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Preface

The study of Displaced Persons reported in this monograph was carried out in two stages: the first involved an analysis of assimilation among a group of Displaced Persons, and the second took the form of a follow-up survey of a sample taken from the first group. The exciting experience of locating and talking to these people after a gap of many years produced results which seemed worth recording, hence this report. But in many ways a follow-up study can be a depressing undertaking, for one is, in some measure, committed to repeating one's earlier mistakes. Sources of imperfection in the final work are even more numerous when, as here, the original investigation was not planned with a later follow-up in mind. I am conscious enough of the defects in the general design of the study, and in some of the research techniques adopted, to feel certain that I would not want to use a similar approach again. This final report, then, is presented as no more than an exploratory contribution to a little-known but highly rewarding field of research.

During the first stage of the project, from 1952 to 1955, I was on the staff of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at The Australian National University, and worked under the direction of the late Professor S. F. Nadel, whose scholarship, keen intellect and imaginative approach to the problems of sociology were an ever-present example and stimulus. The results of my work during these years were reported in my doctoral thesis. In 1962 The Australian National University made it possible for me to continue my studies of migrant assimilation by awarding me a Visiting Fellowship. On this occasion I was attached to the newly-formed Department of Sociology, headed by Professor W. D. Borrie.

I have many good reasons to be grateful for my extended association with the National University, but in this context I wish particularly to thank it for enabling me to carry out the second stage of the project. I should also like to express my sincere appreciation of the good counsel and encouragement I have received from Professor Borrie over a number of years,
and, more especially, for his help in planning the second survey and in bringing this report to the stage of publication.

In the course of the twelve years during which I have been interested in the Displaced Persons in Australia I have become indebted to many people for deepening my understanding of this, the first sizeable group of immigrants brought to this country after World War II. To most of these people I can make only a collective acknowledgment. Many of them were casual acquaintances whose names I never knew. For different reasons, the officials and private residents of the town in which the original study was carried out must also remain anonymous, but I should like to record my appreciation of their interest and co-operation. I must also, of course, leave unnamed the Displaced Persons who provided the material for my research. Some of them were at first extremely suspicious of me, so that I have special reason to be grateful to the many who, if they had misgivings, did not allow these feelings to deter them from giving me generously of their time and hospitality. I have tried to ensure their anonymity by refraining from identifying the places where they live, or have lived, by using fictitious initials when referring to particular individuals, by changing personal details where this could be done without violation to the material, and by avoiding any reference to the country of origin of individual immigrants. I hope that by these precautions I have ensured that none of the people to whom I refer will be recognizable except to themselves.

Happily I can be more specific in gratefully acknowledging my obligations to the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, to the Department of Labour and National Service, to Commonwealth Hostels Ltd, and to the New South Wales Department of Railways and Bureau of Statistics and Economics. And I am particularly appreciative of the ready assistance I have received from the Commonwealth Department of Immigration.

Miss B. Laby and Dr G. Gregory, of the Department of Statistics at the University of Melbourne, accepted the ungrateful task of helping me with the statistical analysis of my material when the project was already too far advanced for them to advise me on the general design. I am most grateful to them for the time and thought they have given to the treatment of the data. But whatever statistical weaknesses are inherent in the material remain, of course, my responsibility alone.

I am also glad to acknowledge the assistance of Dr H. Fallding, who carried out some interviews for me during the 1953 research. Mrs S. A. Laws, Mrs I. Bozic and Mrs T. Stern have spent many
hours discussing the subject of migrant assimilation with me. I should like to express my thanks to each of them and also to Dr J. Zubrzycki and Dr E. Bramsted, for helpful consideration of some of the problems raised by the research. My warmest appreciation is also due to Dr C. A. Price and Dr R. T. Appleyard: I have benefited greatly from my association with them over a number of years, and I am especially indebted to them for reading the manuscript of this book and making a number of valuable suggestions for improving it. I should also like to thank my husband for working through the manuscript and for his help in countless ways.

Finally, I wish to thank the Editorial Staff of the Publications Section of The Australian National University for their help in preparing the manuscript for publication, and I am indebted to the Department of Sociology at The Australian National University and to the Institute of Applied Economic Research at the University of Melbourne for assistance in the typing of the manuscript.

JEAN I. MARTIN
Melbourne, 1964
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Introduction

At the beginning of 1945 the Allied armies found some twelve million displaced persons in Europe. A vast repatriation movement began even before the end of hostilities, and by July 1947 all but one million of these people had returned home. Internationally organized schemes for resettlement eventually dispersed the great majority of those who refused repatriation at this time, and also provided for the later waves of refugees fleeing from the Communist countries of eastern Europe in the years after the war. Between July 1947, when the Preparatory Commission of the International Refugee Organization was established, and the end of 1951, when its successor the International Refugee Organization was disbanded, over one million Displaced Persons were settled in Europe and overseas. Of these, Australia took 170,000, more than any other single country except the United States. After the IRO went out of existence, Australia accepted a further 30,000 European refugees under various assisted-passage schemes. The IRO arranged for and bore the cost of transporting the Displaced Persons to Australia. The Commonwealth government contributed £10 sterling towards the cost of travel of each adult, and undertook to find them employment and accommodation; the immigrants, for their part, were required to sign a two-year contract to work where directed. Because of the severe labour shortage in Australia at

1 The principal references on the origins of the displaced persons, their experiences in Europe, their resettlement overseas, and the international machinery responsible for them are: Kulischer, 1943; Woodbridge, 1950; Vernant, 1953; Holborn, 1956; and Proudfoot, 1957. 'Displaced Person' is the technical term for emigrants who were formally accepted as eligible for international care. In the text the term is used without capital letters for the total body of emigrants and refugees, irrespective of legal or international status. The figures for the numbers of Displaced Persons and more recent refugees brought to Australia come from the Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia, No. 48, 1962.
this time, many ‘essential’ industries were understaffed; it was in these industries, rural and urban, that most of the Displaced Persons worked out their contracts.

This book concerns a small group of Displaced Persons who were living in one of Australia’s larger provincial cities in 1953. Most of them had been sent to Burton, as I shall call this town, under contract, and had stayed on after their contracts had expired. They numbered about 200 in the town’s population of 19,000. In terms of age, sex, social background, nationality and date of arrival, they were fairly representative of the Displaced Person population as a whole, although single Displaced Persons and those from a professional or white-collar background were more likely to leave the town after the completion of their contracts than were, respectively, the married and those who had been skilled or unskilled workers in Europe.

With the objective of making an exploratory, anthropological study of Displaced Persons in process of adapting themselves to a particular community, I went to live in Burton for six months in 1953. I was given permission to take up residence in a British Migrant Hostel recently established in the town. The hostel was staffed mainly by a group of about twelve Displaced Persons, and—once the uneasy period of my initiation was over—I was in more or less daily contact with these people. I also came to know other Displaced Persons living privately in town or in hospital quarters; in some cases I first met these people officially at their places of work; but as time went by I was more often passed

2 Without disrespect, I have adopted popular usage by referring to this city henceforth as a country town, reserving the term city for the state and federal capitals and the large coastal agglomerations of Newcastle, Wollongong, and Geelong. A detailed report of the original study is contained in my unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Craig, 1954). The research methods outlined in this Introduction are discussed at length in chapter 2 of the thesis.

3 This was the general impression of the Employment Officer and other local people who had been in contact with Displaced Persons. It was confirmed by a comparison between immigrants who were in Burton in 1953 and had left by 1954 and those who were in Burton in 1953 and still there a year later. Of seventy-eight Displaced Persons (forty-six men, thirty-two women), fifteen out of twenty-two living singly left during this period, but only fourteen out of fifty-six living in family units ($\chi^2 = 12.61$, significant at the 1 per cent level). Of thirty-two males, eight out of eleven from a professional or white-collar background, and eight out of twenty-one with pre-migration skilled or unskilled occupations had left by 1954 ($\chi^2 = 3.46$, significant at the 10 per cent level). See Craig, op. cit., pp. 89-92.
on from one immigrant to another. Organized groups and formal functions played no part in the lives of the Burton Displaced Persons, but there was much casual visiting and an occasional party. I was eventually accepted into two informal cliques and had intermittent contact with another friendship group.

Participant-observation and informal talks yielded their customary rich harvest of subtle insights and hard facts, but other techniques of investigation were also necessary. Life histories and general information on attitudes, beliefs, and hopes were obtained through loosely structured interviews with seventy-one individuals, forty-one men and thirty women. With a few of these people I had only one interview; with most, two or three; with about ten, interviews were scarcely distinguishable from numerous casual meetings. I did not make a practice of taking notes during the course of the interviews, because I soon discovered that the sight of paper and pencil made my informants uneasy and uncommunicative. They clearly associated the recording of personal data with official inquiries, and they had learnt to be wary of officials. However, once I knew a person well, I found that I could with impunity jot down notes in his presence, and even fill in the schedule of basic information I compiled for each individual. For these seventy-one people and for many others I was also able to secure some independent information from official sources, such as the employment records kept by the local Employment Officer (a member of the Commonwealth Employment Service within the Department of Labour and National Service, which acted as agent for the Commonwealth government in the administration of the contract), from the rate books kept by the local council, and from the records of the hospitals, factories, and state government departments where the immigrants worked. I also went through the files of the local branch of the New Settlers' League. The daily newspaper not only provided useful information on the history of the Displaced Persons in Burton, and on the attitudes of the local people towards them, but also gave me an overall impression of the life of the community. This impression gained depth and substance from the material contained in an informative history of the town, from interviews with numerous officials and private individuals, and from attendance at some of the countless meetings and functions which the citizens of Burton organize the year round with dedicated perseverance.

The sample of seventy-one individuals who were interviewed represented just over one-third of the total adult Displaced
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Persons in Burton in 1953. The distribution of age, sex, and birthplace in the total sample and in the sub-sample of thirty-eight from whom the most detailed material was obtained corresponded fairly closely to the distribution in the local Displaced Person population as a whole (see Table 1). The single men who lived in railway barracks were, however, under-represented in the sub-sample. I interviewed only in English, with the husbands, wives, and friends of the subjects helping as interpreters when the need arose. The sample did include people who spoke little English, and I had to take pains to check and probe the material that came from this source. In all, I met only eight people whose English was so weak that I could not interview them. In presenting the results of the 1953 research, I am well aware that difficulties of communication—a recurring source of frustration to me at the time—often prevented me from getting beneath the superficialities of the immigrants' experiences. But the language barrier would have been much more of a handicap if I had been relying on the interviews alone for my material. Because the research was carried out in a group setting, the information given by one subject complemented and acted as a check upon the material provided by others, and I had many opportunities to watch these newcomers in action in diverse situations, the most revealing of which were the endless discussions that developed whenever a few of them found themselves together with time to spare.

For several reasons I did not try to secure a random sample of interviewees. Originally one of my main interests centred around social groupings. I wanted to interview people who stood in certain relations to one another—such as neighbours or fellow-workers—and this aim precluded sampling of individuals. (I might theoretically have sampled the groups themselves, but by

4 Nine of the ten subjects interviewed by Dr H. Fallding were men living singly, mostly in railway barracks, but none of these was included in the sub-sample of thirty-eight.

