society, especially if they were still hesitant in using English. However, the migrants' sporting associations (like the Savoy Club) were migrant associations, not foreign ones. They provided their members with opportunities to participate with other people within Australia, and they were not by any means Italian or other foreign organisations set up out of their original context on Australian soil. For example, the Myrtleford soccer team provided favourable publicity for Italian migrants locally (since the games were
reported in English in the local papers) and for the Ovens Valley area throughout the Italian-speaking population of Australia (since reports in Italian were printed in La Fiamma). It provided opportunities for migrants from different countries to meet one another (even though the meetings were sometimes hostile); and this made the formation of friendships and the exchange of useful information between migrants possible, helping them to settle down in Australia.

PART III: COMMERCIAL ENTERTAINMENT

Most residents of the area obtained most of their recreation in their own homes, from neighbours and friends visiting them there, and from their family circle. Television watching was easily accommodated to this kind of visiting, but if there was no set the family, family circle or group of neighbours entertained themselves without it.

Amongst the tobacco growers in the sample, 93.7% of the Australian-born had television sets, compared with 57.5% of the Italian-born (59.5% of those born in the north of Italy and 55.6% of those born in the south). The discrepancy between the Australian-born and the Italian-born was partly due to the higher percentage of sharefarmers amongst the Italian-born, for sharemen often felt that they were not yet

---

1 See above, p. 210, fn. 1.
2 See discussion of friends and neighbours below, pp. 220-4.
3 See below, Chapter 6, pp. 267-9.
4 The difference between these two percentages is statistically significant at the 0.01% level.
5 The difference between these two percentages is not statistically significant even at the 10.0% level.
sufficiently well established to afford a television set. Lack of knowledge of English did not hinder television buying. Many non-English-speaking Italians with children had television sets, justifying it by saying that it helped the children with their English. Their children explained the programmes to them when necessary. A few families (Italian and Australian) took a different line, and delayed buying sets until their children had left school, so that the children would not be distracted from their homework by the temptation to watch television.

Only the unmarried inhabitants of the Ovens Valley area relied to any extent on commercial sources for entertainment outside their own homes. However, most categories of the male population (migrants and Australians, farm people and townspeople) made some use of the hotels in the area. Young unmarried adults obtained a great deal of their recreation from sporting activities and from other non-commercial sources, such as dances and socials organised by various community associations.

There was comparatively little cinema-going amongst the Australians, and most of the cinema-going that took place was done by the unmarried. Married Australians usually only visited the cinema when they were in Melbourne during the tobacco sales, or when they paid short visits to the city for their shopping or to visit relatives. In such cases, the film they chose to see was usually the latest big musical, a show they could talk about afterwards to their friends while they played the long-playing record of the sound track. Occasionally families went to the drive-in film-shows at Albury or Wangaratta, but the small local cinema in Myrtleford was not well patronised by Australians.

1 See above, p.206, fn.1.
Some of the Italian-born members of the population had a different pattern of cinema going, connected with the habit of doing everything as a family unit (which was even stronger amongst the Italians than amongst the rural Australians). On Sundays during the winter, whole Italian families came into Myrtleford. They watched soccer in the afternoon and (after attending the evening Italian Mass) spent the latter half of the evening at the cinema. The cinema in Myrtleford showed Italian-language films (with English sub-titles) on Sundays during the winter. However, few of the Italian-speaking tobacco growers in the sample seemed interested in the language of the films they saw. Only 14 (32.5%) of the 43 Italian-born men in the sample who stated that they went to the cinema fairly regularly claimed that they preferred Italian-language films to ones in English. At the opposite extreme, 4 (9.3%) of the Italian-born film-goers claimed that they never went to Italian-language films at all, since the films were usually old and uninteresting ones. The majority of the Italian-born film-goers were indifferent to the language of films as they were indifferent to the language of television programmes, because their children understood English well enough to interpret for them.\(^1\) None of the Australian-born informants in the sample ever went to a film in Italian, not even the Australian-born sons of Italians (though they might have done so with their parents when they were younger).

More of the Italian-born men than of the Australian-born in the sample visited the cinema, but the difference is too

\(^1\) It seems that southern Italians were even less concerned about the language of the films they saw than the northerners were. Out of the 18 film-goers in the sample born in northern Italy, 7 (38.9%) stated that they were indifferent to the language of the picture they saw, whereas out of the 25 born in southern Italy, 81 (72.0%) stated that they were indifferent to the language of the film; the difference between these two proportions is statistically significant at the 5.0% level.
small to indicate a difference between the Italian-born and the Australian-born in the population as a whole.\(^1\) It seems, however, that people born in the south of Italy were rather more likely to visit the cinema, at least occasionally, than those born in the north.\(^2\)

The provision of facilities for commercial entertainment often provided economic opportunities for migrant entrepreneurs, who could establish themselves as cafe proprietors, cinema owners, and so on, without having special training and with only fairly small amounts of capital. The Ovens Valley area provided several examples of this. There were a few cafes in the area which had been run by people of Greek origin for a generation or more, and there was a larger number of cafes and restaurants which were owned by people of Italian origin. Some of the proprietors of these commercial facilities were once tobacco growers, or came from tobacco growing families. For example, the cinema in Myrtleford was built and was still run by an Italian-born retired tobacco grower, who also rented a cafe; and in the mid-1960's the hotel in Whorouly was bought by an Italian-born sharefarmer.\(^3\) Other Italian-born businessmen had come

\(^1\) Only 38.4\% of the Italian-born tobacco growers in the sample stated that they never visited the cinema, compared with 53.1\% of the Australian-born; however, the difference between these two proportions is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0\% level.

\(^2\) Of the informants born in northern Italy, 48.6\% claimed that they never visited the cinema, compared with 27.8\% of those born in the south; the difference between these two proportions is statistically significant at the 10.0\% level. However, the proportions of northerners and southerners going to the cinema more than once a month were practically identical, being 29.7\% and 33.3\% respectively; there is no statistically significant difference between these proportions, even at the 10.0\% level.

\(^3\) It was said that he would have preferred to have bought a farm, but as there was no farm on the market at the time he bought the hotel instead.
into the area specifically as restauranteurs; for example, the proprietor of one of the cafes in Myrtleford first came into the area as the holder of the concession to operate a restaurant at the ski-ing chalet on Mount Buffalo, which was owned by Victorian Railways. The development of tourist facilities of various kinds in the area created opportunities for a number of people in service trades, including Australians. The majority of the hotels in the area were still in Australian hands in 1966, and there were a number of new motels with Australian proprietors and managers.

PART IV: FRIENDS AND NEIGHBOURS

Both the Italians and the Australians of the Ovens Valley area made a point of being 'friends with everybody'; that is, of maintaining good relations with everyone they came into contact with, and making as few enemies as possible. In spite of this, however, there were rivalries within both the Australian and the Italian populations between families who had been living as neighbours for a generation or more. Although people attempted as a matter of policy to remain on good terms with all their neighbours, once a rift had occurred it was often a long time before it was healed. In the meantime, the people concerned were unable to sever relations with one another completely, as various activities (for example, in the local community associations) repeatedly brought them into contact.

In the Ovens Valley area, both Italians and Australians regarded 'friendship' as a term which included acquaintanceships which were fairly casual and conducted according to a standardised code.

1 Family circles, which are discussed below, Chapter 6, pp. 267-9, exist within this ambience of neighbourliness.
Italians regarded a very wide range of people as 'friends' (amici). If an Italian stated 'I am friends with everyone' he meant only that he tried not to make 'enemies' (nemici). In this context, 'everyone' included his Australian neighbours as well as his Italian ones; in fact, everyone he knew by sight. Australians tended to limit the term 'friend' to people they thought of as being like themselves, or people they saw fairly often. As their definition of a friend included fewer people than that of the Italians, their definition of friendship was more comprehensive. A 'friend' was at least someone with whom an individual had a stable, sympathetic relationship. In fact, friendship was likely to be based on neighbourhood, on attendance at the same school at the same time, and on membership of the same religious denomination. Because Catholics usually attended denominational schools with other Catholics, as well as worshipping in the same church as their Catholic neighbours, they were particularly likely to have a majority of their friends in the same denomination as themselves. Children of Italian origin, brought up in the area and attending Catholic schools with Australian Catholics, were being gradually incorporated into the friendship networks of Australian Catholics as a result of their participation in the Catholic education system, and they tended to use the word 'friend' in the same sense as the Australians did.

However, both Italians and Australians interpreted the word 'friend' in the widest possible sense when asked whether they had friends in the other ethnic category. Since Australians had higher status in the Ovens Valley area than Italians had, Italians gained some prestige by claiming to have Australian friends, however slight the relationship actually was; and when the question was put directly even Australians who disliked Italians in general preferred to give the impression that they were actually friendly towards
the Italians of their acquaintance. As a result, both categories exaggerated both the extent and the degree of their acquaintance with members of the other. In fact, the flexibility of the term 'friendship' in the Ovens Valley area makes informants' statements about it misleading. However, pre-war migrants and Australian-born Italians stated that they had Australian friends significantly more often than post-war migrants did.

The term 'friendship', used of a relationship between Italians, sometimes took on the additional implication of a relationship that was more like that between a patron and his client than that between social equals. In the Ovens Valley area, distinct patron-client relationships could be said to exist, though they were not formalised, and they included a range of gradations. One type of patron was the rich Italian tobacco grower who sponsored the migration of a large number of young men from his own paese between the two World Wars, and gave them their first jobs in Australia as labourers on his own property. A contrasting type included people who had been in Australia some years, and had a command of English and a quantity of business acumen, who gave newly arrived paesani and other compatriots the

1 Out of the 73 Italian-born men in the sample, 25 (34.2%) claimed they had Australian friends; out of the 25 Australians interviewed, 12 (48.0%) claimed that they had Italian friends; the Italo-Australians have been excluded from these figures; the difference between these two percentages is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.

2 Because of this, the sociometric questions such as 'how many friends do you have in the opposite ethnic category' which were included in the questionnaire were inappropriate.

3 Of the 17 pre-war migrants and Australian-born Italians, 12 (70.5%) stated that some or all of their friends were non-Italian whereas of the 63 post-war migrants only 29 (46.0%) did so. The difference between these two percentages is statistically significant at the 10.0% level.
benefit of their experience and advice as to how to find jobs, fill in forms and generally 'learn the ropes' in Australia. Almost any successful Italian found that his compatriots asked him for this kind of help, though restauranteurs were particularly well placed to receive such requests and to provide the necessary services. As a result, there were a number of Italian businessmen who each had a following of clients. Clients could occasionally be called on to support their patrons, for example in elections at the Savoy Club or in fund raising activities. Each group of clients tended to be regionally based, and client-groups had a strong connection with chain migration. At least two Calabresi patrons and two from Vicenza were leaders of groups of clients in Myrtleford during the period of this study; and there was also a Friulani group (which included some young men from Vicenza) which was cheerfully referred to by its Friuli patron as 'the Mafia'.

The friendship patterns of both Italians and Australians were affected by the different residential status of members of the two categories. Since most of the Australians were farm owners who had lived on their own farms for a considerable time, and often for the whole of their lives,

---

1 The leaders of a number of such groups of clients were represented on the committee which organised the collection of funds in and around Myrtleford for the relief of victims of the floods in Italy during December 1966-January 1967. They were also leaders of the Savoy Club; see above, pp.205-9.
2 Discussed above, Chapter 3, pp.120-6.
3 One of these was from Catanzaro; see discussion of informants from this province, above, Chapter 3, p.130.
4 See discussion of informants from Vicenza, above, Chapter 3, pp.128-30.
5 See references to this patron and the Dante Alighieri society which he founded, above, pp.209-11.
they usually knew their neighbours well, particularly the other Australian farm owners amongst them. On the other hand, a high proportion of the Italians were comparative newcomers to the area and others were newcomers to the particular part of the area in which they were living, for a season or so before they may have been sharefarming up to 50 miles away from their current farms. Of the 25 Australians in the sample, only one (4.0%) claimed that he did not know his neighbours well; of the 73 Italian-born men in the sample, 29 (39.7%) claimed that they did not know their neighbours well. People in both ethnic categories knew people in their own category better than those in the other. Of the 22 Australians in the sample who claimed to know their neighbours better than slightly, 14 (63.6%) knew their Australian neighbours better than their Italian ones, and 21 (61.8%) of the 34 informants born in Italy who claimed to know their neighbours better than slightly knew their Italian neighbours better than their Australian ones.

---

1 This figure does not include the 7 informants born in Australia of Italian origin; only one of these stated that he did not know his present neighbours well. He had recently moved (with his father and his brothers) from a farm in the Buffalo River area (which had been flooded under the Buffalo Dam Scheme) to a new one in the Kiewa Valley, and most of his friendships were still with people in the Buffalo River-Myrtleford area.

2 The difference between these two percentages is statistically significant at the 0.1% level.

3 Of the 7 informants born in Australia of Italian origin, 6 stated that they knew their neighbours better than slightly, and only 3 (42.9%) stated that they knew their Italian neighbours better than their Australian ones.

4 The difference between these two proportions is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.
PART V: CONCLUSION

Interaction between Italians and Australians in areas of life where interaction was voluntary was, as might have been expected, far less extensive than interaction in areas where it appeared to be necessary. Also, in these areas of life, migrants seeking outlets for their sociability were inclined to form migrant associations of various kinds, rather than join existing Australian associations.

For the Italian residents of the Ovens Valley as a whole, participation in Australian political life was limited, and when it took place it appeared to be governed by slightly different factors from Australian political attitudes. On the whole, the Italians had not adopted the rural value system that encouraged the Australians in the area to vote for the Country Party, and they did not appear to regard it as against their own interests to vote Liberal, even though they were almost all farmers.

Migrant participation in Australian associations was discouraged by a number of factors. Migrants often lacked fluency in English; they were not sufficiently well-known to the Australians to be candidates for leadership positions; and as a minority they often lacked the confidence to take active parts in the associations which were open to them. In the case of many sporting associations, they were further handicapped by not having learnt Australian sports in their youth. In addition, few Australians went out of their way to encourage migrants to participate in associations with Australian memberships. Many of these factors, however, disappeared or became much less important in the case of the children of migrants who had attended school in Australia.

The Savoy Club and the migrant sporting clubs increased the amount of interaction between migrants, and therefore reduced the opportunities and time available for migrants to
interact with Australians. However, they did not perform very many functions for their members, and therefore did not extensively discourage their members from making use of several of the facilities provided by the host society.

Italians were as willing as Australians to make use of the various commercial facilities for recreation which were available in the area. Although this did not lead to much direct interaction between the two ethnic categories, their joint exposure to mass media and their similar patterns of leisure behaviour both indicated and encouraged similar outlooks on life.

Members of both ethnic categories tended to associate informally, on a 'friendship' basis, with members of their own ethnic category rather than with members of the other. This was apparently related to the manner in which friendship was built up amongst both migrants and hosts. However, the longer Australians and Italians remain in the area side by side the more likely it will be that friendship will develop between them. There is some slight evidence that, as might be expected, friendship between migrants and hosts was most likely for migrants who had lived longest in the area, and that the children of migrants who had grown up with the children of their Australian neighbours were likely to have Australian friends in adult life.

Although comparatively few of the Italians of the Ovens Valley area interacted with Australians in areas of life where such interaction was voluntary, for those that did the interaction very easily moved from the categorical to the non-categorical levels. Perhaps the ability to move within Australian circles with enough self assurance and knowledge of local Australian patterns of behaviour to sustain non-categorical relationships with Australians was essential
for the maintenance of voluntary interaction, and perhaps it was the lack of such knowledge and self assurance that led most Italians in the Ovens Valley area to restrict their interaction with Australians to areas of life in which it could hardly be avoided and in which interaction could take the simpler, categorical forms. The difficulties which migrants and hosts experienced in establishing non-categorical relationships with one another probably encouraged members of both categories to avoid one another in much of their social lives, and to seek their club-mates, friends, and other associates within their own ethnic categories.

The following chapter will discuss the areas of life in which interaction between hosts and migrants was unlikely. These were the areas of kinship and family life.
CHAPTER 6

AREAS IN WHICH INTERACTION WAS UNLIKELY

The two previous chapters have shown that there was a considerable amount of interaction between Italians and Australians in the areas in which such interaction was regarded as necessary in the Ovens Valley area, though most of the interaction that took place in these areas was categorical. There was rather less interaction between Italians and Australians in the areas of life in which such interaction was regarded as voluntary, though such interaction as did take place in these areas was frequently of a non-categorical kind. It appears that for many Italians and Australians interaction with people from ethnic categories different from their own was so difficult to maintain that in the areas of life where such interaction was not strictly necessary they went to some lengths to establish voluntary organisations (such as the Savoy Club) in which it was possible to restrict interaction to members of the same ethnic category as themselves.

This chapter will discuss the ways in which the areas of life in which interaction between Italians and Australians was unlikely (the areas of kinship and family life) tended to restrict the opportunities for Italians and Australians to interact in other areas. It will also discuss the effects of the migration situation on the Italian family. The discussion will show that, although the Italians and the Australians of the Ovens Valley area had remarkably similar kinship systems and family lives, the ethnic composition of kinship networks and the importance
of kinship in the social life of the area tended to keep Italians and Australians apart. It will also show that such differences as existed between Italians and Australians with regard to kinship behaviour and family life were the consequence of the migration situation rather than of ethnic origin.

Part I of this chapter is concerned with kinship, and Part II with the nuclear family. Kinship is defined here as a system of social relationships between consanguineally linked adults, whereas the nuclear family is defined as a system of relationships between adults (linked by marriage) and their children. Kinship and the nuclear family overlap when the life cycle of the nuclear family reaches the point at which the children in it become adults, and this area of overlap may be discussed either as part of the kinship system or as the culmination of the nuclear family system. In this thesis, relationships between parents and their adult children are treated as kinship relations rather than familial ones, especially if the children are married and head a new series of nuclear families. Similarly, relationships between adult siblings are treated as kinship relations rather than as familial ones.

Part I will begin by discussing the concept of kinship, and will proceed to a comparison of the kinship terminology and formal kinship structure of Australia and Italy. Then Australian kinship behaviour as described in the relevant literature will be discussed, followed by a similar discussion of Italian kinship behaviour. Australian and Italian kinship behaviour in the Ovens Valley area will then be described. This will be followed by a discussion of the differences between the kinship behaviour of northern and southern Italian migrants, and an account of
the importance of kinship in the organisation of tobacco farms. Then the way in which kinship regulates social interaction through the institution of the 'family circle' will be discussed. Part I will conclude with a general survey of the relationship between kinship behaviour and interaction between Italians and Australians in the Ovens Valley area.

Part II will begin by discussing the sociological literature regarding the Australian nuclear family and the Italian nuclear family both in Italy and in migrant situations. It will then describe the nuclear family household in the Ovens Valley area, with regard to both Italians and Australians and this will be followed by a discussion of the marriage and fertility patterns of both ethnic categories. The roles of women in the Ovens Valley area, and the particular problems of migrant Italian wives will then be considered, followed by a discussion of the roles of children and the problems of inter-generation conflict amongst Italian migrant families. Part II will conclude with a general survey of the relationship between familial behaviour and interaction between Italians and Australians in the Ovens Valley area.

Part III of this chapter will summarise the effect of the lack of interaction between hosts and migrants in these important areas of life on the general pattern of interaction between Italians and Australians in the Ovens Valley area.
PART I: KINSHIP

The Concept of Kinship

Many anthropological studies of kinship emphasise the wide range of social relations which are determined by the positions which the individuals concerned occupy within the kinship system. \(^1\) Compared with the kinship systems found in many societies, the systems of Western Europe (and of people of European origin living in other parts of the world) are extraordinarily narrow in range, simple in terminology and imprecise in the reciprocal obligations which they impose upon kinsmen. \(^2\)

Generally speaking, kinship can be regarded as a kind of penumbra surrounding an individual. Each individual has his own set of kin, which is different from that of any other individual. Even siblings have different children and grandchildren.

In all societies, a group of cognates (that is, kinsmen related by any form of consanguinity) can be reckoned for any individual; but only in some societies do such groups of cognates, or some selection of them, act as corporate units in economic, political and social matters.

---


\(^2\) Kinship systems similar to those of Western Europe are not unknown in non-industrial societies either. For example, the Esquimo system is very like that of Western Europe; see discussion in Fox: *Kinship and Marriage: an Anthropological Perspective*, 1967.
A group of kin who form a corporate social unit may be referred to as a lineage. Usually membership in a lineage is defined in such a way that an individual can only be a member of one lineage (whereas he may be a member of a number of groups of cognates), and the commonest means of forming a lineage is to admit to it everyone descended from a given individual in either the male or the female line.

Kinship systems in which individuals form corporate groups such as lineages do not exist in industrialised European societies, or industrialised societies of European

---

1 'Lineage' is used here to indicate any corporate descent-group, though a variety of words can be used to indicate different levels of kinship organisation; see Radcliffe-Brown: 'Introduction' in Radcliffe-Brown & Forde: African Systems of Kinship and Marriage, 1950.

2 There are a few societies in which lineages recruit their members cognatically (that is, in all lines of descent) while holding corporate identities and corporate rights (see discussion of such a system in Fox: Kinship and Marriage: an Anthropological Perspective, 1967). However, such systems are rare, and their rarity is probably due to the fact that an individual with rights and obligations in all the lineages to which his ancestors belonged is likely to find that he belongs simultaneously to too many groups with conflicting interests.

3 In some elaborate kinship systems individuals may belong to a number of lineages, each recruiting its members on a different basis, but usually in such cases each type of lineage is concerned with a different area of life. For example, patrilineages (recruited through the male line) may control land rights while matrilineages (recruited through the female line) have jurisdiction over accumulated property acquired by trading (see, for example, Forde: 'Double Descent Among the Yakö' in Radcliffe-Brown & Forde: African Systems of Kinship and Marriage, 1950.)
origin, though versions of them exist in some un-industrialised parts of Europe. In industrialised European societies, when kinsmen act as a group it is generally on a voluntary basis, often for an ad hoc reason, (for example, because they have jointly inherited an interest in a piece of property) rather than because the social system enjoins common interests upon kin defined in a particular way.

There is considerable discussion in the literature about the differences within European, industrialised societies regarding kinship, and in particular about the differences between rural and urban kinship behaviour. This is essentially a discussion about kinship behaviour rather than kinship structure. Rural sociologists have emphasised the amount of interaction between kin that takes place in many rural areas, the extent of rural genealogical knowledge, and the emphasis which country dwellers often place on having kin in the neighbourhood. These 'folk characteristics' are contrasted with the characteristics of urban society, in which kinship is said to be unimportant. However, Young and Willmott

---

1 For example, McDonald mentions corporate 'stem families' operating in various parts of Italy. It seems that these are incomplete patrilineages (shedding some junior members in each generation) living in joint households and leasing and working property in common: see McDonald: 'Italy's Rural Social Structure and Emigration', 1956; and McDonald: Migration from Italy to Australia, with Special Reference to Selected Groups, 1958.

2 See, for example, the constant emphasis on kinship throughout such works as Arensberg: The Irish Countryman, 1937; Arensberg & Kimball: Family and Community in Ireland, 1948; and Rees: Life in a Welsh Countryside, 1950.
maintain that, contrary to such expectations, kinship behaviour of the 'folk' kind may be observed in long-settled, working class urban areas, (though middle class areas and new areas of settlement, such a new housing estates, exhibit different patterns of behaviour). ¹ Similarly, after investigating urban kinship behaviour in Adelaide, Martin comes to the conclusion that it is doubtful whether any useful purpose can be served by postulating a dichotomy between urban and 'folk' societies as far as kinship behaviour is concerned. ²

However, many urban sociologists seem to have missed the point which rural sociologists have been making. The difference between urban and rural attitudes towards kin lies, not in the amount of interaction between kin which takes place in each type of area, but in the range of kin within which interaction takes place. Martin's own study, for example, is concerned with only two categories of relatives: 'family' and 'kin'. 'Family' is defined as the nuclear family consisting of parents and children, and 'kin' as 'the original nuclear families (families of orientation) of husband and wife'. ³ Martin is really investigating the degree to which urban people keep up contacts with their own relatives 'in the first degree' after they are married. ⁴ Other urban studies similarly confine

⁴ The 'degrees' of relationship are shown diagrammatically below, Figs. I and II, pp. 238 and 239.
their interest, or are confined by their material, to relationships within the first degree. Only studies of rural kinship behaviour give any information about behaviour between more distant kin. It seems that the penumbra of recognised cognatic kin which surrounds an individual in European-type societies extends further in rural areas than it does in urban ones, though in both rural and urban societies an individual may be expected to spend considerable amounts of time with the relatives that are recognised.

**Italian and Australian Kinship Terminology**

The formal structure of the Italian kinship system (as practiced in nearly all the Italian communities described in the literature) is almost exactly the same as that of the English system used by Australians; it is essentially the general European system described in the previous discussion. The most marked difference between the English and Italian systems is that in Italian the same word (*nipote*) denotes both 'nephew' (or niece) and 'grandchild'. In fact, if the degrees of kinship recognised by both systems are plotted diagrammatically, 'nephew' and 'grandson' are equivalent, both being in the 'second degree'; but the Italian use of the same term for

---


3 See Figs. I and II, below pp. 238 and 239.
both relationships does not necessarily imply that they are regarded as equivalent, for there are distinct words for the reciprocal categories; 'uncle' and 'aunt' are zio and zia, whereas 'grandfather' and 'grandmother' are nonno and nonna (or, less commonly, avo and ava or avola, which might be more accurately translated 'ancestor' than 'grandparent').

Generally, in Italian, as in English, all kinds of 'cousins' are referred to simply as 'cousins' (cugini), without qualification as to the degree of the relationship. However, degrees of cousinship can be specified if necessary. In both Italian and English people with one or more parents in common are 'siblings' (fratelli), people with one or more grandparents in common are 'first cousins' or 'cousins in the first degree' (cugini di primo grado), people with one or more great-grandparents in common are 'second cousins' or 'cousins in the second degree' (cugini di secondo grado), and so on. If the cousins are not of the same generation, the relationship is reckoned as though they both belonged to the generation of the most junior.

Italian lacks a term indicating 'in-law', but it has specific terms for 'mother-' and 'father-in-law' (suocera and suocero), for 'brother-' and 'sister-in-law' (cognato and cognata), and for 'son-' and 'daughter-in-law' (genero and nuora). Cognato and cognata refer both to the siblings of ego's spouse and to the spouses of ego's siblings, just as the terms 'brother-' and 'sister-in-law' do in English. In both the Italian and the English systems, as in most other European systems, a marriage is a union of two individuals, which changes the relationship of each spouse to the kin of the other, but does not alter the relationship of two kin-groups
towards one another. In fact, in kinship systems such as these, there is no kin-group able to respond to the marriages of its members as a corporate body. For an individual, the husbands and wives of his kinsmen are in the same degrees of relationship to him as the kin whom they have married, but the kin of these husbands and wives are no kin to him whatsoever. Similarly, an individual acquires the same degrees of relationship to his or her spouse's kin as the spouse has; but the individual's natal kin do not acquire such additional relationships as a result of the marriage.

People in many European societies (including Australians and Italians) use close kinship terms for relatives who are actually more distant; but this does not take place according to set rules, and the people referred to do not thereby acquire the rights and obligations (if any) of closer relatives. Europeans may also change kinship terms to make them match the relative ages of the people concerned, instead of the strict relationships. For example, Garigue and Firth describe a man of Italian origin in London calling another man 'uncle', though he was not sure of the exact relationship between them, because his mother had called the same man 'cousin.' They also describe a group of Italians in London, in which there had been a number of marriages between cousins, whose members called one another 'cousin' indiscriminately, no longer specifying their (often

1 This aspect of European kinship systems is discussed at some length in Arensberg & Kimball: Family and Community in Ireland, 1948, pp.90-94.

2 That is, there is no 'classificatory' kinship system of the type described, for example, in Mitchell: The Yao Village, 1956.
### ENGLISH KINSHIP TERMS TO THE FOURTH DEGREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of Kinship</th>
<th>EGO</th>
<th>I.</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Great-Great-Grandparents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Great-Grandparents</td>
<td>Great-Great-Uncles and Aunts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand-parents</td>
<td>Great Uncles and Aunts</td>
<td>Third Cousins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parents and Aunts</td>
<td>Second Cousins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th (Ego's) Generation</td>
<td>EGO Siblings</td>
<td>First Cousins</td>
<td>Second Cousins</td>
<td>Third Cousins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Generation</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Nephews and Nieces</td>
<td>Second Cousins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand-children</td>
<td>Great-Nephews and Nieces</td>
<td>Third Cousins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Great-Great-Grandchildren</td>
<td>Great-Great-Nephews and Nieces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Great-Great-Grandchildren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE II

ITALIAN KINSHIP TERMS TO THE FOURTH DEGREE

(Only masculine plural forms of general kinship terms are given)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>EGO</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trisavoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bisnonni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonni</td>
<td>Prozii</td>
<td>Cugini di Terzo Grado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td>Genitori</td>
<td>Zii</td>
<td>Cugini di Secondo Grado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th (Ego's)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fratelli</td>
<td>Cugini di primo Grado</td>
<td>Cugini di Secondo Grado</td>
<td>Cugini di Terzo Grado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>Figli</td>
<td>Nipoti</td>
<td>Cugini di Secondo Grado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Nipoti</td>
<td>Pronipoti</td>
<td>Cugini di Terzo Grado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Pronipoti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>Pronipoti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spouse's father: suocero  Brother's wife: cognata
Spouse's mother: suocera  Sister's husband: cognato
Spouse's brother: cognato  Son's wife: nuora
Spouse's sister: cognata  Daughter's husband: genero

Aunt: zia  Uncle: zio
Aunt's husband: zio  Uncle's wife: zia
doubled) relationships with one another. In addition they refer to people of the same surname in villages in Italy calling one another 'cousin' although there was no known genealogical relationship between the families concerned.\(^1\) Simplifications and courtesies of this kind have their equivalents amongst other Europeans, and amongst people of European origin such as Australians.

The Catholic Church normally prohibits marriage between people related up to the 'fourth degree'.\(^2\) It is


\(^2\) The Church's reckoning of degrees of kinship precludes marriage between ego and any of the kin shown in Figs I and II (see above, pp. 238 and 239). People with a common parent are related 'in the first degree', those with a common grandparent are related 'in the second degree', those with a common great-grandparent 'in the third degree', and those with a common great-great-grandparent 'in the fourth degree'. If the couple are of different generations, the number of generations between the common ancestor and the descendant furthest removed from him or her is the deciding factor. This is similar to the Italian reckoning of degrees of cousinship discussed above (p. 236), but at each level the relationship of cousins is one step behind the degrees of kinship reckoned by the Church. Since siblings are related 'in the first degree', first cousins are related 'in the second degree', and so on. Neither English nor Italian kinship terminology makes a clear distinction between people within the prohibited degrees and those outside them; for example, there is no marked difference between the term for 'third cousin' (who is within the prohibited degrees) and that for 'fourth cousin' (who is outside them), in either language; and in both Australia and in Italy, both third and fourth cousins might be referred to simply as 'cousin', if a relationship as distant as the third or fourth degree of cousinship is recognised at all in day-to-day relations by the individuals concerned.
common amongst Italians for the families of the prospective bride and groom to produce an account of their genealogies to prove that the marriage would not be within the prohibited degrees, if any question is raised.

Comparison of the system of reckoning kinship according to degrees of cousinship with that adopted by the Catholic Church emphasises the variety of ways in which kinship can be reckoned in Europe, although the actual kinship relationships and behaviour which are described by these different methods remain the same. Kinship terminology, in itself, is not used to regulate marriage, and none of the various rules which different countries and different Churches have adopted regarding the degrees of kin which are forbidden to intermarry are consistently reflected in kinship terminology. There is no means of distinguishing, in current usage, in either English or Italian, between 'cousin whom I may marry' and 'cousin whom I may not marry'; and although Italian and English kinship terminologies are almost parallel, the marriage rules in each society are somewhat different.

As it is, for example, in some of the societies described in Radcliffe-Brown & Forde: *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage*, 1950.

For example, though the Catholic Church normally prohibits marriage between kin related within the 'fourth degree', the Church of England permits marriages between kin related in the 'third degree', and even between first cousins (who are related in the 'second degree'), though not between other kin within the 'second degree'. Marriage law in Italy is substantially the marriage law of the Catholic Church; marriage law in Australia is almost the same as that of the Church of England, except that divorce is permitted by the State, and civil marriage takes no account of relationships arising from previous marriages, whether these have been terminated by divorce or by death. Thus, although according to the Church, an individual stands in the (footnote continued on p. 242)
In both the Italian and the English kinship systems, names and titles are usually inherited patrilineally. However, both systems of kinship terminology are almost completely bilateral. In both languages it is possible to distinguish, if necessary, between 'the mother's side' (la parte di madre) and 'the father's side' (il lato di padre) within an individual's group of kin. If any confusion arises about a specific relationship it can always be spelt out. For example, since 'aunt' (zia) may refer to either father's or mother's sister, or to father's or mother's brother's wife, a term such as 'mother's sister' (sorella di madre) might be used in its place. Property may be inherited from either the father's or the mother's side of the family in both English and Italian systems, and both sides are of almost equal importance socially.

The similar structure of the Australian and the Italian kinship systems which has been discussed here does not preclude differences in kinship behaviour between Australians and Italians. Kinship behaviour is the subject of the remainder of this chapter, but only the aspects of this complex subject which are relevant to this thesis are discussed. In fact, for both Italians and Australians, there are differences of detail between behaviour towards cognates and behaviour towards affines (that is, between behaviour towards one's natal kin and that towards the individuals these kin have

(footnote 2 continued from p. 241)
same relationship to the relatives of his or her spouse as the spouse does, the State permits marriages between individuals and their brothers- or sisters-in-law once the original marriage has been terminated; according to the Church, such marriages are equivalent to marriages between siblings.
married or the natal kin of one's own spouse). There are also differences between the ways in which different generations within the same degree of kinship behave towards one another. Ego is related in the first degree to his father, to his brother and to his son; but his behaviour towards each is influenced by the generational differences and the distribution of authority between them; similarly, though his uncle, his first cousin and his nephew are all his kin in the second degree, his behaviour towards each is modified by considerations of age and authority. Generally speaking, within a given degree of relationship, an individual will behave as a subordinate and expect to receive help from individuals senior to him in generation, will be in a relationship of equality with those of the same generation, and will behave as a superior and give help to those of generations junior to himself. In addition to these variations within given degrees of kinship, it may be the case that an individual's behaviour to kin on his mother's side differs from his behaviour towards kin on his father's side. However, in the discussion which follows, only differences between the relationships of kin of different degrees are discussed, for this is all that is necessary to show the importance of kinship in regulating the social lives of Italians and Australians in the Ovens Valley area.

**Australian Kinship Behaviour in the Literature**

There is very little literature discussing the kinship behaviour of Australians. Some urban studies have commented on the lack of contact between the nuclear family and the
circle of kin which surrounds it, while others have pointed out that people usually keep up contacts with members of their own nuclear family of orientation (that is, kin in the first degree) after they have married and set up further nuclear families of procreation of their own. There is no clear indication that extended networks of kin might be more important in rural areas than they are in towns in any of the studies of Australian rural society; comments on family and kinship in these studies are restricted to the elementary nuclear family and its life-cycle. It is unlikely that failure to mention kinship behaviour between consanguineally related adults is due to the coincidence that such behaviour is unimportant in all the rural communities which have been studied; probably it is a consequence of the way in which these studies are focussed. Kinship relationships are important in the lives of adult Australians in the Ovens Valley area, and there is no reason to suppose that the area is unlike other parts of rural Victoria in this respect.


2 See, for example, Fallding: 'Inside the Australian Family' in Elkin: Marriage and the Family in Australia, 1957; and Martin: 'Extended Kinship Ties: an Adelaide Study', 1967.

3 See, for example, such studies of rural Victorian communities as Campbell: Growing up in Karribee, 1963; McIntyre: Sunraysia: a Social Survey of a Dried Fruits Area, 1948; Holt: Wheat Farms of Victoria: a Sociological Survey, 1947; and Oeser & Emery: Social Structure and Personality in a Rural Community, 1954.
Italian Kinship Behaviour in the Literature

Studies of kinship amongst Italians are more plentiful than those of kinship amongst Australians, but they have mainly consisted of studies of migrants, particularly those in America. However, two students of the social structure of Italy itself have remarked on the different patterns of kinship behaviour to be found in different parts of the country. Banfield writes of the intensely individualistic 'familism' of Basilicata, where nuclear families apparently never trust one another enough to co-operate in any activity.¹ McDonald reports that in Calabria, individual nuclear families are able to co-operate with one another through their extended kinship ties. He contrasts this with the relations between the large but incomplete patrilineages (which he refers to as 'stem families')² of Central Italy each of which operates as a single economic unit but seem incapable of co-operating with any other family. These families in turn are contrasted with the nuclear families in Alpine areas, which can co-operate amicably with their neighbours without needing to emphasise kinship ties with them.³ McDonald argues that the patterns of kinship behaviour in particular parts of Italy affect the rates of migration. As far as the Ovens Valley area is concerned, the only

² See above, p.233, fn.1.
³ This is a summary of information included in McDonald: 'Italy's Rural Social Structure and Emigration', 1956; McDonald: *Migration from Italy to Australia, with Special Reference to Selected Groups*, 1958; and communications from McDonald incorporated in Banfield: *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*, 1958
important connection between migration and kinship patterns in Italy seems to be that the migrants encountered in the course of this study came from areas where co-operation between nuclear families was possible (thus encouraging chain-migration), but where the nuclear family itself was the usual residential and economic unit. For example, the sample contained migrants from Calabria but not from either Basilicata or the areas of Central Italy in which 'stem families' are to be found.

Italian migrant kinship behaviour appears to be affected by socio-economic class as well as by region of origin. In their study of people of Italian origin in London, Garigue and Firth\(^1\) reported cases of members of extended families living under the same roof and working together in the same enterprise. The extended families to which they paid most attention were those of migrants who were restauranteurs in London and who held land in Italy as well. Their members had an interest in maintaining their kinship ties with one another that does not exist for the landless peasants and sons of small-holders who have made up the bulk of Italian migrants in Australia and America.