5 When I was present, these discussions were conducted mainly in English, interspersed with the native tongues of those taking part, or with Russian or German (usually 'camp German'), either of which languages could serve as a lingua franca among a large proportion of the Displaced Persons. Group discussion is not always a reliable source of information about individual attitudes and opinions; for the purposes of this study, these free-flowing, spontaneous discussions were especially valuable in highlighting the problems that were uppermost in the immigrants' minds, in providing group support for the expression of attitudes which the participants believed might be unacceptable to me, and in revealing patterns of interaction among them.
the time I had defined the total population of groups from which a sample could be drawn I should have completed a more ambitious field study than was possible at the time.)

However, the most serious obstacle to rigorous sampling was the problem of winning the confidence of the Displaced Persons. An attempt to interview a preselected sample of these immigrants would doubtless have produced meagre results and aroused marked anxiety and antagonism. As numerous observers have confirmed, the Displaced Persons in general were an unusually insecure and suspicious group of refugees. Most of them had lost close relatives during the war; they had left their own homes unwillingly, suffered privation and humiliation, and, after the end of hostilities, experienced years of empty, idle uncertainty before their future was finally decided by resettlement overseas. For Baltic peoples, Poles, Russians, and Ukrainians, most demoralizing of all was the very realistic fear that they would be forcibly repatriated, since the Soviet authorities claimed the right to require all peoples from the Soviet and occupied countries to return home, irrespective of their personal wishes. Soviet officials used tough and brutal methods to round up these 'Soviet citizens' and send them back to Soviet territory, until the Allied authorities eventually refused to lend their further support to this inhuman operation (Proudfoot, 1957, pp. 214-20, 399-418). All of these experiences—together with their fears for relatives remaining at home, their weariness of official investigations, and the fact that many of them had good reason for keeping to themselves some events in their past lives—made it very difficult to gain the confidence of the Displaced Persons and get them to talk freely. Even questions that are usually routine and harmless enough—about past jobs or the number of members in the family of origin, for instance—could cause distress or stir doubts about the purpose of the inquiry.

I was certainly an object of much suspicion when I arrived in Burton. Despite my carefully prepared explanations, no one knew quite what to make of me. I think that most people believed at first that I was carrying out an investigation on behalf

6 The impossibility of using formal sampling techniques in the study of displaced persons during the early years of resettlement was noted by Sebba (1954, p. 274), who investigated displaced persons in Georgia, U.S.A., and by Gillis (1954, p. 25), who studied Polish displaced persons in Wellington, N.Z. Zubrzycki (1960b, pp. 61-2), reports that the eastern Europeans in his sample of immigrants in the Latrobe Valley, Victoria, were at first extremely suspicious of the interviewers; but practically all those who refused their co-operation at the beginning were later won over.
of the Department of Immigration. A few, recalling the activities
of Soviet agents in the camps in Germany, suspected me of
being a Communist spy who might bring pressure to bear on
them to return home, or somehow cause trouble to their relatives
in Europe.\(^7\) It was weeks before the Displaced Persons at the
hostel would do more than cast me a hostile or, at best, a curious
look from a safe distance. When I had once become acquainted
with a few people at the hostel and in the town, I met or heard
of others through them and so gradually extended my contacts.
A small number of people remained too indifferent or too
suspicious to give their wholehearted co-operation; this was one
of the reasons why thirty-three of the case histories remained
incomplete (the other important reason was that subjects moved
away from the town altogether, or took work out of town, which
made it extremely difficult to contact them for interviews). Only
one individual refused to have anything to do with the project.
But, looking back now, I think that the patience, friendliness, and
trust shown by most of the people whom I approached were
quite remarkable, considering how time-consuming, impertinent,
and even frivolous my inquiries must at times have seemed to
them.

If those who finally gave me their full co-operation had been
the best-educated or the most opportunistic, outgoing, or con­
genial of the people I met, the sample would have been seriously
biased. But they had in fact nothing like this in common. Different
people had different motives for helping me, and the reason that
led an individual to respond to my first approaches was not
necessarily the same as that which made him continue to help
me. Some of the immigrants were curious or would have been
offended if I had not thought them interesting or important
enough to include in the survey. Several believed I would be able
to solve some specific problem for them, or hoped I might, in
some ill-defined way, be a useful person to know. Others were
simply glad of the opportunity to vent their disappointments
and complaints. If a few were half-hearted in their co-operation
because they were afraid to talk openly to me, others allowed the

\(^7\) In 1954 V. Petrov gave evidence before the Royal Commission on
Espionage that, until February 1953, Russia maintained in Australia G.R.U.
officers, whose 'special task was the repatriation of Displaced Persons who
came to Australia from Germany after the war and wished to return to
61) reports that among the eastern Europeans in the Latrobe Valley stories
spread 'that the material collected in interviews would be made accessible
to the Soviet Embassy in Canberra'.
first formal contacts to be made just because they were afraid not to, crediting me with an official authority that they felt it would be impolitic to ignore. Some lonely or maladjusted people welcomed the chance to talk to anyone who was interested in them. Indeed, it became more and more obvious as time went by that I was benefiting from the isolated and inferior position that these people held on the periphery of the Australian community: it was at that time rare for a Displaced Person to meet an Australian who genuinely wanted to learn about his experiences and views and with whom he could carry on an easy, informal, and even reciprocal social relationship.

The subsequent history of the thirty-eight Displaced Persons in the sub-sample (henceforth called 'the original sample') confirmed my earlier impression that these were a varied collection of individuals, reflecting a number of different kinds of adaptation to Australian life. When I set out to follow up these thirty-eight immigrants in 1962-3, I found that some who were single in 1953 had now married, but some had not; three had been divorced, and one remarried; others had been separated from their spouses for a time but had come together again. Nine had remained in Burton; the others had scattered throughout the eastern states. Their occupational histories were extremely varied: there were business ventures that had succeeded and others that had failed; some individuals had acquired new job qualifications while others had not. Most but not all of them had homes of their own. Some had made steady progress towards the goals they had set themselves, others had met with serious setbacks. Most of them were in good health, but there were cases of severe organic disease and more cases of functional disorders requiring private treatment or hospitalization. A number of people had made serious inquiries about leaving Australia for another country, and three had in fact gone to the United States. There were two men whom I could not locate (they were single and had apparently left Burton soon after 1953), and a married couple had been murdered.

The thirty-one immigrants whom I saw again in 1962-3 (henceforth called simply 'the sample') co-operated freely and, in most cases, with obvious enjoyment and interest. There was little sign of the suspicion I had encountered in 1953; on several occasions I was even able to discuss openly the reasons why I had met such a cold reception at the beginning of the first study. It is not difficult to understand why I received a more sympathetic response in 1962. The explanation lies principally in the changes
that have taken place in the lives of this group of Displaced Persons within the past ten years and which will be chronicled in some detail in the following pages. But it is also worth noting that these were in any case the people whom I knew best. Some of them had never quite lost their distrust of me, but even in these cases we met again as, in a sense, old friends, for I could look back with them on what they now regard as their pioneering days in this country. The fact that I, by this time, was married and had children and a home of my own helped them to think of me as an average sort of person with problems and interests in common with themselves, although I do not believe that it would have been an asset to me to have had this status in 1953 when the circumstances of their own lives were very different.

Because the thirty-one individuals whom I found again were scattered through some six different towns and cities and because I could devote only a limited amount of time to field work in 1962-3, the follow-up study is much more narrowly based than was the original research. This will become obvious enough in the following pages and need not be elaborated here. Suffice it to note that during the second study the material was collected almost solely through interviews, during which I filled in a brief schedule about housing, employment, etc. since 1953, and the subjects completed an attitude questionnaire and the Word Knowledge Test from the Australian Council for Educational Research, Silent Reading Tests, Form C, 1962 (without time limit). I reluctantly took a greater share in directing the discussion than I had done in 1953 because I could arrange for only one or two interviews with most of the subjects.8

It will be useful to conclude this outline of research techniques and sources with a brief summary of the salient characteristics of the sample. It consisted of nineteen men and twelve women. In 1953 the ages of the men ranged from twenty-six to forty-five and the women's from twenty-five to fifty. There were six married couples among the thirty-one subjects. The remaining group of nineteen contained four men married to German women (being Reichsdeutsche, and hence not eligible for recognition as Displaced Persons by the IRO, these women were automatically excluded from the sample), one married man with a wife in Europe, two married men whose wives were not interviewed, 8I had, respectively, one interview with twelve subjects, two interviews with thirteen subjects, and three interviews with six. As during the first study, most interviews lasted from two and a half to four hours.
two men married to Australians, four single men, one married woman whose husband was not interviewed, one woman married to an Australian, and four widows. Without going into details, we can note that by the time of the follow-up study all except three of the men and two of the women were married and living with their spouses.

It is no simple matter to describe the composition of the family units to which these people belonged. By 1962 twelve of the twenty-six subjects who were living with their spouses had been married before, or were married to partners who had been married before. This meant two things: a number of the subjects had step-children, and a number were separated from their own children. Of the six married couples in the 1962 sample, three had children (of one or both partners) in Australia and three had no children in Australia; of the remaining subjects, nine were married with children, four were married without children, four were widowed or divorced and had children, and two were single. Fourteen of the people in the sample (including three married couples) were actually living in households with their own children; in all except three of these cases, all the children in the household had been born in Australia and were still under twelve years old. Only two women out of the twelve had more than two living children, but, as far as I could make out, very few of them had lost children, and none had borne children who had died as the result of the war.

In mid-1953 seventeen of the subjects had been in Australia less than four years, the length of residence for the sample ranging from two years three months to five years two months. The thirty-one people had been born in nine different countries: Poland, the Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Yugoslavia.

Although I originally intended to focus the research on social groupings, it turned out that group organization amongst these immigrants was extremely weak and casual. In so far as there was a ‘D.P. group’, it existed by default, not by choice. Such friendship cliques as emerged proved to be unstable and peripheral to the main interests of their members. Most Displaced Persons were living alone or in truncated family units; they did

9 In this context ‘Australian’ means Australian-born, of British extraction. Elsewhere the term ‘Australian’ refers to residents of Australia who are not distinguished from the rest of the community as recent immigrants or as members of an ethnic group.
not have family dwellings and there were few children; family
groups could scarcely form the focus of the study. Except at
work, these people did not belong to migrant-Australian groups.
Such social groups as they did feel firmly attached to were for
the most part non-local: some of the immigrants still had more
contact with people in their home countries than in Australia;
some lived in the past, isolated from any effective present rela-
tionships; some had friends throughout the country, people they
had known at home or met on the voyage out. By 1962, family
life had become a more vital influence on the people I was study­
ing, and other immediate, active groups had also won the attach­
ment of some of them, but it was still true that the adaptation
of these immigrants to life in Australia could best be understood
in terms of individual rather than group processes. This did not
mean that a sociological investigation had turned into a psycho­
logical one. But it did mean that at the centre of the study
figured, not the group, but the individual, as the incumbent of a
certain social position, the role-player and the carrier of beliefs
and values. If a label for this kind of essay is necessary, the most
appropriate is probably socio-psychological.

The term ‘assimilation’ can, of course, be used to refer to
groups or to individuals (and in either case, the orientation may
be psychological, sociological, or cultural), to the process of
adaptation, or to the end result of that process. A full-scale
theory would need to embrace assimilation in all of these aspects.
But in this study assimilation simply means the process by which
an individual immigrant adapts himself to life in a new society;
thus every immigrant is assimilated in some measure. Despite the
confusing variety of theoretical models that have been built
around the concept of assimilation (considered now only in this
limited sense), there is a substantial amount of agreement about
what rightly belongs within this field of study. The several
elements, ordered and combined in diverse ways, seem logically
to fall into four sub-processes: learning new behaviour patterns
and adopting new values and norms; assuming new roles within
the social structure of the host society (economic roles sometimes
being singled out from all others and described under some

10 The term ‘assimilation’ is also applied to the fundamental social process
by which individuals become incorporated into new groups, or groups
merge into other groups; but common practice justifies the use of the
word without qualification to refer to the particular case where people
move from one society to settle permanently in another (see Park and
Burgess, 1921; Taft, 1957).
special term, such as economic absorption); coming to feel a sense of belonging in the new society, with all that this implies in terms of self-perceptions, allegiances and responsibilities; and finding satisfaction in these new activities and loyalties. I shall call the first of these elements cultural assimilation or acculturation, the second social assimilation, and the third identification. For reasons that will become clear in the course of the discussion, I have found it appropriate to think of the immigrant’s psychological adjustment as distinct from the assimilation process itself.

The discussion in the remaining chapters is based primarily on the analysis of case-studies of the seventy-one people interviewed and the other kinds of material described earlier. With the qualifications mentioned previously, the sample is believed to be representative of the adult Displaced Persons in Burton in 1953, but, because the cases were not selected at random and because the number who provided detailed material is, in any event, so small (thirty-eight, reduced to thirty-one by 1962), no attempt has been made to base the argument on statistical findings. The material has, however, been quantified wherever this seemed appropriate. The results are presented in the text when they appear to be indicative of trends which are also suggested by the qualitative material as a whole. Tests of significance are not referred to in the text, but interested readers may check on the significance of comparisons between one group of subjects and another by referring to Tables 3 and 4. The raw data for the thirty-one cases followed up in 1962 are given in Table 2.
Between 1948 and 1951 some hundreds of Displaced Persons were directed to Burton and the surrounding district to work under contract in the quarries, railways, hospitals, and other understaffed essential services. But by 1953 the 200 or so Displaced Persons remaining in the town were employed in a variety of organizations: the railways, the hospital, the textile factories, the migrant hostel and the hotels employed the largest numbers. No Displaced Person had a white-collar or professional job in Burton at that time. Of the thirty-eight people in the original sample, half the men and one of the women were in skilled occupations, such as chef, tailor, mechanic; the rest held jobs requiring little skill, such as factory operative or boilerman. There has been some unemployment in the district since 1953, when the post-war boom began to fade. By the time of the 1961 Census, the town's population had increased from 19,000 to 20,000 and the number of Displaced Persons had decreased to about 170. Only nine of the thirty-eight subjects were still in Burton in 1962. The twenty-nine who had left included twelve of the fifteen people who came from what will be called a middle status background in Europe, that is a white-collar or professional background.¹ Some of these twelve might have settled in Burton if they could have found congenial employment there, but they

¹Eight of the people thus classified were already established in a career before they came to Australia, as teacher, journalist, photographer, accountant, army officer, artist, private secretary, and musician. Five were too young to have completed their intended training and two women, without qualifications of their own, were placed in this category because they were married to professional men. Five people out of the whole sample were clearly moving up the class scale before they left Europe; only one of them, a woman who had married a lawyer and had herself become a private secretary, seemed sufficiently well established in a middle status position to be thus classified in this context. But later in the discussion special reference will be made to the adaptation of these five formerly mobile individuals.
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were all used to city life, and ultimately gravitated to Sydney, Melbourne, or Canberra, or left Australia for the United States.

Thirteen of the original fifteen migrants of middle status background were interviewed again in the follow-up study. They have all shown a remarkable capacity to benefit from opportunities and to acquire new qualifications. When they first arrived in Australia, some of them had hopes of taking a university course, but by the time they might have afforded to do so, age or family responsibilities deterred them or the incentive had gone. Instead they have acquired new qualifications by taking courses and passing internal examinations in the government organizations in which they are employed, doing correspondence courses at night while working during the day, or, in the case of one man who has become a highly-skilled chef, attending a special school. Another man who had never lived on the land in Europe has become the only farmer in the research sample. Though not afraid of hard work, he was attracted to farm life because it seemed to offer the easy independence of the gentleman’s existence he had been used to in Europe; he is learning the techniques of raising fat cattle and other crafts, such as making cheese and curing ham, without which, he feels, no estate is complete. The four middle status people who are, or have been, doing the same kind of work as they did in Europe are women: a former teacher, married and supported by her husband, gives occasional private German lessons; an artist paints and works in an art gallery; two office-workers have used qualifications gained in Europe. Only one individual out of the thirteen, a married woman employed intermittently, has neither taken up the work for which she was trained nor acquired new qualifications to lift her above the level of a semi-skilled factory operative. She and another two women, one married and the other a widow past middle age, represent the three middle status people who have remained in Burton.

It was clearly to the advantage of migrants of middle status background looking for white-collar jobs to leave Burton and settle in the city. But the 1962 study showed that subjects of less favoured origins have done better in Burton or in other country districts than in the city: amongst the eighteen immigrants from what will be called a lower status background—farm labourers, factory workers, shop assistants, tradesmen, or the wives or children of people in jobs of this kind—seven of the ten who have gone to live in the city are still in unskilled jobs, compared to three of the eight remaining in the country (see Table 5). Besides the few contained in the sample, numerous patient, hard-
working tradesmen from Europe have found good opportunities for advancement in Burton.

Two migrants of lower status background moved into white-collar jobs while still in the town, although one has now left; they have both been in the public service many years and are both married to Australian women; although young when they left Europe, they had already begun to train for jobs that would eventually have improved their social standing at home. Leaving aside these two men and one woman who did not work before emigration, no one in the whole sample is in a job here that requires greater qualifications than the kind of work he had, or was destined for, at home. Broadly speaking, the unskilled remain unskilled, the tradesmen are working in their own or other skilled or less skilled occupations, and the white-collar workers are in white-collar or at least responsible jobs, but different ones from those they had or planned to have at home.

Service in a government organization has offered these migrants more opportunities for advancement than has any other kind of employment. Commonwealth Hostels Ltd has trained managers and chefs; a hospital has trained nurses; the Department of Railways in Burton has given tradesmen the chance to work in their former occupations or to qualify in new ones; two men employed by the Commonwealth government as clerks have already improved their gradings. The migrants themselves recognize that as public servants they are in a relatively protected and secure situation, where their chances of making progress are as good as anyone else's but where the pressure to get on is never likely to become intolerable. Commonwealth Hostels has been particularly important. From their earliest years in this country, when they were still learning English and finding their feet and would have been neither eligible nor sufficiently confident to seek similar openings in more competitive organizations, a number of the migrants found in this institution opportunities for training, advancement, and even promotion to positions of some responsibility. Because Commonwealth Hostels employed Displaced Persons in large numbers from the time when it first began operations, it was one of the few organizations in which a migrant could capitalize on his knowledge of German and eastern European languages.

Only one of the migrants was in a lower paid and/or less skilled job in 1962 than in 1953. Apart from the married women supported by their husbands, those who were not in better jobs in 1962 consisted of seven men, all of lower status background and
occupying seven of the eight bottom places in the scale of English language ability. Failure to learn good English has clearly limited the kind of jobs open to these people. This failure itself may be the result of intellectual or emotional disabilities on which there is no information. Whether this is so or not, it seems certain that incompetence in English and the tendency to remain in jobs requiring little skill are different facets of the general attitude of these migrants to their work and their place in the Australian community. Not being ambitious either for higher status jobs or for social acceptance by Australians, they have lacked the incentives that seem to have upheld their more mobile fellows in striving to learn the new language. But they have not been without other incentives: they have directed all their energies towards establishing themselves financially. Whether they avoided changing their behaviour and habits because they were interested only in making money or whether money-making assumed importance as a substitute for other satisfactions which eluded them are impossible questions to disentangle, but I shall return to this problem briefly later.

The research produced no evidence that those migrants who had not improved their job status had suffered because of discrimination from employers. Complaints of unfair treatment were extremely rare, both in 1953 and 1962. Instances of helpfulness, understanding and protection on the part of superiors were much more common at both times. The migrants accepted the fact that, so long as they knew little English and were inexperienced in local patterns of work, they could not expect chances of advancement equal to those of Australians. At the same time most of them resented the barriers that hampered European tradesmen and professional people in trying to follow their previous callings in this country. But they blamed this particular form of victimization on the unions or the government, that is, on external forces over which their immediate employers or supervisors had no control.

If the bosses were generally felt to be on the migrants' side, fellow-workers were not. In 1953, about one-third of the migrants had experienced some unpleasant incident involving Australians with whom they worked, and many more had experienced general attitudes of unfriendliness. The resulting feelings of humiliation, rejection and loneliness bubbled repeatedly to the surface of the migrants' conversation at that time, but by 1962 only one man reacted with the same intensity and bitterness. Most of the migrants still believe that working people are gener-
ally less friendly than business and professional people (the usual terms in which they conceive the comparison), but they no longer suffer personally. Variable as their backgrounds were, they seemed at first to share an attitude towards work very different from the attitude of the Australians with whom they associated, and the post-war labour shortage accentuated these differences. The migrants were contemptuous of the laziness and poor workmanship of the Australians. They criticized both employers and management for lack of discipline. A few loudly condemned 'the authorities' for failing to take responsibility for the personal behaviour of employees when off duty. They believed that Australians were jealous of them because they worked too hard, did not take time off to be sociable and got on too well with the bosses. They were convinced that jealousy of their financial achievements in general intruded into the work situation to cause further trouble, and that Australians resented any show of special skill or aptitude from migrants, or any indication that the migrants came from a superior social or educational background. A tradesman, Mr T., summed up what he felt about relations between migrants and Australian co-workers when he said, in an interview in 1962:

In general the working class in Australia are unfriendly towards immigrants, but this is the same everywhere. In Australia the middle class would be more friendly than the working class and the 'high class' the most friendly of all. It is like this: with working people, people who are not educated, 'what is in their hearts comes straight out of their mouths'. If they feel angry or cross they show it and say straight out what they feel about foreigners. But better educated people speak more carefully. No matter what they feel they will be polite, and so there is no trouble. He thinks he gets on best with the better educated people. Working people don't like to be shown how to do things by an immigrant. You must 'go round' if you want to show them something, not look as though you know better than they do. They will flare up and take no notice if you do.2

Learning to 'go round' has played a decisive part in the adjustment of migrants generally to the situations they have to work in. Mrs Z., a woman of educated background who had been employed in uncongenial domestic jobs, had learnt a similar

2 Quotations from interviews are in the third person because this is how I recorded them. The use of the first person gives a spurious impression of verbatim exactness to material that has been written up after an interview is over.
lesson by 1953. She was trying to explain why the antagonism of the Australian staff in the organization where she had previously worked had been directed more against her than against other European employees:

She thinks it was because their approach was different. She was used to being friendly with everyone. These other people from a different background knew that they must go more carefully. But she has learnt now that she just does her work and goes home and nothing more. She 'does not try to get into contact with people any more', and that is better.