It seems usual for Italian migrants to live in nuclear family or expanded family households, though they form multiple family households when resources are scarce.\(^2\)


\(^2\) 'Nuclear family households' are households containing only husband, wife and any children of the married couple; 'expanded family households' are those containing a nuclear family plus one (or perhaps more) individuals related to one of the spouses (for example, a nuclear family and the husband's bachelor brother, or the wife's widowed mother); and 'multiple or joint family households' are households containing more than one complete nuclear family (for example, two married brothers with their respective wives and children).
Kin beyond the first degree may give one another help of various kinds occasionally, but though this help is sometimes substantial, these kin do not often form permanent economic relationships, such as business partnerships.\(^1\) Italian migrants apparently do not rely upon an elaborate structure of extended kinship; but their social life centres on the rather loosely structured 'family circle'.

The family circle and its importance in the lives of migrant Italians is described in Gans's study of people of Southern Italian and Sicilian origin living in Boston.\(^2\) In the city, each nuclear Italian family lived in its own household (occasionally with an unmarried sibling or a widowed parent sharing the home). Married daughters tried to find homes near their mothers, but apart from this link social contact between adults of different generations was minimised. People did not make many 'friends', but incorporated people into their families by 'godparenthood'. Apart from its religious significance, this relationship was a quasi-kinship one. It lay secular obligations upon godparent and godchild towards one another which were rather like those between uncle and nephew; and it linked the godparents to the parents of the godchild in a quasi-sibling relationship. People who were godparents to one's children were fully qualified members of one's family circle.

---

1 See, for example, descriptions of the behaviour of Italian migrants in Jones: *The Italian Population of Carlton*, 1962; and in Gans: *The Urban Villagers*, 1962.
The family circle regularly met as a group, and there was little visiting outside it. People outside the circle were regarded as strangers. However, the family circle was only a selection of the whole range of kin available to a particular married couple. Its members were mainly married couples of approximately the same age and interests as the couple at the centre of the circle. Regular attenders could bring their own kin along, and these did not need to be related to the couple whose family circle it was. Such a group was really a 'peer group', including people of both sexes, recruited along kinship lines. It was not a single kin-group, nor was it a complete one. Unlike the extended families discussed by Garigué and Firth, the family circle did not form an economic unit. Its function was primarily social, though it also helped and supported its members in times of crisis and might serve as a clearing house for useful information about employment opportunities and so on.

The kinship behaviour which Gans describes for the urban, working class Italians of Boston is very much like that which Bromley describes for the Italians in Port Pirie who came to Australia from Molfetta in Bari, southern Italy.¹ This Italian colony was composed of nuclear families, each of which managed its own affairs with little reference to the others; but each married couple, mainly through the kinship ties of the wife, was part of a group of 'peers' with which it interacted.² However the inter-linking alignments which were set up were constantly splitting and reforming as new migrants were incorporated into the groups, and their

¹ See Bromley: The Italians of Port Pirie, 1954.
² Similar observations on the kinship behaviour of southern Italian migrants are made in Gamba: A Report on the Italian Fishermen of Fremantle, 1952.
poorer, more demanding members were shed. (This was less likely to happen in the Italian population of Boston, which was more prosperous and which was no longer receiving new migrants from Italy).

Bromley contrasts the kinship behaviour of the southern Italians from Molfetta with that of the northern Italians in Port Pirie, who came from several provinces in northern Italy, particularly Belluno. The northerners, he states, did not lay any emphasis on kinship. He suggests that because of this they were able to acquire the characteristics of Australian family life more easily than the southerners. They were not under any pressure from their own kinship groups to preserve Italian modes of behaviour, as Bromley believes the southern Italians were.

However, Bromley did not study the northern Italians in Port Pirie closely. Jones is the only student of Italians in Australia who has made a systematic attempt to examine the differences between migrants originating in the north and in the south of Italy. He found little difference between them in Carlton; but his discussion centres on the nuclear family, and kinship behaviour is discussed mainly in relation to chain migration.¹

It is likely that the real differences between the kinship behaviour of people from different parts of Italy are to be found, not between the broad categories of 'north' and 'south' but between different regions within each of these two areas. It has already been pointed out that McDonald and Banfield describe differences between the kinship behaviour of residents of Basilicata and of Calabria, both of which are in the south.²

² See above, p.245.
Australian Kinship Behaviour in the Ovens Valley Area

Kinship was a more important day-to-day element in the lives of the members of the Australian population of the Ovens Valley area whose kin lived in the district than it was amongst the residents of the area whose kin lived some distance away. The kinship behaviour of those with relatives nearby will be discussed first.

Amongst Australians in the Ovens Valley area whose kin lived nearby, there were close contacts between adults related in the first degree, and rather less frequent ones between people more distantly related. There was a good deal of visiting between adult brothers and sisters, and between parents and their adult children. On fine summer weekends the roads were busy with cars as people travelled to visit their kin; and in some cases people lived so close to their kin that they saw them every day. Of the 25 Australian tobacco growers in the sample, 4 (16.0%) had kin in the first degree living on the same farms as themselves, in separate houses. Of the 17 Australians in the sample who were currently farm owners, 8 (47.1%) were in partnership with their fathers and/or their brothers.

Occasionally the primary purpose of a visit was something other than actually seeing one's kin. Relatives were accustomed to take some liberties with one another's property. For example, one Australian woman, whose husband was not himself a farmer, regularly went foraging for firewood on her husband's brother's land, and was often

---

In 3 cases the kin in question were the informants' married brothers, and in the other it was the informant's brother's widow. In one case the informant's married brother was sharing a house with his widowed mother.
frankly relieved if the farmer's family was not at home, as she did not want to waste time being sociable over the inevitable cups of tea.

Men got a great deal of help from adult members of their own nuclear families. For example, two of the Australian farm owners in the sample (one a bachelor and the other the father of two adult sons) clearly depended heavily on their older brothers (who were farming nearby) for financial and legal advice. Close relatives also tended to protect one another from outsiders and officialdom, if necessary. For instance, the father of one of the Australians in the sample insisted on being present during the interview, apparently because he suspected it had some bearing on a criminal case his son was involved in. Another Australian sent his eldest son to supervise the interview of a younger (married) son, in spite of the fact that the young man was no longer legally a partner in the family farm, but had been set up on his own, nominally in sole charge of another part of the family property. Close kinsmen also tended to co-operate with one another in business, even if they were operating rival concerns. For example, a pair of sisters-in-law (wives of brothers) who both provided accommodation for holiday visitors in the Ovens Valley area, regularly exchanged tips and information, and did not poach customers from one another.

Discussing the relationships between neighbours and friends was a favourite pastime. Some relationships, which were more complex and intertwined than usual, were frequently restated to keep the details clear. People were as happy to volunteer details of the links between themselves and other local residents (at least, if their kinsmen were respectable) as they were to discuss the ways
in which people not related to themselves were related to one another. Men were as interested as women in these discussions, and children and adolescents as much as adults.  

Amongst Australians in the Ovens Valley area, kin within the first two degrees were expected to be on friendly terms with one another and to support one another in differences of opinion within the district. It was usually assumed that kin were allies in the dispute between the rival tobacco growers' associations. However, there were some anomalies. For example, in 1966 the Chairman of one association was the brother-in-law (sister's husband) of a leader of the other. The sons of both men sided with their fathers, against their uncles and cousins. (In families where the father had no particular connections with either side, on the other hand, he and his sons might side with his wife's kin.)

Kin within the second degree also gave one another economic assistance of various kinds. One Australian farm owner in the sample was being assisted by his grandfather, who provided all the working capital and equipment he needed to cultivate his tobacco crop; the same young farm owner was assisting his uncle (his mother's sister's husband) by leasing him some land to try an experiment in bean growing.

---

1 For example, on Boat Day in Myrtleford, when people were discussing their acquaintances in the crowd, an Australian woman explained at length to her 19-year-old son how two local families were related to one another (by two cousin-marriages); soon after she explained to me that one of the families concerned contained people who were also cousins to her own husband. On another occasion, a girl, aged about 10, asked her father about the relationship between two families in the neighbourhood, and had the marriage link between them explained.
Economic relationships between kin within the second degree were perhaps affected by the laws of inheritance which operated in Victoria. If a property owner died intestate his property would be divided by the State between his kin in the first and second degrees, though if he made a will he might leave his property as he pleased except that his own wife and children had to be provided for (unless the entire property was left to charity).

Men obtained advice from their more successful kin, and tended to emulate them. One Australian tobacco grower in the sample persuaded his father to try tobacco growing because his cousins (his mother's sister's children) belonged to a family of very successful tobacco growers and he hoped to become as rich as they were. Even without the stimulus of a kinship tie there was considerable emulation of successful men by others; and the help which successful men gave to their less successful kin was sometimes difficult to distinguish from patronage, or favours given with an expectation of return.¹

Like the residents of Gosforth studied by Williams,² the Australian residents of the Ovens Valley area varied between making a distinction between 'kindred' and 'in-laws', and attributing stereotyped attributes to particular groups of kin, including the women who had married into them. The same woman might be heard denouncing an entire family (including the women who had married its members) as, for example, proud and lazy; and a little later be

---

¹ Compare discussions of the obligations between friends (above, Chapter 4, pp.181-2) and of patron-client relationships between Italians (above, Chapter 5, pp.222-3).
heard objecting to the unfairness of those who lumped her together with her husband's kin (whom, she might say, she cordially disliked) merely because she had the same name as a result of her marriage. This confusion of kindred and affines did not reflect any tendency for people to marry within their own kindred; it was purely a semantic confusion, arising from the fact that married women took their husband's surnames.

The relationships discussed so far are those between near kin. Relatives beyond the second degree were generally regarded as little more than neighbours who happened to have the same surname as oneself. If they had a different surname the relationship seemed to be forgotten altogether. An Australian tobacco grower in the sample was unable to explain how he was related to another with the same surname, though he believed there was a relationship somewhere. (At the time of the interview this informant was actually being visited by his namesake, for the wives of the two men were friends, and one woman wanted to see the other's new washing machine). Asked what kinds of relatives they had living nearby, many Australian informants mentioned 'aunties'; others mentioned cousins and other kin in the second degree; but none mentioned more distant relatives.

Many members of the Australian population who had come to live in the Ovens Valley area as a result of their occupations remarked that all the Australians in the area seemed to be related to one another; and many of the Australians born in the area remarked with satisfaction that they had 'hundreds' of relatives in the area. However, the kin they specifically knew and associated with were almost always related to them within the first two degrees. A more distant relationship would only be kept clearly in mind if the kinsman in question was
distinguished in some way; for example, by being a particularly successful tobacco grower. At the same time, even close relatives were conveniently forgotten if there was some reason to be ashamed of them. This pattern was very similar to that reported for some British rural communities.¹

There is little to say about the kinship behaviour of the residents of the region who did not have kin living in the area. Though they maintained contact with their kin in the first degree, particularly their parents, even if they had to travel considerable distances from time to time to do so, they were likely to lose contact with their kin of the second degree. In other words, their kinship behaviour was comparable to that of the urban populations described in several studies.²

Italian Kinship Behaviour in the Ovens Valley Area

Allowing for the conditions of migration, it seems that Italian kinship behaviour in the Ovens Valley area was very like that of the Australians. Relationships between Italians were rather less generally known and discussed amongst the Italian population in general than relationships between Australians were amongst the Australian population; but this was probably because the Italian population was composed of people from a number of different regions, who did not know one another well. For example, relationships between the Veneti in the area were unknown to most of the

¹ See, for example, Frankenberg: Village on the Border, 1957, pp. 46-7.
² See, for example, Martin: 'Extended Kinship Ties: an Adelaide Study', 1967.
Calabresi. However, each regional category of Italians contained people who were related to one another, and whose relationships were constantly rehearsed by the members of the same category; and the longer people had lived in the Ovens Valley area, the more likely they were to know something about members of other categories, at least those members who had been living in the area as long as they had themselves.  

As with members of the Australian population, the most contact between kin among Italians was between people who were related to one another in the first degree. Of the 80 Italian tobacco growers in the sample, 13 (16.3%) had relatives in the first degree living on the same farm as themselves, though in separate houses.  

Substantial help and protection were afforded to close relatives in a number of ways, and it seemed that this was regarded as obligatory. In particular, many migrants assisted their own or their wives' relatives in the first degree to come to Australia. Often they had their relatives taken on as sharemen on the same farm as themselves, where they could board with their kin and have their meals cooked by their

---

1 For example, a woman from Veneto who had spent most of her life in the Ovens Valley area gave me a detailed account of the life history of a Decollatura family which had lived in the area even longer than she had herself. Similarly, the Australian-born 18-year-old son of a migrant from Veneto knew a great deal about the family affairs of a Decollatura-born tobacco grower who was his next door neighbour.

2 This percentage is almost the same as that for Australians in the sample; see above, p. 250. The percentages for northern Italian-born and souther Italian-born are 11.1% and 21.6% respectively, but the difference between these two proportions is not statistically significant even at the 10.0% level.

3 See discussion of chain migration and sponsorship above, Chapter 3, pp.120-8.
kinsmen's wives. It was generally assumed that as long as a young man was living as a bachelor in the house of his father, elder brother, or sister's husband, the head of the household would carry on most official business on his behalf. Older men might be helped by their relatives too, if necessary. In one case a man rescued his wife's sister's husband, who had been sharefarming on a farm where the crop failed just before picking, and gave him a job picking and grading leaf on his own farm for the rest of the season.

As with Australians, there was some expectations on the part of Italian tobacco growers that kinsmen would take one anothers' parts in disputes. Most of the support amongst Italian tobacco growers for one of the tobacco growers' associations came from a number of families from Vicenza, related to one another by marriage.

Close kin sometimes operated farms together. Two Italian men in the sample each owned their farms in partnership with their three married brothers; and there were 6 cases of two or three brothers owning farms jointly. However, none of the Italian men in partnership with their brothers had adult children yet, and there were no cases in the sample in which men were in partnership with their cousins.

When members of the same nuclear family declared that they were not assisting one another, it might indicate either a serious family quarrel or a concerted attempt to obtain better treatment for the family from the world at large.

---

1 People were often surprised that I wanted to interview a singolo (bachelor) who was living with a more responsible person who, it was thought, would be able to answer my questions much better.
There were cases of brothers dividing their jointly-owned farms into separate properties, and of sons quarrelling with their fathers and leaving home. On the other hand there was a case of a southern Italian tobacco grower who had refused to share his tobacco quota with his sons who had set up a farm of their own. His sons regarded his attitude as quite reasonable and considered that it was the duty of the Quota Committee to solve their economic problem by granting them an additional quota. In fact, the apparent family split may have been arranged in order to obtain an increased quota.

As with the Australians, for practical purposes kinship amongst the Italians in the Ovens Valley area only included kin within the first two degrees. Within this range people expected protection from outsiders, political support in disputes, and occasional favours; but usually they did not expect long-term economic support or business association. There were very few instances of people in partnership with any kin more distant than the first degree; but when there were partnerships of any other kind, they were with kinsmen of the second degree, or with relatives by marriage (fathers- or brothers-in-law) rather than with more distant kin or with non-relatives.

Kin in the second degree assisted one another amongst the Italians as much or as little as they did amongst the Australians. For example, one young grower in his first season as a sharefarmer in 1965-66 was helped in grading

---

1 See discussion below, pp. 328-9.
his leaf by his retired grandparents. Another had been taken into partnership by his father's brother.¹

Kin often attempted to shield one another from intrusions by outsiders and officialdom. For example, they might feign ignorance of their own kin if a stranger asked questions about them.² Similarly they might claim ignorance of relatives they were ashamed of. However, people felt free to boast about kinsmen they were proud of. Two informants (one from Teviso and one from Catanzaro) spoke proudly about relatives who were at the University, or who hoped to go there after preliminary year in Technical College.

The restriction of the effective kinship network to kin within the first two degrees might have been partly the effect of migration, for much of a migrant's kinship network might still be in Italy. All the Italians in the sample had at least some relatives of the second degree and beyond still in Italy, though many of them had all their kin of the first degree in Australia. However, there was practically no difference between the Italians and the Australians in the Ovens Valley area regarding visits to the relatives who were in the area.³ Relatives outside

¹ This partnership was merely an additional investment for the uncle, who owned several farms and ran a sharefarming company; but it represented a very good start in life for the nephew. The uncle had a son who was at boarding school, and he clearly hoped that his son would do 'better' for himself than become a farmer.

² For example, a girl from Decollatura whom I knew quite well declined to explain to me which of her many tobacco growing relatives was which, when I asked her to do so, claiming that she did not know which of them were her cousins and which were members of another family of the same name, from a different town. In ordinary conversation she gossiped freely about her cousins, all of whom she knew well.

³ Of the 36 Italian-born informants with relatives in the Ovens Valley area (other than those living in the same house (footnote continued on p. 260)
the area (in particular relatives in Melbourne) were visited regularly too.\textsuperscript{1} Amongst the Italians, especially, weddings attracted large gatherings of kin of every degree. People travelled to see their relatives at Christmas or Easter, if they could, and often when people visited Melbourne for the tobacco sales, or for a few days\textsuperscript{1} holiday during the off-season, they stayed with relatives.\textsuperscript{2} Relatives of distant degrees as well as close ones were visited, for the object of the exercise was a trip, and the obligations of kinship provided a destination and a lodging.

These patterns of kinship behaviour, which were very similar for Italians and Australians, reduced the amount of free time which residents of the Ovens Valley area had for other activities, and limited the people they knew well to a small number composed almost entirely of kin.

(Footnote 3 continued from p.259)

or on the same farm), 15 (41.7\%) visited them once a week or more; and the comparable figure for the 30 Australian-born informants with relatives in the area is 13 (43.3\%); the difference between these two percentages is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0\% level.

\textsuperscript{1}

Of the 57 Italian-born informants with relatives in Australia (other than those in the Ovens Valley area), only 10 (17.5\%) visited them less than once a year or never; the comparable figure for the 30 Australian-born informants with relatives in Australia but outside the Ovens Valley area is 5 (16.7\%); the difference between these two percentages is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0\% level.

\textsuperscript{2}

This was the case for both Australians and Italians; of the 60 informants who had had at least one holiday of a week or more during the twelve months preceding the interview, 28 (46.7\%) stated that they spent all or part of their last holiday staying with relatives.
Finally, it should be pointed out that the longer migrants had lived in the Ovens Valley area the more likely they were to have relatives living there.\(^1\) In other words, although the migrants with the longest residence were apparently the most likely to interact with Australians in the public areas of life,\(^2\) they were also the most likely to have kin in the area with whom they could conduct extensive intra-ethnic interaction in their private lives.

Differences Between Northern and Southern Italian Migrant Kinship Behaviour

The differences between the kinship behaviour of northern and southern Italians in the Ovens Valley area were differences of degree rather than of kind, and they appear to be related to the different migration patterns of the two categories rather than directly to different patterns of kinship behaviour in northern and southern Italy. It is likely, of course, that the different migration patterns themselves were at least partly due to different kinship patterns in Italy.

1 Of the 17 Italian informants in the sample who were born in Australia or arrived before the Second World War, only 1 (5.9\%) had no relatives living in the Ovens Valley area; of the 21 who arrived after the War but before 1955, 6 (28.6\%) had no relatives living in the Ovens Valley area other than those living on the same farms as themselves; of the 42 who arrived after 1955, 29 (69.0\%) had no relatives living in the Ovens Valley area other than those living on the same farms as themselves. The difference between the first two percentages is statistically significant at the 10.0\% level, and that between the last two is statistically significant at the 1.0\% level.

2 That is, the areas of life discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 above, pp.144-227.
Since there are often marked differences between the kinship behaviour prevalent in different parts of 'northern' Italy and different parts of 'south', it is important to remember that of the 37 northerners in the sample interviewed for this study, 16 were from Vicenza and 10 from Treviso, and that of the 36 southerners, 17 were from Catanzaro. The comparison carried out here is therefore essentially between Veneti and Calabresi,¹ and northerners and southerners from other provinces will not necessarily show the same differences.

Northern Italians in the Ovens Valley area usually had fewer relatives in Australia than southerners had, in spite of the fact that northerners had usually been living in the country rather longer than southerners had, and so had had more opportunity for building up kinship networks in Australia. Other differences between northerners and southerners were that northerners came from a wide variety of comuni; whereas southerners came in denser clusters from fewer comuni,² and that northerners seemed more likely than southerners to migrate alone, or with friends, with little help from kinsmen.³ (The latter fact may be related to the number of northerners who migrated before the Second World War, and therefore before the current sponsorship

¹ For details of the regional origins of the tobacco growers interviewed in the course of this study, see below, Appendix II, pp.430-64.
² See discussion of the different patterns of migration in the sample above, Chapter 3, pp.128-31.
³ Only 19 (51.3%) of the 37 informants born in northern Italy were sponsored by relatives when they came to Australia, compared with 26 (72.2%) of the 36 migrants from southern Italy; the difference between these two percentages is statistically significant at the 10.0% level.
schemes which encourage migrants to ask relatives to sponsor them came into force).  

The impression made by northern Italians in the Ovens Valley area was that they were less permanent settlers than the southerners, in spite of their frequently longer residence in the area. In conversation they made references to trips back to Italy which they had made or were thinking of making, and to relatives who had been in Australia but who had returned to Italy again. Several northerners had returned to Italy and re-emigrated to Australia more than once, apparently continuing the pattern of temporary repeated migrations which had long been traditional in some of the villages in the northernmost parts of Italy (though the substitution of Australia for neighbouring European countries involved some modifications of the pattern).

Of the 37 informants born in northern Italy, 15 (40.5%) had made at least one trip back to Italy since their first migration, compared with only 7 (19.4%) of the 36 southern Italians in the sample. 2 Only 2 informants had visited Italy more than once since their first migration, and both were born in northern Italy.

---

1 See discussion of the times of arrival of different categories of migrants in the Ovens Valley area above, Chapter 3, pp.113-9 and of the history of Italian migration to Australia above, Chapter 1, pp.3-9.

2 The difference between these two proportions is statistically significant at the 5.0% level.
Several other factors probably encouraged this pattern. Northerners (who often came from small family farms) were more likely that southerners (who often came from families of landless rural labourers) to have property interests in Italy. Moreover, on the average northern Italians had been living in Australia slightly longer than the southerners, and had had more opportunity to save the money for the fare to Europe. In addition, the northern Italians were slightly more likely than the southerners to emigrate as bachelors, and many bachelor migrants visited Italy in order to find wives. Finally, since the north of Italy is more prosperous than the south, the relatives of northerners often preferred not to emigrate, whereas the relatives of southerners tended to join their migrant relatives, so that northerners often had to return to Italy to visit their kin, while southerners frequently had most of their kin in Australia.

As a result, although northerners were apparently as attached to their kin as southerners were, they were less dependent upon them; and they usually had smaller kinship networks in Australia at any given moment.

1 Of the 37 northern Italian migrants in the sample, 6 came to Australia before the Second World War, 8 came between 1947 and 1951, 13 between 1952 and 1956, 9 between 1957 and 1961, and one since 1962. The comparable figures for the southern Italian migrants were respectively 4, 9, 15, 4 and 4.

2 See discussion below, pp. 295-6.

3 There is no statistically significant difference between the percentages of northerners with relatives living in Australia who visited them once a week or more, and the comparable percentage of southerners, even at the 10.0% level; nor is there a statistically significant difference between the percentages of informants in each category who visited their relatives less than once a month, even at the 10.0% level.
Kinship on the Tobacco Farms

Both Italian and Australian tobacco growers showed a tendency to work with, and therefore to live near, their relatives.\(^1\) Table XXVIII\(^2\) shows the pattern of relationships on the farms with which the 105 tobacco growers in the sample were associated. It indicates that on the majority of farms where there was more than one male owner,\(^3\) two or more owners were related to one another; that on slightly less than half the farms with more than one shareman, two or more sharemen were related to one another; and that on a small proportion of farms with sharemen, at least one owner and one shareman were related to one another. Usually the relationship between relatives on a tobacco farm was that of kin of the first degree. Incidentally, on 45 of the 49 farms which had two or more male owners, all the owners were related to one another. Sharefarmers on the same farm were usually drawn from more diverse origins. Out of the 79 informants associated with farms that had more than one shareman, only 9 were associated with farms on which all the sharemen were related to one another. However, the greatest differences in origin were those between sharemen and owners. Only 7 informants were associated with farms on which owners and sharemen consisted only of relatives of one kind or another.

\(^1\) See discussion of residence on tobacco farms above, Chapter 4, pp.176-8.
\(^2\) See below, p.266.
\(^3\) This analysis does not take account of women in partnership with their husbands or their sons.
TABLE XXVIII

KINSHIP RELATIONS BETWEEN TOBACCO GROWERS ON THE FARMS WITH WHICH A SAMPLE OF TOBACCO GROWERS (OWNERS AND SHAREMEN) WERE ASSOCIATED, 1966-67

| Relationship between owners (farms with two or more male owners only) | Number of farms in each category with which men in the sample are associated | Nearest Relationship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kin in 1st degree | Kin in 2nd degree | Relatives-in-law | No Relationship | Total |
| Relationship between owners (farms with two or more sharemen only) | 42 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 49 |
| Relationship between sharemen (farms with two or more sharemen only) | 24 | 2 | 6 | 47 | 79 |
| Relationship between owners and sharemen (farms with sharemen only) | 6 | 2 | 7 | 80 | 95 |

Derived from: Sample survey of tobacco growers; see below: Appendix I, pp. 390-401
It is likely that the frequency with which owners were associated with their relatives, compared with the frequency with which sharemen were, reflects the greater freedom of choice which owners had regarding their occupational associates. Probably sharemen would have been associated with their relatives as often as owners were if they had been able to choose their associates freely, and if all their close relatives were in the Ovens Valley area.

On the other hand, the low proportion of farms on which owners and sharemen were related to one another reflects the difference in social status between owners and sharemen.

The Family Circle in the Ovens Valley Area

Observation in the Ovens Valley area suggests that family circles such as Gans describes1 existed for the southern Italians in the area, and also for the northern Italians and Australians.

Because of chain migration, many migrants had friends or relatives in the area who introduced them to their own family circles when they arrived, and many made haste to bring relatives out to join them as soon as they could, thus setting up further family circles.

The southern Italians in the Ovens Valley area, particularly those from Decollatura and other communi in Catanzaro, used the family circle in much the same way as the population described by Gans. They used godparenthood

---

1 See discussion above, pp. 247-8.
to incorporate non-relatives formally into the circle.¹ and they seemed particularly anxious to have their close relatives within easy reach. Out of 37 informants from southern Italy in the sample, only 20 (54.1%) still had any relatives in the first degree remaining in Italy.

Northern Italians, although they also depended on kin for companionship, organised their social lives in a less rigid way than southerners. Their family circles were more often open to non-kin, and they did not involve so many repeated visits to precisely the same household. The slightly diminished importance of family circles to northern Italian migrants was reflected in the greater willingness of northerners to be separated from their close relatives. Out of 36 informants from northern Italy in the sample, 30 (83.3%) still had some relatives in the first degree in Italy.²

By comparison with the two categories of Italian migrants, Australians had the most open and loosely-knit family circles of all. Any individual might belong to a number of different circles, kinship did not need to be the major recruiting factor (though it remained an important one),

¹ However, important though godparenthood was, it did not seem to be used as often as kinship in the second degree, or even mere neighbourliness, as a reason for the sponsorship of a new migrant. Only one of the informants in the sample migrated under his godparent's sponsorship. None sponsored the migration of their godchildren; nor were there any cases in which migrant and sponsor were 'related' by being parent and godparent of the same child at the time of migration.

² The difference between this proportion and that for the southern Italians is statistically significant at the 1.0% level.
and there was no use of substitutes for kinship, such as
godparenthood, to incorporate non-relatives formally into
the circle.

The family circle was a time-consuming institution,
and it was almost invariably composed of members of a single
ethnic category because its recruitment was so heavily based
on kinship. Through it, people made new friends of the
people brought to it by other members, but these were
generally people much like themselves. There were few
kinship ties between members of different ethnic categories
to serve as links joining members of different ethnic
categories into single family circles. The effect of this
kin-based sociability was to maintain a degree of social
segregation between Australians and Italians, and between
Italians from different regions.

**Kinship and Interaction in the Ovens Valley Area**

It is clear that kinship played a very important part
in the lives of both Australians and Italians in the
Ovens Valley area. Both ethnic categories frequently
visited their kin within the first and second degrees, if
they were nearby, and kin assisted one another in economic
affairs, backed one another up in disputes, exchanged gossip
and information and sometimes worked or owned property
together. The contribution of kinship towards the formation
of the family circle meant in addition that kinship helped
to regulate the social life and patterns of interaction of
the residents of the area. Altogether it may be said that
kinship helped individuals and families to make contact with
and to deal with the world outside their own homes; and
kinship ties helped to establish the position of individuals
and families within the various status hierarchies (of
wealth, style of life, and social reputation) of the area.
Because kin helped one another economically, the wealth of a relative contributed to the local reputation of an individual; and because kin exchanged gossip and information, kin-groups and family circles adopted similar styles of life.

Although kinship and the family circle helped to place individuals and families in the social life of the areas as a whole, the relative positions of individuals and families were not very clearly defined. It has already been pointed out that there was little general agreement about relative social status in the Ovens Valley area. Although kin-groups and family circles overlapped with other formations of the same kind, the network of relationships was discontinuous. Agreement about the relative positions of people connected to one another by kinship, friendship and association was possible; but it was difficult to relate the positions of people known to one another in some detail to the positions of people in a different network.

The major points of discontinuity were related to ethnic origin. Kinship behaviour did not differ much between different ethnic categories; but there were very few cases of intermarriage between different ethnic categories. Therefore there were very few instances in which Italians and Australians, northern and southern Italians, or even Australians of southern Irish origin and Australians of other origins, were related to one another. Since they were not related, they rarely belonged to the same family circles, for family circles were based on kinship. The lack of kinship links between different sections of the

---

1 See above, Chapter 3, pp. 132-7.
2 See discussion of intermarriage below, pp. 282-91.
population reduced the amount of interaction between them. In addition, the importance of kinship in the social lives of both Italians and Australians reduced the time and the inclination which members of either category had for making contact with members of the other.

It is possible that many residents of the Ovens Valley area relied more heavily on kinship links in the current migrant-host situation than they would have done if they had not been surrounded by people who were not members of their own ethnic categories. Forced to interact, even at a categorical level, with members of other ethnic categories in the areas of life where such interaction was regarded as necessary, they sometimes felt bewildered and cut off from satisfying contact by cultural differences. Some Australians in this situation seemed to cling to institutions from which Italians were absent (such as the Presbyterian Church), and the company of kin and members of the family circle who were definitely 'their own kind' must have been particularly attractive. For Italians, living and working alongside not only Australians but also Italians from very different regions from themselves, the familiarity and security of kinship and family circle was even more necessary. Moreover, the support of kin and of the family circle was of assistance not only in finding refuge from the outside world, but also in dealing with many of the problems faced by the migrant family as a result of the stresses put on it by the migrant situation.

It seems then that the effect of kinship networks and the family circle in the Ovens Valley area was primarily to

---

1 See comment on this point above, Chapter 4, pp.156-7.
2 See discussion of some of the problems of the migrant family below, pp.310-6 and pp.324-33.
give the residents of the area a sense of security and social support in the face of considerable social change and the presence of large numbers of people from different ethnic categories.
PART II: THE NUCLEAR FAMILY

The Australian Nuclear Family in the Literature

In urban studies in Australia, there is some confusion about the pattern of roles within nuclear families. McElwain and Campbell\(^1\) suggest that the role of the father is in some danger of becoming vestigial, since in so many families all domestic decision-making, relating to childrearing and household organisation, is left to the mother. Fallding sees the current situation of the family as 'patriarchy being challenged by a pattern of partnership'.\(^2\) Middleton sees the possibility of the development of a number of patterns of partnership between husbands and wives;\(^3\) Herbst presents a schema of types of family behaviour;\(^4\) and Taft sees a still wider range of forms of family organisation.\(^5\) A study carried out by Adler in 1958 shows that in the average Australian family the mother takes more of the decisions relating to all aspects of family life than the father does, and that in the majority of cases the mother alone is responsible for carrying out the decisions.\(^6\)

---

2. See Fallding: 'Inside the Australian Family', 1957.
Gruen suggests that rural families in Australia differ from urban families in much the same way as they do in other countries. In rural areas, he points out, birthrates are higher than urban ones, the traditional division of interests between the sexes has persisted, and there is less stress than in the towns on intellectual and educational attainments.¹

Of rural Australian studies,² only that of Oeser and Emery discusses interaction within the family. Their comments suggest that in the Australian farm family the father is a stronger authority figure than he is in the city family, particularly in dealing with his sons. Oeser and Emery attribute this to the control which he exercises over their economic position, both in the present and in the future. However, since his work does not take him away from home, and since his wife carries on her household duties on the farm itself, there is a tendency for many of the parents' activities to be performed in partnership, though both husbands and wives resist this.³ The question arises whether the same conditions obtain in rural families in

³ See Oeser & Emery: Social Structure and Personality in a Rural Community, 1954, especially Chapters VII and VIII.
which the father is not a farm-owner (and so cannot hand on his livelihood to his sons), or where the sons themselves do not expect to spend their lives as farmers (that is, where they are being educated out of the farming community). ¹

The Italian Migrant Nuclear Family in the Literature

The nuclear family life of Italians, has, like Italian kinship behaviour, been more fully described in studies of migrants than in studies of Italians living in Italy. Gans gives a particularly full description of the nuclear family of the Italians of Boston. ² He reports that households almost invariably consist of single nuclear families. There are few 'expanded family' households (that is, households where other kin are resident in addition to the nuclear family of procreation of the household head). Husband and wife relationships are segregated (that is, husbands and wives have few interests or activities in common, and each spend considerable portions of their leisure time in pursuits from which members of the opposite sex are excluded). ³ Family life is adult-centred. Children are expected to behave in ways that will fit in smoothly with their parents' activities; and they usually go out to work as soon as they are old enough to leave school. Gans remarks on the strong differentiation of male and female roles; and on the emphasis on female chastity, compared with the 'action-seeking' pattern of life of the young men who

¹ See discussion of farm families with metropolitan aspirations below, pp. 318-9 and 330-3.
³ 'Segregated-role' marriages are discussed in Bott: Family and Social Network, 1957.
are only dragged into marriage and domesticity with difficulty. The whole pattern is similar to that of the working-class family in London, described by Willmott and Young, except for the role performed by mothers in relation to their married daughters. According to Gans, amongst the Italians, 'mothers tend to assist rather than guide their married daughters. They help out in the household and in the rearing of children, but they have neither the power nor authority of the "Mum", the ruling matriarch of the English working-class family.' Gans attributes this difference to the gap which exists between the immigrant generation to which the mothers belong, and the American-born generation to which their married daughters belong.

Studies of Italian migrants in Australia describe similar patterns of family urbanisation to those reported by Gans, though they remark that there is a high incidence of expanded family households. They also draw attention to some variations within the overall pattern. Gamba distinguishes between first generation migrant families and those of the Australian-born or Australian-education second generation. The first generation families, he says, have high fertility rates, dominant fathers, submissive wives, heavily chaperoned daughters and obedient sons. Joint and expanded family households are common.

1 See Young & Willmott: *Family and Kinship in East London*, 1957.
4 See definition of these terms above, p. 246, fn. 2
The second generation, on the other hand, tends to form families in which there are fewer children, and the father's authority is somewhat relaxed. Most households consist of the nuclear family only. In other words, second generation families are more like those described by Gans than first generation families are. A socio-economic influence is at work, as well as length of residence in Australia, however. First generation migrants who have achieved substantial economic success allow their wives to lead more independent lives, and their children often go in for the trades and professions.¹

Jones also reports a high incidence of expanded family households amongst first generation Italian migrants in the Carlton area of Melbourne. In some cases there is overcrowding. He concludes that the causal factor in household composition is economic; when overcrowding occurs it is the result of the poverty of migrants who have only recently arrived in Australia and have not had time to improve their economic position. His study pays as much attention to migrants from the north of Italy as to those from the south, and he comes to the conclusion that there are no significant differences between the families of northerners and southerners, at least with regard to such factors as family size and household composition.² On the other hand, in Griffith, Price found that, although not all the differences between northerners and southerners with regard to family size and age at marriage were statistically significant, there was a consistent tendency

for southerners to have large families and to marry younger than northerners. He points out, also, that there were marked differences between different regional groups within the northern and southern categories, both amongst migrants and within Italy itself. He remarks: 'Italian regional statistics over the last thirty years or so reveal that in some ways - size of family, for instance - there is more similarity between Abruzzi-Molise and the Veneto than between Abruzzi-Molise and Calabria or the Veneto and Piedmont.' Because such marked differences exist within the regions designated 'north' and 'south' Italy in this thesis, it is necessary to bear in mind that the majority of the northerners interviewed come from Veneto (Vicenza and Treviso) and the majority of the southerners from Calabria (mainly Catanzaro).

It may be concluded that the family life of Italian migrants in Australia may be expected to be very like that described for Italian migrants in Boston, whatever part of Italy the migrants come from; but that the similarity will be more marked in second generation families than in first generation ones. It should also be noted that, although the studies of Italian migrants cited here all relate to migrants living in towns or cities, the family life which is described is similar in many respects to that of Australian rural families as described by Oeser and Emery.

3 See discussion of the regional origin of the migrants in the Ovens Valley area, above, Chapter 3, pp.113-9.
4 See discussion above, p.274.
The Nuclear Family Household in the Ovens Valley Area

Amongst both Italians and Australians in the Ovens Valley area, the household almost invariably consisted of a nuclear family. All the married men in the sample were living with their own wives and children. One-third of the children of both Australians and Italians who were over 15 years of age were living away from their parents, usually with their own spouses and children. Some married men in the sample had a widowed mother or a widowed father living with them, but none were sharing their homes permanently with both their own parents. However, three informants (all southern Italians) were temporarily living with their wives' parents or with married brothers, pending completion of partially-built houses nearby on the same farms.

There were a few cases amongst both northern and southern Italians (particularly amongst the sharefarmers) of bachelors living with their married brothers or their married sisters, but none in which more than one bachelor brother was living with a married couple.\(^1\) Altogether, there were very few joint family households, but several expanded family households.

A notable feature of the Ovens Valley area was the comparatively high marriage ratio.\(^2\) There appeared to be a strong element of domesticity among tobacco growers. As

\(^1\) However, in one case, two bachelor brothers shared a house and had their meals next door at their married sister's house; this was a southern Italian family, in which the bachelors were sharefarming on the farm owned by their sister's husband.