Adjustments of this kind have done much to reduce the tension between these immigrants and Australian workers. While the migrants have gradually become more perceptive, they have also become less sensitive to insults and hurts. 'I have a skin like a crocodile', as one woman put it. Lacking support for their ideals of workmanship and discipline, and finding the burden of bearing a lone standard intolerable, most of them have also adopted the norms of their fellow-workers, or at least ceased making an issue of behaviour that they disapprove of. Although I have little independent data on the present work situations of the subjects, it seems clear enough that there has been a mutual process of adjustment between migrants and fellow-workers and that not only do the migrants perceive less hostility than in the past but that they are also in fact treated more like everyone else.

The pattern made by each migrant as he threads his way through the occupational fabric of the community can be understood only in terms of certain underlying values by which he makes judgments and forms decisions. All the migrants were motivated in some measure by the desire for money, status, and security. Often one consideration, such as wages or the respectability of a job, would set limits to a range within which some other factor would determine the final choice, but one value clearly tended to dominate the others in each individual.

In 1953 most, though not all, of the lower status subjects judged a job above all else by the money it would bring in. Mr Y., who was ill at ease and disliked in his job, put it like this:

He didn't care what job he did. He would clean out lavatories if necessary, so long as he earned the money. 'Money is everything.'

But by 1962 this man, like a number of others, had come to look upon his work as a source of other satisfactions besides money. After some weeks of unemployment he had taken a job as a
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builder's labourer, a less-skilled job than he had held in 1953. But he described it as very satisfactory. He gets a good deal of overtime, likes working in the fresh air, and with a few people rather than in a big organization. This job suits him because he thinks he may be able to learn a trade that will help him to build a home of his own. He gets on well with the people he works with.

Several men, trained as tradesmen but working in less-skilled occupations and uncertain about future opportunities, felt in 1953 that any job they were likely to get could have no meaning for them except as a source of income. But by 1962, employed in their old trades or in new ones, settled among workmates who accepted them, filling a recognized place in some now familiar organization, with prospects of promotion and their future economic security assured, they no longer judged a job only by the pay packet that went with it.

The migrants of middle status background typically held from the beginning something akin to a 'professional' attitude to work. Mr F., who had recently taken over a new job in the organization in which he had been working for a number of years, said in 1962:

He doesn't know whether this new job will mean more money or not. But he doesn't really mind. The job is 'a challenge' to him, and he wants to make a go of it.

Even though in 1953 none of these people had yet found the kind of work they hoped for, they worked diligently and efficiently, devoting themselves to their routine jobs as they would willingly have given themselves to the more demanding occupations they aspired to. By 1962 they had all learnt to be content with less exciting, responsible, and satisfying employment than they had once hoped for, but they had nevertheless found relatively congenial jobs with which they were, in varying degrees, identified. Their work provided them above all else with the opportunity to act independently, express their own ideas, and exercise some measure of authority over others. It gave them a feeling of importance, of being valued for some unique and individual contribution. The following extracts from an interview with a successful chef, who had once thought of becoming a journalist, illustrate some of the meanings that people of this kind attach to their work. Immediately on meeting Mr G. again in 1963, I was told
that he had now become a great success in his profession. What started off as a joke had become something serious. This was his job in life now. The cooking school he went to was very successful. When it was over, the chef told him that he had nothing more to teach him now. In lots of ways to be a cook is a very unsatisfactory job. You have to please the management, the customers, the kitchen staff, and the owners. It is impossible to please all of these at once, so he long ago decided to please the owners and the customers. [After giving several instances of tiffs with the management] he emphasized that he likes to speak out when something is wrong. He can afford to.

Another five people of middle status background shared in some measure the attitudes of these professionally-minded subjects, but were much more preoccupied with social recognition, with the outward symbols of status that went with a job, than with its actual content. These migrants were dominated by what Eisenstadt (1954a, p. 115) has called 'a definitely “ritualistic” attitude which makes their self-esteem dependent on their acquiring and retaining these different symbols and amenities, which become, as it were, ends in themselves, and necessary symbols of the self'. The migrants placed in this category in 1953 have had a variety of jobs since that date, but they all moved into white-collar occupations at the earliest opportunity, except for the one who became an independent farmer. They have all had to modify their earlier aspirations a good deal, and by 1962 the four who were in full-time employment were more interested in using the money they earned to consolidate a congenial type of life than in pursuing occupational ambitions as such.

There were, finally, four individuals of varying backgrounds, who in 1953 valued a job more for the security it offered than for anything else. What they wanted was an inconspicuous niche, where they would be protected from competition and enjoy psychological as well as financial security. They have changed jobs reluctantly; indeed one woman has remained in the same position ever since she came to Australia thirteen years ago. With the passing of time the search for security has become more important in the outlook of many migrants besides these four. There are various reasons for this. With some people the change seems to have been the natural accompaniment of growing older. In other cases, their primary financial objectives achieved, some migrants feel that they no longer need to make money their only consideration. Others again, disappointed in their earlier ambitions for money or status, have come to doubt whether the game was
worth the candle; they have lowered their level of aspiration, settled into undemanding, more or less dead-end jobs and discovered a new peace of mind.

The migrants with whom this study is concerned were satisfied with their jobs according to the extent to which their particular demands were being met, or seemed likely to be met in the future. But, as we have seen, circumstances modified or changed demands, with the result that a migrant could come to appreciate a job which he had once found scarcely bearable, and vice versa. Furthermore, satisfaction can be measured only in the context of a particular time perspective: most of the subjects thought of the jobs they had in 1953 as temporary expedients, and were satisfied with them in these terms. But by 1962 the majority realized that possibilities were limited and that what they had won by that time foreshadowed fairly accurately what they were likely to achieve during the rest of their working lives. So by 1962 nearly all of them judged the jobs they had in the light of long-term considerations. At this time, all except two of the men had found jobs which they could regard quite happily as permanent. One of the two exceptions was working in an unskilled job which suited him well, but which he cheerfully expected to exchange for another, as he had done innumerable times in the past. The other man, still gazing longingly over his shoulder at the life he had left behind in Europe, was resigned to the fact that he would never find a job he could enjoy in this country. The attitudes of the women varied considerably: three from a middle status background had reluctantly accepted a domestic existence; of the other four women of similar origins, two were settled in congenial jobs and two doubtful about their prospects, not because they were immigrants but because they were women and nearly forty years old. Three of the five women of lower status background were grateful to be freed of the burden of working outside the home, the fourth would have taken a full-time job if her husband had let her, the fifth had work that suited her, but was not involved in it at all, and easily satisfied.

In discussing employment among the research sample so far I have proceeded as if each individual had one job and one source of income. In fact the situation was much more complex. At least six of the men have at some time held two regular jobs concurrently, usually taking advantage of shift work hours in their main jobs to fit in some secondary privately arranged em-
Jobs and Money

employment, like working at night in a small machine shop or at weekends on a farm. Some of these six and others besides have also taken on intermittent work, like shoe-mending or electrical repairs. Others have kept boarders or sold garden produce. Some have built their own homes and exchanged labour with other migrants doing the same thing. Excluding for the moment men who only worked overtime (as nearly everyone has done at some time or another) and/or had the support of a working wife, the number of men who have at some stage and for some years had more than one source of income is eleven out of nineteen. Nine of the eleven still had a second source of income in 1962. The eleven included only two of the six middle status men (and both had special qualifications for their second job), compared to nine out of thirteen men of lower status background.

The immigrants also differed in their readiness or capacity to save. In 1953 over half of them were saving so stringently that they bought almost nothing beyond the necessities of food, clothing, and shelter. Having acquired the houses, furniture, equipment, and cars that they were aiming for, most of them had by 1962 relaxed their efforts in some measure: wives no longer worked full-time; money was spent on personal luxuries, holidays, or doctors. Other people have over the years acquired some property and personal possessions, but have never sacrificed day-to-day pleasures and comforts in the cause of long-term aims. Their saving pattern has changed little during the period.

Attitudes towards saving were clearly related to the European background of the migrants, although the contrast between the thrifty lower status migrants and the more easygoing people of middle status was more marked in the early days than it is now. But single people of all backgrounds—that is those who were single in 1953 and married people who recalled a time before 1953 when they were unmarried—found long-term saving harder than did people with family responsibilities and support. They were often looking for something to spend their money on, buying clothes that they had no occasion to wear, radiograms that they had no one to play to, and cameras that they used on rare occasions to take photos that no one wanted to see.

But saving patterns were not determined by attitudes towards saving alone. Some people had no opportunity to save because of illness or family responsibilities. On the other hand, if husband and wife both worked and there were no children, money accumulated without austere living. In a few cases, thrift was not equalled by capacity to manage money and the hapless migrant
lost all his savings in unwise investment in houses or cars.

Apart from one man who brought a few hundred pounds capital with him to Australia, these immigrants have established themselves financially through their own efforts at working and saving since they arrived in this country. Most of them have at some time borrowed money but none has received any substantial help from any outside source. The table below summarizes house and car ownership in 1953 and 1962.

HOUSE AND CAR OWNERSHIP, 1953 AND 1962
19 MALE DISPLACED PERSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Middle status</th>
<th>Lower status</th>
<th>Middle status</th>
<th>Lower status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned house and car</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (3)*</td>
<td>6 (6)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned house only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (7)*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (3)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned car only</td>
<td>1 (1)*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (2)*</td>
<td>2 (1)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned neither house nor car</td>
<td>5 (1)*</td>
<td>6 (5)*</td>
<td>1 (1)†</td>
<td>2 (2)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)†</td>
<td>(1)†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House paid off</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Married.
† Living singly (including separated, divorced and widowed).

None of the cars owned by the subjects in 1962 was more than three years old, and ten of the thirteen had been bought new. All except one family had bought their cars on hire purchase, but most of them had paid off the loan or were doing so in less than the maximum time allowed by such agreements. More than half the people who owned cars in 1962 had previously owned at least one cheaper second-hand model. It is extremely difficult to estimate what money the house-owners have put into their homes, because in most cases they have either built the houses themselves or they have bought old dilapidated houses or new partly-finished ones and put work and money into renovating them, adding to them, or finishing them off. The total amount of cash paid out for houses when completed seems to have ranged from £850 to £3,500 in Burton, and from £2,300 to £5,300 in the city. Only three families paid more than £4,000 for a house in the first instance.

The number of cases involved is small—sixteen homes and
twenty individuals—but there is some indication of differences between subjects of middle and lower status background in patterns of acquiring homes. In general the middle status migrants have bought more expensive properties, have been more willing to borrow comparatively large sums of money over a long term, and have been less disposed to undertake major house-building or renovating tasks themselves. They have also taken longer to establish themselves in homes, partly because they have not saved so effectively, partly because they wanted costlier houses, and partly because they seem to have been reluctant to commit themselves to any particular locality to the extent that home ownership might imply. (Not that they or people of different background necessarily think of buying a home as an irrevocable step: five families have already had one home and sold it to build or buy another.)

The most prosperous of all the subjects was an intelligent and educated man who had the unique good fortune to join a flourishing business established by fellow-immigrants. In 1962 only some of the remaining migrants in white-collar jobs were earning more than the skilled or unskilled workers. But a rough estimate of the equity held by the nineteen males in houses, cars and major consumer durables indicated that middle status people tended to be less well off than the people of lower status background: five of the six middle status men owned assets (as defined) valued between £800 and £3,000, while seven of the thirteen lower status men had assets worth £3,000 to £6,000.3

The determining factor in financial success has not been the remuneration received by the individual for his main job, but the tenacity with which he has pursued economic interests. Leaving aside the businessman just referred to, the most prosperous migrants are five men of lower status background, who quickly saw what they could hope to achieve in this country, chose their goals, and pursued them with a zeal and clarity of purpose not to be found among the less single-minded migrants of more favoured origins. These men have all worked very long hours in

3 The value of assets was calculated roughly as follows: houses were valued by an estate agent, and the sum owing, if any, deducted from the market value to give the amount of the owner’s equity; cars were valued at current market prices, according to make and model, and the sum owing, if any, deducted from the market value; the amount spent on major consumer durables (i.e. costing originally £100 or more) was calculated to the nearest £100 and added to the two previous items, without allowing for depreciation. Few people held substantial savings in the form of cash or investments, but where such savings exceeded £100, they were also added to the value of assets.
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Overtime or in second jobs or both. They have all had the help of wives working full-time for a number of years. Four have built their own homes. Some notes from interviews with Mr A., the most rationally-organized and determined of these men, will illuminate this kind of adjustment.

1953: [By the time he had finished his contract] he realized that if he was to do any good here he must either have money or know English. There is no use being sentimental about these things: these are the hard cold facts. If you have money you don’t need to know English. He didn’t have money, so he decided to learn English. . . . He boarded with an Australian family because he knew that he must associate mainly with Australians if he was to learn the language properly. That was one thing that made him choose to spend most of his time with Australians. The other thing was that he wanted to save money and he couldn’t if he had to keep up with the other New Australians [i.e. single men like himself]; they spent too much. [After another couple of years] he felt he wanted to settle down. Being in love and all that he had finished with long ago. He had to have a wife who would work. He knows that every woman likes to stop working after marriage, but he couldn’t afford that. Like any other man, he likes a pretty girl, but he couldn’t afford that either. If he had to keep his wife, his plans to build a house, get a car and so on would be postponed indefinitely. So they agreed not to have a family for three years. . . . Now he and his wife work seven days a week. He doesn’t like to work so hard any more than anyone else does, but he has to. . . . A better job than he has now would be a job with better money, but he wouldn’t take a labouring job if he could help it, not because he would be influenced by the fact that these jobs are rated lower, for he has lost the ‘sentiments’ that would make him think of such things, and for him the material benefit must come first. Like everybody else he at one time had ideas about what he wanted to do, but these had all been killed in the past ten years. . . . In answer to a question, he said he wasn’t interested in national clubs. He didn’t see what benefit he could get out of them. If he became interested in a club he would be under some obligation to give it his time when he could be doing other things for himself.

1962: Comparing himself to some of the other Displaced Persons whom he knew when he first came here, he decided that their life was no good for him; they spent all their money on drinking and got only a headache for it. That’s what you might call putting everything on the ‘front stage’. But he decided to work for the ‘back stage’, to build up everything behind him. You can’t spend your money just as you want to and have all the other things you want. You have to decide about this.
But in establishing themselves financially in this country, only a few of the migrants included in this study have journeyed along such a straight and unbroken path, moving steadily towards well-defined goals from year to year. Most of these people—including some who are now quite secure financially—have encountered obstacles to delay them, been led along deceptive blind alleys, or been forced to retrace their steps and begin the journey again. Illness, unemployment, marital troubles, excessive ambition, and ignorance in handling business affairs have served to make progress towards financial stability often erratic and uneven. So have drinking and gambling, prompted sometimes by an inward rebellion and at variance with conscious purposes, but in other cases rather the manifestation of a search for identity, an attempt to find a place in a group and to share in communally-accepted interests and routines. Indeed, the more these people have come to take part in community life of any kind, the less have they been able to concentrate on their personal economic welfare, for they have had to incur obligations to provide hospitality, to give presents, to support churches, associations, and local causes. In one way the migrant certainly travels fastest who travels alone: not alone in that he lacks a helpmate, but alone in the sense of being isolated from the distractions and obligations of sociable living.
The Displaced Persons were the first large group of non-British migrants to come to Australia after the war. Politicians and government officials, mindful of traditional attitudes of indifference or hostility towards 'foreigners', tried to impress the Australian people with a sense of responsibility towards these hapless refugees. They also sought to make the immigrants understand that they would be warmly welcomed into membership of 'our national family', as Sir Robert (then Mr) Menzies expressed it at the First Citizenship Convention in Canberra in 1950. Taking their cue from such pronouncements, leading citizens of Burton publicly reiterated similar sentiments as migrants began arriving in the town from 1949 onwards. At the well-attended civic welcome held in March 1951 to celebrate the opening of the migrant hostel (housing British migrants, but largely staffed by Displaced Persons), the Mayor told the newcomers from Europe:

To ... our New Australians we extend the hand of friendship and express the hope that in this their adopted country, they will find avenues and means to fulfil their most cherished hopes among a freedom-loving people. ... They will find Australia a generous and friendly country. ... Our people will be glad to welcome you (British and non-British) into their homes.

The local newspaper repeatedly reminded the townsfolk of their obligations towards both British and European immigrants, and on occasions castigated them for their apathy. A Pastoral Letter read at the Roman Catholic Cathedral in 1950 exhorted parishioners to be especially tolerant, sympathetic, patient, and helpful to migrants from Europe.

At first the task of seeing that these high ideals were acted upon fell mainly to the local Employment Officer, the one person who had contact with most of the Displaced Persons arriving in Burton in these years. This man took a personal interest in a
number of immigrants, but his attempts to encourage local associations to organize entertainments for the newcomers met with a poor response. In 1950 his public request that the people of Burton should invite New Australians into their homes on Australia Day produced only two invitations.

Then in August 1950, largely at the instigation of the Assimilation Division of the Department of Immigration in Canberra, a Good Neighbour Committee was formed in the town, with the Employment Officer as Honorary Secretary. The interest which this Committee at first aroused did not last, and in October 1951 it was replaced by a branch of the New Settlers’ League. This government-subsidized Australia-wide organization, now called in New South Wales, as in the other states, the Good Neighbour Council, is intended to co-ordinate the activities of voluntary groups, churches, and other bodies concerned with the welfare of immigrants. Hence the branches of the Council are normally composed of delegates from local associations. The enthusiastic support at first given to the Burton branch reflected the current feeling that the community had ‘a migrant problem’. But again interest soon flagged. The churches did not bestir themselves. Few of the hundred or so associations in the town bothered to appoint delegates. The eight groups which responded to the challenge to ‘do something for the immigrants’ made only sporadic, short-lived efforts, concentrated for the most part on the British residents in the migrant hostel. After the beginning of 1952 even these meagre tokens of friendship faded out, except for the Rotary Club’s International Night. During 1952 the meetings of the New Settlers’ League were largely devoted to the affairs of the British migrants, who used it as a pressure group in a conflict that they were at the time waging with the hostel management. By the end of 1953 regular meetings had ceased. Its few remaining supporters claimed that the organization no longer had a job to do because of the imminent closing of the hostel and because the Europeans in the town were by now ‘all assimilated’. Despite efforts by the State Secretary to revive it, the branch was virtually disbanded in February 1954. It had impinged in no way on the lives of the European immigrants. Only a handful of them even knew of its existence.

It was no new experience for the people of Burton to have groups living in the community, but not of it. The town population was composed principally of ‘natives’ and ‘newcomers’—to adopt the terms used by the local people. But it also included recognized peripheral groups—like the schoolteachers and the
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Greek community—who can be called ‘outsiders’, although this term was not commonly used to refer to them. The natives had not necessarily been born in Burton, but had lived in or around the town most of their lives. They were ordered into occupational and economic hierarchies and into a prestige hierarchy which was not exactly coterminous with either of the others but rested partly on family membership, personal qualities, and community service. At the bottom of the economic and occupational hierarchies were a number of families who, although they should have qualified as ‘natives’, were not in fact referred to as such—unless it was as ‘natives but . . .’—for the term carried marked positive overtones which ruled them out. They were people whom the community did not want to own. In a sense they were, like other peripheral groups, outsiders. A lot of the newcomers left the town before they could become anything else; if they stayed long enough they were recognized as natives, or ‘like a native’, but how quickly the transition occurred depended on their readiness to conform to the local mores. If they overreached themselves by trying to initiate radical changes, assume leadership, or assert themselves unduly, the process of acceptance would be retarded. The outsiders were the people who, except in limited and particular spheres, were not interested in being received into the established community, that is amongst the natives and the accepted newcomers. These several principles of alignment—class divisions, the native-newcomer dichotomy, and in addition the Protestant-Catholic division—were so generally recognized and accepted that the public life of the community was reasonably harmonious and effective. But underneath the surface simmered dark springs of bickering, jealousy, envy, and unkindness, and the townsfolk were quick to become defensive in face of the discreditable contrast between the community ideal of spontaneous and unquestioning friendliness and the inescapable fact that people were in practice treated differently according to the pigeon-holes in which they were placed. In their more insightful moments the established members of the community recognized that newcomers often found Burton inhospitable, unfriendly and ‘cliquey’, but they were quick to explain away this impression. They showed themselves especially sensitive on the subject of the Displaced Persons. People to whom I described the research I was doing in Burton often reacted immediately with an explanation of why they, as individuals, or the town in general, had not taken the welfare of these immigrants to heart, interpreting my interest as a criticism of themselves, although
nothing of the kind was implied in what I said. They dimly recognized that the Displaced Persons had a unique claim to their attention and kindness because of the grim experiences that these newcomers had suffered as refugees and the circumstances under which they had come to Australia. Moved by a sense of duty, sharpened in many cases by vague guilt feelings, a number of local people did make gestures of goodwill towards these new arrivals, inviting them to meetings, taking them out for drives, and asking them into their homes. But, having made peace with their consciences, they rarely followed up these first contacts in such a way as to allow the immigrants to become involved in the social life of their own families. They were usually relieved to be absolved from further effort when they found—as they did on many occasions—that the Europeans were apparently indifferent and ungrateful: 'They just want to be left to themselves', the Burton people would say.¹

But this was not the whole story. There were some individuals who offered genuine friendship, free from unconscious compulsions. There were others who enjoyed drawing favourable attention to themselves by producing on social occasions an 'interesting', attractive, or talented European guest. Some informants believed that Australians were more inclined to react in this way at the time when migrants were first arriving in the town, and still a 'novelty', than they were later. But this precarious relationship between migrant and Australian was usually short-lived: sometimes it was the migrant who got tired of being treated 'like an animal in the zoo'; sometimes it was the townsfolk who became bored with their find. One obliging zither player, having exhausted his repertoire, 'wasn't invited any more'.