\(^2\) See discussion above, Chapter 3, p.83.
Table XXIX shows, only 19 individuals in the sample of 105 were unmarried. Fourteen of these were living with relatives, usually their parents. Only 3 were living with non-relatives, and only 2 were living alone. Two factors

**TABLE XXIX**

MARITAL STATUS AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF A
SAMPLE OF TOBACCO GROWERS (OWNERS AND SHAREFARMERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN</th>
<th>Never Married</th>
<th>Married Once</th>
<th>Married twice</th>
<th>Married but not living with spouse</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven or more</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derived from: Sample survey of tobacco growers; see Appendix I, below, pp.390-401.

encouraged this domesticity. First, since the owners of tobacco farms generally provided their sharemen with houses, rent-free, on their farms, married men with families were attracted to sharefarming in preference to occupations in which they would have had to find their own accommodation;
and second, the occasional help of women and children was very valuable to a sharefarmer, who needed extra labour at such times as harvesting, and preferred not to hire workers who had to be paid wages. In fact, many tobacco growers stated that a single man on his own could not make a profit on a year's sharefarming, because of the cost of the labour he would have to hire. Most single growers lived in households in which there were women and children who helped them in their work on the farm.

Out of 25 Australian informants, only 4 (16.0%) were unmarried and only 2 of these still lived with their parents. Only 15 (18.8%) of the 80 Italian informants were unmarried and only 8 of these (4 of them born in Australia) still lived with their parents. Of the 32 Australian-born informants, 19 (59.4%) were living in households containing five or more people, compared with 35 (47.9%) of the 73 Italian-born informants. The equivalent figures for informants born in northern and southern Italy, respectively, were 56.8% and 38.9%.

The behaviour of migrants in the Ovens Valley area supports Jones's finding in Carlton. When possible Italians, like Australians, preferred to live in nuclear family households, and this was the case for both northern and southern Italians. Exceptions to this rule usually arose only when accommodation was needed for newly

1 The difference between the proportions of bachelors amongst Australians and Italians is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.
2 The difference between these two proportions is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.
3 The difference between these two proportions is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.
arrived migrants with little money or when bachelors had to be accommodated in the homes of married relatives.

Marriage

Neither Australians nor Italians in the Ovens Valley area were very willing to marry outside their own ethnic category, or to marry people born far from the districts where they were born themselves. Of the 21 Australian married men in the sample, 19 (90.5%) had married Australian women; and out of 62 Italian-born married men, 60 (96.8%) had married women of Italian origin. Only 3 informants born in Australia of Italian origin were married, and none of these had married women of Italian origin, but the number is too small for this result to be tested for significance. Table XXX compares the origins of the men in the sample with those of their wives.

Not surprisingly, the Italian-born men who were married before they migrated had all married Italian-born women. However, if only Italian-born men married after migration are considered, 47 out of 49 (95.9%) had married women of Italian origin. Table XXXI shows the choices of wives by Italian-born men who married before and after emigration.

---

1 There were actually 63 marriages of Italian-born men in the sample, but one of these was the remarriage of a widower, who married Italian-born women on both occasions.

2 The difference between these two proportions is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.

3 See below, p.283.

4 The difference between this proportion and that of Australian men marrying Australian wives is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.

5 See below, p.293.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Australian of Italian origin</th>
<th>Italian-born</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUSBANDS</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIVES</td>
<td>German-born</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derived from: Sample survey of tobacco growers; see below: Appendix I, pp. 390-401.
The expressed feelings of Australians and Italians about marriage between the two ethnic categories showed that both tended to regard it with disfavour. Only 8 (25.0%) of the 32 Australian-born informants (including those of Italian origin) and 15 (20.5%) of the 73 Italian-born informants regarded it favourably. However, the Italians who regarded it favourably were amongst those who had lived in the area longest, who were most prosperous, and who could realistically look forward to their children's marriages into some of the most respected local Australian families. For them, intermarriage would be an indication that their social status was somewhat superior to that of other migrants.

There was little difference between Italians and Australians in their experience of intermarriage as it affected their own relatives. Only 10 (31.3%) of the Australian-born and 25 (34.2%) of the Italian-born stated that they had relatives who had married into the other ethnic category. Differences between northern and southern Italians with respect to these characteristics were almost non-existent. Of men born in northern Italy, only 18.9% were favourably disposed to the idea of intermarriage between Italians and Australians, and the comparable figure for southern Italians in the sample is 22.2%. Of the northern Italians, only 37.8% stated that they had relatives who had married Australians, and of the southern Italians only 30.6% did so. These figures do not

---

1 The difference between these two proportions is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.
2 The difference between these two percentages is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.
3 The difference between these two percentages is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.
4 The difference between these two percentages is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.
indicate the actual rate of intermarriage between Italians and Australians, however. Stated attitudes towards intermarriage as a hypothetical proposition are a different matter from reactions to a specific situation, and the relatives people knew of who had married out of their own ethnic category did not necessarily comprise all their relatives who had married out.

Italians generally said that they objected to intermarriage because Australian girls could not cook Italian food and could not speak either Italian or their local dialect. Sometimes during the interviews this statement was followed by an account of how well the Australian wife of a particular relative of friend in fact succeeded in learning to cook, or how quickly she had learnt to speak dialect in order to talk to her husband's mother and other relatives. A few Italian men (mainly those from Calabria) stated they would not like their own wives to have as much freedom of movement as Australian girls had, apparently in the belief that a woman who went about much on her own was in moral danger..

Australians seemed to have no very clear objection to intermarriage other than the general association of Italians with lower status occupations and a lower standard of living. One informant (a Presbyterian and a Freemason, whose father had been born in Northern Ireland) had objected to his niece's marriage to an Italian Catholic on religious grounds, but apart from this there was little evidence of particular objection to the Catholicism of most Italians. In contrast, several Australian Catholics were against intermarriage; one explicitly stated that he objected to the idea of mixing the Australian and Italian races because the result would be 'mongrel' human beings.

1 Probably more men would have expressed the same opinion if they had not felt it might be impolite to me, since I was travelling from farm to farm in order to interview people.
Several studies of migrants have discussed the factors influencing intermarriage.\(^1\) One of the latest of these suggests that religion and occupational status may be more important in determining intermarriage than ethnic origin.\(^2\) However, a later study still has questioned this.\(^3\) Such evidence as is provided by the marriage patterns of the small sample of tobacco growers interviewed in the course of this study suggests that religion only had an effect in so far as religious functions provided opportunities for migrants and members of the host population to meet, and in making migrants who were co-religionists more acceptable marriage partners for hosts than migrants of other denominations would have been.

Marriage between members of different denominations was very rare in the Ovens Valley area.\(^4\) However, the marriages that had taken place between Catholics and Protestants had almost all taken place between Italians and Australians. Often they were accompanied by the conversion of the Protestant partner to the Catholic faith.


\(^4\) See above, Chapter 4, p.145.
There were 7 cases of inter-ethnic marriages in the sample. In 2 cases, Italian-born men married Australian women, in 2 more Italo-Australian men married Australian women, in one case an Australian man married the Australian-born daughter of an Italian, in another an Australian man married a German-born woman, and in the last the Australian-born son of an Italian married a German-born woman. Of these 7 marriages, 4 were between Catholics, 2 were between Catholics and women who had converted to Catholicism, and only one was between a Catholic and a Protestant. In the whole sample there were only 2 other inter-denominational marriages, both between Australians; in one a Presbyterian was married to an Anglican, and in the other an Anglican was married to a man who claimed he had no religion.

If religion alone, irrespective of ethnic origin, were the determinant of inter-ethnic marriages, the number of marriages between Italian-born and Australian-born contracted in Australia might be expected to reflect the proportions of Italian-born and Australian-born Catholics in the Catholic population as a whole. The Italian-born comprised approximately 17.6% of the Catholic population of the Ovens Valley area.¹ It might therefore be expected that the 24 marriages in the sample contracted by Italian-born men with women met in Australia would include only 17.6% (that is, 3.7) marriages with Italian Catholics, while the remainder (that is, 20.3) would be with Australian

¹ See above, Chapter 4, p.145, fn.2.
Similarly, the marriages of Australian Catholic men (who comprised 7 of the married men in the sample) might be expected to include 17.6% (that is, 1.2) with Italian women and 82.4% (that is, 5.8) with Australian women. In other words, if marriages were regulated by religion rather than by ethnic origin, there would be something like 21 marriages between Italian-born and Australian-born in the sample; in fact there were only 2.

As far as occupational status is concerned, examination of this sample suggests that occupation had rather less effect on inter-ethnic marriages than religion had. Of the 86 current marriages represented in the sample, 38 (44.2%) were between people whose fathers had the same occupations, and of these 29 (33.7% of the current marriages of men in the sample) were between people whose fathers had the same status within their occupations. However, where there were status differences between the fathers of a married couple, or where the fathers were in different occupations, the differences of status between them were not very large.

For example, the father of one of the marriage-partners might have been even lower than 17.6% of the marriages between Italian men and women met in Australia, for the Italian population of the Ovens Valley area contained slightly more men than women. The Italian female population of the area was therefore probably less than 17.6% of the total female Catholic population. See discussion of the masculinity ratios of the migrant and Australian populations of the area above, Chapter 3, pp.107-8.

1 Actually the proportion of marriages between Italian men and Italian women might have been even lower than 17.6% of the marriages between Italian men and women met in Australia, for the Italian population of the Ovens Valley area contained slightly more men than women. The Italian female population of the area was therefore probably less than 17.6% of the total female Catholic population. See discussion of the masculinity ratios of the migrant and Australian populations of the area above, Chapter 3, pp.107-8.

2 That is, worked within the same industry, such as tobacco growing or dairy farming.

3 That is, had the same rank, such as farm owner, manager or shareman.
have been a farm owner in a fairly small way, and the father of the other a clerk, or a sharefarmer.

Amongst both Italians and Australians similarities of occupation between the parents of the couples concerned were equally common. In 30 (48.4%) of the 62 Italian-Italian marriages represented in the sample, and 7 (41.2%) of the 17 Australian-Australian marriages, the fathers of the couples concerned had the same occupations. However, it was commoner amongst Australians than amongst Italians for them also to have the same status within their occupations. Of the 30 Italian-Italian marriages within the same occupational categories, 22 (73.3%) were within the same status categories; but all of the 7 Australian-Australian marriages within the same occupational categories were within the same status categories. However, inter-ethnic marriages were inter-occupational and inter-status marriages more often than in-ethnic marriages were. Of the 7 inter-ethnic marriages in the sample, only one (12.5%) was between people with fathers in the same occupational category, and even in this case the fathers had different statuses within their occupational category.

Altogether, it seems that both Italians and Australians in the Ovens Valley area tended to marry within their own ethnic categories. Within these categories they tended to marry within their own religious categories and to a lesser extent within their own occupational and status categories. However, if an inter-ethnic marriage was made

---

1 The difference between these two proportions is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.

2 The numbers of marriages within each ethnic category are too small to permit tests of statistical significance being carried out on these figures.
it was quite likely to be between people of different denominations (though it might be accompanied by the conversion of the non-Catholic partner) and very likely indeed to be between people of different occupational and status categories.\(^1\)

The few inter-ethnic marriages made by individuals in the sample indicate that people who intermarry find their marriage partners outside the usual social round of common friends and common interests. Out of the 6 men of Italian origin in the sample married to women of non-Italian origin, 3 married girls who came to the tobacco growing region alone, because of their work; they were respectively a receptionist, a teacher and a nurse. A fourth married a girl who came to the Ovens Valley area with her father who was hired to help with the milking on the farm next-door (owned by the informant's uncle). In all these cases the girls met their future husbands before they had become involved in a series of local contacts based on the characteristics they had in common with the local Australians. The two Italian men who married locally-born Australian girls chose wives whose fathers were part of the very small local category of mechanics and factory hands. The sole Australian man who married a girl of Italian origin was himself a newcomer to tobacco growing,

\(^1\) This finding relates to a situation in which inter-ethnic marriages were still uncommon; therefore, it is not in conflict with the American finding that in areas of long-established migrant settlement, where inter-ethnic marriages are frequent, they usually take place between people of the same religious and occupational category; see, for example, Kennedy: 'Single or Triple Melting Pot? Intermarriage Trends in New Haven, 1870-1940', 1944; and Gordon: *Assimilation and American Life*, 1964.
and to the tobacco growing region round Myrtleford (though
he had been born in Wangaratta.)

Inter-ethnic marriages were also likely to be between
people originating in different localities, whereas in-
etnic marriages were likely to be between people born in
the same localities. Apart from the 4 inter-ethnic marriages
between people born in different countries, the 2 Australian-
born men of Italian origin who married Australian women
married women born in Melbourne, though they themselves were
born in the Ovens Valley area; and only one inter-ethnic
marriage was between people who were both born in the
Ovens Valley area.

Generally speaking, both Australians and Italians
married within their own localities, as well as within
their own ethnic categories. Out of the 63 marriages of
the Italian-born in the sample, 28 (44.2%) were between
people born in the same comune; and out of 21 marriages
of Australians in the sample, 8 (38.1%) were between
people born within the same district (usually the Ovens
Valley area).  

The campanilismo of Italian migrants has been discussed
at length in many studies. The figures given in Table

1 The difference between these two proportions is not
statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.
2 That is, the degree to which Italians are supposed to
limit their social relations and their interests to the
area within which the campanile (bell-tower) of the church
in their natal village or parish is visible.
3 For example, in Foerster: The Italian Emigration of our
Times, 1919; Jones: The Italian Population of Carlton,
1962; Bromley: The Italians of Port Pirie, 1954; and
Garigue & Firth: 'Kinship Organisation of Italianates in
London', 1956.
XXXI indicate the degree to which it affected the Italian tobacco growers of the Ovens Valley area. The men married before migration, and those who returned home to get married and bring their brides to Australia, were most frequently the ones who had married within their own comuni. Of the 14 men married before migration, 10 (71.4%) married women from their own comuni, compared with 18 (36.7%) of the 49 men married since migration. This probably reflects the social and geographical range within which men living in rural conditions can search for wives, as well as their sentiment about their own locality. The same effect is also to be seen in the preference of Australians for marrying their neighbours.

An interesting feature of these marriage patterns is that, out of 5 marriages between Italian-born men and girls born in Australia, 3 were to the Australian-born daughters of Italians. A number of writers have remarked on the high incidence of marriages between migrants and Australian-born members of their own ethnic categories. The figures in this sample are too small to indicate the degree of marriage between people born in Italy and people of Italian origin born in Australia, but it is clearly an important component in the marriage patterns of Italian migrants.

1 See below, p. 293.
2 The difference between these two proportions is statistically significant at the 5.0% level.
### TABLE XXXI

**CHOICE OF WIVES BY A SAMPLE OF ITALIAN-BORN TOBACCO GROWERS**

**(OWNERS AND SHAREFARMERS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIVES</th>
<th>Married before migration</th>
<th>Returned to Italy to marry</th>
<th>Brought out woman known in Italy</th>
<th>Brought out stranger</th>
<th>Met wife in Australia</th>
<th>Came out to join fiancée</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From same comune as husband</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From same province in Italy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From same area of Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Italian girl married to northern Italian man</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian-born daughter of man from same province or area in Italy as husband</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian-born daughter of southern Italian man married to northern Italian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derived from: Sample survey of tobacco growers; see below, Appendix I, pp. 390-401.

1 This category includes women who came to Australia as proxy wives or fiancées of their present husbands.
It is interesting to note that marriages within the Italian population of the Ovens Valley were rarely marriages between people originating in the same comuni; indeed, they were often contracted between people from very different parts of Italy. Of the 24 informants who met their wives in Australia, only 4 married women from the same comuni as themselves, and only 11 married women born in or originating from the same regions as themselves. Of the men in the sample, 7 were northern Italians who had married women born in or originating from the southern part of the country. These factors reflect the choices which were available to migrant men in the Italian population in Australia.

Price discusses the effect of stages of settlement and the build-up of migrant communities in the host country upon inter-ethnic marriages and marriages between migrants and members of the migrant population born in the host country. In the Ovens Valley area, it seems from the age of children of inter-ethnic marriages that such marriages had only been taking place since about 1950, and that they had been taking place continuously since this date. However, this might be the effect of the comparative youth of the individuals in the sample rather than a reflection of the history of intermarriage in the area. As the Italian population of the Ovens Valley area increased after the Second World War the number of Italian girls in the area whom Italian men might marry also increased; but at the same time the Italian population was increasing in social status and general eligibility, so that more

1 See Table XXXI above, p. 293.
marriages between Italians and Australians became possible. However, the numbers of inter-ethnic marriages and of marriages between Australian-born Italians and migrant Italians in the sample are too small for the investigation of this argument.

Italian men who migrated as bachelors had considerable problems to face in finding wives. Australians tended to resist intermarriage, and migrants themselves were not usually in favour of it. The migrant Italian population had a fairly high masculinity ratio, so not all migrant bachelors could find wives within it. Some men were engaged before migration, and brought their fiancées out to marry them as soon as they had established themselves in their new country. Many men proposed by letter to girls they knew in Italy, and paid their fares to Australia to marry them here. A few men obtained introductions (through other migrants) to girls in Italy whom they had never met, and, after an exchange of letters, brought them out to Australia. Three men in the sample married girls whose passages they paid before they met them; and another paid a girl's fare out, but had his proposal rejected after she arrived in Melbourne. There were few proxy marriages in the sample, for since the war it has been fairly easy for unmarried girls to obtain visas and assistance from the Australian immigration authorities. Prospective brides who had relatives in Australia arrived unmarried, and often waited a week or so before making up their minds whether to marry the bachelors who had paid their fares.

Many unmarried men went back to Italy for a trip after they had been in Australia for a year or so. Often, their friends joked that they had gone to look for wives. Though this may not have been their only intention, a high percentage came back to Australia with brides, or engaged
to women who would follow them out and marry them after a few months. One man in the sample, from Decollatura, who visited his home town after spending all his adult life in Australia, stated earnestly that he had had no intention of getting married, but while he was in Italy he became imbrogliato (involved) with a girl twelve years his junior, whom he married and brought back to Australia.

Since most men got to know the girls they married through their personal contacts, it is not surprising that they so often married girls from their own localities, and from families known to their own relatives. Often the families of the individuals involved were aware of, and partners in, the whole of the courtship. For example, an Italian boy of 18, newly arrived in Myrtleford from Soveria Manelli (Catanzaro), formally asked the parents of a girl of 16 (who had been born in Soveria Manelli but had lived in Australia for ten years) if he could become engaged to their daughter before he approached the girl himself.

Some Australians said that amongst the Italians this supervision of the social lives of the younger generation (which was more pronounced amongst southern Italians than amongst northerners) sometimes reached the extreme of marriages being actually arranged by the parents of the couple concerned. Some of the Australian gossip about arranged marriages amongst the Italians was ill-informed, however. For example, Australian gossip said that one Italian-born boy living in Myrtleford only met his bride to be, for the first time, at the instigation of his parents, a fortnight before the wedding. In fact, she was born in the same town in Italy as he was (Decollatura), came to Australia eighteen months before the wedding, and was living in Wangaratta with her brother when her future husband (who was the cousin of her brother's fiancée) met
her and became engaged to her long before the wedding. In spite of the great interest which all the relatives of the individuals concerned took in marriages and the choice of marriage partners, arranged marriages in the strict sense of the term did not seem to take place, at least amongst the present generation of migrants.

Table XXXI shows that there were 7 instances in the sample of men from northern Italy marrying girls born in the south, and one of a man born in the north marrying the Australian-born daughter of a southern Italian. There were no instances of southern Italian men marrying northern Italian girls.

Southern Italian men in the sample were rather more likely to be married before they migrated than northern Italian men were. In some cases they were joined by their wives and Italian-born children some years after migrating themselves. As a result, Italian migrant bachelors found that there was a small local population of southern Italian girls in which they could search for wives. On the other hand, there were comparatively few unmarried

---

1 Australian families too took a considerable interest in the marriages of their members, though possibly not quite as much as Italian families; for example, see reference to the objection of an Australian uncle to his niece's marriage to an Italian, above, Chapter 4, p.155.

2 See above, p.293.

3 The sample is too small for this result to be regarded as statistically significant, and the finding is not in line with those reported for other Italian populations in Australia; for example, in Griffith considerable numbers of southern Italian men had married northern Italian women, though the proportions differed for different regions in northern and southern Italy; see Price: Italian Population at Griffith, 1955.
northern Italian girls. Taking into account these characteristics of the unmarried migrant population, it was to be expected that there would be more marriages of northern Italian men to southern Italian women than vice versa.¹

In addition, observation suggested that northerners looked down on southerners, so that few northern families were willing to allow their daughters to marry southern men. (A similar point of view was evident amongst the Australians, who married northern Italians more readily than southerners, if they married Italians at all). Southern Italian families, however, were likely to be favourable to their daughters' northern Italian suitors.

Since several southern Italians were married before migration, and since southern Italian men rarely married northern women, the rate of in-marriage between southern Italians was higher amongst southern Italian men than the rate of in-marriage between northerners amongst northern Italian men. Out of 29 married northern Italian men in

¹ Of the 34 northern Italian-born men in the sample who came to Australia as adults (past school-leaving age), 31 (91.2%) came as bachelors; of the 32 southern Italian-born men in the sample who arrived as adults, 27 (84.4%) came as bachelors. The difference between these two proportions is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level, but it is in line with the more definite findings reported by Jones. He found that migrants from the north of Italy were less often married on arrival in Australia than migrants from the south; that generally southern Italian migrants married in Italy and emigrated 3-6 years later; and that people who were married before migration married younger and had larger families than those who married after migration. See Jones: *The Italian Population of Carlton*, 1962.
the sample, 18 (62.1%) were married to northern Italian women; in comparison, out of 33 southern Italian-born married men, 30 (90.9%), were married to southern Italian women. This difference disappears if only marriages before migration are considered.

Apart from the influence of extraneous factors on their marriage patterns, however, it seems that southern Italians generally had a stronger sense of campanilismo than northern ones did. Comparison of the choice of marriage partners of migrants from Vicenza and Catanzaro shows that men from Vicenza who married before they left Italy were less likely to have married women from their own comuni than men from Catanzaro were. However, the men from Vicenza tended to marry into neighbouring comuni, not into other regions of Italy.

These generalisations are based on the patterns of behaviour in the Ovens Valley area. Other situations show different patterns. For example, in Griffith, where most of the southerners came from Reggio Calabria and most of the northerners from Treviso, Price found that southerners had a higher rate of inter-ethnic marriage with Australians than northerners had. In the Ovens Valley area there were too few inter-ethnic marriages to make meaningful comparisons with the Griffith figures possible, but out of the 5 Italian-Australian marriages contracted by men in the sample, 4 involved northern

---

1 The difference between these two percentages is statistically significant at the 1.0% level.
2 See above, Chapter 3, pp.128-30.
Italians and only one involved a southerner. The difference between this and Griffith may have arisen because people from Catanzaro (the largest group of southerners in the Ovens Valley area) behaved differently from people from Reggio Calabria; because people from Vicenza (where many of the northerners in the Ovens Valley area originated) behaved differently from those from Treviso; or because the history of settlement in Griffith was different from the history of settlement in the Ovens Valley area. For example, the population of southern Italian origin in Griffith may have been too small for the southern bachelor migrants to find wives within it, and adverse conditions may have made it impossible for them to return to Italy to seek wives there.

**Fertility**

The sample indicates that Australian tobacco growers had larger families, on the average, than Italian ones. Of the married men in the sample, the 21 Australians had an average of 3.0 children each, and the 3 Italo-Australians an average of 3.3 children each, and the 62 Italian-born men an average of only 2.2 children each. If the same comparisons are made for wives, the 23 Australian women had an average of 3.0 children each, the 4 Italo-Australians 1.5 children each, the 57 Italian-born women an average of 2.2 children each, and the 2 German-born wives of men in the sample an average of 2.0 children each. The average number of children per marriage at the time of the interview, for the whole sample, was 2.5.

These figures cannot be standardised for duration of marriage, as the questionnaire did not include a question relating to date of marriage. However, if the number of

---

1 See Questionnaire, below, Appendix I, pp.402-29.
children per year, since the birth of the first child, is reckoned for various sections of the sample, it still appears that Australians were more fertile than Italians. Australian wives of men in the sample had had 0.27 children per year since the birth of their first children, northern Italian women had had 0.22 children per year, southern Italian women 0.24 children per year, and the two German-born wives of men in the sample 0.33 children per year.

The larger size of the average Australian family was probably due to the different age ranges of the categories of wives concerned. Only 12.1% of the Italian-born wives in the sample were past child-bearing age, while 18.5% of the Australian-born wives were aged 45 or over. A higher proportion of Italian families in the sample may be assumed to have been incomplete at the time of the interview.

'Northern' Italian here includes two women born in Australia whose parents originated in northern Italy, and 'southern' Italian includes two women born in Australia whose parents originated in southern Italy. The two 'northern' Italo-Australians had had an average of 0.27 children per year each since the birth of the first child, and the two 'southern' Italo-Australians an average of 0.40 children per year each: for the total of four Italo-Australian women, the average is 0.30 children per year each since the birth of the first child; however, there were too few Italo-Australian wives of men in the sample for these figures to be regarded as statistically significant.

The difference between these two percentages is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level, so it cannot be taken to indicate a difference of the same kind between the whole population of Australian wives and the whole population of Italian wives in the Ovens Valley area; however it does go some way towards explaining why the Australian families in the sample were so much larger than the Italian families.
It does not appear that Italian women usually had their first children at an earlier age than Australian women did. The average age at which the Australian wives in the sample had their first children was 24; for the Italian-born it was also 24; for the Italo-Australians it was 26; and for the German-born, 20. Taking all the wives in the sample together the average age at which the first child was born was 24 years. Of the Australian-born wives, including the 4 Italo-Australians, 5 (18.5%) had their first child before the age of 21, compared with 14 (24.6%) of the Italian-born.\(^1\)

In his study of the 1954 Census figures, Day noted that in Australia generally, Italian-born women whose families had been completed by 1954 had fewer children than their Australian Catholic counterparts.\(^2\) He put forward three suggestions to account for this: 'first, a commonly substantial separation of spouses during the period of migration; second, the socio-economic origins and aspirations of the migrants themselves; and third, the somewhat related possibility that Italians are, as a group, rather less attached to the broader Catholic system of values that has developed in Australia.'\(^3\) These three effects were still at work amongst the Italian population.

---

1 The difference between these two proportions is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.


of the Ovens Valley area in 1966, but to a very much smaller extent than in Australia as a whole in 1954.\(^1\) For example, the period of separation of husband and wife, as a result of migration, is now far shorter than it was in the pre-war and immediate post-War periods.\(^2\)

Out of 57 Italian-born wives of men in the sample, 14 were married before their husbands migrated, and 8 of these had borne one or more children in Italy before migration. For all the Italian-born wives of men in the sample, the average gap between the birth of any child and its successor was 4.3 years, but for the 8 women who had children in Italy before migration, the average gap between the last child born in Italy and the first child born after migration was 5.4 years.

The gap between pre- and post-migration children was partly due to the enforced separation of husband and wife while the husband found the resources to establish a home.

---

1 See discussion of the aspirations of Italian migrants for the education of their children below, p.319 and pp.329-33, and of the attitudes of Italian migrants to the Catholic Church above, Chapter 4, pp.147-54.

2 Price calculates that for southern Europeans as a whole, the average interval between the arrival of a male settler and that of his wife, or between his arrival as a single man and his marriage to a girl from the same region of Italy as himself, was 13.3 years before 1907, 11.2 years between 1907 and 1916, 8.2 years from 1920 to 1929, and 5.9 years from 1930 to 1939; see Price: *Southern Europeans in Australia*, 1963, p.137. Jones reports that for a sample of Italians in Carlton, most of whom arrived in Australia after the Second World War, the average period between the arrival of a married male settler and that of his wife was 3.77 years; see Jones: *The Italian Population of Carlton*, 1962, p. 326. It has already been pointed out that amongst the Italians in the sample interviewed in the course of this study, most of whom arrived in Australia after the Second World War, the average period of separation before married migrants were joined by their wives was 3.7 years; see above, Chapter 3, p.123, fn.2.
and bring his wife and children out to join him. Further delays in child-bearing might have occurred while migrant couples established themselves in Australia. In the Ovens Valley area, however, the second was not an important factor. Migrant women who came straight to the area from Italy usually had children within the first year or two. Since this was a farming area, children were less of an economic liability than they would have been in a city.

At the time of the interviews, the average number of children in the families of women born in northern Italy was 2.1, compared with an average of 2.2 in the families of women born in southern Italy. Although these averages are almost identical, they tend in the opposite direction from the tendency that might be expected in view of the ages of the women concerned. Of the women born in northern Italy, 16.7% were past child-bearing age, compared with only 10.3% of the women born in southern Italy.\(^1\) It is likely that northern Italian families, when completed, would be smaller than completed southern Italian families, since uncompleted southern families were already larger than uncompleted northern ones.\(^2\)

There were greater differences between the families of the wives born in northern Italy and those of wives

---

\(^1\) The difference between these two percentages is not statistically significant even at the 10.0% level, so it is only relevant to discussions of the structure of the families included in the sample, not to discussions of the population as a whole.

\(^2\) This is in line with Price's finding that Italian migrants in Griffith who came from Veneto had on the average smaller families than migrants from Calabria; see Price: *Italian Population at Griffith*, 1955.
born in southern Italy, than between the families of Australian wives and those of Italian wives as a whole. Women born in the north of Italy had their first children, on the average, at the age of 25, whereas southern-born wives had their first children, on the average, at the age of 23. More significantly, only one (5.6%) of the 18 wives born in the north had her first child before her 21st birthday, whereas 13 (32.5%) of the wives born in the south of Italy did so. This is consonant with the finding discussed above, that women from the north of Italy usually had smaller families than women from the south.

The Roles of Wives in the Ovens Valley Area

A woman could work on a tobacco farm and keep at least half an eye on her children at the same time. A number of wives of tobacco growers regularly helped their husbands in the paddocks. It was usually taken for granted that the Italian-born wives of sharefarmers would work alongside their husbands, except on the heaviest tasks, unless they had very small children to look after. Australian-born wives, whether married to sharemen or owners, usually helped only by pulling plants out of the seedbeds at planting-out time, and by tying the ripe leaves on sticks ready to go into kilns at picking time. Some Australian wives of farm owners helped their husbands by looking after the bookkeeping and other administrative tasks associated with large farms; on some mixed farms the owners' wives helped with the dairy cattle but left all the tobacco business to their

---

1 The difference between these two percentages is statistically significant at the 10.0% level.
husbands; and many owners' wives (Italian and Australian) did not work on the farms at all.

Out of the 105 tobacco growers interviewed, 44.8% owned or worked on farms where the owners' wives did not help in the operations of tobacco growing in any way, whereas only 6.7% were associated with farms on which sharemen were employed but where the sharemen's wives give no help at all. Of all the informants, 23.8% were associated with farms on which the owners' wives helped only at planting-out and picking times, compared with 29.5% who stated that on the farms with which they were associated the sharemen's wives helped only at these times. Only 5.7% of the informants were associated with farms on which the owners' wives actually worked in the paddocks during the growing season (and these were all farms on which the owner himself grew at least a portion of his tobacco group without the aid of sharemen); in contrast, 44.8% of the informants stated that on the farms with which they were associated, the sharemen's wives regularly worked in the paddocks alongside their husbands.

The Australian wife of one of the Australian men in the sample grew a crop of tobacco herself, with the help of her 16-year-old daughter, on a three-acre share; but this, like the elaborate managerial activites which the

---

1 The difference between these two proportions is statistically significant at the 0.1% level.

2 The difference between these two proportions is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.

3 The difference between these two proportions is statistically significant at the 0.1% level.
Australian wives of a few Australian farm owners undertook on behalf of their husbands, was a sign of independence rather than an economic necessity. Generally farmers' wives worked on their husbands' farms only in order to save the money which would otherwise be spent on wages. A woman was commended for helping her farmer husband on the farm, but pitied at the same time if this meant that she had to do heavy manual work. Most Australians commended their Italian sharemen's wives for the amount of work they did on the farm, but condemned the sharefarmer husbands for 'making' them do it. Men who had become owners after some years as sharemen were glad to make it possible for their wives to concentrate on housekeeping. Australian men, whether owners or sharefarmers, were usually particularly anxious that their wives should not work in the paddocks if it could possibly be avoided. Australian men were, perhaps, rather more willing than Italian men to allow their wives to take jobs away from the farm in order to earn money (though there were very few employment opportunities available for women in the Ovens Valley area); but generally speaking neither Italians nor Australians (and neither men nor women) regarded it as desirable that married women should work outside the home. It was hardly ever thought that a motive for such a thing might be a desire on the part of the woman to have an activity that would take

1 Women who had to work to support themselves and their children (widows or deserted wives, for example) usually only had a choice between domestic work and taking in boarders.
### TABLE XXXII

**Work Done on Tobacco Farms by the Wives of a Sample of Tobacco Growers (Owners and Sharefarmers)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Done</th>
<th>Australian</th>
<th>Italo-Australian</th>
<th>Italian-born</th>
<th>German-born</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No work</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help husbands at planting-out and picking seasons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help husbands in paddocks during growing season (as well as at planting-out and picking seasons)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nearly as much work on the farm as a man, full-time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derived from: Sample survey of tobacco growers; see below, Appendix I, pp. 390-401.

1 'Italo-Australian' = 'Australian-born of Italian origin'.
her outside the confines of the home. When married women did work outside their homes it was usually represented as a favour to the employers (for example, because the business in question could not find competent clerical staff) or as a corollary to the interest their husbands had in the enterprises concerned, rather than an ordinary job.

Table XXXII shows how much work was done on the tobacco farms by the wives of the 86 married tobacco growers in the sample according to the origin of the women concerned. It shows that more Italian than Australian wives worked on the farms, and that work in the paddocks during the growing season was almost exclusively confined to Italian-born women. The Italian-born wives who did not work on the farms were either the mothers of very small children, or else the wives of farms owners who had sharemen working for them.

Australian women only occasionally had social commitments (membership of associations, etc.) that took them out of the house, and few seemed to feel any frustration because they could not carry on professions or other careers; see discussion or leisure activities above, Chapter 5, p.204-5.

On this kind of basis, the English-born wife of the Italian-born owner of a small tobacco farm was employed in the office of the V.T.G.A. Ltd.; and the Italian-born wife of a senior official in the same Association was employed as a substitute for her Italian-born husband, as liaison officer (or interpreter for Italian-speaking tobacco growers) during her husband's absences from the Ovens Valley area.

See above, p.308.

On man in the sample had been married twice, so there were 87 wives in all.

According to Table XXXII 30.4% of Australian wives worked on the farms compared with 75.9% of Italian-born wives; the difference between these two proportions is statistically significant at the 0.1% level.
The Problems of Migrant Wives

It has been suggested that non-British migrant women in Australia are particularly prone to suffer mental breakdowns, though this is less marked in the case of the southern European-born than in the case of other non-British migrant women. Krupinski and Stoller attribute these breakdowns, and the fact that they usually take place when women are in their forties, to 'the end of the mother's usefulness in a grown-up, now-assimilated family which has left her behind'.

There is some evidence that Italian-born women in the Ovens Valley area were subject to more strain than other women in the area. Examination of admissions to Victorian Mental Health Institutions in 1965 shows that of the females admitted who were resident in the local Government Areas which included the Ovens Valley area 10.6% were born in Italy, whereas of the comparable males admitted only 5.1% were born in Italy. These percentages are very

---

1 See figures for Australia as a whole in Krupinski & Stoller: 'Family Life and Mental Ill-health in Migrants', in Stoller: New Faces, 1966; and for admission to Mental Health Institutions in Victoria in 1963, Mental Health Research Institute of Victoria, Statistical-Epidemiological Unit: Bulletin No. 4: Admissions, Discharges and Deaths during 1962, 1965, Table 81-84.


3 That is, all admissions, whether first admissions or not; the statistics in the published sources cited above, fn. 1, refer to first admissions only.

4 The information quoted regarding admissions in 1965 was kindly supplied by Alan Stoller, Chief Clinical Officer of the Mental Health Authority of Victoria, and Dr. J. Krupinski, Research Epidemiologist of the Mental Health Research Institute of Victoria.
different from those of Italian-born females and males in the entire population of the Ovens Valley area in 1966, which were 5.4% and 6.6% respectively.¹

The figures of admissions to Mental Health Institutions in Victoria in 1965 also suggest that there may have been a tendency for the Ovens Valley area as a whole to have a higher incidence of mental illness than the rest of the Census area of North-Eastern Victoria. If the figure for all admissions during 1965 are expressed per 10,000 of the population as it stood in the Census year of 1966, admissions of males are 29.2 per 10,000 for the Local Government Areas which include the Ovens Valley area, but only 18.8 per 10,000 for the rest of North-Eastern Victoria;² and the comparable proportions for females are 49.4 per 10,000 for the Local Government Areas which include the Ovens Valley area, but only 46.9 per 10,000 for the rest of North-Eastern Victoria.³

However, admissions to mental health institutions, undifferentiated with respect to age, diagnosis or prognosis, and possibly affected by the preference of some ethnic categories to nurse their mentally ill dependents

¹ The discrepancy between the percentage of Italian-born males amongst the total male residents of the Ovens Valley area, and the percentage of Italian-born males amongst the male residents of the Ovens Valley area admitted to mental health institutions, is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level. However, the discrepancy with respect to females is statistically significant at the 5.0% level.

² The difference between these two proportions is statistically significant at the 1.0% level.

³ The difference between these two proportions is statistically significant at the 1.0% level.
at home, are unsatisfactory indicators of the degree of mental illness in a given population; and this study was not designed to incorporate a scientific investigation of the prevalence of mental illness in the Ovens Valley area.

As far as direct observation can show, informants' wives and other migrant women encountered in the course of this study rarely reacted abnormally to the strains of living and working on tobacco farms. The few women known to have had a history of mental illness were not all migrants, and none were the mothers of adult children. However, the figures of admissions of Italian-born women from the Ovens Valley area to mental health institutions suggest that the area had a particularly high incidence of mental illness amongst its female migrants. If this was so, it was less likely to be due to the difficulties of the older women (of whom there were comparatively few) than to the problems of some young wives and mothers; and their main problem was isolation.