The immigrants for their part had varying expectations of the local people and made diverse responses to their gestures of goodwill. Many of them were too self-conscious to accept hospitality that they could not return, living as they did in rented rooms or in quarters provided on the job, and lacking still the household equipment that they would consider necessary for entertaining

¹ After discussing the unresponsiveness of Displaced Persons to friendly overtures, Murphy (1955, p. 130) goes on to state that, from the point of view of these immigrants, Australians showed little genuine friendliness: 'The common picture was that the D.P. would . . . in general be moderately welcome. Certainly, few of them experienced anything like real hostility. But after a couple of invitations to home, to drink, to play tennis, duty seemed to have been fulfilled on the Australian's part, and although relations might remain perfectly cordial there was no deepening of the contact or extension through it to other contacts.'
visitors. Most of them were indeed loath to enter into any relationships that would reveal their comfortless, crowded, and makeshift manner of living to the curious, censorious eyes of Australians: contact with the conditions under which they were living would, they feared, only confirm Australians in their poor opinion of Displaced Persons. Moreover, being reluctant to expose themselves to an unfamiliar situation when they could avoid it, and unsure of how they should behave or what would be asked of them, most of these people ignored occasional invitations to special entertainments organized for their benefit. The few who accepted, usually the better educated and the more fluent in English, hoped that these functions would mean the beginning of a natural, effortless process of acceptance into the social life of the community. But they were disappointed. Their reactions can be illustrated from the case of the Rotary Club's International Night, which was for several years an annual occasion for entertaining European and British immigrants. Informants who had attended these evenings appreciated that Rotary was the one local organization which had persisted beyond the first flush of enthusiasm in offering hospitality to Europeans, but when these meetings were over they were usually left with the hopeless feeling that no genuine communication had been established between themselves and the members. They came to recognize—if not accept—that these occasions were symbolic expressions of an ideal, not a means of putting the ideal into practice. Mr C. described how the Rotarian who had been appointed as his 'host' at one of these dinners had called around to see him a couple of times after the meeting. But Mr C. realized that the Australian was somewhat embarrassed by the situation and 'didn't know what to do with him'. After one fruitless appeal for help in finding somewhere for his family to live, Mr C. did not bother this man again. Another young man, Mr K., was less philosophical. He described his feelings like this:

At the time of the Rotary meeting last year, a lot of the New Australians who attended were out of work. He wanted to get up and say, 'if you really want to help the New Australians why don't you do something about getting them jobs instead of all this talking' . . . When the meeting is over, they say, 'good night, see you next year'. Not one of them would ask you home for a cup of tea afterwards.

To this informant, and to a number of others of middle status background, Rotary represented the elusive group of 'better-
class' Australians whom they had no chance to meet socially in the course of their everyday lives. They rebelled against the abortiveness of these contacts because of the humiliation of being brushed aside by the very people with whom, they had believed, they would quickly find a common ground for friendship once the ice had been broken.

Much of the inappropriate, ungracious, or exhibitionistic behaviour of the migrants at this time was to be explained not so much in terms of their European cultural background but as a reaction to their inescapable sense of inferiority. When one young man, on being invited to spend the evening with a well-to-do Australian family in the town, replied, 'Oh yes, he would go; he would do anything that would help him with his English', he did not mean to be rude; this was simply a defensive reaction to a gesture that he did not expect or understand. Young single men would try to impress Australian girl-friends by throwing their money around, especially by giving inappropriately expensive presents. Mr K.'s friendship with a local girl faded out after three years because, according to him, he could not promise the girl all the material comforts she expected if they married. He described the relationship like this:

All the time he had not taken a thing from her family. He was always the one who gave things although he was the poor one. He bought the girl a watch for £75—there isn't another like it in Burton—and a ring for £35. And he gave her mother a crystal mirror for her birthday. Although they knew that he had no money, they came to expect him to do everything on the same scale.

Self-consciousness about their low position in the community also helped to explain the migrants' behaviour towards certain Australians whom they called 'friends', but with whom there was never any question of establishing a reciprocal relationship. These individuals were sometimes local people who had taken an interest in immigrants, as previously described, or they were Australians whom the migrants approached after getting to know them at work, professionally, in shops or businesses. Personally these people were hardly more than acquaintances, but in the migrants' eyes they took on something of the role of patron and became symbolic links with the Australian community. A migrant was proud to have found an Australian contact of this kind. The more respected the Australian seemed to be in the town, the more prestige flowed over onto the migrant; hence the migrant's
favourite choice as a patron was some senior person at his place of work. It was important that these local contacts should see the migrant at his best, and, to this end, they would never be asked to join in, say, a boisterous drinking party, but would receive a pressing invitation to a wedding, christening, or similar ‘prestige’ function.

Overtures of this kind were usually sincere, if ill-judged. But a number of informants more or less openly exploited their contacts with Australians. With varying degrees of finesse, they cultivated local people whom they believed could be useful to them. In return for deference, presents, or hospitality, they expected these Australians to use ‘influence’ on their behalf, to lend them money, to help solve their family troubles, or to provide an entrée to the social life of the community. From superficial observation this kind of opportunism was not always easy to distinguish from the demands for attention and consideration made by other migrants who were motivated more by an unconscious need to find a powerful protector. An Australian woman who was trying to extricate herself from a relationship of this kind expressed a typical dilemma when she said:

She resented the way they make you feel that you are personally responsible for their troubles and fate, and that since they have nothing you’ve no right to what you have either.

At the time of the first study in 1953, stable friendships between Australians and the informants, based on mutual trust, common interests and shared activities, were almost non-existent. Such social contacts as did occur gained their form, flavour, and purpose from the fact that the parties involved were of unequal social and economic status. The Australians were the givers and the Displaced Persons the recipients, and each group resented the role in which it had been cast. Furthermore, at this time many of the Displaced Persons were still showing those symptoms of personal disorganization which were commonly observed amongst them in the camps in Europe (see Murphy, 1955; Shils, 1946). They were unusually anxious and suspicious, and sensitive to signs that they were not wanted or not appreciated, but also demanding, unreliable, and casual in their personal relations, and indifferent to the wishes and feelings of other people. Their attitude to Australian society was also ambivalent. On the one hand, they needed to be accepted and respected by the dominant in-group who ‘belonged’. On the other hand, afraid of exposing themselves to embarrassment and hurt by venturing out into the
Australian community, they bolstered their shaky self-respect by belittling Australian society and denying that they wanted to be part of it. Few of these people were at this time the stuff out of which stable, satisfying, social relations are made.

These various factors in the social environment of Burton and in the attitudes and preconceptions of Europeans and Australians combined to produce the situation as it existed in 1953. At the time of this first study, only one individual in the sample belonged to an Australian association, although another two had previously been members of young people's church organizations. Two men who were married to local girls visited Australian relatives-by-marriage in their homes, and one other woman also visited an Australian family. Two other young men had previously had Australian girl-friends, but in each case the affair had ended in some unpleasantness, and contacts with Australian families met through these girls had not survived. Another eight subjects knew Australians personally and called them 'friends', but the Australians referred to were no more than casual acquaintances, or they were patrons or protectors of the kind described above. The migrants might have been in the homes of these people once or twice, but were not regular visitors. They had met their Australian contacts through other immigrants, at work, or in chance encounters in shops, cafés, cinemas, or in the street. None had got to know these 'friends' through the good offices of local associations or at welcoming functions.

As nearly all of the subjects had some social contact with other European immigrants, there was much more opportunity to observe the pattern of relationships among immigrants than between immigrants and Australians. Here again, friendships seemed to be mostly tenuous, shallow, and disappointing. The personal factors mentioned above affected relationships with other immigrants as with Australians. And there was a parallel ambivalence: on the one hand, these people looked naturally to their fellow-immigrants to supply the companionship, emotional support, and —on occasions—the concrete help that they needed; but on the other hand most of them were reluctant to commit themselves to a whole-hearted friendship or to identify themselves too closely with other Europeans.

Most of the formal social and cultural activities in Burton were organized by a comprehensive, interlocking system of associations; there were service groups like the Red Cross, business organizations like Rotary and Apex, special interest groups such as musical, historical, sports, and photography clubs, church
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groups, and multi-purpose groups like the Country Women's Association. To lead an active life in Burton outside the home involved belonging to one or more of these associations and attending additional functions organized by one's friends in other groups. Apart from the activities of these organizations, the town provided little in the way of entertainment.

The immigrants interviewed often ruefully compared Burton with its meagre offering of pubs, cinemas, and dance-halls, to their home towns in Europe, where cafés, dances, parks, theatres, opera houses, and sports activities provided abundant opportunity for people to meet and mix together. Though their vision of the past may have become idealized, it is certain that the bleak round of activities available to them in Burton did nothing to encourage the expression and consolidation of friendships. Some of the men met their friends over a drink in a hotel bar, and the women occasionally went shopping or had coffee together in town. But, apart from an occasional party, most social contact among the Displaced Persons took the form of casual visiting. Although days of national importance in the immigrants' home countries sometimes provided an excuse for an impromptu celebration, there were no organized national activities, nor any formal national societies, apart from a short-lived and embryonic group associated with an order of Hungarian nuns who made their home in Burton for three years. A very small minority of church-minded migrants met together when Polish and Hungarian priests and a Lutheran pastor made one of their occasional visits to the town.

Because the Displaced Persons in Burton were so few in number and so diverse in nationality and social background, each individual had only a narrow range of congenial companions—people with whom he shared common interests and a common language—from whom to choose his friends. The range was narrower than it might theoretically have been just because of this absence of any clubs or social activities where migrants could meet each other. Although informants of lower status background from eastern Europe—particularly Lithuanians, Poles, and Ukrainians—tended to associate more with one another than

2 Wentholt (1957, p. 93) presents an illuminating discussion of the impact made by the 'low-density', symbolically poor culture of New Zealand upon Dutch immigrants to that country. Many of these immigrants became depressed by the lack of vitality in the culture and, concomitantly, in themselves. Driven upon their own resources, and unwilling to find a substitute solution in developing a minority group cultural life, they became 'culturally impoverished and coarsened'.

they did with people of middle status or other nationalities, there were numerous friendships between people of different nationality and/or different social background. This tendency for migrants to be drawn together though they had nothing in common but their loneliness and boredom is another reason why relationships between them were so often tenuous and troubled.

Many of the Displaced Persons—particularly but not exclusively the younger single men—made up for being isolated and having nothing to do in their spare time by elaborating another type of relationship—their contacts with shopkeepers and other service personnel in the town. At this period when they were feeling so unwanted and so uncertain of their position in the Australian community, they found it enormously comforting that someone remembered their faces, called them by name, and was concerned about their wants and welfare. So they would spin out these reassuring contacts to fill in the empty hours. The Australian and Greek shopkeepers, for their part, found the Displaced Persons good customers, and, with rare exceptions, treated them with courtesy and consideration. It was these people whom many of the Displaced Persons would describe as their ‘friends’ if you asked them whom they knew in Burton.

About a quarter of the immigrants in the original sample made regular visits to friends outside the community, and most of the others kept in contact with people elsewhere by letter and occasional visits. These contacts were usually with fellow-nationals—people they had known at home, met on the voyage out, or become acquainted with when they were first in Australia. Some were friends whom they had met in Burton but who had later moved away. They were widely scattered, as one would expect in the light of the high rate of mobility of the Displaced Persons during their early years in Australia. By linking the individual immigrant to a variety of groups and places in the larger Australian community, they personalized an otherwise alien environment. During these early years the influence of fellow-immigrants in other places was probably more powerful than any other force (apart from personal experiences) in providing the individual with information (and misinformation) about Australia, and in shaping his attitudes. Although the apparent success and happiness of friends elsewhere heightened the dissatisfaction of many of the subjects with their life in Burton, only four of them seem to have left Burton expressly to join friends in other places.3

3 Sebba (1955, pp. 148-9) refers to the unsettling effect produced by letters from friends upon the isolated rural Displaced Persons in Georgia.
Since 1953 the Displaced Persons whom I knew in Burton have dispersed through many different parts of Australia and beyond. The thirty-one interviewed again in 1962-3 were living in six different places, nineteen of them in the suburbs of large cities. In the circumstances I could not obtain the rounded picture of these various communities comparable to the knowledge I had of Burton in 1953. It was even more difficult to find out much about the different social milieux encountered by those subjects who had moved around in the intervening years. The material does, however, make it possible to say something about changes in the general capacity of the subjects for social relations, and to compare, first, the experiences of subjects of middle and lower status background, and, second, the experiences of the people who have stayed in Burton or gone to another country town, with those who have left for the city.

I do not know how deep-seated were the neurotic tendencies I noted among the subjects in 1953, nor have I more than impressionistic evidence on the personality adjustment of the subjects at the present time. But the interview material and the way the immigrants reacted to myself during the second study are suggestive. In 1962 as compared with 1953, nearly all the subjects showed less anxiety about their relations with other people, were less inclined to report instances of quarrels, misunderstandings, and generalized tension in their personal contacts, gave more detached and realistic accounts of themselves, and revealed less sense of inferiority feelings and more self-assurance. Although there were many reasons why they should have been franker and more friendly to me in 1962, I was repeatedly surprised by the spontaneous welcome and willing co-operation I received, even from people who had been hesitant and suspicious before. All this seems to add up to the conclusion that these immigrants were less neurotically disturbed in 1962 than in 1953 and that their capacity to enter into mutually satisfying relations with other people was accordingly greater; this is what one would expect if the earlier disorganization represented a reaction to the deprivations and uncertainty they had suffered as refugees, and to the strangeness of their new surroundings. Several exceptions to this

---

4 Murphy (1952) described neurotic tendencies among Displaced Persons in Australia similar to the characteristics I noted in 1953. In their discussions of mental illness among European immigrants to Australia, Listwan (1956, 1959) and Mine (1963) emphasize that certain typical pathological reactions result from environmental pressures, and not from deep-seated personality disorders. Listwan (1956, p. 777) calls these 'migration stresses' and claims that 'The patients improve remarkably well when social adjust-
general finding will be mentioned later, in this and the following chapters.

Although I have the strong impression that most of these people were psychologically better adjusted in 1962 than in 1953, I also believe that they were more detached from their surroundings than one might expect in 'normally' integrated individuals. This detachment showed itself most markedly in their attitudes towards friendship. As we have already seen, in 1953 they thought of 'friends' as people standing in a variety of relationships towards them. In 1962, I made a point of asking most of them what they meant by friends, and whom they had received personal help from, or given help to, in recent years. My questions often led to an animated emotionally-loaded discussion. In the final count, only a few of the subjects claimed to have, outside their own families, any close friends—people 'you would jump in the fire for', as one of them put it.

There is no such thing in the world as a friend [said Mr S.]. There are just a lot of people who come together because they are lonely.

On the other hand, I was given many accounts of disillusioning experiences with supposed friends—experiences which showed how shallow the relationship had proved when it was put to the test.

The theme of being isolated from close ties outside the immediate family appeared again in the immigrants' answers to questions about helping others and receiving help. Some said that they had given assistance, like lending money, looking after people in sickness, proffering advice and smoothing the way for fellow-immigrants whose English was poor. But few of them admitted to receiving help themselves. Although several complained bitterly that no one had come to their aid when they
needed it, their most common reaction was an indignant denial that they needed to depend on anyone, or a forceful assertion that they always had stood on their own feet, and always would.

Whatever words they use, these immigrants do distinguish between their 'real' friends and others. Companions with whom they share their social life are not necessarily 'real' friends; on the other hand, they may have a genuine and satisfying relationship with friends thousands of miles away, whom they see rarely or never at all. These considerations make it necessary to indicate clearly what I mean by 'friendship' in the following pages: it is the term I apply to enduring, personal relationships, involving some repeated sharing of activities, like visiting, going on expeditions or holidays together, drinking together, or attending social functions together. Only a few of these relationships would fall into the class of 'real' friendships, as defined by most of my informants. It would be meaningless to rely on some single criterion, like home visiting, to define this kind of relationship, because class background, age, and present circumstances lead different people to live out their friendships in different ways.

For the purposes of statistical comparison, social relations with Australians were rated on a three-point scale: no Australian friends scored one; Australian friends but no membership in Australian associations scored two; Australian friends and membership in Australian associations scored three.

In 1953 the immigrants from a middle status background had greater competence in English, as measured by my own judgment of their capacity to understand and express themselves in the spoken language, than had those of lower status. In 1962, when English ability was assessed by means of an objective test which measured capacity to understand the written word, middle status subjects gained an average score of 76, lower status subjects an average of 39. Competence in English presumably affects the quality of friendships between Australians and Europeans, although this is an elusive question to pursue. By 1962, however, only those immigrants with extremely limited English ability seemed to have found difficulty in making Australian friends: four of the five subjects least competent in English had no Australian friends, but above this low level of English ability nearly everyone (twenty-four out of the remaining twenty-six people) had some Australian friends. By 1962 the twelve people living in the country all had Australian friends (and eight also belonged to Australian associations), but six of the nineteen who had made
their homes in the city had no Australian friends and no membership in Australian associations.

Among the eighteen lower status people included in the study, the eight country dwellers had higher average English scores and higher average scores for social relations with Australians than had the ten city dwellers.

A rough classification of the subjects in terms of leisure-time interests gives some indication of the extent to which they shared in the life of the surrounding society: those who have pursued some new interest or hobby, or taken up some old interest again in this country, can be distinguished from those whose activities have not expanded in this way. The classification is necessarily somewhat arbitrary: interests directly associated with earning income are not counted; neither is purely social activity, nor drinking, nor church attendance. But gambling is counted as an interest, and so is reading, where books are a regular part of everyday life. The full list of other interests represented is: playing sport, stamp collecting, model railway building, painting, performing music, writing and translating, acting, taking part in political activities, regularly attending concerts, theatres, and art exhibitions.

The eighteen subjects who had taken up an interest of this kind had a mean score of 69 on the English ability test, while the average score for the thirteen who had no such interests was 35. This difference probably reflects the fact that competence in English encourages immigrants to expand the range of their activities, and also the fact that, in pursuing these various interests, immigrants improve their English. The immigrants who had such interests differed from those who had none also in terms of pre-migration status (eleven of the eighteen with interests, but only two of the thirteen without were of middle status), in the extent of their social relations with Australians (the eighteen had a mean score of 2.5, and the thirteen a mean of 1.8), and in place of residence (ten of the eighteen with interests, but only two of the thirteen without, lived in the country).

In sum, the subjects of middle status background have shown a capacity to learn English, to fit into the Australian community, and to take up non-profit-making interests, wherever they happen to be. But the lower status immigrants have had more varied experiences, those in the more personal, stable, and small-scale environment of country towns having more competence in English and more social contact with the Australian community, and being more inclined to expand the scope of their interests.
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than their counterparts in the cities. These variations among the lower status immigrants seem to be due both to selective processes which attract a certain type of individual to country towns and to the impact of different environments. They may also be partly accounted for by the fact that the country-dwellers in the sample are the people who have stayed put (even two people who went from Burton to a small country town elsewhere were returning to a place they already knew from their first months in Australia). They have had longer in the one place to find their feet; the process of adapting themselves to Australian society has not been interrupted or complicated by moving around.

On closer analysis it becomes clear that, in the eyes of the local people, the Displaced Persons in Burton today have merged into the lower strata of the community as a whole. They will never quite qualify as 'natives', but they are closer to being regarded as 'accepted newcomers' than as 'outsiders'. Their numbers are fewer than they were in 1953. Most of them have now been established in Burton for ten years or more; they are nearly all married and living in their own homes. Although they are to be found in the older and less desirable residential quarters, they are not concentrated in any particular localities. Neither do they cluster in particular jobs. They are no longer conspicuous and no longer felt to be a problem. For their part, the migrants, like other residents who have been as long in the town, now have their own circles of acquaintances; when they walk down the street they stop to speak to people they meet. The life of the town is familiar and they feel at home. All those who have remained in Burton have both European and Australian friends, except for Mr A. and Mrs B., whose friends are all Australians. (Mr A., it will be recalled, is married to an Australian girl.) But there is still little chance for an individual to confine his social contacts only to his fellow-countrymen. Indeed, four of the nine people in Burton have no friends of their own nationality in the town, although they all keep up contacts with fellow-countrymen elsewhere. Three of the Burton men are, however, married to German women, and two of the married women in the sample are themselves ethnic Germans; these five families all have contacts with other Germans in the town, and two of the wives belong to a semi-formal social group of German-speaking women.

Burton has recently acquired some handsome new civic buildings, but its social and cultural life is no more exciting today than it was ten years ago. The migrants do, however, have more
to do in their leisure time and take more part in social activities than in 1953. The men's interests and contacts have expanded more than the women's: some go fishing and shooting, some drink in the pubs, and some gamble on the races as enthusiastically as any native-born; one has taken up painting, and another bowls. They share few of these interests with their wives, with the result that most of them know socially a number of people who are strangers to their families and who rarely if ever come into their homes. Several wives complained of their husbands' outside activities, and especially their drinking and gambling. The wife of Mr J. described a row over gambling which threatened to break up her marriage altogether until both she and her husband came to admit that there was no use quarrelling, because, as she reported saying to him:

We are only two. We have no friends or relations here. What is the point if we don't go along together. We have no one else.

It was clear that what the women really resented was not the drinking, gambling, etc. as such, but the fact that they were excluded from these pursuits; the men had penetrated deeper into the life of the town than they had, and left them behind. The four women in the sample each had at least one or two neighbours, former workmates or other women friends with whom they exchanged casual visits, but they were for most of the time house-bound. Only one of them, a widow who had to support herself, was still employed outside the home.