The isolation of some migrant wives stemmed mainly from their inability to speak English. Of the 51 Italian-born wives who took part in the interviews with their husbands, 28 (54.9%) spoke no English at all. In comparison, only 13 (17.8%) of the 73 Italian-born men who were interviewed spoke no English.\footnote{The difference between the Italian-born men and the Italian-born wives with respect to knowledge of English is statistically significant at the 0.1% level. Of the 34 wives born in southern Italy, 21 (64.7%) spoke no English compared with 6 (35.3%) of the 17 wives born in northern Italy; the difference between these two percentages is statistically significant at the 5.0% level. The difference between the proportions of northern and southern Italian men who could speak English is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level. The difference between the two categories of (footnote continued on p. 313)}
English was inability to obtain a driving licence, since the driving test was conducted in English. In fact, most of the Italian-born wives of men in the sample were unable to drive.¹ In the country, severe difficulties were placed in the way of the social activities of people who could not drive, and the non-driving Italian wives had very little opportunity to learn English or to meet either Italians or non-Italians if they were dependent upon their husbands for transport. Owners of farms were on the telephone, but sharemen were not, so the majority of Italian women could not keep in touch with their friends even indirectly.

(Footnote continued from p.312)
wives with regard to length of residence does not seem great enough to account for their different knowledge of English. There were only 4 pre-war migrants amongst the wives of the informants, and all were from the north of Italy; if these are included in total the average length of residence in Australia of the northern Italian wives in the sample was 11.4 years, compared with 9.5 years for the southern Italian wives. If only post-war migrants are considered, the northern wives only had an average length of residence in Australia of 8.1 years, less than that of the southern wives. In either case the average length of residence in Australia of the southern wives was sufficient to give them the opportunity to learn to speak English as well as the northern Italian wives.

¹

The question of ability to drive was not included on the questionnaire, and its possible importance was only realised after several interviews had been conducted. Of the 13 Australian-born wives of whom the question was asked, 11 (84.6%) were able to drive, compared with only 8 (24.8%) of the 33 Italian-born women of whom the question was asked. The difference between these two percentages is statistically significant at the 0.1% level. However, there is no statistically significant difference between the percentages of northern Italian women (23.1%) and of southern Italian women (25.0%) who could drive, out of those who were asked.
The most isolated women were those with small babies, who could not leave their children. The wife of one informant had only been away from the farm on which her husband sharefarmed on two occasions in the past two years, each time to go into the hospital for the birth of a child. Trips away from the farm were easier for women on farms that had a large number of sharefarmers, for the chance of obtaining a lift into Myrtleford or one of the other local shopping centres was greater the larger the population of the farm.

As Italian social life depended so much on the family circle, which was based on a nucleus of relatives,¹ the isolation that several Italian wives experienced is indicated by the fact that out of the 57 Italian-born wives of the men in the sample, 16 (28.1%) had no relatives in Australia,² and 12 (21.0%) were too far away from their relatives to visit them even as often as once a month. Only 10 (17.5%) visited their relatives once a month or more, compared with 12 (44.4%) of the 27 Australian-born wives of men in the sample.³ This isolation was usually the lot of women (and their husbands) who had not been in the area long enough to establish their own family circles; but whereas the husbands could find company in the Savoy Club or in the pubs, the women in this situation could not.

¹ See discussion above, pp. 267-9.
² This compares with a similar minority of 16 Italian-born men (22.2% of the Italian-born men in the sample) who had no relatives in Australia.
³ The difference between the percentage of Australian-born wives of men in the sample who visited their relatives once a month or more and that of Italian-born wives who did so is statistically significant at the 5.0% level.
In addition, even in the parts of the Ovens Valley area where the farms were close to one another, and on the farms which had a number of families resident on them, farmers' wives could still be very isolated unless there were other women in the vicinity who spoke the same language. In such a polyglot region, even Italians and Australians (who formed the largest categories in the population) sometimes found themselves surrounded by people they could not understand. The Sicilian wife of one of the sharemen interviewed lived on a farm which was also occupied by the owner and two other sharemen, all with their families; however, she spoke only Italian, the owner and his family spoke only English, and the other sharemen and their families spoke only Spanish.\(^2\)

Isolation sometimes had the advantage of increasing the solidarity between husband and wife. Several husbands made a point of doing the shopping with their wives in Myrtleford at the weekend, and this provided them both with an outing. Several husbands felt constrained to spend almost every evening at home since their wives spoke no English and could expect no visitors.

---

1 Since the average number of sharemen per farm was 2.3 (see above, Table II, p. 61) and 89.1% of the informants who were growing tobacco at the time of the interview lived in houses that were part of the farms which they owned or on which they worked (see above, Chapter 4, p. 176, fn. 1), it may be inferred that most farms had more than one family living on them.

2 The separate social worlds in which Italians and Australians lived is indicated by the fact that in these circumstances it did not occur to the women on the farm to begin to learn one another's languages by attempting to talk to one another.
Isolated migrant wives were in a minority, however, for most women belonged to family circles. Also, for most of the farmers' wives of the Ovens Valley area a good deal of social activity was involved in simply staying on the farm. Most farms received a stream of visitors (travelling salesmen, people visiting on farm business, and friends paying social calls); and on the larger farms the residents alone composed a sizeable colony. In addition there was a tendency for tobacco growers to live and work with their relatives. Isolation was felt mainly by migrants new to the area, who had not yet brought out relatives to keep them company, and who had young children that tied the mother to the house.

The Roles of Children in the Ovens Valley Area

A wide range of tasks on tobacco farms could be carried out by children, but the actual amount of time spent by children on farm tasks varied considerably from family to family. The work children did ranged from a few chores carried out more or less willingly, reflecting the child's own interest in the farm, to an amount that seriously interfered with school work. School teachers in the area complained that some children were unable to do their homework, or were even being kept home from school, because they had to help on the farm. This was particularly common at planting-out and picking times, which unfortunately did not coincide with school holidays. Children often helped in cultivation by joining their parents in the fields after school during the growing season; and after the crop was picked the older ones might help to grade the cured leaves. Children often helped in money-making activities other than tobacco growing, too; for instance they might help in milking if the farm had dairy cattle. In addition, the family might co-operate in money-saving projects as a kind of collective hobby; for example, men built caravans in their backyards,
ready for the family holidays, helped by their sons' carpentry and the sewing of their wives and daughters.

Two main categories of tobacco growers were particularly likely to keep their children heavily occupied on their farms. First, there were the farmers whose values were 'local' ones and who regarded successs for their children as success in keeping on the family farm. They regarded the time their children spent on their farms as an apprenticeship for the future when they would be running them themselves. They were usually aware, however, that the commercial aspects of farming were more easily dealt with by people with secondary education, and they did not usually encourage their children to work on their farms to the detriment of their school work. On the other hand, children who knew that they would have fairly secure futures as farmers in any case had no great incentive to be ambitious about their education. This was particularly the case with boys who would actually inherit farms, but a number of non-owners' sons also made tobacco growing their career. Between them, the Australian tobacco growers in the sample (owners and sharefarmers) had 15 sons aged 15 or over, and 6 (40.0%) of these were themselves full-time tobacco growers, usually alongside their fathers; the Italians in the sample between them had 20 sons aged 15 or over, and 4 (20.0%) of these were full-time tobacco growers.\(^1\)

---

1 See discussion of 'local' aspirations above, Chapter 3, pp.137-40.

2 The difference between these two proportions is not statistically significant, even at the 10.0% level.
The other category which might keep its children occupied on the farms was that of the migrant sharefarmers. The unpaid labour of their children, like that of their wives, saved them wages which they would otherwise have had to pay to hired men. In addition, they often needed their children's help for translation. Complex business transactions and technicalities relating to tobacco growing were often discussed between owners and sharemen through the medium of a bi-lingual 8 year-old who had learnt English at school. The fact that parents often had to ask their children for help of this kind probably helped to create tension between the migrant generation and its offspring, as the omnipotent parents of Italian tradition lost some status in the eyes of their children when they had to depend on them in dealings with the outside world. Apart from the possible long-term psychological effects, however, translation was a comparatively light task for the children; physical labour on the farms was far more onerous.

The use by sharemen of their children's labour, even to the detriment of their school work, conflicted with the hopes which those whose values were metropolitan had for their children's future. As a result of this, in spite of the migrants' aspirations, only a quarter of the working sons of Italian tobacco growers in the sample had managed to establish themselves in occupations other than tobacco growing, compared with half the working sons of Australian

1 See further discussion of this point below, pp. 322-3 and 327.
2 See discussion of 'metropolitan' values above, Chapter 3, pp. 137-40.
tobacco growers in the sample.\(^1\) This conflict in aspirations probably contributed to inter-generation conflict in migrant families, which will be discussed later.\(^2\)

A comparison of the educational standards achieved by the children of Italian and Australian tobacco growers indicates indirectly the number of metropolitan aspirants to be found in each ethnic category. The Australian tobacco growers (owners and sharemen) interviewed had 15 sons aged sixteen or over between them, and 5 of these children had carried on their education beyond the age of sixteen; that is, 33.3\%\(^3\). The Italian tobacco growers interviewed had 18 sons aged sixteen or over between them, and 13 of these had had some education beyond the age of sixteen; that is, 72.2\%\(^3\). These differences are remarkable in view of the fact that most of the Italians in the sample were sharemen who were under considerable pressure to use their children as labour on their farms. Often the education which sharemen's children received beyond the age of fifteen was only brief, because of this pressure. The figures given here only indicate their parents' desire to educate them out of rural life, not their ability to do so.

---

1. The numbers of Australian and Italian sons of tobacco growers in the sample who were at work are too small for tests of significance to be made on these proportions.
2. See below, pp.330-3.
3. Although the numbers involved are small, the difference between the two proportions is significant at the 5.0\% level.
There was little opportunity for working girls to do anything but white collar jobs in the Ovens Valley area. The only factories that employed women were in Wangaratta, which was some distance away from most of the tobacco farms. Girls who failed to obtain jobs as teachers, secretaries, clerks or shop-assistants could only earn money by occasional domestic work or by seasonal work on the tobacco farms, for example at picking time.

It was quite common for young, unmarried Italian girls to go out to work in the Ovens Valley area, particularly if they were educated in Australia and were bilingual. Most of the shops, offices and banks in Myrtleford employed at least one clerk or assistant who could speak both English and Italian, and these employees were usually young girls. Daughters of some Italian families were also found amongst the lay teachers in the local Catholic schools. Italians seemed proud of their daughters' achievements in acquiring and keeping white collar jobs, and there was little feeling that it was improper for a young girl to go out to work where she might come into contact with the general public. However, in the case of young southern Italian girls arrangements were often made to have brothers or cousins drive working girls to and from work, rather than allow them to walk about by themselves.

Unmarried Australian and Italian girls usually lived at home with their parents. The principal exceptions to this were teachers, G.P.O. telephonists, and other employees of large scale organisations which posted their employees to different places. These girls were all Australians; Italian girls from the area living away from home were either staying with relatives in Italy or attending a Catholic lay teachers' training college in Melbourne (with the intention of coming back to teach in their home parish, where they would resume living at home).
Very few men in the sample had children over 15, so what would happen when the younger generation became completely adult and the older one died or was ready to retire can best be inferred from the history of the informants themselves and their parents.

As far as the farm owners were concerned, the system of providing for sons seemed to be much the same amongst both Australians and Italians. If a man had only one son, he simply left his farm to a single heir. If he had two or more sons, he might divide the land between them, leave it to them jointly, purchase additional land to provide for the sons who would not inherit the original farm, or see that the sons who would not inherit land were either set up in other occupations or provided with the education to earn their livings in some other way. If a farm was left jointly to a man's sons, the problems of dividing it, or else of providing in some other way for the multiple heirs of the estate, was only postponed. Farms were never owned as single entities by groups of cousins. Inheritance problems were generally solved by the Will of the previous owner, but there were occasional wrangles between heirs. Difficulties also arose over probate and death duties. There were a few farms which were being administered by trustees until all the difficulties had been cleared up; and there were a few cases of brothers farming together until the death duties were paid, intending to split up later, when funds would be available to help each one to develop his share of the property. Sometimes, even after probate and death duties have been cleared, brothers who had inherited a farm jointly operated it as a single unit as long as their mother was still alive and living on the farm with them.

With farm families it was often rather difficult to see who actually ran the enterprise. A group of brothers might
take the advice of their father almost as though it were a command, as long as he was alive and living on the property, even though he no longer had any legal standing as owner of the farm. On the other hand, owners took the advice of sons who were nominally merely sharefarmers or junior partners in the enterprise. A number of growers who themselves had bought or inherited grazing or dairy properties stated that they originally added tobacco growing to their activities only because their adolescent sons wanted to have a go at it. Wives and daughters, who lived on the farms and helped to run them, often had considerable influence in decisions about their operation too.

Many Australians stated that Italian farmers were more autocratic in their dealings with their sons than Australian farmers were; and they substantiated this with stories of strained relations and outright quarrels in the families of their Italian neighbours. Some Italians recounted family histories that bore these stories out. On the other hand, a number of Italian parents in the sample complained that in Australia children were not disciplined as much as they should be, and that the State, the police and public opinion would not allow them to punish their children as much as necessary. However, many Australian-educated Italian children were indispensible to their parents as interpreters, and as they grew older as advisers about relations with the 'outside' world. This may explain the fact that Italians seemed to be readier than Australians to relinquish control of their farms to their sons during their own lifetimes. In fact, the migration situation changed

---

This is similar to the point made about the relationship of the migrant Italian mother to her adult American-born daughters; see reference above, p.276.
the roles of fathers and sons in relation to one another, and incidentally created several difficulties between the generations.¹

Only one of the 31 Italian farm-owners in the sample had had to wait until his father died before taking over his farm; 6 took over during their fathers' lifetimes. In contrast, 5 of the 18 Australians who were or had been farm owners had had to wait until the deaths of their fathers before becoming owners themselves, and only one took over control while his father was still alive.²

It is possible that the seeming readiness of Italian fathers to hand over control of their farms was due to a desire to avoid probate duties, which the farm would have had to pay if the transfer took place after the father's death. This desire might have been combined with a trust that their sons would allow them to control the farm in fact, thought they no longer did so legally. However, such a trust would probably not have been well-founded, since Italian sons seemed rather more likely than Australian ones to quarrel with their fathers and leave home.³

However, there were more cases of married Italian farm owners living with their fathers than there were of married Australian farm owners living with their fathers. Usually an Australian farm owner did not marry until his father was dead and he had inherited the property.

¹ See further discussion on this point below, pp.324-33.
² There were too few owners who have inherited their farms for significance tests on these figures to be carried out.
³ See discussion of the problems of migrant families below, pp.324-33.
Sometimes amongst Italians the old man's partner or successor was his son-in-law (daughter's husband) rather than his son; and in some cases represented in the sample the property had been taken over from a retired tobacco grower by a partnership of his sons and his sons-in-law. The number of instances in which siblings or siblings-in-law were co-owners suggests that there was no preference for selecting a single heir amongst Italians.

Men who did not inherit farms (that is, sons of sharemen and other non-farm owners and some younger sons of farm-owners) had to resign themselves to working for employers. Some made careers for themselves in metropolitan occupations and eventually left the Ovens Valley area.

Italians who did not inherit farms had greater difficulty in establishing themselves than Australians in a similar position. They were often handicapped because they arrived in Australia when they were too old to acquire enough English to qualify for apprenticeships or advanced education. A few went to work for specifically Italian concerns (for example, small building firms or continental groceries); many only had the alternatives of becoming sharefarmers like their fathers or becoming unskilled labourers. Only the few whose English was good enough acquired skills or professional qualifications.

Inter-generation Conflict in Migrant Families

Ethnic origin, as such, did not apparently lead to many behaviour differences between Italian and Australian families in the Ovens Valley area; but characteristics associated with their migrant status affected the behaviour
of Italian families. A number of studies abroad\(^1\) have remarked on the particular problems which may result from the inter-generation conflict which often arises in migrant families. The conflict may express itself in a number of ways, ranging from family disputes about the extent of parental authority to outright juvenile delinquency. Studies in Australia\(^2\) suggests that the same tensions may arise in the families of migrants here,\(^3\) but that very little juvenile delinquency is to be found amongst southern European migrants (who include Italians), at least when delinquency amongst juveniles born in southern Europe is compared with that amongst juveniles born in other regions or in Australia itself.\(^4\)

Discussions of inter-generation conflict within migrant families suggest that it may be caused by either or both of


\(^3\) However, Zubrzycki points out: 'The instances of rebellious behaviour and more extreme forms of personal disorganisation of juvenile delinquency amongst the immigrant children are, fortunately, not as prevalent in Australia today as in a comparable period of immigration to the United States'; Zubrzycki: 'The Immigrant Family: Some Sociological Aspects', 1966, p.67.

\(^4\) See Krupinski & Stoller: 'Family Life and Mental Ill-health in Migrants', 1966.
two major factors. First, migrant children may react against their families as a result of the shame which they feel in belonging to a category which has low reputational status in the eyes of the host society.¹ Second, there may be strain in the migrant family itself, as it moves from one social setting into another with different values.²

With regard to the first suggested cause of tension in migrant families, it is unlikely that members of the second generation of Italians in the Ovens Valley area found the reputational distance between themselves and the Australians painfully wide. Though Italians and Australians tended to live in separate social worlds in many areas of life, Italians had high reputational status in the area compared with most other migrant categories. Some Italians in the area were extremely prosperous, and Italians were rarely openly despised even by the Australians who disliked their presence in the area.

The second factor affected migrant families in the Ovens Valley area somewhat obscurely. The general similarities between rural Australian and migrant Italian family life have already been pointed out: but despite the broad similarities between rural Australian and rural Italian family life, differences of detail still existed. Some migrant parents insisted that their family life should be 'Italian' and some Australian-reared children of Italians reacted against this by identifying with Australia and rejecting their parents' values. On the other hand, in

¹ See Child: Italian or American? The Second Generation in Conflict, 1943.
some migrant families the parents themselves became self-consciously Australian in their behaviour. This did not necessarily abolish differences between themselves and their children, however. Attempts by adult migrants to carry the Australian ways they had learnt into their family lives were often inadequate in comparison with the expectations of their children who had absorbed many Australian values and behaviour patterns at an early age from their school teachers and friends. The consequence was often that the parents became uncertain about whether their attitudes and behaviour were properly Australian, and the children became the arbiters in the household. Conflict between parents and children over values might be avoided, but at the price of loss of parental authority. The dependence of many migrant parents on the services of their children as interpreters also contributed to the lessening of their authority.

However, neither Australian nor Italian families in the Ovens Valley area were particularly successful in coping with their children's adolescence and transition to adulthood. Oeser and Emery remark on the difficulties which rural Australian families experience at this stage in child-rearing.¹ In the Ovens Valley area Australian parents often evaded their difficulties by what appeared to the Italians as a scandalous indifference to the activities of their children. Italian parents (particularly southern Italian ones) were distinctly more protective than Australian ones, and some were indignant that in Australia the police and the law courts did not uphold the rights of parents over their

¹ See Oeser & Emery: Social Structure and Personality in a Rural Community, 1954.
children, as the law in Italy still did. However, even the southern Italians did not attempt to shelter their children as they would have done in Italy a generation or so ago; for example, adolescent girls went out to work with minimal chaperonage by their families.

During fieldwork, four cases of friction between migrant parents and their adolescent children were recounted in detail by either the parents or the children concerned. One of these cases concerned a son aged 16, living alone with his southern Italian father. His mother had still not arrived from Italy, although the father had migrated eight years earlier. The boy stole a car and drove off to Melbourne. The father was still indignant when he was interviewed over a year later because the boy had been dealt with by the machinery of the courts and probation officers rather than being handed over to him for chastisement and safe-keeping. In the other case, two adolescents (a son and a daughter, both under 16) distressed their northern Italian parents by going out unchaperoned, drinking, and generally behaving wildly. Eventually they were both sent to their mother's sister in Italy; it was hoped she would be able to bring them up according to traditional Italian ideas once they were removed from the influences of Australian society. The factors which these two cases appeared to have in common were that both mothers seemed emotionally disturbed and relations between the parents were difficult. Problems arising from unhappy family backgrounds also occurred in the Australian population; for example, an Australian girl encountered during fieldwork had left home at the age of about 17, complaining of excessive regimentation. Her mother had died when she was small, and her father had become an alcoholic. The home she left was that of her aunt, who had adopted her on her mother's death.

The two other cases of tension in Italian migrant families were recounted by the sons who had rebelled. In one case, the son of a Calabrian tailor had rebelled at his father's demand that he join him in the small tailoring business which he kept up alongside his small tobacco farm. The son continued to live at home, but found employment for himself as a trainee insurance agent. He had built up the agency into a flourishing local enterprise by the time of this study, and the relations between himself and his father were extremely cordial. The other case concerned a Vicenza tobacco grower and dairy farmer, who wanted his eldest son to stay on the family farm. The son left home at the age of 16 and became a labourer in the bush. By the time he was interviewed he owned his own bush-clearing contracting business and his own tobacco farm; he and his father had still not established good relations.

The relationship between migration and intra-familial tension in the Ovens Valley area which this very slender evidence suggests is that most migrant families could solve the problems which arose within them because of the migrant situation for themselves. However, if the family was also under stress because of other factors (for example, because of the personality of one of the parents), the migrant situation provided the children with means of demonstrating their independence and distressing their parents that would not have been available in other circumstances. In particular, they could deny the validity of their parents' principles and authority by claiming (perhaps erroneously) that they were not in accord with the values of the host society.

However, in the last two cases cited the trouble between fathers and sons apparently arose from the fathers' attempts to exert their authority arising from their ambition
for their sons and for the family enterprises. The dilemma which these histories indicate was common to many migrant families, and probably created many other situations of tension without actually leading to the disruption of the family. It has already been pointed out that the Italian migrants of the Ovens Valley area were generally motivated by economic and social ambition. 1 It has also been indicated that they often desired to provide their sons with educations that would enable them to take up trades or professions. 2 The migrants themselves had predominantly worked as agricultural labourers or on small family holdings before coming to Australia. 3 In many cases, they had prospered as well as or better than their own fathers by migrating. Of the 54 Italian informants whose fathers had never left Italy, 28 had fathers who owned small holdings, and 22 had fathers who were labourers. Seven of the small holders' sons had become farm owners in the Ovens Valley area by 1966, and so had six of the labourers' sons. Even the informants who were still sharemen usually expressed themselves satisfied with life in Australia, considering that they were already more prosperous than their relatives in Italy and looking forward to becoming still more prosperous in future.

Comparisons between the socio-economic status of fathers in Italy and migrant sons in Australia cannot be pushed very far in this thesis, because the information obtained about migrants' fathers was insufficient to justify an attempt upon the extremely difficult problem of

1 See above, Chapter 3, pp.108-9.
2 See above, pp.318-9.
3 See above, Chapter 3, p.110.
comparing socio-economic status in two very differently structured societies. However, the migrants' own belief that they had improved their opportunities for social mobility appears to be justified by Broom and Jones in their recent comparative study of father-to-son social mobility rates in Australia, Italy and the U.S.A., which indicates that rates of social mobility are in fact appreciably higher in Australia than in Italy.

Migrant families in the Ovens Valley area had two possible routes to prosperity. They could aim either for success in 'local' (mainly farming) terms, or for success in 'metropolitan' terms. Their interest in providing their sons with skills and education suggests that many fathers were aiming at metropolitan success for their sons. Such aspirations might be expected to become more widespread as tobacco land and quotas became scarcer, and the opportunities for establishing new farms decreased. However, metropolitan success was usually an individual affair rather than a family one. In many cases a family had to make considerable sacrifices in order to support a son through an apprenticeship or advanced education, and many families found these sacrifices too heavy, especially in view of the fact that the individual rather than the family would benefit from them.

---


3 See discussion of local and metropolitan values above, Chapter 3, pp.137-40.

4 See discussion above, pp.318-9.
Meanwhile, the tobacco still had to be planted, weeded and harvested. Both owners and sharemen desiring to keep their labour costs down were tempted to use their sons' labour (and in some cases this might be a means of making money available for their sons' education).

Ownership of a farm, which would be a family enterprise rather than an individual one, and would ensure an income to the father in his old age (even if he lost direct control of it), presented a constant alternative to the education of children for metropolitan careers. Farm owners might sacrifice a great deal (including the education of their sons) to maintain their farms as going concerns which their children could inherit, and sharemen might make equivalent sacrifices to obtain the resources to purchase farms.

Generally speaking, the tobacco growers who were most single-minded about educating their children were the owners of poor farms, and the sharemen who no longer expected (perhaps in view of their increasing age) to be able to accumulate the resources to buy a farm. However, in several families a change in family fortunes meant that the ambition to see a son a 'metropolitan' success was abandoned. This might be the result of either prosperity of misfortune. An exceptionally prosperous sharefarming season accompanied by the opportunity to buy a farm might lead to a son's vocational training being abandoned so that he could devote his attention to building up his inheritance. Misfortune and the accumulation of debts might mean that a son had to give up his own ambitions in order to help the family finances by becoming a shareman like his father. In any case, whether a son had originally been offered an alternative to a farming career or not, and whether he had been forced to abandon an alternative by either good or bad fortune, he might resent the demands made on him by the family enterprise when he
considered the opportunities for individual advancement which some of his contemporaries were able to seize.

To sum up, it appears that tension in migrant families in the Ovens Valley area was caused, not by any shame felt by Italian children about their ethnic origin, but by the difficulties faced by migrant families. These difficulties were caused by several factors. First, migrant parents often became dependent on their children to interpret for them, and to explain Australian values and behaviour patterns to them, and so lost their traditional authority. Second, there were no effective local patterns of handling relations between parents and adolescent children which Italian families could have copied from Australians to replace the undermined Italian patterns. Third, the existence of competing routes to success (the 'local' one with its emphasis on family achievement, and the 'metropolitan' one with its emphasis on individual achievement) made it difficult for parents to carry out a consistent plan for their children's future. However, despite all these causes of tension, open conflict between children and parents was only likely to break out if relations between them were already difficult because of the parents' personality problems.

The Nuclear Family and Interaction

The nuclear family was one of the most important organisations in the Ovens Valley area. In many cases it was also a residential unit and an economic unit, unlike the organisations of kinship, the family circle, and so on, discussed in earlier chapters. Important as it was, however, it tended to be isolated from other organisations. Unlike economic, political or religious organisations, it was not under pressure to include outsiders in its membership. In fact, the only way an outsider (for example, a migrant)
could be admitted to the nuclear families of the host society was by intermarriage. However, it has been pointed out that there were great difficulties in the way of meeting potential marriage partners other than through such organisations as kinship, friendship and the family circle. The very few inter-ethnic marriages that had taken place differed from the general pattern of marriages in the area by bringing together people from different localities and often of different religions; they were also more often between people of different occupational backgrounds than in-ethnic marriages were.

People of different ethnic categories had very few opportunities to get to know one another well in the Ovens Valley area, where sociability was so heavily based on kinship, religious affiliation and lifelong friendships going back to schooldays. This was apparently the major objective obstacle to inter-ethnic marriage. There was also an important subjective obstacle, however, in the often-expressed unwillingness of both Italians and Australians to intermarry. This unwillingness was usually justified by reference to the differences which were believed to exist between Italian and Australian family life, but this examination has shown that the differences between the two populations in this respect were often greatly exaggerated.

Such differences as did exist between the Australian and the Italian nuclear family in the Ovens Valley area seem to have been more the consequences of the migration situation than of original ethnic differences. The rural Italian family in Italy apparently differs from the rural Australian family in the Ovens Valley area principally in the greater extent of the father's authority and in the greater protectiveness of Italians towards their children, particularly daughters. The Italian family in the Ovens Valley area
appeared to differ from the Australian one in the extent to which parents became dependent upon their children, and the extent to which wives, often isolated from their own kin, become dependent upon their husbands. Additional differences arose from the necessity for husband and wife to work hard together to establish the family in Australia, and from the common desire of the parents to provide their children with a means towards social mobility.

These factors not only created differences between the Italian and the Australian families of the area, but also imposed considerable strains on the Italian families. The difficulties experienced by Italians in adjusting their family life to the conditions imposed by migration almost certainly helped to reduce the opportunities for interaction between migrants and members of the host society, by encouraging migrants to depend on the family circle, their kin and other co-ethnics for advice and social support in solving their family problems. This increased the importance of co-ethnics in their lives and reduced both the inclination and the amount of time available for interaction with Australians.
PART III: CONCLUSION

In the Ovens Valley area, kinship relations were important for both Australians and Italians, though kinship ties did not determine inheritance, succession, land rights, or political influence, as they do in some societies. Effective kinship ties only operated between people related within the first two degrees of kinship, and more particularly between people related in the first degree.

Kinsmen could be called on for occasional social support, for help at busy times in the agricultural year, for political support, for protection from the inquiries or gossip of non-kin, and sometimes for economic assistance or investment in a kinsman's enterprises. In particular, kin provided a basis for the organisation of social life. Relatives of all kinds and all ages were visited simply because they were relatives; and in addition some kin became part of an individual's family circle.

The family circle was particularly clearly defined, and particularly important, in the lives of the southern Italians in the Ovens Valley area (that is, principally the Calabresi). However it was also important amongst the northern Italians (that is, mainly the Veneti), and it existed, though in a more loosely-knit form, amongst the Australians as well. The differences between the family circles of northern and southern Italians were related to the different migration patterns of the two regional categories. Once they had migrated, southerners were more likely to establish a colony of kin around themselves than northerners were. On the other hand, the northerners probably did not really regard themselves as separated from the kin they had left in Italy. They often returned to Italy at least once, and perhaps they regarded their migration as temporary to a greater extent.
than the southerners did. Though northerners usually had fewer kin in Australia than southerners, they visited those they had as often as the southern Italians and the Australians visited theirs.

Amongst both Italians and Australians, tobacco growers showed a tendency to work with their kinsmen. This was particularly marked in the case of farm owners, who could choose who their occupational associates would be. However, perhaps because of the difference in status between owners and sharemen, it was unusual for the owners and the sharemen on a single farm to be kinsmen.

The importance of kinship in the lives of both Italians and Australians in the Ovens Valley area inhibited the degree of interaction between Italians and Australians in several areas of life. There was so little intermarriage between Italians and Australians that there were very few kinship links between the two ethnic categories.

Although the differences between Italian and Australian nuclear family life in the Ovens Valley area were less than many residents of the area believed them to be, there was very little interaction between migrants and hosts in the area of family life, and very little inter-marriage between different ethnic categories. The same may also be said with respect to family life, interaction and intermarriage as between the northern and southern Italians living in the Ovens Valley area.

However, the migrant family was placed under considerable strain by the conditions of migration, and in responding to this strain many Italian families developed patterns of behaviour that differed considerably from those of the Australian families in the area. In fact, the rural Italian family in Italy was probably more like the rural Australian
family in the Ovens Valley area than the migrant Italian families were. The main sources of strain in the migrant family were apparently: the changing distribution of authority within the family as migrant parents came to be dependent on their Australian-reared children; the difficulty of arranging for the economic future of the children in the face of the incompatible conditions for success in 'local' and 'metropolitan' terms; and the degree of social isolation of migrant wives.

Although family life was the area in which least interaction between hosts and migrants took place, the situation of the migrant family had an effect on the interaction patterns in other areas. The following chapter will discuss this in the course of surveying interaction in general and the relationships between different patterns of interaction in different areas of life.
CHAPTER 7
THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERACTION BETWEEN MIGRANTS AND HOSTS

The preceding chapters of this thesis have described the interaction between Australians and Italians in various areas of life in the social conditions prevailing in the Ovens Valley region. This description gives a static picture of the situation as it was at the time this fieldwork was undertaken. However, it was pointed out early in this thesis that assimilation is a process; and if interaction between migrants and hosts is, as this thesis maintains, an essential part of the process, it should be viewed in dynamic terms. This chapter will consider the process by which the patterns of interaction between hosts and migrants develop over time, as the length of time the migrants have spent in their country of adoption increases.

The overall interaction between hosts and migrants, and amongst migrants themselves, will be described with reference to four categories of Italians: those who arrived in the Ovens Valley area after 1955, those who arrived after the Second World War but before 1955, those who arrived before the Second World War and those who were born in Australia. The discussion will be descriptive rather than statistical, because of the small numbers of informants interviewed in some of the categories used.

After these descriptions, the conclusions which this study has prompted regarding the developing pattern of interaction between migrants and hosts over time will be

---

1 See above, Chapter 2, p.18.
stated; and the chapter will end with a consideration of the relationship between migrant-host interaction and the process of assimilation as a whole.

Migrants who arrived after 1955

Forty-two Italian informants arrived in the Ovens Valley area between 1955 and 1965. Most of them had spent some time in other parts of Australia before settling in this area. Only 9 out of the 42 came directly to the Ovens Valley area. However, 3 of the others went to other tobacco growing areas in Victoria (Echuca and Gunbower) on arrival from Italy.

On arrival in the Ovens Valley area, all but one entered the tobacco growing industry immediately. The exception worked for a while as a bushman for a contracting firm. Thirty-two entered tobacco growing as sharefarmers; the rest worked on tobacco farms as wage labourers before obtaining positions as sharemen.

The expansion of the tobacco growing industry after 1955 took up most of the previously uncleared land in the area, and led to the imposition of quota restrictions. Migrants who arrived after 1955 had had little opportunity to accumulate the capital to buy farms before this expansion, and they found it more difficult to obtain farms of their own than earlier arrivals had. Only 4 migrants in this category had become farm owners by 1966. (Another, who was registered as a shareman on his father's farm, was for all practical purposes, a farm owner). The sharemen employed by these owners were all co-ethnics, usually the owners' relatives.

1 The year 1955 has been chosen for making a division between the post-War migrants because none of the informants in the sample arrived during that year, and because those who arrived later differ in many respects from those who arrived earlier.
Several of the sharemen who had arrived after 1955 were forced into contact with Australians and other non-Italians by their work. Twelve were employed on farms with Australian owners, and a few worked alongside Australian sharemen. However, half the sharemen in this category of migrants worked on farms where the owners and the other sharemen were all Italian.

Only 4 of the 42 informants in this category spoke English well. Ten spoke virtually no English, though some of them had arrived in Australia as long ago as 1952.

Twenty-four informants had no relatives living in the Ovens Valley area. Another five had no relatives living in the Ovens Valley area apart from those living on the same farms as themselves. However, only 11 of the informants in this category had migrated without sponsors, and 22 had sponsored further migrants themselves. One had sponsored as many as 5 other migrants. Many of the informants who had no relatives in the Ovens Valley area therefore had relatives in other parts of Australia.

Four of the informants who arrived in the Ovens Valley area after 1955 had not lived in Australia long enough to be eligible for naturalisation. Of the remainder only 12 had been naturalised by the date of the interview.

Most of the informants who arrived after 1955 (25 out of 42) had only Italian friends. Only 14 included Australians amongst their friends. Only 18 knew any of their neighbours well, and of these 8 stated that they knew their Italian neighbours but not their Australian ones.

Only 12 of the 42 informants in this category belonged to any clubs. Eight belonged only to the Savoy Club, 2 belonged to local Soccer Clubs with predominantly Italian memberships, and 2 belonged to two clubs each, in both cases the Savoy Club and an Italian-based Soccer Club.
Six of the 42 indicated that they had relatives who had married Australians, but in contrast 6 others stated that they did not know of any Italians at all who had married Australians. Eight disapproved of intermarriage between Italians and Australian, one very strongly.

Generally speaking, migrants in this category interacted very little with either Australians or Italians. They had not been in the area long enough to attract many of their relatives, or to establish extensive contacts with either hosts or other migrants. In any case, because most of them were working as sharemen, the amount of time they had available for establishing contacts outside their own households was restricted.

Since migrants in this category had few social contacts outside their own homes, they were rarely encountered by members of the host society. However, a few had established some contacts with Australians as a result of relationships with migrants who had unusually good contacts with members of the host society. In other words, these few were 'clients' of leading members of the Italian population whose favours included introducing them to members of the host society. The migrants who did not have such 'patrons' might live in the Ovens Valley area for ten years without developing many contacts either with hosts or with other migrants.

Post-War Migrants up to 1954

Twenty-one of the Italian migrants in the sample arrived in the Ovens Valley area between 1949 and 1954. As Table IV shows, this was the period immediately preceding the expansion

---

1 The newly arrived 'clients' whose patron was the founder of the Dante Alighieri Society, for example, were amongst the Italian members of the Society; see above, Chapter 5, pp.222-3.

2 See above, Chapter 3, p.70.
of the tobacco-growing industry in the region. All but 5 of these informants came directly to the Ovens Valley area on arrival in Australia. Fourteen were sponsored by relatives. All but 7 sponsored further migrants themselves, and 6 sponsored 5 or more. Nine of these 21 informants were not naturalised by 1966.

Twelve of the migrants in this category found their first jobs in the Ovens Valley area as wage-earners or sharemen on tobacco farms. The rest worked for some time in other local industries before becoming sharemen. The expansion of the tobacco-growing industry after 1954 gave many of them the opportunity to become farm owners, and by 1966 16 of the 21 owned or partly owned tobacco-farms.

The 5 informants who were still sharemen included 3 of the 5 bachelors in this category of migrants. The bachelors were probably handicapped economically by having neither wives nor sons to help them accumulate the capital for a farm. Of the married sharemen, one seemed to be an inefficient businessman, and he had given up tobacco growing altogether by 1967. The other had intended his two sons to be skilled tradesmen rather than farmers, but illness in the family led to the abandonment of their apprenticeships, and by 1967 he and his sons were all working as sharemen in an attempt to restore the family finances.

Only 2 of the farm-owners in this category were still unmarried, and they had become owners in partnership with their fathers, with whom they had previously worked as sharemen. The other owners had bought their farms with the help of their wives, their wives' fathers or brothers, or their own brothers or sons.

Only one of the farm-owners in this category had no sharemen working for him. Nine had only Italian sharemen, 4 had both Italian and non-Italian sharemen (Yugoslav, Spanish and Greek), and the remaining 2 had only non-Italians (Yugoslav and Spanish).
Out of the 21 migrants in this category, 17 had relatives living in the Ovens Valley area, apart from those living on the same farms as themselves or sharing the same households. They all appeared to have several Italian friends and 9 claimed Australian friends as well. However, only one informant claimed to know both his Italian and his Australian neighbours. Six stated that they knew none of their neighbours well (not having lived on those particular farms for very long). Another 6 stated that they knew their Australian neighbours better than their Italian ones (usually because the Australians' farms were closer to them than the Italian-owned ones).

Twelve of these informants stated that they did not belong to any clubs. Seven belonged to the Savoy Club; one belonged both to the Savoy Club and to a Soccer Club centred on Whorouly; and the other had joined the Workman's Club in Mount Beauty.

Three informants spoke English fluently, and 6 others spoke it reasonably well (apparently as a result of having attended school in Australia for some time). Nine had very little English, and 3 spoke none at all.

All but 2 of the migrants in this category had friends who had married Australians, and 13 of them had relatives who had done so. Only one expressed some disapproval of intermarriage between Italians and Australians. None of the informants in this category had married a non-Italian himself.

Few of the migrants who arrived during this period were well known amongst the Australians living in the area, though they sometimes had considerable prestige within the tobacco-growing industry itself.

It seems that in spite of economic success, knowledge of English, and familiarity with Australia, the migrants who arrived in the Ovens Valley area between the end of the War
and 1955 were not involved in extensive interaction with Australians by 1966. For the most part they spent their time with relatives and with other Italians. They had far more contact with Italians, and slightly more contact with Australians than migrants who arrived after 1955.

Pre-War Migrants

Ten of the Italian informants interviewed arrived in the Ovens Valley area before the Second World War. Six of these came directly to the area; the remainder first spent some time in other parts of Australia. All but 3 were sponsored by their fathers or their brothers.

On arrival in the Ovens Valley area, 8 obtained employment as tobacco growers, generally as sharemen alongside brothers or fathers already working in the area. The other 2 became respectively a bush-cutter and an employee in his own father's building contracting firm. By 1966, 8 had become farm-owners, one was still a shareman and the other had declined from being a shareman to being a wage-labourer on a tobacco farm.

The wage-labourer differed in many respects from his co-ethnics. He had failed to 'make good', and lived unmarried and alone, working only occasionally. He spoke English badly, was not naturalised, and had no relatives that he kept in touch with either in Australia or in Italy. He had not sponsored any other migrants, belonged to no clubs, and appeared to be a social isolate.

The shareman had stayed in the Ovens Valley area only for a few years after his arrival in 1934. After living in other parts of Australia, he returned to the area in 1959, when he was over 60 and therefore too old to be able to make much profit as a shareman. He had four young daughters (still unmarried) and no sons. His migration had been
sponsored by his brother, and he himself had sponsored the migration of a number of relatives and paesani. He and his (Italian-born) wife had a number of relatives in the Ovens Valley area, and more in Melbourne, where he expected to retire in a few years' time. He spoke little English and his wife spoke none. He belonged to no clubs, but had a large number of Italian friends with whom visits were exchanged two or three times a week. He had no Australian friends. He had become naturalised in 1954, twenty years after arriving in Australia.

All the eight farm owners were naturalised. One had an Australian wife, spoke English at home, but belonged to the Italian Savoy Club. He spoke Italian to his sharemen on the farm, and had both Italian and Australian friends. His own migration had been sponsored by his father, and he had not sponsored any migrants himself.

The other farm owners all had Italian-born wives. One had sponsored the migration of a large number of friends, and of his own and his wife's relatives. (None of the others had sponsored any migrants). He spoke some English and was well-known to many Italians and to some Australians. Another was a successful business man, and had extensive commercial interests in the Ovens Valley area in addition to his share in the tobacco farm run by his brothers. He was a notable patron of newer migrants, and was well known to both Italians and Australians.

Two other farm owners spoke English fairly well and had some Australian friends, though more Italian ones. The remaining 3 spoke very little English, and depended on their Italian friends and relatives for social contacts. One was reasonably prosperous and seemed to be on good terms with his Australian neighbours. Another had given up farming on his own account and leased his farm while he took a factory
job in Wangaratta, where he worked alongside Australians but had only Italian friends. The third owned a declining farm in Gapstowd, an area where the neighbouring Australians disliked the intrusion of Italians. All his social contacts were with Italians.

All of the pre-War migrants interviewed had Italian friends who had married Australians, and six of them had relatives with Australian spouses. Only one disapproved somewhat of intermarriage between Italians and Australians; but only one had an Australian wife himself.

Only 3 of the pre-War migrants interviewed spoke English at all well; only 4 said they had Australian friends as well as Italian ones; only one belonged to an Australian club, though 4 belonged to the Savoy Club; and out of the 8 who were farm owners, 6 had had only Italian sharemen on their farms.

The Italian-born who were most widely known to the Australians of the Ovens Valley area were almost invariably pre-War migrants, but by no means all the pre-War migrants had extensive contacts with Australians. Those whom the Australians encountered most frequently were those who had done well economically, and who had extensive social contacts both with Australians and with other Italians who interacted extensively with Australians. However, the sample indicates that 4 out of 10 pre-War migrants had failed to prosper, and that of the remainder only 2 were at all extensively involved with members of the host society.

The pre-War migrants interviewed had tended to share their own economic success with their relatives and to build up social networks composed almost entirely of Italians. The opportunities presented by the small, but growing, tobacco-growing industry at the time of their arrival enabled them to achieve economic success without being much involved with Australians. From statements made by both Italians and
Australians about the pre-War days in the area, it is likely that the Australian population at that time was in any case less willing to interact with Italians than it generally was by 1966. As the Italian population of the area increased, it became fairly easy for the migrants to find friends, sharemen and wives for their sons amongst their co-ethnics, and the tendency of the migrants to interact with one another rather than with Australians was encouraged.

It is also likely that interaction with Australians in itself might have caused a reaction leading pre-War migrants to prefer to interact with other migrants wherever possible. Since migrants interacted with Australians only in some areas of life, it is likely that they found the attitudes of Australians which they encountered there incompatible with the attitudes which they still retained in the areas of life in which they did not interact with Australians. In addition, the education of their children in the Australian school system helped to create tensions within Italian families. In these circumstances, the migrants who already had considerable contact with Australians were the most likely to turn to their co-ethnics for social support, and to go out of their way to interact with other migrants as much as possible. Considerations such as this probably explain the founding of the Savoy Club 20 years after the arrival of considerable numbers of Italians in the area, and the fact that its founder members were all men who had achieved considerable success in Australia and who were accustomed to interacting with Australians.

Italo-Australians

There were 7 Italo-Australians in the sample, 6 of them the Australian-born sons of migrants and one the grandson of a migrant. None of these informants had sponsored any migrants from Italy. All were Australian citizens, and all
but two were farm owners. The two registered as sharemen at the time of the interview worked for their own fathers and expected to inherit their farms in due course.

One of these informants had been apprenticed as a motor mechanic but later gave up his trade to join the family in tobacco-growing. The others had all begun their working careers assisting on the family farm. In one case there had been a family quarrel, and the son had eventually developed his own farm in isolation from his father. Another 4 Italo-Australians were bachelors still living with their parents. The remaining 2 lived in separate households (in one case on the same farm as the parents) while maintaining close contact with the parental household. None of the 3 married Italo-Australians had Italian wives. Two had married Australians and one a German.

All these informants had been educated in Australia and spoke English fluently. However, 5 of the 7 owned or worked on farms on which the sharemen were all Italian. Another owned a farm on which the sharemen were Greek and Italian. The grandson of a migrant was the only one to own a farm on which there were no Italian sharemen, and he spoke no Italian whatever. The others could all speak their parents' dialects, but had little knowledge of 'standard' Italian.

Five of the informants in the category had no relatives living on their farms other than the members of their own households; but all had relatives living in the Ovens Valley area. Several were related to other people in the sample.1

1 Two of the Italo-Australians were related to one another as uncle and nephew, and another pair were first paternal parallel cousins. One of the others was a grandson to a pre-war migrant informant and also second cross-cousin to a post-1955 migrant informant.
All the sons of migrants in the sample had both Italian and Australian friends. The migrant's grandson claimed to have only Australian friends and counted himself and his own relatives as entirely Australian. The sons of migrants all knew both their Italian and their Australian neighbours fairly well, though 3 stated that they knew their Italian neighbours better than their Australian ones. The grandson, however, claimed to know none of his neighbours well. He and his father and brothers had bought a new farm in the King Valley only shortly before the interview (with money paid in compensation for the flooding of their original farm under the Buffalo Dam scheme) and had not fully settled into their new home.

Two informants in this category stated that they belonged to no clubs. Four belonged to one club each: one to the Savoy Club, two to local sports clubs and one to the Young Farmers' Club. The other belonged to two clubs, both of them local youth clubs.

All the Italo-Australians in the sample knew Italians who had married Australians, and 3 mentioned relatives who had done so. They were all in favour of intermarriage. In fact, general conversation with pre-War migrants, and with Italo-Australians (who were the children and grandchildren of pre-War migrants) suggested that the most successful and longest established Italian families looked on intermarriage with Australians as an index of social success.

Although most of the Italo-Australians in the Ovens Valley area were under 25, and many of them were unmarried, they were often well-known to the Australian population at large. Their knowledge of English, and the Australian friends they had made at school, gave them many opportunities for making contact with Australians. In addition they usually had relatives and friends amongst the Italian population. They
were able to interact (and intermarry) with the Australians more readily than other members of the Italian population, and with their extensive contacts within the Italian population they were able to act as bridges between migrants and hosts.

Comparison of the Interaction Patterns of Different Categories of Italians

It appears that on the whole migrants who arrived in the Ovens Valley area after 1955 had direct, categorical relationships with Australians only in areas of life where interaction with Australians was necessary, and that they had direct, non-categorical relations with a small number of Italians principally in areas of life where interaction with Australians was unlikely (that is, in the areas of kinship and family life). They had very little interaction with either hosts or other migrants in the areas of life where interaction with Australians was voluntary.

Migrants who arrived in the area after the Second World War but before 1955 generally had categorical interaction with Australians in areas of life where such interaction was necessary, and a little non-categorical interaction with them in areas of life where such interaction was voluntary. They had, on the other hand, a great deal of non-categorical interaction with other Italians in both the areas in which interaction with hosts was unlikely and the areas in which interaction with hosts was voluntary.

Migrants who arrived before the War occasionally had both categorical and non-categorical interaction with hosts in all three types of areas of life; but they were far more likely to have both categorical and non-categorical relationships with other Italians in all three areas. Although they were more likely than any other category of migrants to admit Australians into such areas of unlikely
interaction as kinship and family life (as the wives of their sons) they were also more likely to arrange things so that in areas of voluntary interaction they could interact with migrants rather than hosts (as in the foundation of the Savoy Club) and so that in areas where interaction with hosts was generally considered necessary they could interact principally with Italians (as in employing Italian sharemen on their farms).

Only the Italo-Australians were as ready to associate with Australians as with Italians in all areas of life, and there were some signs of a tendency amongst them to associate with Australians rather than with Italians.

It seems that migrant interaction with Australians spread very slowly from interaction in areas of life where it appeared to be necessary to interaction in areas where it was voluntary, and then to areas in which it was unlikely. Meanwhile, interaction with other Italians spread from the areas of kinship and family life (where interaction with hosts was unlikely) to interaction in voluntary associations, and so on, (where interaction with hosts was voluntary), and then to interaction in areas of life where it had earlier been necessary to interact with hosts.

Increasing interaction between migrants to some extent competed with increasing interaction with hosts for the time and attention of the individual migrant; but the two processes appear to have been supportive too, in that it was often through other migrants that individuals made contact with members of the host population. It seems that the people with the most extensive contacts with the migrant population were those who were most likely to develop extensive contacts with the host population.

It seems that the process of increasing interaction with hosts was an extremely slow one; and that the process of
increasing interaction with other migrants was almost as slow. Many informants had lived in the Ovens Valley for ten years without developing much interaction with either hosts or other migrants.

It also appears that interaction with hosts created certain strains for migrants that they might try to avoid or alleviate by increasing their amount of interaction with other migrants. The problems of the migrant family, which arose partly out of the fact that men, women and children had different degrees of contact with hosts and therefore developed somewhat different values and attitudes, were alleviated to some extent by turning to the kinship system and the family circle (composed of people under similar pressures) for social support. The difficulties of operating simultaneously with Italian values in such areas of life as kinship and the family and with Australian values in areas of life associated with voluntary associations and with tobacco growing were avoided by associating with Italians rather than Australians in voluntary associations such as the Savoy Club, and by employing Italian sharemen.

Developing Patterns of Interaction

This study has been concerned with interaction between migrants and hosts in only one area of rural Victoria. However, it has been undertaken in the hope of shedding light on the processes of interaction (and of migrant assimilation in general) as they might be expected to affect other migrant-host situations as well as the one considered here. Since the patterns of interaction which are outlined in this section are the consequence of particular factors affecting the Ovens Valley area, it seems reasonable to suggest that similar patterns will be found wherever conditions like those of the Ovens Valley area exist. In particular, the patterns of interaction described here should be approximately repeated
wherever the migrants are motivated by a desire to improve
their standard of living, the hosts do not practice rigid
anti-migrant discrimination, and migrants and hosts work in
the same industry and live in close proximity. Where
migrants are political refugees (and therefore attempt from
the first to segregate themselves from the host population by
forming consciously national organisations) or where they
are segregated from the host population by discrimination,
the possession of a distinct religion, or the distinction of
their residential areas, interaction between migrants and hosts
may be expected to follow rather different patterns from those
of the Ovens Valley area.

In this study interaction between migrants and hosts has
been considered in relation to several areas of life, and
these areas have been grouped into three types: areas in
which interaction between migrants and hosts was considered
necessary; areas in which it was voluntary; and areas in
which it was unlikely. Some consideration has also been
given to the type of interaction taking place, and three
categories of interaction have been discussed: indirect
interaction (by means of mass media, or other migrants);
direct, categorical interaction (in which migrants and hosts
play specific, well-defined roles in relationship to one
another, such as farm-owner and sharefarmer); and direct,
non-categorical interaction (in which the roles are more
diffuse, and continuously re-defined through the interplay
of the personalities concerned). It was suggested that
interaction between migrants and hosts would tend to begin
in the areas of life in which it was necessary, and gradually
progress through the areas in which it was voluntary, finally
reaching the areas in which it was unlikely. It was also
suggested that relationships would begin by being indirect,
or direct but categorical, and only after some time in
contact with one another would migrants and hosts enter into direct non-categorical relationships.¹

The stages of interaction with hosts which the Italian tobacco-growers interviewed in the course of the study had reached by the time the fieldwork was carried out are plotted in Diagram I(a) below.² Since the process of increasing interaction continues with the Australian-born offspring of migrants, the Italo-Australians are also included in the diagram. Each migrant who arrived in the Ovens Valley area before the Second World War is indicated by a '1'; each migrant who arrived between the end of the War and 1955 is indicated by a '2'; each migrant who arrived after 1955 is indicated by a '3'; and each Italo-Australian is indicated by a '4'. The three kinds of areas of life which are distinguished are areas in which interaction between migrants and hosts was generally considered necessary,³ those in which it was voluntary,⁴ and those in which it was unlikely.⁵ The three kinds of interaction are indirect, direct but categorical, and direct and non-categorical. Although the line between categorical and non-categorical behaviour may be difficult to draw in individual cases, the analytic distinction between the two forms of interaction seems clear.

Overall estimates of the stage of interaction reached by individual Italians have been made by a consideration of the

---

¹ See discussion, above, Chapter 2, pp.44-5.
² See below, p.356
³ That is, the areas of life discussed in Chapter 4, above, pp. 144-90.
⁴ That is, the areas of life discussed in Chapter 5, above, pp. 191-227.
⁵ That is, the areas of life discussed in Chapter 6, above, pp.228-389.
### Diagram I(a)

**The Stages of Migrant-Host Interaction Reached by the Italian Tobacco Growers in the Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Migrant-Host Interaction</th>
<th>Areas of Life in Which Migrant-Host Interaction Was:</th>
<th>Necessary</th>
<th>Voluntary</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct:</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-categorical</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For explanation of this diagram, see discussion above, pp.355-7.

Derived from: Sample survey of tobacco growers; see Appendix I, below, pp.390-401.

Material gathered during the interviews, and in each case the most 'advanced' level of interaction is indicated, though the same individual may have displayed advanced types of interaction at the same time. Thus, a man who was on fairly good terms of friendship with several Australians is plotted as having direct non-categorical/voluntary interaction with hosts, even though he also had categorical relationships with hosts (as a shareman, as a Catholic layman, etc.) and interacted with them in areas of life where interaction was necessary, as well as areas in which it was voluntary.
Similarly, a man who was on terms of friendship with his Australian employer is plotted as having direct non-categorical/necessary interaction with hosts, though he obviously had direct categorical/necessary interaction with his employer as well. The most 'advanced' types of relationships are those towards the bottom of the table, and the most 'advanced' areas of interaction are those towards the right.

Plotting under the 'unlikely' heading indicates, in relation to the Ovens Valley area, that the individual concerned interacts with Australians in the areas of kinship or family life: that is, that he, or a member of his household, or a relative of his in the first degree married an Australian.

Consideration of this diagram suggests that interaction between migrants and hosts does progress over time from one type of area of life to another, and from one type of interaction to another, in the sequence originally suggested. It also indicates that the progress may be extremely slow, and that most migrants never complete it. Italo-Australians are more likely to complete it than their Italian-born parents. Further, it would appear that interaction in areas of life where such interaction is voluntary is more likely than interaction in areas where it seems to be necessary to lead to non-categorical forms of interaction; and that interaction in areas where it is unlikely is more likely to be non-categorical than categorical.

Consideration of Diagram I(a) suggests that the sequence of developing patterns of interaction can be mapped out in such a way as to indicate the paths by which migrants may move from initial indirect/necessary interaction with hosts to final direct non-categorical/unlikely interaction with hosts. An outline of this path as it appears from Diagram I(a) is given in Diagram I(b).^1

---

^1 See below, p.358.
**DIAGRAM I(b)**

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF PATTERNS OF INTERACTION BETWEEN MIGRANTS AND HOSTS AS SUGGESTED BY CONSIDERATION OF THE ITALIAN TOBACCO GROWERS IN THE SAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of migrant-host interaction</th>
<th>Areas of life in which migrant-host interaction was:--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct: Categorical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct: Non-categorical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For explanation of this diagram, see discussion above, p.357
Derived from: Diagram I(a) above, p.356.

This straightforward development of increasing interaction between migrants and hosts is complicated by two factors. First, by difficulties in migrant-host interaction itself, and second by the effects of interaction between migrants themselves.

The complexities regarding migrant-host interaction arise from the fact that interaction between individuals in areas of life where migrant-host interaction is regarded as necessary may normally involve some of the most difficult types of interaction. In such a situation neither migrants nor hosts may have had sufficient experience of easier types of interaction with one another to be able to manage the problems associated with more difficult types. Under these circumstances, they may fall back on easier types of interaction, even though these are inappropriate to the area of life in question. If this retreat is impossible, they may
reduce their interaction to the bare minimum for the purposes in hand. The latter is particularly likely to happen when a new migrant has to interact with an inexperienced Australian farm owner or official for specific purposes. The former is most likely to happen when a migrant (for example, a farm owner) becomes involved in interaction with a host in an area of life which is normally characterised by non-categorical relationships (for example, in dealings about tobacco politics with a host farm owner). In this situation, both are likely to emphasise the possibilities for categorical behaviour in the relationship, and the Italian may be encouraged to behave in an 'Italian' manner (as understood by Australians) so that any real intimacy between them is avoided.

Interaction between migrants themselves develops by a process of its own, which is in many ways the reverse of the process leading to increased interaction between migrants and hosts. Interaction with other migrants appears to be necessary in such areas of life as family life and kinship (the areas in which interaction with hosts is unlikely), and to be unlikely in areas such as economic activities, religion and education (the areas in which interaction with hosts appears to be necessary). Moreover, although interaction with migrants may often be categorical, or even indirect, migrants are likely to have non-categorical relationships with other migrants in all areas of life, and only to have categorical relationships with them if they prefer to arrange to have specific, 'business' relationships with other migrants rather than with hosts. Therefore, as interaction between migrants increases, it progresses from interaction in areas of life such as family and kinship, through interaction in voluntary associations, etc., to interaction in religious and economic
life; and it also progresses from relationships which are non-categorical, through relationships which are categorical, to relationships which are indirect.

Diagram II(a) below\(^1\) shows the stages of interaction with other Italians reached by the Italian tobacco growers in the sample at the time they were interviewed. It is constructed in the same way as Diagram I(a) above,\(^2\) except that the areas of life in which interaction between migrants and hosts was described as necessary in the earlier diagram are here described as areas in which interaction between migrants was unlikely, and areas in which interaction between migrants and hosts was earlier described as unlikely are here described as areas in which interaction between migrants was necessary. Movement towards the top of the diagram, and movement towards the left of the diagram, are regarded as 'advances', and informants are plotted at the most 'advanced' position they have reached in any of their relationships, less 'advanced' relationships being disregarded.

Migrants plotted as having non-categorical/voluntary interaction with other migrants are those who appeared to have gone out of their way to provide themselves with migrant friends (particularly by sponsoring the settlement of friends in the Ovens Valley area). Those plotted as having categorical/voluntary interaction with other migrants are those who sought out other migrants in migrant clubs. Those plotted as having categorical/unlikely interaction with other migrants are those who had economic dealings mainly with other migrants (for example, by employing only Italian sharemen). The interaction of Italo-Australians with Italians has also been plotted, for the sake of comparison with the interaction of migrants with other Italians.

---

1 See below, p.361.
2 See above, p.356.
### DIAGRAM II(a)
THE STAGES OF MIGRANT-MIGRANT INTERACTION REACHED BY THE ITALIAN TOBACCO GROWERS IN THE SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of migrant-migrant interaction</th>
<th>Areas of life in which migrant-migrant interaction was:</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Voluntary</th>
<th>Necessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct: Categorical</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11111111111</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>222222222</td>
<td>222222</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct: Non-categorical</td>
<td></td>
<td>111111111</td>
<td>1111111111</td>
<td>222222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>444</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For explanation of this diagram see discussion above, p.360.
Derived from: Sample survey of tobacco growers; see Appendix I, below, pp.390-401.

Consideration of this diagram suggests that the sequence of developing patterns of interaction between migrants can be mapped in a similar way to the sequence of patterns of interaction between migrants and hosts in Diagram I(b).\(^1\)

Such a map is given in Diagram II(b).\(^2\)

It is interesting to note that the Italo-Australians in the sample, who were the most 'advanced' of the informants in relation to interaction between Italians and Australians, were less advanced than several of the migrants in relation to interaction between Italians; and one of the Italo-Australians

\(^1\) See above, p.358.
\(^2\) See below, p.362.
had apparently blocked himself off from any increase in his interaction with Italians by reducing his interaction with them to categorical/necessary interaction.

**DIAGRAM II(b)**

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF PATTERNS OF INTERACTION BETWEEN MIGRANTS AS SUGGESTED BY CONSIDERATION OF THE ITALIAN TOBACCO GROWERS IN THE SAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of migrant-migrant interaction</th>
<th>Areas of life in which migrant-migrant interaction was:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct: Categorical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct: Non-categorical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For explanation of this diagram see discussion above, p.361. Derived from: Diagram II(a) above, p.361.

These considerations, together with the fact that interaction between migrants apparently increased in a pattern counter to that of the increase in interaction between migrants and hosts, indicates that interaction between migrants and interaction between migrants and hosts tend to exclude one another; that the more a man interacts with hosts the less he will interact with migrants, and *vice versa*. However, several other considerations must be looked at before a full statement of the relationship between the two processes of interaction can be attempted.
One such consideration is that if migrants begin by interacting with members of the host society in areas of life where such interaction appears to be necessary, then it will follow that something like a 'law of diminishing marginal returns' will set in in relation to other areas of life. Interaction with hosts will not seem very attractive in areas in which it is not seen to be necessary, because participation in those areas is not crucial to existence in the host country. It will seem still less attractive in areas in which interaction with other migrants is seen as necessary, for in those areas migrants are already provided with social contacts with members of their own ethnic category.

Another relevant consideration is that, since the roles of individuals are interconnected in systems (position-sets), a change in some roles may imply changes in other roles in the system. These changes may pose problems for the relation of the position-set as a whole to its environment that may make both individuals and families unwilling to make further changes. For this reason, migrants may establish migrant clubs rather than join clubs already existing in the host population. This is particularly likely to happen when migrants have become accustomed to interacting with members of other ethnic categories in several areas of life, and have become aware of some of the difficulties involved in such interaction.

Even if the position-set of a given migrant, or a particular migrant family, had several features in common with the equivalent host position-set at the time of immigration, changes brought about by the migration situation may generate changes in the whole system, including changes in the features that were initially similar. The discrepancy which then develops between the migrant and the equivalent host position-set may reduce the possibilities for further
interaction between migrants and hosts. For example, the nuclear family in Italy appears to have many features in common with the Australian nuclear family of the Ovens Valley area, but the effects of migration are such as to decrease the similarities between them. In Italian migrant families, parents become more dependent on their children and wives become more dependent on their husbands than they would be in either Australian rural families or families in Italy. This is related to the fact that migrant Italian adults, particularly women, have fewer opportunities for interaction with Australians than their children.

An additional consideration is that the larger the migrant population becomes in a given area, the more able it is to provide social arrangements which satisfy the interests of its members, and the more areas of life there will be in which migrants can interact with one another rather than with members of the host society.

The Australian-educated children of migrants are likely to act as mediators between migrants and the host society. Consequently, as they increase in number, direct interaction between migrants and hosts may decrease. The grandchildren of migrants, however, may have very little contact with the migrant population.

All these considerations lead to the conclusion that the more migrants interact with hosts, the more likely they will be to increase their interaction with other migrants.

Another set of considerations, however, indicates that interaction with other migrants can lead to increased interaction with hosts.

One consideration pointing to this conclusion is that migrants who have lived in the host country longest, and who have several relatives living nearby as a result of chain-migration, have most contact both with the migrant population
and with the host society. They may take advantage of their economic position to employ co-ethnics, and so reduce the extent of their interaction with hosts in economic areas of life; but they are also likely to have friends in the host society and even to encourage their relatives and dependents to marry into the host population, thus indicating their willingness to interact with members of the host society even in the sphere of kinship.

Recent migrants appear to develop contacts with members of the host society as a consequence of the contacts they develop with other migrants. If they join a migration chain whose older members have considerable contact with hosts, or if they attach themselves to a 'patron' who has contacts with members of the host society, they are likely to be introduced to hosts. Otherwise their contacts with members of the host society may be limited to formal contacts with their employers, public officials, and so on.

Chain-migration seems to be an important factor affecting the development of interaction as well as the process of migration itself. Migrants who arrive to join a chain are able to make contact with members of the host society through longer-settled members of the chain. Migrants who establish a chain themselves thereby extend their social base in the migrant population, and the security given by this appears to enable them to increase their own contacts with members of the host society. Migrants who are not members of chains tend to be isolated from the rest of the migrant population for many years after their arrival in the host country, and their lack of contact with other migrants reduces their opportunities for making contacts with hosts other than contacts of a categorical nature in the areas of life where interaction with hosts appears to be necessary.
It appears that although interaction with other migrants is a counter-process competing with interaction between migrants and hosts for the time and attention of the individual migrant, the process and the counter-process tend to reinforce one another. The more migrants interact with one another, the more likely they are to have opportunities of interacting with hosts; and the more they interact with hosts the more likely they are to make arrangements in which they can interact with other migrants.

It appears that interaction between migrants and hosts is inherently ambivalent. At any point a step that might lead to further interaction might also lead to less interaction. For example, it seems that the more migrants interact with one another, the more likely they are to interact with members of the host society - unless their interaction with other migrants is so extensive that there is no time or energy left for interaction with hosts. Similarly, the children of migrants may act as bridges between migrants and hosts - unless they identify so much with the host society that they avoid contact with migrants. Even by acting as bridges between migrants and hosts they might actually reduce rather than increase interaction between them, for as bridges they serve indirect interaction between migrants and hosts, and therefore may either make interaction possible where it was impossible before or reduce the possibilities for direct interaction that would have been exploited but for their intervention.

It seems that the areas of life in which interaction between migrants is most likely to lead to interaction between migrants and hosts, and interaction between migrants and hosts is most likely to lead to interaction between migrants themselves, are the areas of life in which both forms of interaction are voluntary. This is mainly because in these areas both migrants and hosts can choose between arranging their lives in conjunction with migrants or with hosts, or
in several combinations of the two. In the areas of life where interaction between migrants and hosts is generally seen to be necessary or those in which it is unlikely, very few hosts or migrants are free to decide whether they will interact with members of their own ethnic categories or with others. A few are in a position to decide for themselves, however. In the areas of unlikely host-migrant interaction they may themselves marry into the other ethnic category or encourage their close relatives to do so. In the areas of necessary host-migrant interaction they may employ only members of their own ethnic categories on their farms.

An additional reason for the importance of the areas in which interaction is voluntary for the transitions between host-migrant and migrant-migrant interaction is the fact that interaction with anyone at all in these areas is voluntary. Several of the more recent migrants had no interaction with anyone in these areas, and this was possible because the various activities carried on in them were not crucial to their existence in Australia. Therefore, if and when they decided to participate in these areas, they were still to a considerable extent free to decide whether to do so in conjunction with other migrants or in conjunction with hosts. Their choice was not pre-empted by the established social structures of the area (as it was in areas where interaction between migrants and hosts was generally considered necessary), or by relationships already established before migration (as it was in areas where migrant-host interaction was unlikely). Their freedom was greater than in either of the other two types of area, even though it was not absolute. On the whole, in areas of life where migrant-host and migrant-migrant interaction were both voluntary migrants were more likely to enter into interaction with other migrants, principally because their introduction to individuals in these areas was likely to be through people with whom they had non-categorical
relationships (that is, through friends rather than through people with whom their relationships were on an entirely 'business' footing), and their relationships with migrants in the areas of life where interaction with hosts was unlikely were more likely to be non-categorical than their relationships with hosts in areas of life where interaction with hosts was generally considered to be necessary.

The relationship between the development of increasing interaction between migrants and hosts and the associated development of increasing interaction between migrants is mapped in Diagram III.¹ The development of increasing interaction between migrants and hosts is shown as in Diagram I(b),² and that of increasing interaction between migrants as in Diagram II(b).³ Diagram III indicates that, although at any moment a migrant may be increasing both his interaction with other migrants and his interaction with hosts, at certain points he may switch from increasing his interaction with one ethnic category to increasing his interaction with the other. The extent to which he proceeds with either form of interaction, and the points at which he switches from one to the other, will be determined partly by the specific opportunities available to him at any given time, and partly by his own motivation towards one kind of interaction or another. The map merely indicates the set of different routes that appear to be possible in view of the patterns of interaction displayed by the migrants of the Ovens Valley area.

¹ See below, p.369.
² See above, p.358.
³ See above, p.362.

### Diagram III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of interaction</th>
<th>Areas of life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant-Host Interaction Necessary:</td>
<td>Migrant-Host Interaction Voluntary:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant-Migrant Interaction Unlikely</td>
<td>Migrant-Migrant Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key:
- — Path of developing interaction between migrants and hosts
- — Path of developing interaction between migrants
- — Possible transitions between migrant-host and migrant-migrant interaction.

Derived from: Diagrams I(b) and II(b) above, pp. 358 and 362.

### Interaction and Assimilation

This thesis has investigated interaction between migrants and hosts in a situation in which there are comparatively few structural barriers to such interaction. In the Ovens Valley area Italians and Australians are not segregated by residence, occupation or religion, and neither category enforces discrimination against the other. It has been shown that under these circumstances interaction between the two
ethnic categories gradually increases, over many years; but that the interaction of migrants with migrants increases simultaneously, and possibly at a faster rate than interaction between migrants and hosts. However, the two interaction processes tend to assist one another as well as to compete with one another.

It was an initial premise of this thesis that interaction between migrants and hosts was an essential part of the process of assimilation, since it is primarily through interaction with members of the host society that migrants are socialised into the values and attitudes of the host society. Even under circumstances which are favourable to migrant-host interaction, migrants will not be socialised into the mores of the host society in any general sense. In fact, they will interact with, and therefore be socialised into, the local variant of the host society with which they are surrounded residentially and at work; and into the migrant population composed of their own neighbouring co-ethnics.

It is likely that the values and attitudes of the local host population, and those of the local migrant population, will differ from those of the host country at large in a number of ways. In the Ovens Valley area it is clear that the local Australian values differ from those of Australia as a whole, both because it is a rural area in a predominantly urban country, and because it is an area which has recently been undergoing a fairly rapid transition. Many of the attitudes held by the population are of the traditionally 'rural' types; and many others are as yet incoherent, or inconsistent with other attitudes. Whatever values and attitudes are inculcated in the migrants as a result of their interaction with Australians, they will be those current in the local population and only indirectly related to the mores held by the majority of the population of Australia.
Any socialisation process (including that of individuals living in their native countries) inculcates the values of the locality rather than of the nation. In order to measure the amount of socialisation that has taken place in the case of migrants, it is therefore necessary to investigate the extent to which they share the attitudes of the hosts with whom they are in contact, rather than the extent to which they share the attitudes which are predominant in the nation as a whole.

In the Ovens Valley area an investigation of local attitudes would probably show the existence of two sets of 'host' attitudes, each held by different segments of the population. One of the sets of attitudes would be characterised by locally oriented, rural attitudes (and would generally be held by many members of long established farming families) while the other would be characterised by metropolitan attitudes (and would generally be held by the professional and commercial residents of the area, and by several younger people looking towards Melbourne rather than the Ovens Valley area for careers). These sets of attitudes would probably have some features in common (such as, for example, the value put on Australian national identity and national habits of thought); but many persistent differences would exist between them. Most migrants would probably be found to be more influenced by Australians holding the second set of values. Although many migrants have dealings with Australians who might be expected to have local values, their interaction with them is mainly on an employer/employee basis. The influence of professionals such as priests and school-teachers on their attitudes and those of their children is likely to be stronger than the influence of the local farmers. However, those migrants who interact considerably with Australians in the various voluntary organisations of the area are likely to be more strongly influenced by the local Australian farmers than by people with a 'metropolitan' outlook.
Not all the attitudes of the Australians in the area would be associated with either 'local' or 'metropolitan' outlooks, however. In relation to a number of topics, attitudes would probably be scattered, incomplete and idiosyncratic. These less coherent attitudes would be associated with all segments of the population, and would be related to ideas and situations recently introduced into the Ovens Valley area by the social changes which have taken place there. Many of these ideas and situations are still too novel for stable, generally held attitudes to have developed about them. The more topics there are on which Australian attitudes are still fluid and idiosyncratic, the more difficult it will be for migrants to acquire a new set of attitudes for themselves which consistently reflect Australian ones.

The local host population, however, is not the only influence upon the migrants' attitudes. Interaction with other migrants is likely to modify the migrants' attitudes in several ways that will make them differ somewhat from those of the neighbouring Australian population. The attitudes current in the migrant population will not be simply those of the country of origin, but will be developed as a result of contact with the host population. In several respects they may be a compromise between the attitudes held by migrants before migration (that is, those formed by their own local sub-cultures in the country of origin) and the attitudes current amongst neighbouring Australians; but many others may be a distortion of neighbouring host values, or a reaction against the host society as a result of the difficulties of settling in it.

It is clear from these considerations that even when migrants interact with members of the host society, the patterns of interaction and the various problems arising in the socialisation process are such as to complicate the
relationship between interaction and assimilation. However, the relationship, however complicated, is a positive one; and it is unlikely that migrants will become socialised into the host society (and thus approach assimilation) to any degree unless interaction between themselves and the host population is extensive.

It is now possible to consider whether interaction between migrants and hosts is better regarded as one amongst several other sub-processes of assimilation, or as a fundamental sub-process underlying all others. The examination of interaction in this chapter suggests that the development of interaction is a sub-process amongst several others. It is made possible by the civic assimilation of the migrants and the absence of prejudice and discrimination on the part of the host population; and it leads to acculturation and amalgamation or marital assimilation.

Consideration of both Taft's and Gordon's arguments,¹ and of the migrant-host situation in the Ovens Valley area, suggests that certain minimal amounts of most of the sub-processes they discuss may be pre-requisites of interaction between migrants and hosts, while increased amounts are the products of such interaction. Migrants may need a minimal knowledge of the language and customs of the host society in order to be able to interact with hosts (as Gordon suggests); but their acculturation is increased by interaction. There must be some members of the host society who do not discriminate against migrants in order for migrants to have the opportunity of interaction with hosts; but interaction may lead to decreased prejudice and so to decreased discrimination. There must be some degree of civic assimilation of migrants, or migrants would not be able to feel the degree of satisfaction

¹ See discussion of these above, Chapter 2, pp.27-31.
and identification with the host society that, Taft suggests, lead them to interact with hosts; but interaction leads to an increase of civic assimilation too.

It is suggested that the relationship between migrant-host interaction and the sub-processes of assimilation discussed by Gordon and Taft is that shown in Figure III.¹ It is not possible on the basis of the evidence given in this thesis to define the minimal amounts of each sub-process which are pre-requisites of migrant-host interaction, or to suggest what the relative importance of each of the pre-requisites might be under different conditions, but it is suggested that these questions should be further investigated.

Conclusion

This chapter has analysed the development of patterns of interaction between migrants and hosts in the Ovens Valley area, and considered the implications of this analysis for the study of assimilation as a general phenomenon.

It was found that recent migrants interact very little with either hosts or other migrants, that long-established migrants interact considerably with both hosts and migrants (though more with migrants than with hosts), and that the second generation, while interacting considerably with the migrant population, tends to interact more with hosts. It was concluded that over time individual migrants' interaction with hosts would increase, and so would their interaction with other migrants. While increased interaction with hosts and increased interaction with other migrants might compete with one another for the time and attention of the individual, the two processes may reinforce one another at certain points. Increased interaction with hosts is not likely to take place unless interaction with other migrants also increases.

¹ See below, p. 375.
FIGURE III

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MIGRANT-HOST INTERACTION
TO OTHER SUB-PROCESSES OF ASSIMILATION

1 The names Gordon and Taft in brackets after the names of sub-processes of assimilation refer to the sources of the definitions of the various sub-processes referred to in this diagram; see discussion above, Chapter 2, pp.27-31.
The relationship of these patterns of interaction to the processes by which a migrant is socialised into the attitudes and values of the host society was discussed, and it was concluded that (although the relationship is complicated by several factors) no re-socialisation of migrants could be expected unless they interacted with members of the host society.

Finally, the relationship of the development of interaction to other sub-processes of assimilation was discussed, and it was suggested that the development of interaction takes place alongside other sub-processes, being dependent upon structural assimilation and being both influenced by and an influence upon the development of attitudinal assimilation. It cannot take place without the co-operation of other sub-processes, but neither can some of the other sub-processes take place in the absence of the development of migrant-host interaction.

The following chapter will summarise the conclusions of this thesis.
CHAPTER 8
CONCLUSION

This thesis has been concerned mainly with the interaction between Italians and Australians in the Ovens Valley area, with the development of patterns of interaction between migrants and hosts, and with the relationship between interaction and other aspects of assimilation. In the course of describing the lives of Italians and Australians in the tobacco growing area of Victoria, some light has also been thrown on two additional topics: the study of Italians in Australia and the study of Australian rural areas. This chapter will summarise the conclusions reached with respect to these two subsidiary topics as well as the three main ones.

The Study of Italians in Australia

So far there have been comparatively few studies of the Italian migrant population of Australia, and those that have been carried out have been either demographic studies or studies of the relationships between Italians within the migrant population. This is the first attempt to study directly the relationships of migrant Italians with members of the neighbouring Australian population. Seen from this angle, the Italian population appears less independent of the host society than it has appeared to be in other studies of Italians in Australia.

This is partly the inevitable outcome of focussing attention on the points of contact between the two populations, but it is not altogether an artefact of the viewpoint adopted. The Ovens Valley area differs from the
regions in which other studies of Italian migrants in Australia have been carried out in several important respects. The Italians are not concentrated in a particular residential district or in a particular socio-economic category, as they are in the settings of other studies. In addition, the Italian population of the Ovens Valley area can be regarded as complete. The most successful migrants (in terms of economic achievement and contact with Australians) have not moved away from the district into more desirable residential areas, as successful migrants in large cities tend to do.

In other respects, however, this study confirms the findings of other studies of Italians in Australia. It seems that Italians generally migrate in order to improve their own and their children's socio-economic position. This main objective makes many of them somewhat indifferent to their immediate physical comfort, and to other 'luxuries' such as political involvement. They are usually interested in educating their children so that they can enter higher status occupations than themselves, but the short-term advantage of using their children's labour in a family enterprise often over-rides these longer-term ambitions. They are not generally nationalistic in a political sense, nor do they go out of their way to educate their children in Italian language and culture. It appears that where Italians have formed residential enclaves it has not been with the deliberate intention of avoiding contact with the host society.

Italian migrants to Australia generally come from rural backgrounds, although they often have aspirations towards urban occupations and prefer to live in towns. If comparisons between the behaviour patterns of Italian migrants and Australians are to be made, there is a strong case for making them between migrants and rural Australians,
rather than between migrants and the Australian population as a whole, which is largely urbanised.

In the Ovens Valley area there are few observable differences between Italians and their Australian neighbours, except with respect to kinship behaviour and family life. Differences in kinship behaviour are of degree rather than of kind. Italians organise much of their social lives round the obligations of kinship and the institution of the family circle; Australians do the same, though to a lesser extent.

With respect to family life, both Italians and Australians refer to marked differences between the two populations. Italians tend to disapprove of the more permissive methods of child-rearing prevalent in Australia, and some disapprove of the 'freedom' of Australian women. Both populations believe that Italian fathers are more authoritarian than Australian ones. This may be the case when families in Italy are compared with Australian ones, but the migrant situation (which makes many parents dependent on their Australian-educated children) brings about changes in the migrant Italian family that make it differ from families still in Italy as much as from rural Australian families. In practice, fathers in Australian farm families exercise more control over their children than Italian migrant fathers do.

Differences between northern and southern Italians in the Ovens Valley area follow the same pattern as differences between Australians and Italians. They relate mainly to kinship and family life. On the whole, southerners are more protective of their wives and unmarried daughters than northerners, and they depend more on kin to provide them with companionship. They often bring many of their own and their wives' relatives to Australia. By contrast,
northerners are more likely to keep in touch with their relatives mainly by letter, and to return to Italy to visit them there.

The difference between these two patterns of behaviour is probably related to different landholding patterns in different party of Italy. Migrant southerners usually come from families of landless agricultural labourers. They have no property in Italy to draw them back, and their relatives have no property there to keep them at home. Migrant northerners often come from families of smallholders. They often retain some interest in the family holding which may necessitate a return visit to Italy, and their relatives may prefer to remain on the property rather than join them in Australia.

These generalisations are drawn from the behaviour of the northerners and southerners in the Ovens Valley area, who are mainly Veneti and Catanzariti. Migrants from parts of northern Italy where conditions are different from those in Veneto, and from parts of the south which differ from Catanzaro, may exhibit different patterns of behaviour in relation to migration.

The Study of Rural Areas of Australia

The description of life in the Ovens Valley area given in this thesis differs from the sociological descriptions of life in rural areas of Australia undertaken out of an interest in rural life itself. It is given for the purpose of presenting the local situation as it affects the Italian migrants, and is therefore less complete than a study of a rural area per se. Even this description, however, indicates some of the similarities and differences between the Ovens Valley area and other rural areas described in the sociological literature.
In the Ovens Valley area, as in other rural areas, effective kinship links are rather more extensive than they are in towns, and the residents of the area generally find their friends amongst their kin and the neighbours with whom they have grown up. Because of the importance of immovable property (land) in the local economy, many families have stayed in the same district for several generations. However, the population is not as completely stable as concentration on the longest established families in the area might suggest. There has been a continuous trickle of people (younger sons, bankrupt farmers) leaving the area, and a continuous stream of new arrivals buying up established farms and clearing new land.

The Ovens Valley area is an example of a particular category of rural areas: that of areas which are interlocked with the larger 'metropolitan' regions within which they are situated.¹ The number of such areas is increasing as metropolitan regions become larger and as improved communications and various government agencies directly based on the metropolis make their presence felt in rural areas. As a result of this interlocking, representatives of the metropolis take up residence in rural areas in increasing numbers, and metropolitan occupations become more readily available to the children of rural dwellers. Additions to, and subtractions from, the rural population therefore become more likely, and farming becomes less commonly regarded as the inevitable future for rural children.

¹ This use of the word 'metropolitan' is introduced above, Chapter 3, p.52.
Finally, the Ovens Valley area (like many other parts of Australia) has undergone a great deal of economic development and accompanying social change. The changes have included alterations in the relative socio-economic positions of families long-established in the area and the arrival of large numbers of migrants. New forms of social relationships sometimes have to be improvised. Often when Italians and Australians interact it is in situations which are new to them both. The attitudes which Italians adopt as a result of these encounters may therefore reflect not established, generally held Australian attitudes but idiosyncratic and temporary responses to a novel situation.

Interaction Between Italians and Australians in the Ovens Valley Area

The characteristics of Italian migrants, and the characteristics of the Ovens Valley area, have both contributed to the particular way in which interaction between migrants and hosts has developed there. The migrants are generally motivated by a desire to improve their economic position, and the increasing prosperity of the Ovens Valley area has provided them with ample opportunities. The sharefarming organisation of the tobacco growing industry gave them an opening, and at first the availability of unclaimed land and the lack of restriction upon tobacco producers made it possible for many sharemen to become farm-owners. The demand for labour on the tobacco farms, and the general prosperity of the area, has led the majority of the host population to accept the presence of large numbers of migrants without much resentment. The proximity of Melbourne, and the involvement of the Ovens Valley area in the surrounding 'metropolitan' region, has also helped to make amicable relations between hosts
and migrants possible. If any men become unemployed they can search for work in Melbourne and the surrounding areas, and do not have to remain in the Ovens Valley region to compete with members of other ethnic categories for employment. In addition, the fact that tobacco is a cash crop, sold on a large scale in a market regulated by the State Department of Agriculture, has created a situation in which economic success or failure does not depend very much on personal factors (such as local contacts, relatives in key positions, and so on). Neither migrants nor hosts have significant economic advantages that the other ethnic category is excluded from, so no resentment has developed on this score.

Italian migrants do not go out of their way to preserve their national and cultural identity, and so do not place cultural barriers (such as the maintenance of their language and the development of elaborate ethnic institutions) in the way of participation in the life of the host society.

The combination of all these factors has made it possible for Italians and Australians to interact quite extensively in those areas of life where such interaction is generally accepted by both hosts and migrants as necessary (economic life, religion and education). Interaction also takes place, though to a lesser extent, in those areas of life in which interaction between migrants and hosts is voluntary (such as political life, and local community and sporting associations).

However, the characteristics of the Italians and the Australians of the Ovens Valley area are less favourable to the development of interaction in the areas of friendship, kinship and family life. Rural Australians, and Italians both in Italy and abroad, tend to establish their friendships and marriage links upon existing kinship and local ties.
Not being native to the locality or related to blood to the Australians, Italians generally find their friends and their marriage partners amongst themselves, thus maintaining mono-ethnic kinship systems which largely circumscribe the friendship and marriage patterns of any succeeding migrants who are members of the same migration chains. Italo-Australians, however, have the opportunity of making friends with hosts through their contacts with them at school, and none of the married Italo-Australians in the sample had Italian wives.

The Study of Developing Patterns of Migrant-Host Interaction

The way in which interaction between migrants and hosts develops has been examined in this thesis, and it is suggested that similar patterns of development will be found in any migrant-host situation which shares the essential features of the situation in the Ovens Valley area. These essential features are that hosts and migrants are not segregated by residence, occupation or religion, and that neither category enforces discrimination against the other.

Three phases of interaction, which operate simultaneously, have been distinguished. The first is that of increasing interaction between migrants and hosts. It begins with interaction in areas of life where it is regarded as necessary (economic life, religion and education) and proceeds through interaction in areas in which it is voluntary (political life and community and sporting associations), to interaction in areas of life where it is unlikely (kinship and family life). There is also a movement from interaction in relationships which are indirect, through direct, but categorical relationships, to non-categorical relationships. The process begins with interaction in areas
of life where it is regarded as necessary, and the relationships are either indirect or direct but categorical. It gradually extends to non-categorical relations in areas of life where interaction is regarded as necessary, and to both categorical and non-categorical relationships in areas of life where interaction is voluntary. The last stage is non-categorical interaction in areas of life where migrant-host interaction is unlikely. The process is a gradual one. Interaction in areas of life where it is voluntary often does not occur until ten years after an individual's migration, and interaction in areas of life where it is unlikely may not occur for migrants at all, but only for their Australian-educated children.

The second phase is that of increasing interaction between migrants themselves. In this phase, the components of the areas of life in which interaction is necessary, voluntary and unlikely are the reverse of those in the first phase, and the movement is from non-categorical to categorical relationships, rather than from indirect, through categorical, to non-categorical ones. Interaction between migrants begins with non-categorical interaction in the areas of life in which such interaction is regarded as necessary (family and kinship), and proceeds to both categorical and non-categorical interaction in the areas of life where such interaction is voluntary (community and sporting associations). The last stage is categorical interaction in the areas of life where interaction between migrants is unlikely (particularly economic life). This process may be more rapid than the process of increasing interaction between migrants and hosts, but a migrant may still spend ten years in his new country before beginning to interact with other migrants in areas of life where interaction with them is voluntary. In the case of interaction between migrants it is migrants themselves who
are likely to complete the process. Their Australian-educated children may never interact with other migrants in the areas where interaction is unlikely.

The third phase is the relationship between these two processes. In many situations, they simply compete with one another for the migrant's time and attention; but under some circumstances they reinforce one another. A migrant may be more willing to increase his interaction with hosts if he has established satisfactory interaction with other migrants, and migrants often extend their interaction with hosts as a result of their interaction with other migrants who introduce them to hosts. On the other hand, a migrant who finds that he or his family is facing problems as a result of the difficulties caused by interaction with hosts may increase his interaction with other migrants. Finally, a migrant who interacts extensively with hosts may be used as bridge between the two ethnic categories by other migrants, and so find his interaction with migrants increased.

Points of transition between interaction with other migrants and interaction with hosts are most likely to occur in the areas of life in which interaction with both hosts and migrants is voluntary, but they may also occur on occasion in other areas of life as well.

Interaction as an Aspect of Assimilation

This thesis has regarded assimilation as a re-socialisation process, dependent, like all other socialisation processes, upon interaction. It was postulated that migrants learn the behaviour patterns and the value systems of the host society through interaction with members of that society.

The form that assimilation takes will therefore depend upon the amount and kind of interaction between migrants
and hosts, and upon the values and attitudes of the hosts that migrants come in contact with. In the Ovens Valley area, interaction between migrants and hosts is increasing gradually, and in the process migrants are introduced to the attitudes of the Australian population of the area. Those attitudes are not clear-cut, however. Different attitudes on many subjects are shown by people who are locally-oriented and people who are oriented to the metropolitan region which surrounds and includes Melbourne. Moreover, on many subjects local attitudes are still fluid and idiosyncratic, as a result of the extensive social change that has taken place in the area.

The assimilation of migrants will also be affected by their interaction with other migrants. The values and attitudes they will encounter in this interaction will not be simply those of their original country, but will be adapted to meet the conditions encountered in the host society. A modified version of host attitudes will therefore be acquired through this interaction, together with a modified version of some attitudes current in the country of origin.

It is clear that the migrant's assimilation, or re-socialisation, into his new country will be a slow process, will be assimilation to the local sub-culture formed by his Australian neighbours rather than to the prevalent culture of the host society, and will be modified by his assimilation to the local migrant culture. The conditions of this assimilation are such that a migrant is unlikely ever to acquire attitudes and behaviour patterns that are identical with those of members of the host society.

Although interaction between migrants and hosts is a crucial part of the process of re-socialisation, it is only one of several sub-processes in the overall process
of assimilation. It is interdependent with other sub-processes, as they are with one another. It appears that other sub-processes (such as acculturation and the civic assimilation of migrants) must have reached certain minimal levels for interaction between migrants and hosts to be possible at all. Interaction may then lead to the further development of these sub-processes (such as increased acculturation) and to some marital assimilation. This further development may then lead in turn to further interaction, and so on.

Suggestions for Further Research

Three main lines of further research are suggested by this study.

First, additional studies of Italian migrants in Australia are needed. Most Italian migrants in Australia live in the metropolitan centres, but almost all the studies of Italians that have been carried out have taken small settlements of Italians in non-metropolitan areas as their subjects. Only a small and unrepresentative sample of Italian migrants has been investigated.

Second, additional studies of rural areas of Australia are needed, especially studies of areas which, like the Ovens Valley region, are undergoing rapid social change and becoming increasingly involved with metropolitan regions. Very little has been published on rural Australia during the last fifteen years, and there has been practically no discussion of the effects of social change and increasing metropolitan involvement on rural areas.

Third, the process of assimilation needs further study. This needs to be developed in two directions. First the patterns of interaction between migrants and hosts in different migrant-host situations need to be investigated.
The outline of the process of developing interaction presented in this thesis is necessarily tentative, since it is derived from the investigation of a single migrant-host situation. Second, the various sub-processes of assimilation need further clarification, and their relationships with one another need to be precisely formulated. It is to be hoped that further studies will elaborate, extend, and perhaps replace the preliminary outline of their relationships offered here.
The sampling frame for the survey which was carried out in the course of this study was the list of all tobacco growers (owners and sharefarmers) in Victoria, 1965-66. This was more suitable than the list of registered tobacco producers for the same period, which only lists the owners of farms. It was also more suitable than the lists of registered voters for the Local Government Areas in the region, as these only list householders and people of Australian nationality; inevitably they under-represent the Italian population of the area, as well as the sharefarming population as a whole, for sharemen usually live in houses owned and provided free by the farm owners. There is no complete list of all the residents of the area. The list of tobacco farm owners and sharefarmers, in spite of the disadvantage that it includes only tobacco growers, was the most representative sampling frame of the whole local population that could be obtained, and it was also the one that most nearly approached a complete list of the Italian population of the area.

Some parts of the list were discarded from the sampling frame, however. The names on the list are grouped according to the regional sub-divisions of Victoria used by the tobacco

---

1 That is, the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board List, 1965-66. (See Bibliography under 'Miscellaneous: Victorian Department of Agriculture', p.492).
2 That is, the Excise List, 1965-66.
3 That is, the Voters' Rolls, 1966-67.
growers' associations and by the Victorian Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board. These sub-divisions are:-

Wangaratta (farms on the outskirts of the City of Wangaratta)
Markwood
Cheshunt (farms in the King Valley)
Gapsted (farms in the Ovens Valley, downstream)
Whorouly (farms from Myrtleford)
Myrtleford (farms in the centre of the Ovens Valley)
Buffalo River (farms in the valley of the Buffalo River)
Ovens (farms in the Ovens Valley, immediately upstream from Myrtleford)
Upper Ovens (farms at the head of the Ovens River, upstream from the Ovens area; plus farms in the Kiewa Valley)
Outer Districts (farms in various parts of Victoria, Nathalia (farms beyond the Ovens Valley area)
Gunbower (the district round Echuca that was an important tobacco growing area in the past but is now declining).  

In order to cut down travelling time, growers in the areas of Cheshunt, Markwood, Wangaratta, Gunbower, Nathalia and Outer Districts were omitted from the sampling frame. There were 138 tobacco farms listed in the areas which were omitted, compared with 260 in the areas from which the sample was drawn. In the unsampled area there were, on the average, 1.5 sharemen to a farm, compared with an average of 2.7 in the sampled area. In the unsampled area, 68.8% of the farms were owned by growers with Italian-sounding surnames compared with 49.2% of the farms in the sampled area, and of the growers (owners and sharemen) listed in the unsampled area, 65.7% had Italian-sounding surnames, compared with 52.5% in the sampled area. Generally speaking, the unsampled area contains smaller farms

---

1 See Chapter 3, above, pp.54-62, for detailed discussion of the topography of the tobacco growing area, and the location of the different sub-divisions.
than the sampled one, and its farms are losing their value because the buyers nowadays prefer tobacco grown on the upstream soils of the Ovens Valley area. In many cases retiring Australian owners have sold these comparatively unsuccessful farms to Italian buyers only in the last few years. It is possible that the sample under-represents the relatively new, less well-established migration chains by excluding this area from the sampling frame. However, the exclusion of tobacco growers associated with farms some distance from Myrtleford enables the study to focus better on the community aspects of the tobacco growers' lives, for the growers that remain in the sample almost all have Myrtleford as their local centre.

The list which was used as a sampling frame is almost entirely composed of males. Occasionally, however, women or limited companies (whose shareholders might be either male or female) are listed as owners or part-owners of farms; and sometimes the mothers, wives or daughters of sharemen are listed as individual sharefarmers. It was decided to exclude women and limited companies from the sample. Even when

---

1 The difference between the sampled area and the unsampled one is mainly due to the size of tobacco farms in the two groups of regions, but it is also influenced by the fact that in the Gunbower region (which includes Echuca) tobacco farming is carried on with rather different working arrangements from those in use in the Ovens Valley area. Growers who have moved from Echuca to the Ovens Valley area state that in Echuca farms are not divided up between sharemen, as they are in the Ovens Valley area, but that each owner and his sharemen do all the work of the whole farm together, as a single team, throughout the whole season. In this way, the owner's own work almost does away with the need for one shareman. In the Ovens Valley area, this effect is achieved only when the owner himself cultivates a few acres on his own farm rather than having a shareman to cultivate them. However, this occurs on rather less than one-third of the farms in the Ovens Valley area (apart from the small farms on which the owner cultivates all his crop himself without the help of any sharemen at all).

2 A sharefarming company operating in the area was also excluded from the sample.
women are listed as owners or sharefarmers, they are hardly ever, in effect, more than assistants to their husbands, brothers, or sons, and these men are almost always listed as owners or sharefarmers alongside the women working with them. However, the exclusion of women was difficult to carry out, particularly in the case of sharefarmers. The owners of the farms are each responsible for providing the Victorian Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board with the names of their sharefarmers, and in many cases initials are given instead of Christian names, making it impossible to tell whether the individual listed is male or female. All the obviously female individuals were withdrawn from the sampling frame, however, and any individuals in the final sample who were later discovered to be female were simply dropped from the total number of interviewees.

A more complex problem of the same kind arose with respect to national origin. It was decided to interview only people of Italian and Australian origin; but other ethnic categories (particularly Yugoslavs, Greeks and Spaniards) are represented amongst the tobacco growers. It is not always possible to guess the national origin of an individual from the name, particularly if initials are given instead of Christian names. Occasional misspellings by farm owners of their sharefarmers' difficult foreign names are an additional hindrance. Finally, the total list of growers was split up into 'Italians', 'Australians', 'don't knows' and 'others'. Individuals deemed to be of 'other' national origin than Italian or Australian were discarded from the sampling frame; and those 'don't knows' who turned out in the course of the investigation to be of non-Italian origin were discarded from the total number of interviewees in the same way as those who were discovered to be female.

The use of initials instead of Christian names, combined with the occasional duplication of Christian names within
ramifying kinship networks, created an additional problem, for it is not always possible to tell when a name appears twice or more on the list of tobacco growers whether it refers to the same individual every time. Registration of tobacco growers is by farms, and some individuals have interests, as owners or sharemen or both, on more than one farm. The sampling frame was cleared of ambiguities of this kind as far as possible, and the names about which queries still remained were listed in the sampling frame as often as they occurred in the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board List. If their first listing came up in the sample, they remained in the sample whether or not they turned out in the course of the interview to have been multiply listed. If their second or subsequent listing came up in the sample, they were dropped from the final number of interviewees if it turned out that they had in fact been multiply listed, but they were retained in the sample if it turned out that they were simply namesakes of the individual first listed.

In the sampling frame as drawn up ready for the selection of the sample, no distinction was made between owners and sharefarmers. As it happened, when the selection had been made it was found that the sample reflected the proportions of owners and sharefarmers amongst tobacco growers as a whole quite accurately. It also accurately reflected the distribution of tobacco growers throughout the sub-districts of the tobacco growing areas of Victoria which were included in the sampling frame.

Different sampling ratios were adopted for the Italian and for the Australian sections of the sampling frame. For the Australian section, the ratio was 1:7, and for the remainder it was 2:11. Altogether, the final sample comprised:
Italian farm owners: 36 + 1 to be discarded if the name was found to be a duplicate

Italian sharefarmers: 58 + 3 to be discarded if the names were found to be duplicates

Don't Know farm owners: Nil

Don't Know sharefarmers: 11 + 1 to be discarded if the name was found to be a duplicate

(Don't Knows to be discarded if not of Italian origin)

Australian farm owners: 21

Australian sharefarmers: 8

(None of the few possible duplicate Australian individuals were selected in the sample)

TOTAL: 110 Italians (including 'don't knows'); 29 Australians.

Of the Italian farm owners in the sample, 4 could not be contacted (having left the area since the 1965-66 list of tobacco growers had been compiled); one was found to be a Spaniard; and one was found to be a woman. Of the Italian sharefarmers, 14 could not be contacted; one was found to be Spanish; and 2 were found to be women. The 'possible duplicate' Italian farm owner was, in fact, the namesake of another grower, and not a duplicate; he was interviewed, and so was one of the 3 'possible duplicate' Italian sharefarmers. The other 2 'possible duplicate' Italian sharefarmers could not be contacted. Of the 'don't know' sharefarmers, one was Spanish, and 3 could not be contacted; the remainder were all of Italian origin and were interviewed, except for the 'possible duplicate' 'don't know' sharefarmer who was found
to be Australian and discarded from the sample. Of the Australian owners, 2 could not be contacted, and one refused to be interviewed. Of the Australian sharefarmers, one could not be contacted. Altogether 25 Australians (18 owners and 7 sharefarmers) and 80 Italians (31 owners and 49 sharefarmers) were interviewed.

Lack of contact was usually due to the fact that potential interviewees had moved away from the area, to other parts of Australia or to Italy. These moves might be either permanent or temporary (to have a holiday or to look for a wife to bring back to Australia). Of all the Italian farm owners in the sample, one had left his farm and could not be traced; one lived outside the Ovens Valley area and could not be interviewed; and 2 others could not be contacted because they were visiting Italy. Of the Italian and 'don't know' sharefarmers who could not be contacted, 7 had moved to other parts of Australia (most of them to Melbourne); 3 were visiting Italy; and 9 could not be traced. Of the Australian owners, one could not be traced and another lived on a farm outside the Ovens Valley area. One Australian sharefarmer could not be traced, either.

There was a higher proportion of non-contacts amongst sharemen than amongst owners, as sharefarmers usually have no local investment to keep them in the area. If they have a bad season, or feel dissatisfied with prospects in the tobacco industry, it is easy for them to leave at the end of the season and find work elsewhere. There are few kinds of work open to unskilled labourers (such as tobacco sharemen) that offer the return tobacco growing does in a good year,

---

1 The individual's name is not given in the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board List, 1965-66, though his presence is noted. He was included in the sampling frame as a possible Italian, and discarded when he turned out to be non-Italian.
and prospective sharefarmers are usually at hand waiting for openings in the tobacco growing industry; but for one reason or another (for example, because the work is becoming too heavy for an aging man, or to obtain better prospects for the children in a larger centre, such as Melbourne) there are always a few people leaving at the end of each season.

Although the 105 informants finally interviewed were classified straightforwardly as 49 farm owners and 56 sharefarmers in the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board List of 1965-66, the range of actual occupational status amongst these growers at the time of the interviews was considerably wider and more complex. Only 47 growers were still sharemen; 5 were no longer growing tobacco; 2 had become tobacco growers on wages; 2 were tenants of tobacco farms; and one had become a farm manager. There were 11 owners growing their own tobacco crops without the help of sharemen; 28 owners employing sharemen; and 3 combining the ownership of farms with other business activities. In 6 cases the status of the individual in question could not be simply classified at all. For example, one grower was being paid by his grandfather to cultivate a crop of tobacco on his own farm, which his grandfather had leased to him; he was at once the owner of the farm and the employee of his own tenant.

The tobacco growers in the sample, married and unmarried, had an average of 2.0 children each; the married growers alone had an average of 2.4 children each. If only wives and children are taken into account, all the men in the sample had an average of 2.8 dependents each, and the married men had an average of 3.4 dependents each. However, this gives no direct indication of the dependency ratio, as it neither includes dependent relatives such as non-working parents, nor excludes those wives and children who formed part of the workforce. It is probably an under-estimate of the dependency ratio among tobacco growers. Even as such it is well above the
dependency ratio for the area as a whole in 1966, when this study was carried out.¹

The male marriage ratio amongst this sample of tobacco growers (86 married men out of a total of 105, giving a ratio of 81.9) is also considerably higher than that for the area as a whole;² and so is the apparent fertility ratio of the wives of the men in the sample.³ Even if all the women aged between 15 and 44 living in the informants' households are taken into account (unmarried sisters, daughters, and so on, as well as wives), together with all the children under 5 years of age, whether or not they are the informants' children, the fertility ratio of the tobacco growing population of the Ovens Valley, at 73.5, is higher than that of the population of the area as a whole.⁴

All the tobacco growers interviewed were adult men, so their age distribution cannot be directly compared with that of the whole population. Out of the 105 tobacco growers interviewed 27 were under 30, 54 were between 30 and 44 years old and 17 were between 45 and 59 years of age. Only 7 were 60 years old or more.

Altogether, 73 informants were born in Italy, 7 were born in Australia of Italian-born parents or grandparents, and 25 were of Australian origin. Of the Australian-born informants, 22 were born in the Ovens Valley area; 5 of these were of Italian origin. Of the Italian-born, 24 came straight to the

¹ See Table X, above, Chapter 3, p.87.
² See Table X, above, Chapter 3, p.87.
³ Of the wives of men in the sample, 74 were between 15 and 44 years of age, and the men in the sample had, between them, 65 children under 5, making an apparent fertility ratio of 87.9; for comparison with the area as a whole, see Table X, above, Chapter 3, p.87.
⁴ See Table X, above, Chapter 3, p.87.
of the Ovens Valley area on arriving in Australian and 48 had lived in other parts of the country before coming to the area; 18 of these had lived only in Melbourne. Of the informants of Australian origin 8 came to the Ovens Valley area from other parts of Australia, one of them from Melbourne. One of the Australian-born informants of Italian origin had come to the Ovens Valley area from Echuca. Another normally lived in Echuca, where he still had a farm, but he also owned a farm in the Ovens Valley area jointly with his brother, who lived on the Ovens Valley property.

The age distribution of the 32 Australian-born individuals in the sample was slightly different from that of the Italian-born part of the sample. Half of the Australian-born were under 30 years of age, but only about one-sixth of the Italian-born were; nearly two-thirds of the Italian-born were between 30 and 45. The higher median age of the migrants probably reflects the fact that they began their careers in Australia as adults rather than as adolescents (unlike the Australian-born), and that they took a certain amount of time to become established. The various regional groups in the sample of Italian migrants do not show differences in age distribution that are statistically significant.

Of the 25 informants of Australian origin 17 (68.0%) were farm owners or part-owners, compared with 4 (57.1%) of the 7 Australian-born informants of Italian origin and 27 (37.0%) of the 73 Italian-born informants. These figures are in line with those showing the occupational status of people with Italian surnames and those with Australian surnames.

1 One informant did not state whether or not he had come directly to the Ovens Valley area on arriving in Australia.

2 See discussion of the various regions of Italy represented by the migrants in the sample above, Chapter 3, pp.113-9.
amongst tobacco growers as a whole, though the sample shows owners as a lower proportion of growers in each category than the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board List of registered growers does.

The naturalisation ratio for the Italian-born part of the sample, at 49.3, was considerably higher than that for the Italian-born population of the Ovens Valley area as a whole in 1966. This is probably due to the fact that the sample consisted mainly of the more successful and settled members of the Italian population. Only 4 individuals in the sample had not been in Australia long enough to be eligible for naturalisation. When only the eligible migrants are considered, the naturalisation ratio for the sample is 52.9. There are no statistically significant differences between the naturalisation ratios of migrants from different parts of Italy.

The sample was composed of adult men, almost all of whom were married with young children. It included only tobacco farm owners and fairly well established tobacco sharemen. The migrants included in it were amongst the most successful and well settled members of the Italian-born population. Inevitably the sample exhibits characteristics somewhat different from those of the population of the Ovens Valley area as a whole, but despite its unavoidable biases it is able to indicate many of the characteristics of the larger part of the tobacco growing population in the area, and of the larger and more settled part of the Italian migrant population.

Table XI, above, Chapter 3, p.91, shows that 44.2% of all registered growers in 1965-66 were farm owners or part-owners, and that 76.6% of these were growers with Australian names and 47.4% were growers with Italian names; in the sample, 45.7% of tobacco growers interviewed were owners or part-owners, and of these 68.0% had Australian names and 38.8% had Italian names.

See Table XIX, above, Chapter 3, p.107
The interview schedule, which is appended, is wide-ranging and loosely structured, designed as an adjunct to participant-observation of the community (including both hosts and migrants) in the Ovens Valley area. Only a selection of the data collected in the interviews has been used in the present thesis, although Chapters 4-6 are based almost entirely upon interview material. 146 items of information about each informant, and 45 items of information about each married informant’s wife, were coded and punched onto IBM cards. A total of 342 two-way tabulations were carried out by computer, and many additional, less cumbersome statistical exercises were carried out more directly. Many data are still unutilised. However, all the data that are relevant to this thesis have been presented here.

The questionnaire used in the interviews is as follows:

---

1 See discussion of the methods of this study, above, Chapter 1, pp.12-5.
Questionnaire, p. 2.

**ALL INFORMANTS**

Name or initials

Sex

Date of Birth

Place of birth: Country
Region
Town/village/paese, etc.

Current residence: i.e. this address
this area
Australia (give town)
other (give details)

Marital status (single, married, divorced,
separated, widowed)

Number of children

Date of arrival in Australia

Date of arrival in this area

Previous place of residence in Australia, if any

Any country of residence other than Australia
and Italy
Places
Dates
Questionnaire, p.3.

IF INFORMANT OR WIFE FROM ABROAD

Nationality
Date of Naturalisation, if any
Sponsor (relationship to sponsor)
Of people at home: Who helped the migrant to come out (relationship to migrant)
What kind of help was given? (helping to pay fare, etc.)
Of people in Australia: Who helped the migrant? (relationship to migrant)
What kind of help? (help to immigrate, to settle?)
Has the subject sponsored any other migrant? (relationship to such a migrant)
Has the subject helped any other migrant? (relationship to such a migrant)
What kind of help was given? (help to immigrate, help to settle?)
Why did the subject decide to come to Australia?
Questionnaire, p.4.

ALL INFORMANTS

Place of birth: Country
Region
Town/village/paese, etc.

IF ALIVE: Present residence (i.e. at this address
in this area
Australia (give town)
other (give details)

Date of arrival in Australia (if applicable)
Date of arrival in this area (if applicable)
Usual occupation: (a) of non-migrants
(b) of migrants: (i) before migration
(ii) since migration
Questionnaire, p. 5.

ALL INFORMANTS

Number of siblings (+ = older than subject; - = younger)

Male or female

Place of birth: country
region
town/village/paese, etc.

IF ALIVE: present residence (i.e. at this address
in this area
Australia (give town)
other (give details)

Date of arrival in Australia (if applicable)
Date of arrival in this area (if applicable)

Usual occupation: (a) of non-migrants
(b) of migrants: (i) before migration
(ii) since migration
Questionnaire, p.6.

ALL INFORMANTS

Any other relatives of subject:

A. In this area, not growing tobacco
B. Growing tobacco in this area
C. In Australia, not in this area
D. In country of origin
E. Abroad (other than in country of origin)

ONLY VERY GENERAL INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR THIS TABLE
Questionnaire, p. 7.

ALL INFORMANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMANT</th>
<th>WIFE</th>
<th>CHILDREN WHO HAVE COMPLETED EDUCATION</th>
<th>CHILDREN WHO HAVE NOT YET COMPLETED EDUCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many years of education?

What stage of education has been attained
(i.e. part-primary, complete primary, part-secondary, complete secondary, part-tertiary, complete tertiary)

Details of any training, apprenticeships, degrees, diplomas, certificates, etc.

Is subject qualified for any trade of profession?
If so, what?

Number of years during which the medium of instruction was:
   A. English
   B. Italian
   C. Other (give details)

What stage of education would the informant like the still incompletely educated children to attain?

Or what kind of professional or vocational training?

Probe for each child, and differences between boys and girls.

Check against achieved education of the older children.
Questionnaire, p.8.

ALL INFORMANTS

First regular job
Last job before coming to Australia
Last job before coming to this area
First job in Australia
First job in this area

History of work on tobacco growing:
  Date of entry
  Length of time as sharefarmer
  Number of farms on which subject has been sharefarmer
  Any long periods of absence from tobacco after start
  History of farm ownership, if any: Date of start
    Number of farms owned or part-owned
    Location of each farm owned
    Number of sharemen on each farm owned
    Was owner also working as shareman?

Present occupation

Is the informant satisfied with conditions in Australia? 
in this area?  
in the tobacco 
industry?

Apart from possible trips abroad, would you like to spend 
the rest of your life in Australia?

INFORMANT  ADULT CHILDREN
1  2  3  4  5  6  7...
Questionnaire, p.9.

ALL INFORMANTS

Status of informant: owner
part-owner
lessee
part-lessee
shareman
manager
other

Are owners relatives of informant?
(State relationship, if any)

Are they co-ethnics of the informant
(state English, Italian, other)

Are sharemen relatives of informant?
(State relationship, if any)

Are they co-ethnics of the informant?
(state English, Italian, other)

If there is a manager on this farm, is he a relative of the informant?

What relationship?

Is he English, Italian or other?

This farm  Another farm  Another business (specify)

Owners
 1  2  3  4  5  6...

Sharemen
 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8...

Manager

410
Questionnaire, p.10.

ALL INFORMANTS

Farm organisation:

Employment of paid labour:  (a) all the year round
(b) sometimes
    when?
(c) only at harvest
(d) never

Division of running costs between:
Owners Sharefarmers Manager

Ownership of equipment (tractors, etc.):
Owners Sharefarmers Manager

Division of profits between:
Owners Sharefarmers Manager

Division of work on the farm between:
Owners Sharefarmers Manager
    (e.g. at what times of the year
    does the owner help on the farm,
    and what kinds of things does he do?)

Is there a written or a verbal agreement about all these arrangements?

Does the informant intend to stay on this farm for the foreseeable future or is he
    thinking of leaving?
    If he is planning to move, ask why.

How does the informant feel about the running arrangements on this farm?
Very satisfied Satisfied Indifferent Dissatisfied Very dissatisfied
Questionnaire, p.11.

ALL INFORMANTS

What does this farm produce besides tobacco? Dairy produce
Poultry
Hops
Fruit (specify)
Vegetables (specify)
Nuts (specify)
Other (specify)

Do other members of the household help with the tobacco?
Which members?
What help do they give?

Do other members of the household help with other farm activities?
Which members?
What help do they give?

In informant's opinion, do the members of the other ethnic group arrange tasks within their households in the same way?

Do members of the informant's own ethnic group usually arrange things this way?
Questionnaire, p.12.

ALL INFORMANTS

Did wife go out to work before marriage?
What kind of work did she do?

Does wife own/part-own (a) this farm
(b) any other farm
(c) any other kind of business (state what)

Does wife work (a) only in house
(b) on the farm (unpaid)
(c) on the farm as an earner of some kind (specify)
(d) for wages in some other business (specify)

Does informant think these arrangements are typical (a) of own ethnic group
(b) of other ethnic group

If atypical, why have they come about in this case?
Division of labour between men and women on this farm:
Woman working out of doors but not on tobacco
Woman working on seedlings but not in paddocks
Woman working in paddocks only at harvest (tying)
Woman picking at harvest as well as tying
Woman working in paddocks other than at harvest

Doing what?

In the informant's opinion, is this the usual arrangement (a) among his ethnic group?
(b) amongst the other ethnic group?

If he considers these arrangements atypical, why have they come about in this case?
Probe for attitudes towards working women: (a) working wives
(b) working girls
and the different kinds of jobs each might be allowed to take.
Questionnaire, p.14

**ALL INFORMANTS**

Household composition:
- Name
- Relationship to informant

**For non-relatives of informant:**
- Birthplace
- Length of residence in household
- Occupation

House ownership: 0
- Owned by head of household
- Owned by landlord, and leased or sub-leased by household head
- Owned by owner of farm, rented by shareman-household head
- Owned by owner of farm, occupied rent-free by shareman
- Other (specify)

Is the informant planning to move, or to stay in this house for the foreseeable future?

If he is planning to move, ask why.
Questionnaire, p.15.

ALL INFORMANTS

Mechanised transport available to informant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Make</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does informant have:</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Frig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washing Machine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often does subject watch TV?

Every night
2-3 times a week
Only at weekends
Only about once a week
Special programmes only
Only when visiting a place where they have TV
Questionnaire, p.16.

ALL INFORMANTS

What does subject listen to on the radio?
- Local news
- Italian music
- American/Australian/English music
- Serials (in English)
- National news
- Sport
- Other (specify)
- English language programmes

Does the subject attend classes in the language of the other ethnic group? (Evening classes in English at the primary school and in Italian at the high school)

FOR ITALIANS: Are there any classes in Italian culture in the area?
- If so, does the subject attend?
- Any member of household, family
Questionnaire, p.17.

**ALL INFORMANTS**

How often does subject go to the cinema?
- Rarely
- Once a month or more
- Once a week
- More than once a week

Does the subject go to the cinema in Myrtleford?

Does the subject go to Italian films?
- English films?
- Both?

What newspapers does the subject read?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Local or National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Local or National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire, p. 18.

INFORMANTS OF ITALIAN ORIGIN

What language is usually spoken in the home? English

Italian

Dialect

Other (specify)

Is one language usually spoken to some members of the household and another to others?

If so, what is spoken to whom?

Have you ever visited Italy?

When?

For how long?

Which part of Italy?

Who did you visit there?

Which members of the family went with you?
Questionnaire, p.19.

ALL INFORMANTS

What social clubs does the subject belong to?
Name of clubs
Do all the other members belong to same
ethnic group as subject?
What language is usually spoken in the club?
How often does subject attend?
Less than once a month
More than once a month, less than once a week
Once a week or more
When did subject last attend?
Probe for use of hotels and cafes, as informal clubs

What sports is the informant interested in? Names:
As player or spectator?
Do these sports bring informant into contact with
members of other ethnic group or only with his
own?
Questionnaire, p.20.

ALL INFORMANTS

When did you last have a holiday? (i.e. a week or a fortnight away from the farm)

For how long?

Where did you go?

Who did you spend it with? Relatives (which?)

Friends

Members of this household

With strangers (lodgings, hotel, etc.)

What is the most important public holiday (long weekend) in Australia?
Questionnaire, p.21.

**ALL INFORMANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to subject</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Approximately how often are they seen? Weekly/monthly/yearly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Which of your relatives do you see most often?
- Informant's relatives
- Wife's relatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connection with subject</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Approximately how often are they seen? Weekly/monthly/yearly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Apart from relatives, who else do you see?
- Informant's connections
- Wife's connections
Questionnaire, p.22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ALL INFORMANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Who are the informant's next-door neighbours?

(NOT the other residents of this farm)

Who does subject know best in the other ethnic group?

Name

Occupation

How often subject sees them
(a) once a week or more
(b) once a month or more
(c) less than once a month

Do subject and friend visit each other's homes?

(a) once a week or more
(b) once a month or more
(c) less than once a month
ALL INFORMANTS

Do you have any friends who have married members of the opposite ethnic group?
How many such marriages do you know about personally?
About what proportion of the marriages round here are intermarriages, do you think?
Do you think intermarriages have become more common recently?
Do you think intermarriage is a good idea?

Reason for opinion

How would you feel if your daughter (or sister, depending on age of informant) wanted to marry:

(a) a non-member of your own ethnic group Reasons?
(b) a member of the opposite ethnic group Reasons?

How would you feel if your son (or brother, depending on age of informant) wanted to marry:

(a) a non-member of your own ethnic group Reasons?
(b) a member of the opposite ethnic group Reasons?

Have any of your relatives married (a) outside your ethnic group?

Which relatives?
Who did they marry?

(b) into the opposite ethnic group?
Which relatives?
Who did they marry?
Questionnaire, p.24.

ALL INFORMANTS

Political affiliation: Support for a party
Which?
Not interested

What party do you think most of the opposite ethnic group support?

Which tobacco growers' association do you support?

Which do you think most members of your ethnic group support?

Which do you think most members of the opposite ethnic group support?

Do you think Italian tobacco growers have different interests from British-Australian ones?
Questionnaire, p.25.

ALL INFORMANTS

What religion is the subject?

Church attendance:  
- Never
- Occasions such as Christmas and Easter
- Occasions such as weddings and funerals
- Once or more a year
- More than twice a year, less than once a month
- Once a month, less than three times a month
- Three times a month or more

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secular/semi-secular church functions:</th>
<th>Name of organisation (e.g., youth club)</th>
<th>Is subject a member or a participant</th>
<th>Is attendance regular, irregular, or infrequent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other members of family/household</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(state which members)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CATHOLICS: Which Sunday Mass does subject usually attend?  
- English
- Bilingual
- Italian

MIGRANTS: What does subject think are the main differences between the Church in Italy and in Australia
ALL INFORMANTS

Does informant think the following people are more Ausrealian or more Italian?

Italian-born, came to Australia before age 5
" came to Australia before high school age
" came to Australia during high school period
" came to Australia after leaving school
" came to Australia as an adult, resident here 10 years or more, not naturalised
" came to Australia as an adult, now naturalised
" married to an Australian girl

Australian-born of Italian parents; speaks Italian at home

Comments on above question

INFORMANTS OF ITALIAN ORIGIN: Do you think of yourself as more Australian or more Italian now, or do you feel that you haven't changed much at all since coming to Australia?
Questionnaire, p.27.

INTERVIEWER'S ESTIMATES

Informant's occupational status (owner, sharefarmer, etc.)
Informant's birthplace
Informant's ethnic origin
Informant's marital status

Assessment of informant's social standing: well off
middling
not well off
poor

Assessment of living conditions: very comfortable
comfortable
uncomfortable
very uncomfortable

Assessment of English: None
Poor
Middling
Good
Fluent

Informant  Wife  Others present at interview  
1  2  3  4  5  6...
(names)
INTERVIEWER'S OBSERVATIONS

Date of interview
Persons present at interview
Time taken in interview
Any reason to suspect answers not reliable?
Attitude of interviewee during interview
What was the most striking thing about the interview?
Any other information?
APPENDIX II

THE INFORMANTS

Some characteristics of the informants in the sample survey of tobacco growers (owners and sharefarmers) carried out 1966-67. Informants listed according to birthplace.

ITALIAN-BORN INFORMANTS

Italia Settentrionale (Northern Italy)

Piemonte (Cuneo)

1. Born Mondovi (Cuneo) in 1927; arrived Australia as government assisted migrant in 1952; arrived Ovens Valley area in 1958; sponsored migration of brother; no other relatives in Australia; married 1964. Wife born Melicuccà (Reggio Calabria); arrived Australia and Echuca in 1962, sponsored by father who still lives in Echuca. Informant sharefarmer 1959-62, farm owner (with brother) 1962- ; no sharemen.

Lombardia (Brescia)

2. Born Rovato (Brescia) in 1928; arrived Australia and Ovens Valley area as government assisted migrant in 1955; sponsored migration of wife; no relatives in Australia; married 1960. Wife born Confiente (Catanzaro); arrived Australia 1960, sponsored by informant who had been introduced and become engaged to her by letter. Informant

---

1 See details of sample above, Appendix I, pp. 390-401.
shareman 1956-58, farm owner 1958-, now owns two farms, two sharemen on each (2 Yugoslavs and 2 Spaniards).

Trentino-Alto Adige (Trento)

3. Born Coredo (Trento) in 1934; arrived Australia and Ovens Valley area in 1961; left Ovens Valley area in 1963 and Australia in 1964, but returned to Ovens Valley area in 1965; original migration sponsored by his brother; informant has sponsored no migrants himself and is unmarried. Sharefarmer 1961-63 and 1965-. Here the farm owner is son of Italian migrant from Valli del Pasubio (Vicenza); the other sharemen are the owner's son, the informant's brother and an Italian from Udine.

4. Born Pomarolo (Trento) in 1926; arrived Australia and Ovens Valley area in 1951, sponsored by friend from Trento who owned farm in Ovens Valley area; has sponsored migration of 3 brothers, his wife, and his parents; no other relatives in Australia; married on a visit to Italy in 1956. Wife born Rome; informant met and married her in Trento. Informant shareman 1951-56; informant and brothers bought farm 1956 and another farm a few years later; 10 sharemen on first farm (4 Greeks, 2 Yugoslavs and 4 Italians, 3 from Veneto and 1 from Toscana) and 16 on the other.

5. Born Rovereto (Trento) in 1922; arrived Australia and Ovens Valley area in 1932, sponsored by father; has sponsored no other migrants; married Australian born in Ovens Valley area to a non-farming family. Informant not a tobacco grower until he bought farm in 1958; sister's husband (Italian-born) as partner; 4 sharemen (one from Trieste, one from Veneto and 2 from Piemonte) and a man from Treviso employed on wages.
6. Born Rovereto (Trento) in 1920; arrived Australia and Ovens Valley area in 1935, sponsored by father; has only sponsored the migration of his wife; married on a visit to Italy in 1953. Wife born in Trento. Informant sharefarmer 1935-47; owner (with father) 1947-; 5 sharemen, one Spaniard, one Yugoslav and 3 Italians.

7. Born Rovereto (Trento) in 1948; arrived Australia and Ovens Valley area in 1954; sponsored by his father; father had been sponsored in 1952 by an Italian farm-owner in the Ovens Valley area; informant has sponsored no migrants and is unmarried. Left school 1963; shareman 1963-; here the farm owners are Italian; the other sharemen are 2 Spaniards, 2 Greeks and 4 Italians (including the informant's father).

Veneto (Belluno)

8. Born Auronzo di Cadore (Belluno) in 1907; arrived Australia 1926, sponsored by his brother; arrived Ovens Valley area 1931; has sponsored the migration of his wife, his wife's brother and his sister's son; met wife on trip to Italy, 1934; married by proxy 1937. Wife born in same comune as informant, migrated 1937. Informant shreman 1931-1950; farm owner 1950-; 5 sharemen, one Spanish and 4 Italian (one from Vicenza, one from Friuli and 2 from Marche).

9. Born San Tomaso (Belluno) in 1940; arrived in Australia and Ovens Valley area as government assisted migrant in 1961; no relatives in Australia; has only sponsored the migration of his wife; married 1965. Wife born in same comune as informant, engaged before migration. Informant sharefarmer 1962-; here the farm owners are two Italian brothers from Vicenza; the other 2
sharemen are respectively a Spaniard and a southern Italian.

Veneto (Treviso)

10. Born Arcade (Treviso) in 1928; arrived Australia as government assisted migrant in 1952; arrived Ovens Valley area in 1954; has cousins in Australia but has only sponsored the migration of a fiancée to whom he was engaged by letter, and who declined to marry him when she arrived; informant is unmarried. Shareman 1954-66; wage labourer 1966– on farm owned by two men from Trento; there are 4 sharemen, one Spaniard and 3 Italians (one from Trieste and 2 from Piemonte).

11. Born Castelfranco Veneto (Treviso) in 1938; arrived in Australia and the Ovens Valley area in 1956; sponsored by elder brother; has not sponsored any migrants himself; no other relatives in Australia; married to a woman from Ramacca (Catania, Sicily) whom he met in Australia. Informant joined brother as farm owner 1956; own farm 1966; has 2 sharemen, his wife's brother (a Sicilian) and his wife's sister's husband (from Treviso).

12. Born Fonte (Treviso) in 1922; arrived Australia (Wangaratta) in 1949; sponsored by cousin; has sponsored migration of his brother, 5 or 6 cousins and friends, and his wife and son; married before migration. Wife born in Riese Pio X (Treviso). Informant became tobacco grower in 1960; sharefarmer 1960–; the owners of this farm are Australians, and there are 2 other sharemen, one the informant's Italian-born son, and the other a Spaniard.

13. Born Monastier di Treviso (Treviso) in 1924; arrived Australia in 1948; sponsored by his mother's brother;
arrived Ovens Valley area in 1960; has several relatives in Australia; has sponsored no migrants other than his wife; married in 1955. Wife born in Roana (Vicenza); he made her acquaintance and became engaged to her by letter and she migrated in order to marry him. Informant shareman 1960-; this farm is owned by an Italian from the same comune as the informant's wife, together with his son and his Australian daughter-in-law; there are two other sharemen, an Australian and an Italian from Friuli, who operate a single share jointly, part-time.

14. Born Montebelluna (Treviso) in 1935; arrived Australia 1960, assisted by the Italian government agency, C.E.M.A.; arrived Ovens Valley area 1961 or 1962; now has several relatives here; has sponsored the migration of his wife and two of her brothers; met and married his wife in 1965 during trip to Italy. Wife born Valdobbiadene (Treviso), migrated on marriage. Informant sharefarmer since 1961 or 1962; this farm is owned by 2 Italian brothers from Trento; there are 3 other sharemen, one from Trento, one from Vicenza and one from Treviso (the informant's wife's brother).

15. Born Nervesa della Battaglia (Treviso); arrived Australia 1952; sponsored by a brother; came to the Ovens Valley area 1958; has several relatives in Australia; has sponsored no migrants himself; married woman born Decollatura (Catanzaro) who arrived Australia and Ovens Valley area 1956, sponsored by her father; informant met and married her in Myrtleford. Informant shareman 1959-; this farm is owned by an Australian; there are no other sharemen.
16. Born Nervesa della Battaglia (Treviso); arrived Australia 1955; sponsored by cousin; arrived Ovens Valley area 1956; has sponsored no migrants himself and has no relatives in Australia (his cousin has returned to Italy); married to a woman born in Ramacca (Catania, Sicily), who arrived in Australia in 1954, sponsored by her father; informant met and married her in the Ovens Valley area. Informant shareman 1956-; this farm is owned by an Italian from Treviso (married to the informant's wife's sister), and there is one other shareman, the informant's wife's brother.

17. Born San Polo di Piave (Treviso) in 1931; arrived in Australia as government assisted migrant in 1962 and came to the Ovens Valley area in 1963; has not sponsored any migrants himself; has a brother and a sister in Australia; is unmarried. Shareman 1965-; this farm is owned by two Italians from Calabria; there are 4 other sharemen, including one from Treviso, one from Padova and one from Piemonte.

18. Born Volpago del Montello (Treviso) in 1929; arrived in Australia in 1956, sponsored by his wife's sister; arrived in the Ovens Valley area in 1963; has sponsored no migrants himself but he and his wife both have siblings in Australia; he was married before migration and came to Australia with his wife. Wife born in the same comune as himself. Informant was a shareman 1963-4; bought own farm (sole owner) 1964; no sharemen.

19. Born Zerobranco (Treviso) in 1926; arrived in Australia 1960 as government assisted migrant; arrived in Ovens Valley area 1962; has no relatives in Australia and has sponsored no other migrants; married before migration and came to Australia with his wife. Wife born in Paese
(Treviso). Informant shareman 1962-; this farm is owned by an Italian from Trento; there are 4 other sharemen, a Yugoslav, a Spaniard and 2 Italians, neither connected with the informant.

Veneto (Vicenza)

20. Born Asiago (Vicenza) in 1924; arrived Australia 1948, sponsored by his mother who had migrated to join her husband in 1936; the informant has sponsored the migration of his brother and his cousin; informant arrived Ovens Valley area 1951; before coming to Ovens Valley area he married a woman born in Australia to Italian migrants from Cogollo (Vicenza). Informant sharefarmer 1951-56; bought tobacco farm with wife's brother 1956; became sole owner 1957; two sharemen on the farm, one Italian and one Spanish, neither connected with the informant.

21. Born Bassano del Grappa (Vicenza) in 1924; arrived Australia 1950, sponsored by a cousin; has himself sponsored migration of an elder brother; arrived Ovens Valley area 1952, but was in Gippsland 1954-59, then returned to Ovens Valley area. Wife was born in Vallarsa (Trento) and arrived in Australia 1938, sponsored by her father; informant met and married her in Australia. Informant shareman 1952-54; became tobacco farm owner 1959; sole owner, with one shareman (an Italian from Calabria).

22. Born Cogollo del Cengio (Vicenza) in 1930; arrived Australia 1951, sponsored by his mother's brother; has himself sponsored the migration of his wife and his younger brother; arrived in Ovens Valley area in 1959. Wife was born in Monte di Malo (Vicenza); informant met
her on a trip back to Italy in 1961 and in 1963 she came to Australia to marry him. She and informant both have relatives in Australia. Informant sharefarmer 1959-; the owners of this farm are Australians; there is one other shareman, an Italian from Sicily.

23. Born Isola Vicentino (Vicenza) in 1927; arrived Australia and Ovens Valley area 1934, sponsored by his father; has not sponsored any migrants himself; has some relatives in Australia. Wife brought to Australia in 1938 from Strigno (Trento); informant met and married her in the Ovens Valley area. Informant became shareman on leaving school; bought own farm (with father and brother) in 1945; they have added two more farms since and sold the first; on one farm there are 3 sharemen, one Spaniard, one southern Italian and one Italian from Belluno; on the other there are 4, all Italian, 2 from Vicenza, one from Treviso, and one from Trento.

24. Born Marostica (Vicenza) in 1934; arrived Australia 1957, sponsored by man from his own comune; has sponsored no migrants himself, has no relatives in Australia and is unmarried; arrived Ovens Valley area 1960. Sharefarmer 1960-; this farm is owned by an Italian from Friuli; the informant is the only shareman.

25. Born Montebello Vicentino (Vicenza) in 1922; arrived Australia and Ovens Valley area 1951; sponsored by a contractor in Myrtleford who was a friend of a friend of his in Italy; has not sponsored any migrants himself, has no relatives in Australia and is unmarried. Shareman since 1951, except for visit to Italy, 1957-59; the owner of this farm is Australian; there are 6 other sharemen, 3 Australians and 3 Italians (including 2 from Vicenza, unrelated to informant).
26. Born Recoaro Terme (Vicenza) in 1920; arrived Australia 1956, sponsored by a distant cousin of his wife; has sponsored no migrants himself other than his wife and children and has no relatives in Australia; arrived Ovens Valley area 1959; married before migration. Wife born in Vallarsa (Trento). Informant sharefarmer 1959-; this farm is owned by an Australian; there are 5 other sharemen, all Italian (one from Udine, one from Rovigo, 2 from Toscana, and the other from the south of Italy 'somewhere near Monte Cassino').

27. Born Recoaro Terme (Vicenza) in 1935; arrived Australia 1960; sponsored by his sister's husband; has not sponsored any migrants himself but has a number of relatives in Australia; arrived Ovens Valley area 1962; married in Australia. Wife born in Caltrano (Vicenza); arrived Australia 1948, sponsored by her father who had migrated 1936; informant met her in Wangaratta. Informant sharefarmer 1962-; the owners of this farm are Italians from Trento; there are 3 other sharemen, all Italians (one from Trento and 2 from Treviso).

28. Born Roana (Vicenza) in 1930; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area in 1951; sponsored by a friend from his own comune; the informant has sponsored no migrants himself, but he paid the fare for his fiancée to migrate though her official sponsor was a cousin of hers; the informant has no relatives in Australia, but his wife has some. Wife born in Laureana di Borrello (Reggio Calabria); introduced to informant by letter and migrated to marry him in 1958. Informant sharefarmer 1951-; this farm has Australian owners; there are 4 other sharemen, all Italian (2 from Veneto and 2 from Reggio Calabria).
29. Born Rotzo (Vicenza) in 1902; arrived Australia 1922 (alone, without a sponsor); arrived Ovens Valley area 1927; has not sponsored any migrants himself; has some relatives in Melbourne; he is unmarried. Sharefarmer 1927-64 (approx.); wage labourer on tobacco farm 1964 (approx.); this farm is owned by an Australian, and there are 7 sharemen, 3 Australians and 4 Italians (3 from Vicenza and one from Belluno).

30. Born Valdagno (Vicenza) in 1931; arrived Australia 1949; sponsored by his father's brother; has sponsored the migration of one of his brothers himself; has a number of relatives in Australia; arrived Ovens Valley area 1950; married in Australia. Wife born Myrtleford to parents from, respectively, Confiente and San Bernardo (both in Catanzaro). Informant shareman 1959-65; 1965- , relief barman at Savoy Club.

31. Born Valli del Pasubio (Vicenza) in 1899; arrived Australia 1922 and Ovens Valley area 1929; migration sponsored by agency recruiting workers for the Queensland sugar cane fields; informant has sponsored the migration of his father, two brothers, his wife, his son, several others from his own comune, and a number of his wife's relatives; he was married before migration. Wife born in same comune as himself; migrated to join him in 1925. Informant sharefarmer 1929-31; tobacco farm owner 1931- ; has 3 sharemen, all Italian, all his wife's sister's sons, born in Villaverla (Vicenza).

32. Born Valli del Pasubio (Vicenza) in 1933; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area 1952; migration sponsored by a man from his own comune who had been a friend of his mother's; informant himself has sponsored the migration of his wife, his son and his wife's sister;
he was married before migration. Wife born in same comune as informant; migrated to join him in 1953. Informant not in tobacco growing 1952-54; not in Ovens Valley area 1954-60; 1960-61 sharefarmer in Ovens Valley area; 1961-, tobacco farm owner (in partnership with man from his own comune); there are 2 sharemen, both Italians, one from Udine and the other from Treviso or Vicenza.

33. Born Valli del Pasubio (Vicenza) in 1937; arrived Australia 1959 and Ovens Valley area 1960; sponsored by his godfather; has himself sponsored migration of his fiancée, his brother and a man from his own comune; he was married in Australia. Wife born in same comune as himself; engaged before migration; migrated to marry him in 1960. Informant shareman 1960-; this farm owned by Italian family from Schio (Vicenza); there are 5 other sharemen, all Italian (3 from Schio (Vicenza), one from another part of Vicenza, and one from Toscana).

34. Born Villaverla (Vicenza) in 1936; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area 1957; sponsored by his brother; has sponsored no migrants himself, but has a number of relatives in Australia; he was married in Australia. Wife born Nervesa della Battaglia (Treviso); migrated in 1958 to join her sister in Melbourne, and met informant on a holiday in Myrtleford; married 1959. Informant shareman 1957-; this farm is owned by an Australian; there are 6 other sharemen, 3 Australians and 3 Italians (2 from Vicenza and one from Belluno).

35. Born Villaverla (Vicenza) in 1945; arrived Australia and Ovens Valley area in 1966; sponsored by his elder brother; has sponsored no migrants himself but has a number of relatives in Australia; he is unmarried.
Shareman 1966-; owner of the farm is his mother's sister's husband, born in Italy in Valli del Pasubio (Vicenza); there are 2 other sharemen, brothers of the informant, born in Italy in the same comune as himself.

Italia Centrale (Central Italy)

Toscana (Lucca)

36. Born Barga (Lucca) in 1938; arrived Australia as government assisted migrant in 1961; arrived Ovens Valley area 1965; sponsored migration of his fiancée and of his brother; has no other relatives in Australia; he was married in Australia. Wife born Gallicano (Lucca); engaged before informant's migration; migrated to marry him 1962. Informant shareman 1965-; this farm owned by an Australian; 5 other tobacco sharemen, all Italian (one from Udine, one from Rovigo, one from Pistoia, one from Vicenza and one from somewhere in southern Italy).

Toscana (Pistoia)

37. Born Sambuca Pistoiese (Pistoia) in 1920; arrived Australia in 1952; sponsored by private migration agency; arrived Ovens Valley area 1960; has sponsored the migration of his brother, of a cousin and of his fiancée; has no other relatives in Australia; he was married in Australia. Wife born Fontana Liri (Frosinone, Lazio); engaged before informant's migration; migrated to marry him 1958. Informant shareman 1960-; this farm is owned by an Italian; there are 2 other sharemen, both Italians (one is the informant's brother and the other is from Veneto).
Marche (Ascoli Piceno)

38. Born Arquata del Tronto (Ascoli Piceno) in 1933; arrived Australia 1952; sponsored by C.E.M.A. (an Italian government migration agency); arrived Ovens Valley area 1961; has sponsored the migration of his fiancée and of his brother; has no other relatives in Australia, though his wife has; married in Australia. Wife born in same comune as himself; engaged before informant's migration; migrated to marry him 1960. Informant sharefarmer 1961-; this farm is owned by the Australian-born son of Italian migrants; there are two other sharemen, the informant's brother and his wife's sister's husband, both born in the same comune as the informant.

39. Born Arquata del Tronto (Ascoli Piceno) in 1927; arrived Australia 1952; sponsored by C.E.M.A. (an Italian government migration agency); arrived Ovens Valley area 1960; has sponsored the migration of his wife, and helped to sponsor that of her four sisters and her three brothers; has no relatives of his own in Australia, he was married by proxy. Wife born in same comune as himself; proxy marriage followed by her migration in 1955. Informant sharefarmer 1960-66; 1966 bought own farm; there are 9 sharemen on it, one Spaniard and 8 Italians (the 3 brothers of the informant's wife, and 2 men from Calabria and 3 from Veneto).

40. Born Arquata del Tronto (Ascoli Piceno) in 1943; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area 1963; sponsored by his sister; has sponsored no migrants himself but has several relatives in Australia; he is unmarried. Shareman 1963-; this farm was bought in 1966 by his sister's husband, born in the same comune as the informant; there are 8 other sharemen, one Spaniard and 7
Italians (the informant's 2 brothers and 2 men from Calabria and 3 from Veneto).

41. Born Roccafluvione (Ascoli Piceno) in 1936; arrived Australia 1956; sponsored by his brother; has only sponsored the migration of his fiancée; has no longer any relatives in Australia; arrived Ovens Valley area 1961; married in Australia. Wife born in same comune as himself; came out to marry him in 1960. Informant shareman 1961-; this farm owned by Italians (unrelated to informant); there are 3 other sharemen, all Italian, none related to informant.

42. Born Rotella (Ascoli Piceno) in 1927; arrived Australia 1952; government assisted migrant; has sponsored the migration of his wife, his wife's sister and his wife's parents; has no longer any relatives of his own in Australia; arrived Ovens Valley area 1961; married on trip back to Italy in 1956. Wife born in same comune as informant; returned to Australia with him in 1956. Informant shareman 1961-; this farm is owned by a Swiss-Australian with Italian name; there is one other shareman, the informant's wife's sister's husband, from another comune in Ascoli Piceno.

43. Born in Rotella (Ascoli Piceno) in 1924; arrived in Australia 1956; sponsored by a man he did not know, the friend of his brother who was already in Australia; the informant has not sponsored any migrants himself, but has several relatives in Australia; arrived Ovens Valley area 1960; married before migration. Wife born in Spinetoli (Ascoli Piceno) and migrated with him in 1956. Informant shareman 1960-; the owner of the farm is an Italian from Auronzo di Cadore (Belluno); there are 4 other sharemen, one Spaniard and 3 Italians (the
informant's brother, one man from Friuli and another from Vicenza).

**Italia Meridionale (Southern Italy)**

**Campania (Benevento)**

44. Born Fragneto Monforte (Benevento) in 1918; arrived Australia 1956; migration sponsored by his wife's father; informant sponsored the migration of his wife and his sons; has hardly any other relatives in Australia; arrived Ovens Valley area 1963; married before migration. Wife born same comune as informant; migrated to join him 1966. Informant shareman 1963-; the owners of this farm are Italians (from Calabria) and the informant is the only shareman.

45. Born San Nicola Manfredi (Benevento) in 1938; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area 1963; sponsored by his fiancée who had migrated in 1962; informant himself has sponsored the migration of a friend from his own comune; he has some relatives in Australia; he was married in Australia. Wife born Pastane (Caserta); engaged to informant before she left Italy; her migration sponsored by her sister. Informant shareman 1964-; the owner of this farm is an Australian; there are 4 other sharemen, all Italian (2 from Campania, one from Marche and one from Veneto).

**Calabria (Catanzaro)**

46. Born Confienti (Catanzaro) in 1929; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area in 1951; sponsored by a second cousin; he himself has sponsored the migration of two brothers and a sister, the husband of another sister, and a cousin; he has many relatives in Australia; he was
married in Australia. Wife born in Decollatura (Catanzaro) and came to Australia in 1951 sponsored by her father who had migrated before the Second World War; informant met and married her in the Ovens Valley area. Informant sharefarmer off and on 1951-58; 1958 bought a tobacco farm in partnership with his wife's father, his wife's brother and his wife's sister's husband; there is one shareman, an Italian from another part of Catanzaro.

47. Born Confiente (Catanzaro) in 1941; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area 1952; sponsored by his father who had migrated in 1950; informant has sponsored no migrants himself, but has a large number of relatives in Australia; he was married in Australia. Wife born Motta Santa Lucia (Catanzaro); came to Wangaratta (where informant met her) in 1965 to join her brother. Informant and father worked on hop-and-tobacco farm 1952-58; 1958 informant and father bought tobacco farm; one shareman, an Italian from Benevento.

48. Born Confiente (Catanzaro) in 1913; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area 1959; sponsored by his son who had arrived 1956; informant has sponsored a cousin; has several relatives in Australia; was married before migration. Wife born in same comune as himself; migrated with him. Informant shareman 1959-; this farm owned by an Italian (not from Catanzaro); there are 4 other sharemen on the farm, all Italian (2 are the informant's sons, and the other 2 are 'probably Veneti').

49. Born Decollatura (Catanzaro) in 1902; arrived Australia 1927; arrived Ovens Valley area 1949 or 1950; sponsor unknown; informant has sponsored the migration of his wife and son, his brother and his family, and his wife's sister and her family; informant has several other
relatives in Australia; he was married before migration. Wife born in same _comune_ as himself; migrated to join him 1950. Informant shareman 1950 (approx.)-59; bought own farm in partnership with his son 1959; one shareman, an Italian from Reggio Calabria.

50. Born Decollatura (Catanzaro) in 1922; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area 1938; sponsored by his father who had arrived in 1927; informant has not sponsored any migrants, but his father has, and informant has a large number of relatives in Australia; informant was married in Australia. Wife born Rocella Ionica (Reggio Calabria); arrived in Australia, sponsored by her brother, 1949; informant met her in Melbourne. Informant shareman 1938-46; 1946, informant, with his father and brothers, bought a tobacco farm; informant no longer takes an active interest in it, developing various commercial enterprises instead; there are 3 sharemen on the farm, all Italian (2 from Veneto and one from the same _comune_ in Catanzaro as the owners).

51. Born Decollatura (Catanzaro) in 1932; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area in 1948; sponsored by his father who had migrated in 1924; informant has sponsored the migration of a number of cousins and of his wife and wife's brother; met and married his wife on a trip to Italy in 1965, and brought her back with him. Wife born in same _comune_ as himself. Informant's father owned a tobacco farm by the time the informant migrated, and informant and his brother have inherited it; there are 4 sharemen, all Italian (2 from Treviso, one from Cosenza and one from the same _comune_ in Catanzaro as the informant).
52. Born Decollatura (Catanzaro) 1931; arrived Australia and Ovens Valley area 1949, sponsored by father who had migrated in 1939; informant has sponsored the migration of three friends from his own comune; has a number of relatives in Australia; he was married in Australia. Wife born in same comune as informant; migrated 1951, sponsored by her father who had migrated 1938; informant met her in Wangaratta. Informant's father owns tobacco farm/market garden; informant set up his own farm in 1960, after his marriage; 1964 he sold it and took up lease on another; informant is sole lessee and there are no sharemen.

53. Born Decollatura (Catanzaro) in 1927; arrived Australia and Ovens Valley area 1949; sponsored by a great aunt (a maternal relative); has sponsored the migration of his brother, his widowed mother and his wife himself; has a few relatives in Australia; met and married his wife on a trip to Italy in 1962 and brought her back with him; she has sponsored the migration of her brother and her sister. Wife born in same comune as himself. Informant sharefarmer 1952 (approx.)-59; bought own farm 1959; only one part-time sharefarmer, and Italian from Udine.

54. Born Decollatura (Catanzaro) in 1925; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area 1950; sponsored by a cousin; has sponsored the migration of his wife and children; has only a few relatives in Australia; was married before migration. Wife born in the same comune as himself; migrated to join him in 1951. Informant sharefarmer 1950-54; bought his own farm 1955; has two sharemen, both Italians from Toscana.
55. Born Decollatura (Catanzaro) in 1932; arrived Australia 1951; sponsored by his father who had migrated in 1950; the informant has not sponsored any migrants; arrived in the Ovens Valley area in 1958; married in Australia. Wife born in the same comune as himself; arrived in Australia 1952; sponsored by her father who migrated in 1950; met informant in Ovens Valley area. Informant shareman 1951-; this farm is divided between the informant's wife's father and the informant's wife's two brothers; the informant and another Italian (from the same comune as the informant) are the only 2 sharemen on the informant's wife's father's half of the farm.

56. Born Decollatura (Catanzaro) in 1936; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area 1952; sponsored by father who had migrated 1950; has sponsored no migrants himself, though his father has sponsored a number of people from the same comune, mostly his relatives; informant has a number of relatives in Australia; he was married in Australia. Wife born Nicastro (Catanzaro); arrived Australia 1961; sponsored by her father who migrated in 1957; informant met her in the Ovens Valley area. Informant and father worked for wages in hop garden until 1957 when they bought a tobacco farm; now this farm has been divided, the informant's father having one half and the informant and his brother the other; there are 3 sharemen on the informant's half, all Italians born in the same comune as the informant, 2 of them married to his cousins.

57. Born Decollatura (Catanzaro) in 1935; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area 1954; sponsored by his father who had migrated in 1949; informant has not sponsored any other migrants, though his father has; informant has a number of relatives in Australia; he is
unmarried. Informant sharefarmer 1954-60; 1960 informant, his father and his sister's husband bought a dairy farm and leased some tobacco land; there are no sharemen.

58. Born Decollatura (Catanzaro) in 1924; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area in 1964 after spending 17 years in Argentina; actual sponsor was his wife's brother; informant has sponsored no migrants himself; has a few relatives in Australia; was married before migration. Wife born in same comune as himself; migrated with informant. Informant shareman 1964-; this farm is owned by Italians from the same comune as informant; there are 3 other sharemen, all Italian (one from Cosenza and 2 from Treviso).

59. Born Motta Santa Lucia (Catanzaro) in 1920; arrived Australia 1951, sponsored by his brother's Australian employer; informant has sponsored his own wife and children, and a friend from the same comune as himself; informant also has some relatives in Australia; arrived Ovens Valley area 1959; married before migration. Wife born in same comune as himself; migrated to join him in 1954. Informant shareman 1959-; this farm is owned by an Italian from Confiente (Catanzaro); there are 6 other sharemen, one Yugoslav and 5 Italians (one from Veneto, married to the owner's daughter; one from the same comune as the owner; one a brother's son of the owner; one Italian from Cosenza; and one Italian from Catanzaro unrelated to the owner or the informant).

60. Born Soveria Manelli (Catanzaro) in 1931; arrived Australia and Ovens Valley area in 1952; sponsored by his father's brother; has himself sponsored his brother and several other relatives; in association with his brother he has sponsored his sisters and his parents; he has a
large number of relatives in Australia; he was married in Australia. Wife born in same comune as himself; arrived in Australia 1956; sponsored by a cousin of her mother's; met informant in Melbourne; Informant sharefarmer 1952-59; bought farm with brother 1960; farm divided between the brothers 1965; informant has 2 Spanish sharemen on his half.

61. Born Soveria Manelli (Catanzaro) in 1933; arrived Australia 1953 and Ovens Valley area 1954; sponsored by his brother; in association with this brother he has sponsored the migration of his sisters and his parents; he has a number of other relatives in Australia; he was married in Australia. Wife born Borgia (Catanzaro); arrived Australia 1956; sponsored by her father who migrated 1952; met informant in Ovens Valley area. Informant sharefarmer 1954-59; in 1960 bought farm with brother; in 1965 they divided the farm between them; informant has 2 Italian sharemen on his half of farm (one from the same comune as himself and the other from another comune in Catanzaro).

62. Born Soveria Manelli (Catanzaro) in 1938; arrived Australia 1957; sponsored by 2 men from his own comune; has sponsored the migration of two or three men from his comune himself; has a few relatives in Australia; arrived Ovens Valley area 1960; married in Australia. Wife born in same comune as himself; arrived Australia 1962; sponsored by her sister's husband; met informant in Ovens Valley area. Informant shareman 1960-61; left tobacco growing 1961; shareman again 1963-; this farm owned by Italian from same comune as informant; there is one other sharemen, from another comune in Catanzaro.
Calabria (Reggio Calabria)

63. Born Melicuccá (Reggio Calabria) in 1925; arrived Australia 1956; sponsored by an aunt; sponsored migration of his fiancée, of his sister and of another woman who came out as his fiancée but did not marry him; has few relatives in Australia; was married in Australia. Wife born in same comune as himself; migrated to marry him 1963. Informant shareman 1964-; this farm is owned by Italians from Decollatura (Catanzaro); the informant is the only shareman.

64. Born Melicuccá (Reggio Calabria) in 1925; arrived Australia 1957 after spending 6 years in Argentina; sponsored by his brother; together with his brother's son he has sponsored the migration of another brother; has several relatives in Australia; arrived Ovens Valley area 1958; married by proxy. Wife born in same comune as himself; engaged before migration; migrated to join him 1959. Informant sharefarmer 1958-; this farm is owned by an Australian; there are 6 other sharemen, all Italian (one is a Sicilian; the rest are relatives of this informant, all from Reggio Calabria).

65. Born Oppido Mamertina (Reggio Calabria) in 1939; arrived Australia 1951; sponsored by father who had migrated 1949; informant has not sponsored any migrants; only relatives in Australia are parents and siblings; he arrived Ovens Valley area 1965; married in Australia. Wife Australian; born Echuca where she met informant. Informant's father bought tobacco farm Gunbower 1958; informant is running a new farm in Ovens Valley area, being part-owner of both this and the Gunbower farm with his father and his brother; one shareman (a Spaniard) on the Ovens Valley farm. In 1965-66 season informant himself was sharefarmer for a neighbour in the Ovens Valley area (an Australian).
66. Born Rosarno (Reggio Calabria) in 1928; arrived Australia 1955; government assisted migrant; has sponsored no migrants himself; has a few relatives in Australia; arrived Ovens Valley area 1963; married in Australia. Wife born in Italy, comune and province unstated (not comune of informant); arrived Australia 1958 to join her brother; informant met her in Gippsland and married her in 1960. Informant shareman 1963-; except for one season when he was in Melbourne; this farm owned by Australian; 5 other sharemen, all Italian (all from same comune as informant, 2 his relatives).

Italia Insulare (Island Italy)

Sicilia (Catania)

67. Born Raddusa (Catania) in 1932; arrived Australia 1960; sponsored by his sister's husband; has himself sponsored the migration of his two brothers, his parents and his fiancée; has no more distant relatives in Australia; he arrived Ovens Valley area 1962; married in Australia. Wife born Lentini (Siracusa, Sicily); engaged to informant before his migration; migrated to marry him 1962. Informant shareman 1962-; this farm owned by Australian; there are 2 other sharemen, both Spanish.

68. Born Ramacca (Catania) in 1898; arrived Australia 1933; sponsored by brother; has himself sponsored the migration of about 20 other people, relatives and friends from his own comune; has several relatives in Australia; arrived Ovens Valley area 1934, left soon after, but returned for good in 1959; has married twice. First wife was born in the same comune as himself, migrated to marry him in 1949, and died 1959. Second wife was born in Sambiase (Catanzaro); was a widow when introduced to him
by letter; migrated to marry him in 1962. Informant shareman 1934 for a season; then continuously since 1959; the owner of this farm is Australian; there are 6 other sharemen, all Italian, all from Reggio Calabria and related to one another.

69. Born Ramacca (Catania) approximately 1936; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area 1949; sponsored (along with his father and the rest of his immediate family) by a friend of his father's from the same comune; don't know if he has sponsored any other migrants; has several relatives in Australia; is unmarried. Informant shareman 1950-55; bought farm with father 1955; bought another farm with his brother later; 4 sharemen on his father's farm (one the informant's sister's husband, born in Francoforte (Siracusa, Sicily), the other 3 Greeks); 3 sharemen on farm owned by informant and his brother, all Greek.

70. Born Ramacca (Catania) in 1919; arrived Australia and Ovens Valley area 1965; sponsored by his brother; has not sponsored any migrants himself except his wife and children; has very few relatives in Australia; was married before migration. Wife born in same comune as himself; migrated to join him 1966. Informant shareman 1965-; this farm is owned by his brother (in partnership with another Italian); there are two other sharemen, one the informant's son and the other a Greek.

71. Born Vizzini (Catania) in 1903; arrived Australia and the Ovens Valley area 1939; sponsored by his brother; has sponsored no migrants himself except his wife; has several relatives in Australia; was married by proxy. Wife born in same comune as himself; migrated to join him 1949. Informant shareman 1941-46; owned and ran his own tobacco farm 1946-53; has been absentee landlord since 1953; his
tenant is an Italian from Calabria; informant has no hand in running the farm; he lives in Wangaratta where he works in a textile mill.

**Sicilia (Siracusa)**

72. Born Francoforte (Siracusa) in 1943; arrived Australia 1955; sponsored by his father who arrived in 1953; informant has not sponsored any other migrants; he has a few relatives in Australia; arrived Ovens Valley area 1960; married in Australia. Wife born in Wangaratta to Italian parents from Ragusa in Sicily; met and married informant in the Ovens Valley area 1965. Informant shareman 1960-; this farm is owned by an Australian; there is one other shareman, an Italian from Catanzaro.

73. Born in Francoforte (Siracusa) in 1934; arrived Australia 1956 as government assisted migrant; he has sponsored the migration of a brother, but the brother seems unlikely to accept the offer; has a few relatives in Australia; arrived Ovens Valley area 1957; married in Australia. Wife born Ramacca (Catania); arrived Australia 1949, sponsored by her father; met informant in Ovens Valley area. Informant shareman 1957-60; bought own farm 1960; operated it himself 1960-62; a brother's son has managed it since 1962; informant still helps to operate it; there is one shareman, an Italian born in Sicily. Informant has been shareman in addition, 1962-; owner of the farm where he works is an Italian from Sicily (the father of the informant's wife); there are 3 other sharemen, all Greek.
AUSTRALIAN-BORN INFORMANTS OF ITALIAN ORIGIN

Parents born in Veneto (Vicenza), Italia Settentrionale (Northern Italy)

74. Born near Gunbower in 1936 to parents from Asiago (Vicenza); father arrived in Australia in 1927; informant has sponsored two cousins from Vicenza and has a large number of relatives in Australia; he still lives in Gunbower but bought farm in Ovens Valley area in partnership with his brother in 1963; married in Australia. Wife born Hamburg, Germany; arrived Australia 1948; met informant in Gunbower. Informant worked tobacco farm in partnership with eldest brother 1952-54; then left tobacco growing temporarily but became tobacco farm owner in partnership with his father and another brother 1957; now the three of them own two farms in Gunbower and one in the Ovens Valley area; in Gunbower there are 3 Greek sharemen on one farm and 4 sharemen on the other (2 Greeks and 2 Italians from Treviso); on the Ovens Valley area farm there are 8 sharemen (4 Greeks and 4 Italians, one from Vicenza and 3 from Treviso).

75. Born Echuca 1947; his mother was born in Valdagno (Vicenza) and his father in Asiago (Vicenza); his parents met and married in Australia, where they had both lived since about 1930; informant has sponsored no migrants, but has a large number of relatives in Australia; he arrived Ovens Valley area about 1953; he is unmarried. Informant shareman 1962-; the owner of the farm is his father; and his younger brother is the only other shareman.

76. Born Ovens Valley area 1931; father and mother both from Schio (Vicenza); father arrived Australia 1927, mother in 1930; they were married before father's migration; informant has sponsored no migrants himself;
has several relatives in Australia; he has married in Australia. Wife Australian, born in Melbourne, met informant on holiday in Ovens Valley area. Informant left home 1947; bought own tobacco farm 1949; grows tobacco part-time, combining it with bush-cutting contract; 1965 sold old farm and bought new one; one shareman (Italian, no connection with informant).

77. Born Myrtleford 1946; father born Schio (Vicenza) arrived Australia 1933; mother born Quero (Belluno) arrived Australia 1936; they met in Melbourne, when informant's father was already growing tobacco in the Ovens Valley area; informant has not sponsored any migrants but has a number of relatives in Australia; he is unmarried. 1957-65 informant sharefarmed on his father's tobacco farm; 1965 informant set up as tobacco farm owner in partnership with his father's brother and another Italian (not a relative); the farm has 5 sharemen, 2 Italians (one from Padova and one from Treviso) and 3 Yugoslavs.

78. Born Myrtleford 1943; both parents from Schio (Vicenza); father arrived Australia 1939; mother arrived Australia 1940; informant has not sponsored any migrants but has several relatives in Australia; he is unmarried. His father bought tobacco farm approx. 1950; informant is now part-owner of it; there are 6 sharemen, all Italian, 3 from the same comune as informant's father (one is the informant's cousin), 2 from other parts of Vicenza, and one from Toscana.

79. Born Myrtleford 1948; mother born Asiago (Vicenza), arrived Australia 1931; father born Valli del Pasubio (Vicenza), arrived Australia 1924; parents met and married in Australia; informant has not sponsored any
migrants, but has a large number of relatives in Australia; he is unmarried. Informant's father is the son of a tobacco farm owner, and has a farm of his own; informant has been shareman on his father's farm since leaving school; there are 3 other sharemen, all Italians, one from Udine and 2 (who are brothers) from Trento.

Parents born in Australia

80. Born Myrtleford 1940; father born in Australia of Italian parents; mother Australian. Informant does not know of any relatives in Italy; he is married to an Australian born in Melbourne, a teacher whose job brought her to the Ovens Valley area. Informant's father has owned a dairy/tobacco farm in the Ovens Valley area since 1911; old farm flooded under Buffalo River Dam Scheme; new farm, owned by informant and his three brothers, bought 1964; 3 sharemen, all Yugoslavs.

AUSTRALIAN INFORMANTS

Born in the tobacco-growing region of the Ovens Valley area

81. Born in Ovens Valley area 1947 on a farm bought by his father the same year; father and mother both from families in the catering trade; father is a grazier; informant is unmarried. Informant wished to try tobacco growing so father turned some of his property over to tobacco 1962-63; this has ceased; 1965- , informant has sharefarmed on a neighbour's tobacco farm; owner of this farm is Australian; there are 2 other sharemen, a father and son, both Australians.

82. Born Ovens Valley area 1946; father owns large tobacco farm in conjunction with the informant's unmarried
brothers; both father and mother belong to local families; informant is married to an Australian born in Ovens Valley area, the daughter of a dairy farmer. In 1964, when the informant married, his father made a small tobacco farm over to him, on which there is one Spanish shareman; the informant is only a part-time owner; he is also an apprentice motor mechanic in Myrtleford.

83. Born Ovens Valley area 1946; father came from Wandiligong and bought a large mixed farm in Ovens Valley area 1928; mother born in New South Wales; informant unmarried. Informant and his three brothers are co-owners of the farm with his father; in 1930 his father started growing tobacco on the property; now there are 9 tobacco sharemen, 2 Yugoslavs, 5 Spaniards and 2 Italians.

84. Born in Ovens Valley area 1945; great-great-grandfather pioneered the family farm which informant has now inherited along with his elder brother; both the father and the mother of the informant come from local families; informant is married to the Australian daughter of a local dairy farmer. Informant's brother started growing tobacco on part of the property in 1960 (before he and informant inherited the property); informant concentrates on dairy farming on the other half of the property; there are 3 sharemen on the tobacco farm, 2 Italian and one Spanish.

85. Born Ovens Valley area 1942 on his father's farm; both mother and father belong to tobacco growing families; informant married to Australian daughter of an electrician; she came to Myrtleford from Melbourne with her family in 1945. Informant worked on his father's farm for wages 1956-58; and as shareman 1958-63; informant and his father bought this farm in partnership 1963 (in addition to the
one informant's father still owns alone). Informant has leased this farm to his father's father and a friend, and is employed by his tenants on wages (along with his younger brother) to cultivate the tobacco crop.

86. Born Ovens Valley area 1940; father's father pioneered the family farm which informant and his elder brother have inherited; informant's mother also from a local family; informant has married the German-born daughter of dairy shareman who worked on his farm until recently. Informant's brother takes care of the tobacco-growing side of the property; informant looks after the dairy side; there are 3 tobacco sharemen, one Australian and 2 Italians.

87. Born Ovens Valley area 1939; father inherited tobacco and grazing property from his father; mother born in Buckland, the daughter of a gold miner; informant unmarried. This farm owned by his father; informant a tobacco shareman on it since leaving school; 2 other sharemen, both Italian.

88. Born Ovens Valley area 1923; father is a retired blacksmith who owns this farm in partnership with informant; mother from local farming family; informant married to Australian farmer's daughter from Yass, whom he met when she came to Ovens Valley area to visit relatives there. There are no sharemen on the farm.

89. Born in Ovens Valley area in 1918; father's father owned a farm in the area, but the farm which the informant and his brother have inherited was bought by the informant's father; informant's mother came from farming family, but not Ovens Valley area; informant married to an Australian from New South Wales who came
to the Ovens Valley area as a hospital nurse. There are 2 tobacco sharemen on the farm, both Italian.

90. Born in Ovens Valley area in 1916; father was a hotel keeper; both mother and father were born on outskirts of Ovens Valley area; informant has married an Australian woman born in Myrtleford whose father was a cook; informant was a butcher before buying a grazing property; 1962-65 he grew tobacco on part of it because his son wanted to try tobacco growing; his son was his only shareman; informant has now ceased growing tobacco.

91. Born Ovens Valley area 1910; father's father pioneered farm which informant's father owned and informant's brother inherited; informant married Australian daughter of local baker and storekeeper. Informant himself inherited a farm from his mother's father's sister jointly with another brother; and has bought another farm on his own which is not productive yet; there are 3 tobacco sharemen on the first farm, 2 Yugoslavs and one Australian.

92. Born Ovens Valley area 1910; father owned farm in area; mother born locally; informant married Australian daughter of a local tobacco grower; informant inherited part of his father's farm in 1934; earlier he had worked as a dairy hand and tobacco shareman on his father's brother's farm nearby; on this farm (which only grows tobacco) there is only one shareman, a man from the north of Italy.

93. Born Ovens Valley area 1901; father and mother born in Northern Ireland; father bought a farm in the Ovens Valley area in 1886; informant married Australian daughter of railway worker; she was born in Ovens Valley area;
informant and his brother inherited their father's mixed farm and operated it jointly until death of brother recently; tobacco grown on the farm since 1913; there are 3 sharefarmers registered on the farm, farming two shares between them; a man, his wife, and his wife's sister, all from the north of Italy.

94. Born Ovens Valley area 1898; his father who was born in southern Ireland pioneered a farm in the area more than 100 years ago; mother born in Ovens Valley area; informant is unmarried. Informant inherited part of his father's farm, along with a younger brother, blinded in a car accident, also unmarried; two other brothers have inherited the rest of the farm; on the informant's farm there are 2 tobacco sharemen, a father and son from the south of Italy.

Born on the outskirts of the tobacco growing region of the Ovens Valley area

95. Born in Wangaratta in 1940; father a hotel keeper from Yarrawonga; mother born in Wangaratta; informant married to the Australian-born daughter of an Italian couple from Valdagno (Vicenza) who was born in Myrtleford; her father is a tobacco grower; informant sharefarmer 1959- ; this farm is owned by an Australian; there are 6 other sharemen, 2 Australians and 4 Italians (one from Belluno and 3 from Vicenza).

96. Born Yackandandah 1932; father and mother also born in Yackandandah; father a dairy farmer in Ovens Valley area; informant married to Australian daughter of a tobacco grower; she was born in Ovens Valley area; on marriage in 1958 the informant became joint owner with his wife of a tobacco farm which she had inherited from her father (only a portion of her father's entire
property); there are 4 sharemen, one German, one Australian and 2 Italians (at least one of whom is a Calabrian).

97. Born Tallangatta 1921; father born New South Wales; mother born near Benalla; family came to Ovens Valley area 1928 when informant's father bought dairy farm now owned by informant's brother; informant's wife is Australian, the daughter of another dairy farmer; her father came to the Ovens Valley area from Tallangatta (where he was born) in 1929; the informant and his wife grew up as near neighbours; informant bought his own farm in 1940; it is principally a dairy farm, but tobacco has been grown on it since 1960; there are 3 tobacco sharemen, all Australian, 2 are father and son and the other is the son of this informant's next-door neighbour.

98. Born in Wangaratta 1910 but brought up on a large grazing property in the 'high plain' beyond Harrietville; father and mother born in Harrietville; informant's wife an Australian born in Wangaratta, the daughter of an ex-sheep farmer turned hotel keeper; the informant's father was a grazier until 1950 when most of the property was sold and only some land at Everton suitable for growing tobacco was retained; the land had originally been used for grazing cattle on their way to market at Wangaratta; this property had three or four Italian sharemen on it at a time, growing tobacco, until 1964 when the informant left it (his father having died); the informant moved into Wangaratta, where he is employed as a farm equipment salesman.

99. Born in Beechworth 1910; has lived in the tobacco growing region since 1923; his father and mother were born in Beechworth; father began as dairyfarmer; began
growing tobacco 1927; informant's wife is Australian, born in Wangaratta, the daughter of a dairy farmer from Whitfield; informant and his father and brother are joint owners of a tobacco farm (other brothers are growing tobacco independently); on this farm there are 4 sharemen, all Italian (from the north of Italy).

Born outside the Ovens Valley area

100. Born in Tasmania 1940; arrived in Ovens Valley area 1961 on advice of a cousin who had settled in the area; wife is Australian, the daughter of a tobacco farm manager in the Ovens Valley area; informant shareman 1961–; this farm has Australian owners; there are 8 other sharemen, 2 Spaniards, 2 Yugoslavs and 4 Australians.

101. Born in Victoria, 30 miles away from the Ovens Valley area, in 1938; arrived in Ovens Valley area 1961; wife is Australian, born outside the Ovens Valley area, whose father came to the area to operate a bakery in Whitfield in 1949; met informant in the Ovens Valley area. Informant shareman 1961–; the owner of this farm is Australian; no other shareman.

102. Born in Melbourne 1932; settled in Ovens Valley area 1955; wife is Australian, born in Myrtleford; informant met her when he was visiting the area, while still a regular soldier; settled in the area because it was her home; informant shareman 1962–66 (though for intermittent spells he grew tobacco on day wages); in 1966 he gave up tobacco and became clerk at a saw mill in Myrtleford.

103. Born Bendigo, 1930; grew tobacco in Gunbower with his brother (who started before he did) 1956–64; 1964, he and his brother moved to Ovens Valley area. Wife an Australian also born in Bendigo. Informant farm owner
Gunbower 1956-64; farm owner Ovens Valley area 1964- ; although he is still nominally part-owner of farm (which he and his brother are trying to sell) he takes no interest in it and is employed by Victorian Department of Agriculture as extension officer in the Ovens Valley area.

104. Born Western Australia 1925; father grew tobacco in Western Australia, and informant and his two brothers inherited his farm and grew tobacco there until 1963; then they moved to a farm in the Ovens Valley area. Wife an Australian, also born in Western Australia. Informant shareman 1963-66; manager 1966- ; farm owned by his elder brother; there are 9 sharemen, 2 Australians (one the informant's younger brother), 6 Yugoslavs, and one Greek Macedonian who came to the Ovens Valley from Western Australia, like the informant and his brothers. Informant's wife and daughter also have a small share on the farm.

105. Born in Gippsland, Victoria, 1918; arrived Ovens Valley area as a child; father bought a dairy farm at Bowman's forest (near Gapsted); informant did not inherit it, but leased land at Everton from about 1946; informant's wife an Australian, born in Ovens Valley area, where her father was a farmer. Informant has grown tobacco on his leased land since 1960; no sharemen.
APPENDIX III

FINANCIAL AND MARKETING ARRANGEMENTS IN THE
TOBACCO GROWING INDUSTRY

Four companies buy Australian tobacco: these are: Rothmans, Wills, Philip Morris and Geoffrey Phillips. The Australian government, like many others, finds tobacco a suitable commodity on which to levy purchase tax, and the Federal Department of Customs and Excise keeps a watch on tobacco production. In addition, in order to protect the Australian tobacco growing industry the Federal and State Governments administer a quota system which regulates the amount of tobacco grown in each of the three tobacco growing States in Australia, and within each State individual quotas are meted out to each tobacco farm owner. In Victoria the allotment of quotas is the responsibility of a Quota Committee formed of officials of the Victorian Department of Agriculture and representatives of the tobacco growers. At the end of the season, the leaf is handed over to the Victorian Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board for sale, and the Board transports it to Melbourne where it is auctioned.\(^1\)

The organisation for selling the tobacco leaf works smoothly; but the Marketing Board and the Quota Committee encounter difficulties. Many of these have their origins in the complex inter-personal relationships between growers who have operated as neighbours in the same industry for many years. Others have their origins in the particular difficulties which face growers in some districts of the

\(^1\) See account of Government action in relation to the tobacco growing industry in Chapter 3, above, pp.68-73.
Victorian tobacco growing regions. Many disputes between growers have been incorporated into the conflict between the various tobacco growers' associations of Victoria, and the history of this conflict may conveniently be summarised here.

During the 1950s, the Victorian Tobacco Growers' Association was formed to represent the growers in their dealings with tobacco buyers and various Government departments. At the end of the decade, when tobacco was selling at very good prices, the officers of the Association set up a tobacco breeding farm (mainly with the intention of developing a strain resistant to Blue Mould) and a redry plant (to preserve unsold tobacco). Both were set up under the auspices of the newly formed Victorian Tobacco Growers' Co-operative. Though the Co-operative was still extant in 1966, the farm was being run simply as a commercial leaf-producing enterprise. Research was left to the Victorian Department of Agriculture's Research Station at Ovens, which had been set up at about the same time as the Co-operative. The redry plant has apparently never been used. At the end of both the 1966 and 1967 selling seasons there was discussion about the possibility of using it to dry unsold tobacco to be stored until the following year, but in the event the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board itself retained and preserved the unsold tobacco.

In 1961, there was a split in the Association. The leadership changed hands, and the new officials retitled the Association 'The Victorian Tobacco Growers' Association Limited'. The defeated group formed themselves into 'The

---

1 See discussion above, Chapter 3, pp.73-6.
2 See Table IV, above, Chapter 3, p.70.
3 The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation also conducts research into tobacco growing, on land made available at the Victorian Department of Agriculture's Research Station at Ovens.
Ovens and Murray Tobacco Producers' Organisation'. The V.T.G.A. Ltd. is a large organisation, including both owners and sharefarmers. The O. & M. limits its membership to a handful of owners, most of whom own very large farms. Though a number of owners of large farms are also to be found in the V.T.G.A. Ltd., there is a tendency to identify the O. & M. with 'the big men' and the V.T.G.A. Ltd., with 'the small men'.

During the period of this study there were a number of unsettled disputes between the rival tobacco growers' associations. For example, a court case was pending about the status of the V.T.G.A. Ltd. Was it the legal heir of the old Association, and was it entitled to use the assets of the old Association as it did? The trustees of the older organisation had become the leaders of the O. & M., and they made the most of the fact that the old Association was not officially wound up before the new, Limited, Association was formed.

1965-66 was the first growing season in which the quota system was in operation, and many problems remained unsolved by the time the 1966 sales took place. In particular, it was not clear what the Marketing Board's policy should be regarding 'over-quota' tobacco; that is, tobacco produced by an individual grower in excess of his quota. In 1966 there was a ban on the import of Rhodesian tobacco, and that year the Queensland growers had a bad growing season and were unable to meet the State quota. Since there was a shortage of tobacco from other sources, the buyers

---

1 In a good year almost every grower has some over-quota tobacco, as he plants rather more than the amount necessary to meet his quota in case of accidents to the crop; but the strongest demand to market over-quota leaf came from the growers who had recently expanded their capacity and who could therefore produce far more than was necessary to meet their quotas.
made very good bids for Victorian tobacco, and growers felt that any over-quota tobacco which was put on the market would also fetch good prices. Some over-quota leaf was handed over to the Marketing Board for sale, along with the quota tobacco, and only the Board had the authority to decide whether or not to submit the over-quota leaf for auction. In the end, some of it was sold at low prices for export, but it was not submitted for sale in the open market. It seemed that the Board was unwilling to jeopardise the stabilisation scheme while it was still in its experimental stages by simply allowing the growers to submit as much leaf as they liked for auction. Some growers did not submit their over-quota leaf to the Marketing Board, but stored it against the possibility of a future need for 'old leaf' to make up quotas in a bad season.

The 1966 selling season also saw the introduction of a new schedule of leaf grades, agreed between the Marketing Board, the tobacco growers and the buyers. It contained more subdivisions than the previous schedule, but it was constructed on the same principle, taking into account the position of the leaf on the tobacco plant, and its colour, quality and texture after curing. Under the stabilisation scheme, before the sales started, buyers and growers agreed on minimum prices for leaf in each category of the grading schedule. When the tobacco was submitted for sale an assessor examined each bale of leaf and indicated the price it should fetch according to the way in which it compared with the schedule. Then the buyers for the four tobacco companies toured the sales floor with the auctioneer, bidding for each grower's batch of bales. If the prices were below those indicated by the assessor, the bales were re-examined by an arbitrator, who decided whether they should be reclassified in accordance with the value put on them by the buyer, or whether the assessor's original valuation should
be upheld. If the assessor's and the buyer's valuations could not be reconciled, the bales were resubmitted for auction at the next sale.

Clearly the tobacco growing industry is extensively controlled by the State and Federal Governments. Under these circumstances tobacco growers are inclined to look for political rather than economic solutions to all their difficulties. For example, the problem of over-production is met by agitation demanding the right to present over-quota tobacco for sale or an increase in Victoria's overall quota, rather than by a reduction in production; and growers who have difficulty in producing leaf of a kind which the market demands rely on the stabilisation scheme to ensure a market for their tobacco, rather than leaving the tobacco growing industry, buying better farms or investing in improvements to their soil.

The marketing arrangements of the tobacco growing industry places large amounts of money in lump sums in the hands of the tobacco growers at the end of the selling season. The distribution of these sums amongst the personnel on each farm, and the various financial arrangements of tobacco growers, will now be examined.

Under the stabilisation scheme, payment for the leaf is made by the buyers to the Marketing Board, which deducts sales costs (for example, the cost of transporting the bales to Melbourne) and forwards the balance to the holder of the quota (usually the owner of the farm) on which the tobacco was grown. The quota-holder deducts the running costs (the amount spent during the year on fertilisers, insecticides, and so on) and hands on a previously agreed percentage of the remainder to his sharemen, if any. Usually owners and sharemen split the balance of the cheque 50:50. Of the 105
growers interviewed, 93 were connected with farms where a sharefarming system was in operation, and 78 of these were connected with farms on which the owners and the sharemen took half the sales cheque each.

Usually both owners and sharemen have commitments which they must meet out of their shares of the profits. The owner is responsible for providing and maintaining all the capital equipment of the farm; this includes tractors and other machinery, kilns and grading sheds, and the houses which most owners provide rent-free for their sharemen. The sharefarmer is responsible for providing all the labour needed to grow the crop, and he must pay the wages of the labour hired at various times during the season. A shareman with ten acres of tobacco to cultivate has to hire labour to help him at nearly every stage of the cultivation process, unless he has a wife and adolescent children who contribute unpaid labour.

Since sharemen have to support themselves and their families throughout the year, and pay the labour they hire at the time it is hired rather than at the end of the season when the sales cheques have come in, they need a supply of cash or credit to operate their share of the farm. Sharemen who were in the industry for the previous season usually live

---

1 The sample was a random selection of tobacco growers (including both owners and sharemen) not of tobacco farms, so the figures quoted may not accurately reflect the proportions of farms organised or managed in a certain way; for discussion of the sample, see Appendix I, above, pp.390-401.

2 The staff at the Department of Agriculture Research Station at Ovens estimate that seven acres of tobacco is the ideal area for a single shareman to cultivate, but most sharemen prefer to have rather more, so that they can take up a larger share of the owner's quota and so make more money during the season. Two men, one single and one married, with the wife helping them both, often manage about 20 acres of tobacco between them.
until mid-January on the proceeds of the last sales cheques (which arrive during the second half of September). Then they apply to the banks for finance until the next season's cheques come in. Usually the farm owners guarantee their sharemen's debts to the bank for a month or so, until there is some leaf in the kilns. Once it is picked and cured, the leaf is insured and can be pledged as security against bank loans; and at this point the owner is usually willing to increase his guarantee. When the first sales cheque is received at the end of June, the owner pays off his sharemen's overdraft from their portion of the sales cheque, and this cancels the guarantee.

Men who are sharefarming for their first season have to live from mid-October (when planting-out starts) until mid-January on what they have saved in previous occupations, or else find a farm owner who is willing to guarantee their debts for longer than usual. Alternatively, they may begin as sharemen side by side with their fathers, brothers or other relatives who have already been growing tobacco for a season or more. In this case they borrow the money they need from their relatives, and live on credit in their households until the leaf is picked and in the kilns.

Two national banks have branches in Myrtleford. The manager of one estimated that his bank might advance up to a half a million dollars to tobacco sharemen during the season. Expenses incurred by an individual shareman for hired labour might amount to $500 per annum, and running costs might amount to another $500. On an average a sharemen might clear $3,000 per annum. Some sharemen receive as much as $10,000 and others as little as $1,500 depending on the amount of

1 The owner pays as much as this per share on his farm; the running costs come out of the total sales cheque before it is divided between owners and sharemen.
land they cultivate, the size of the quotas which the owners have to divide between their sharemen, the quality of the tobacco, and the state of the market that year. It is generally reckoned that a 5-ton share of a quota, to be grown on seven or eight acres of land and giving a nett return of about $2,000 per annum to the sharefarmer is a reasonable minimum for a man and his family to work and to support themselves on. ¹

Owners who do not have sharemen are generally those with very small quotas, who do all the work of tobacco growing themselves, with the help of their families. A handful of growers have fairly large farms and no sharemen, preferring to use hired labour for all the work of the farm. ²

Where owners and sharemen divide the profits in some other ratio than 50:50, it is often because one or the other is doing more than usual. Sharemen receive more than 50% if they provide some of the capital equipment used on the farm, if they find their own accommodation, or if they do some of the work on the farm (such as preparing the ground for planting) that is normally done by the owner. If the owner does more than the usual owner's tasks on the farm, the sharemen receive less than 50% of the profits, but only one of the informants in the sample worked on a farm where there was such an arrangement. Only one grower interviewed paid his sharemen higher percentages than usual simply in order to obtain the best available workers.

Some farms employ managers who are either paid wages by the farm owner, or else paid out of the total sales cheque

¹ This result will be approximately obtained if 5 tons of tobacco is sold at the minimum price fixed under the stabilisation scheme; see above, Chapter 3, pp.72-3.

² None of the owners in the sample were relying solely on hired labour during the 1966-67 season, though one had done so in previous years.
before it is divided between owners and sharemen. In many cases they are actually resident mechanics, who drive and maintain whatever machinery is used on the farm. Sometimes they take over some of the duties normally performed by the owners, but only occasionally are they substitutes or deputies for inactive or absentee farm owners.  

Some of the people referred to as farm owners are actually tenants, and sometimes it is difficult to distinguish them from sharefarmers. In many cases they do not pay a fixed rent, but give the owner of the farm a percentage (perhaps 25%) of the sales cheque. In effect they are sharemen who have taken on the responsibility for the running costs as well as for the labour needed during the growing season, leaving only the fixed capital to be provided by the owner of the farm.

A number of farms are owned in partnership, and in some cases it is impossible to discover who the actual owners are, as they are obscured behind the title of a proprietary company. Another company in the Ovens Valley area is a sharefarming organisation, which operates in much the same way as a secretarial agency. The proprietors of the company undertake to see that all the sharefarmer's tasks on a farm are carried out, and sends its own employees to do the work.

---

1 Of the 105 tobacco growers interviewed 89 were connected with farms that did not have managers at all, and 3 did not state whether or not there were managers on the farms where they worked. Where there were managers they looked after the machinery or did other jobs that were normally the responsibility of the owners; in only 3 cases were they actually substitutes or deputies for inactive or absentee owners.

2 Companies that owned farms were excluded from the sampling frame; see discussion of sample above, Appendix I, pp.390-401.
paying them out of the sharefarmer's percentage which the company itself receives from the owners.¹

On the farms, individual sharemen often work in teams of two, one married and one single, with the unmarried grower boarding with the married one, and the married grower's wife helping both men by hoeing and so on. A number of farm owners prefer their sharemen to organise their work in this way, and a common arrangement is for an unmarried man to work with his married brother.² In any case, temporary teams are formed for operations such as planting out, which are carried on by sharemen working in pairs, with the assistance of the farm owner.

On the original sampling frame from which the random sample of tobacco growers interviewed in the course of this study was drawn, 56 of the 105 growers interviewed were stated to be sharefarmers and the remaining 49 to be owners.³ When they were interviewed during the 1966-67 growing season, 5 were no longer growing tobacco, 2 had become tobacco growers on wages, 47 were sharemen, 2 were tenants, 1 was a farm manager, 11 were owners growing their own crops without the help of sharemen, 28 were owners employing sharemen, and 3 combined ownership of farms with non-farming activities. The remaining 6 could not even be placed within this range of

¹ Neither the sharefarming company nor any of its employees were included in the sampling frame; see discussion of the sample above, Appendix I, pp.390-401.

² Of the 47 informants who were sharemen at the time of the interview, 3 were in married brother/unmarried brother teams, 2 were in similar teams with non-relatives, and one was in such a team with his father.

³ This compares with the original selection of 139 individuals, 81 of whom were stated to be sharefarmers and the remaining 58 to be owners. The greater wastage of sharefarmers is discussed in the comments on the sample above, Appendix I, pp.395-7.
categories. One grower, for example, was being paid by his grandfather to cultivate a crop on a farm which was his own, but which his grandfather had leased from him; he was at once the owner of the farm and the employee of his own tenant.

The complexity of many of the variations on the basic owner-sharefarmer arrangements, and the large amounts of money that are sometimes involved, necessitate careful accounting. There are also financial complications arising from the purchase and the mortgaging of farms, and from probate arrangements when land is inherited. In addition, many growers need the help of accountants to compute their tax returns. Migrant growers make full use of the services of solicitors, accountants and bankers to manage their elaborate financial affairs, in spite of the language difficulties.\(^1\)

Written contracts between owners and sharemen are uncommon, however, in spite of the complexity of tobacco growing financial arrangements. Perhaps the standardised 50:50 division of profits and the check on farm financial arrangements which is provided by the bank's accounts of the transactions of owners and sharemen make written contracts unnecessary. Some sharemen claim that there would be more written contracts if they had their way, but that the owners dislike them. Only 16 of the tobacco growers interviewed were associated with farms on which any of the sharemen had written contracts with the owners, and only 11 of these were associated with farms on which all the sharemen had written contracts. Of the remaining informants, 72 were associated with farms on which there were only verbal agreements between

\(^1\) Most professional offices in Myrtleford (the solicitor's, the accountant's and so on) employ at least one assistant or clerk who can speak Italian; but none, as yet, have interpreters for Spanish, Greek or any Yugoslavian language.
the owners and their sharemen. Only 6 of the men in the sample who were sharemen at the time of interview had written contracts with the owners of the farms on which they worked; all 6 were Italian, but there are so few Australian sharemen in the sample that the absence of any Australian sharemen with a written contract cannot be regarded as statistically significant.

Table II indicates that the average number of sharefarmers on each farm during the 1965-66 growing season was 2.3, not counting the men employed by the sharefarming company which was in operation on three farms. The largest farms were those with the largest numbers of sharemen, but the number of sharemen per farm does not give an unequivocal indication of the size of a farm. For example, the adult sons of an owner who are living and working with him might be registered as sharefarmers rather than as part-owners. On the other hand, a farm owned jointly by three or four partners (brothers, for example) may have no registered sharemen because the owners do the sharemen's work as well as their own. Some growers do all the work of growing part of their crop themselves, though they also have sharemen growing the rest of the crop with whom they co-operate by carrying out the owner's tasks. There are also a few farms on which the owners pay wage labour to grow the tobacco crop instead of employing sharemen.

1 These figures do not add to 105 because not all the farms the informants were associated with had sharemen; and in addition 8 informants did not, or could not, state what the contract situation was on the farms they were associated with.

2 See above, Chapter 3, p.71.

3 The details given of farms in the Excise List and the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board List for 1965-66 are difficult to interpret on this point, but apparently this is the case on approximately a quarter of the farms which employ sharefarmers.
Although the tobacco growing industry has prospered during the last few years, tobacco growers are always aware of the risks involved, and slight reverses in the weather during the growing season lead to despondent speculations about the likelihood of crop failure. Owners and sharemen both claim that they are particularly subject to risk. Owners point out that they have capital tied up in their farms, and will be left with heavy debts if they have a bad season, whereas a shareman can leave the industry if things go too badly. Sharemen point out that, even after a bad season, the owner still has his capital, whereas they have nothing at all if the crop fails.

At least 3 of the sharemen interviewed during this study were on the point of giving up tobacco growing for the security of wage earning. Between the 1965-66 season and the 1966-67 season 2 interviewees listed as sharemen in 1965-66 gave up tobacco growing for regular non-agricultural employment for wages, and 2 others gave up sharefarming to grow tobacco for wages.\footnote{In addition at least 7 individuals in the original sample of 139 were Italian sharefarmers who had left the district during or just after the 1965-66 season to find work in other parts of Australia.\footnote{This is less lucrative and less prestigious than sharefarming, and their descent to it indicates that they failed as sharefarmers the season before.}} In addition at least 7 individuals in the original sample of 139 were Italian sharefarmers who had left the district during or just after the 1965-66 season to find work in other parts of Australia.\footnote{See discussion of the 'no contacts' in the sample above, Appendix I, pp.395-7.}

By contrast, farm owners can make up a loss on tobacco by switching to other crops, or other farm activities. Out of the 105 informants in the sample, 60 were associated with farms on which at least one other kind of farming was normally
carried on alongside tobacco growing, and out of the 49 informants who were stated on the original sampling frame to be farm owners, 3 had given up growing tobacco altogether. One had reverted to his former concentration on grazing, and the other 2 had given up farming and found salaried occupations. Of the practising owner-tobacco growers interviewed, 6 were dissatisfied with the results of their recent growing seasons. They were handicapped in their attempts to diversify their activities, however, by the fact that their farms were too small to be profitably put to any other use than growing tobacco. Out of these 6 growers, 4 had land in the downstream areas, where tobacco growing has become less profitable than in the past. It is unlikely that these growers will find buyers for their farms, and they have little choice but to struggle on as unsuccessful tobacco growers.

Sharefarmers have no investment to tie them to the industry, but at least one Italian shareman in the sample was in a comparable position to that of the owner of a declining farm. His career as a sharefarmer had not been successful, but since he knew little English and lacked any skilled training he was unlikely to find alternative employment that offered prospects as good as tobacco growing.

Most tobacco growers had prospered in the years preceeding this study however. Many had improved their economic position considerably. The predominance of growers

1 Out of the 105 informants, 17 were connected with farms that were growing tobacco and grazing beef cattle; 20 with those that kept other kinds of stock, not necessarily cattle; 9 with farms in which crops other than tobacco were grown; and 8 with farms where stock was kept, and other crops were grown as well as tobacco. The other 6 did not state what other activities were carried on or were no longer growing tobacco.

2 See discussion above, Chapter 3, pp.73-4.
with Italian surnames\(^1\) amongst farm owners is evidence of the extent to which newcomers to the Ovens Valley area had 'made good'; but in future it will be more difficult for new arrivals to become farm owners. There is little uncleared land left that is suitable for tobacco growing, and in any case new farms can only be set up if quotas can be obtained for them. Established farms had become very expensive by 1966. The standard price for a tobacco farm equipped with kiln and grading sheds was $2,000 per acre, and there were very few good farms for sale.

A number of growers frankly preferred tobacco growing to any other means of earning a living, if only because of the possibility of very good returns. Two informants stated 'tobacco growing is a disease', and indicated that they would not give it up no matter how many bad years they had. Both these men had moved into the Ovens Valley area from less successful tobacco growing areas. Many growers talked enthusiastically about the intricacies of growing and marketing tobacco, and seemed to thoroughly enjoy cultivating their crops, in spite of the overwork and anxiety they and other growers suffered from periodically.

\(^1\) See above, Table XI, Chapter 3, p.91.
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