All the Australian friends of the immigrants living in Burton are what would be recognized locally as working-class people. The experiences of Mrs B. illustrate one way in which a middle status migrant can adjust to the limited opportunities available in a town like this. Talented, intelligent, dignified, and good looking, Mrs B. has over the years attracted the attention of a few local middle class people who interest themselves in the cultural life of the community. At first she felt that these people were patronizing her, because her job as a factory operative, her poor financial circumstances, and her inability to return hospitality, all made her conscious that she was not—in this context—their social equal. She resented her position, but put up with it, under cover of a courteous and deferential demeanour, because she hesitated to alienate anyone who might be useful to her. With the passing of the years, Mrs B. has become more secure in her personal life and has made friends with Australians who share her interests, but who come from the lower strata of Burton
society. She expects nothing from the middle class people who still occasionally make overtures to her, and indeed avoids their advances when she can do so without giving offence. She still feels that she is a ‘nobody’ in the town; she has ‘no social position’, but ‘the wonderful thing is that it doesn’t make any difference any more. I don’t mind a bit. That is God’s gift to us.’ Now she is free to stand outside the community, unconcerned about what people think of her, whether they will accept her, or whether she is behaving correctly. I believe, however, that Mrs B. has been able to achieve this calm acceptance of her position largely because of the admiration, respect, and companionship she receives from her unpretentious Australian friends, who defer to her superior refinement, education, and artistic ability. She has settled for a niche where her self-respect and self-confidence are comfortably supported, instead of striving, as she might have done, to work her way into a group which would have demanded more of her and where the risks of failure and rejection would have been greater.

The people who have left Burton have had more varied experiences in making social contacts than those who have stayed. The five lower status subjects who have neither made Australian friends nor joined any association (that is two married couples and a man who is married but whose wife is not included in the sample) are alike in other ways: except for one man who is nearly average, they are at the bottom of the scale of English language ability; none of the men was in a more highly-skilled job in 1962 than in 1953; they all worked extremely hard and lived frugally during their first years here, and they are now amongst the most prosperous people in the sample. The contrast between the two married couples will illustrate, nevertheless, two rather different patterns of social adjustment. Mr and Mrs L. are sociable, cheerful, and friendly. With Australians they feel ill-at-ease and self-conscious, afraid that they are making themselves conspicuous or foolish. But they delight in the company of people as unpretentious as themselves, and the only recreation they have known since coming to this country is to pass a few hours with their European friends. Mr and Mrs L. are more relaxed and sociable today than they were in 1953. They will never be spendthrifts, but they are capable of enjoying the fruits of their first arduous years here.

Mr and Mrs M. have heavier family obligations and still feel themselves far from financially secure. Mr M. has never reconciled himself to the fact that his trade qualifications were not
recognized in this country. He is as disgruntled today as he was in 1953 and disinclined to be sociable or hospitable to anyone. He sleeps during his lunch-hour at work, not only because he is always tired from the extra jobs he does in his spare time, but also because he has no interest in the things his Australian workmates talk about. Mrs M. is not quite so dissatisfied as her husband, but she is house-bound looking after boarders and a large family and has little chance of making contacts on her own. Mr and Mrs M.'s only social contacts are with fellow-nationals whom they meet at church or at the celebrations organized by their national society—which they attend about once a year—and with one or two families from their own country, who visit them occasionally. This is the sum total of their social life and their recreation.

The Ls. and the Ms. both decided to leave Burton for financial reasons, the apparent motive for all their major decisions since arriving in Australia. They were not particularly attracted to the city, and the kind of life they lead there is little different from the life they would have had if they had stayed in Burton, except that they now have more opportunities to associate with fellow-countrymen and are less exposed to casual contact with Australians. By contrast, there is another group among the informants who found Burton so culturally and socially sterile that they could never have felt at peace with themselves if they had stayed there. They made for the city, in search of congenial jobs, a full life, and civilization. The three migrants in this category—two women and a man—have much in common: they are all of middle status background; they had an excellent mastery of English in 1953 and today are at the top of the scale of English ability; they were poor savers; in 1953 they all looked on their jobs as a source of symbolic status; they have all moved into white-collar occupations. (One of the women, Mrs N., has now married a man in a managerial job and is herself no longer employed.) In 1953 they were as anxious to dissociate themselves from their fellow-nationals and from immigrants in general as they were to be accepted by Australians of some prestige and standing. In dress, deportment, taste, and interests they did their best to conform to what they believed to be middle class Australian standards. Since they settled in the city, their experiences have been in many ways alike, though not quite what might have been predicted in 1953. The two women, one of them having previously been divorced by an Australian husband, have married Europeans. Mr C. was already married to a European wife before
he came to Australia. Because of her husband’s job and family responsibilities, Mrs N. has become socially isolated; she no longer works among Australians and she has relinquished her interests in art and the theatre which previously gave her some links with the Australian community. Her husband is not a fellow-countryman. The few friends she sees occasionally are of various nationalities, but none of them is Australian. In terms of assimilation into the Australian community, she has retrogressed since 1953. Mrs D. and Mr C. have both become absorbed into a highly urbanized and intellectually somewhat sophisticated group of people of mixed nationality, including a few Australians (most of whom are married to Europeans), but including no one of their own nationalities. Mr C. was temporarily separated from his wife, and both he and Mrs D. lived at first as single people in parts of the city where there is a high concentration of Europeans and a somewhat cosmopolitan atmosphere.

These three migrants are as reluctant to mix with their fellow-countrymen today as they were in 1953. Mr C., for instance, is in business with partners of his own nationality, but he avoids clients of the same nationality (because, he says, they expect favours), and ‘keeps away’ from his own countrymen socially. Although the evidence is meagre, it seems likely that these three subjects feel threatened by unduly close contact with people from their own countries. They want to remain anonymous, to keep a distance between themselves and others who might presume to penetrate the protecting walls they have built between their present and past lives. But they are also ambitious and status-conscious. In Burton in 1953 they were looking for acceptance among the only people whose recognition could enhance their prestige and raise them above the level of their fellow-immigrants—that is the middle class Australians. Soon after 1953 each of them moved to the very different environment of a large metropolis, where they drifted spontaneously towards already well-established groups, mixed in nationality and cosmopolitan in interests and outlook. They did not deliberately renounce the idea of gaining acceptance among established middle class Australians, nor did they feel that they had been rejected by these sections of the community. They had simply gravitated towards a milieu which contained alternative groups—as Burton did not—that were at once more accessible and more congenial than middle class Australian groups. Sharing in the cultural life of the city gives them a far more satisfying sense of identification with this country than they ever won from their disappointing forays into Burton
society. When the husband of Mrs D. said, 'We haven't missed a single Australian play that has been put on here', he meant to imply a personal pride in Australian theatre. These three people still have personal worries, but they are no longer absorbed by the desire to establish themselves among Australians, as they were in 1953.

Of the remaining seven middle status people who have left Burton, one is Mr E., who by 1962 had advanced some way towards realizing his vision of himself as a kind of gentleman farmer, devoted more to the achievement of the good life than to the pursuit of gain. Accustomed to a gregarious and convivial existence in Europe, he thinks of good company as essential to the good life, and has collected around himself a circle of Australian and European friends to share his leisure hours. In keeping with the social position that he is making for himself, he has recently joined a well-respected association, with excellent club facilities, in a nearby town.

The last six middle status people who are no longer in Burton have followed a common pattern of social adjustment. Four of them (including one married couple) now live in a state capital, and two in smaller cities, but none voluntarily left Burton because of a preference for city life: three had been transferred to positions elsewhere and the others went away in search of better jobs, and today all six are in employment that they find demanding but satisfying. Much of their leisure time is taken up with reading; they listen to music, but rarely attend concerts or theatres or take part in cultural events. They are all decidedly self-contained people, finding such fulfilment as they can in their work, their families, their largely home-centred interests and hobbies, and their few close friendships. Their social life is in fact meagre, but they like to hold and attend occasional parties or smaller entertainments which are run more or less formally and 'properly', according to the standards of their country—and more particularly their class—of origin. Their friends, mostly of long standing, are both Europeans and Australians. Unlike the first three middle status subjects described above, these people think it quite natural that they should have friends among their fellow-countrymen. Beyond this, they also acknowledge a special responsibility to act as mentors, spokesmen, and helpers to people of their own nationality (whether personal friends or not), particularly to those without their advantages of education and experience. Mrs F., for instance, looked after a family whom she had known for a long time while the wife was in hospital,
and gave a home to a friendless young man when he was recovering from an illness. Because of his legal experience, Mr G. has been able to advise numerous migrants—mostly from his own country—involved in divorce proceedings, actions over insurance claims, and a variety of other entanglements. Mr and Mrs F. supported the charitable work of the nuns who settled in Burton for a time, and Mrs H. is the only individual in the sample who is an active member of a national association. Being a widow living alone, she enjoys the social contacts that the club provides, but gets most satisfaction from her contribution to its charitable and service activities. Four of these people left their homelands while they were still in their teens or early adulthood, but they all seem to have brought with them to this country a well-developed sense of social responsibility. In an attenuated degree they fulfill here the role that would have been expected of them in the class groups they came from at home.

In general, the Displaced Persons in the sample were more fully integrated into the life of the communities where they lived in 1962 than in 1953. That is, more of them took part in Australian associations and more of them had informal social contact with both Australians and Europeans, and the contact itself was more intense. But, as we have seen, the extent of integration varied, especially between middle status and lower status subjects, and between lower status people living in country towns and those in the city. Like the process of economic adaptation, the process of social adaptation has for many migrants been uneven and uncertain; nearly all of them have experienced some disappointments and setbacks in their relations with both Europeans and Australians. Such experiences seem less common today than they were ten years ago. Whether recent or not, they do not loom as large in the migrants' thinking as they did before. Most of these people today have settled homes, roots in one place and a relatively stable set of social relations. From the vantage point of their greater economic and social security, they now conceive of their place in the Australian community with far more equanimity than they did in 1953. Their situation has crystallized since those days, and—even if it has crystallized into a pattern that means something less than the warm, open-hearted acceptance into Australia's 'national family' that they had once hoped for—they have come to value stability for its own sake. They take pleasure in their contacts with the few Australians they know well, and
They no longer expect Australians, qua Australians, to take the responsibility for seeing that they fit into the community; they accept it as just as much their own role, as fellow-workers or neighbours, to make the first move. Often now it is they who are the experienced old hands and the Australian—newly arrived in the job or locality, or in some kind of difficulties—who needs help. Being without a car on one of my visits to Burton in 1962, I was grateful to be taken home on two occasions after interviews; both the people who drove me joked about this reversal of roles—since in 1953 I had a car and they did not—and obviously enjoyed being in a position to offer a kindness, particularly a kindness that confirmed them in their status as established, secure citizens, and so removed the social gap between us.

Indeed there were many indications in 1962 that the enhanced self-esteem of the migrants was an important factor in easing their relations with Australians and that this rediscovered sense of self-respect itself depended heavily on the attainment of financial stability and a standard of living comparable to that enjoyed by most people around them. In short, being as well off as Australians, they now feel that they are as good as Australians. Those people who in 1953 saw money as the talisman that would make the immigrants independent of the Australian community turned out to be right. But what they did not anticipate was that immigrant attitudes would also change, and that independence would lose its overtones of neurotic rejection and withdrawal, that it would become more like a mature and realistic ability to take what comes but not pine after what is withheld. Sustained by this later notion of independence, many of the migrants are now discovering that they do not want to use their (comparative) affluence to enable them to stand aloof, in fear or arrogance, from Australian society. Instead they are looking for ways in which financial success can admit them to the sanctuary of sociable living and community respect.
In the preceding chapters the discussion has been focused on the economic and social activities of the Displaced Persons covered by this study. The attitudes, motives, and conceptions that underlie these activities—already indicated at numerous points in the analysis—will now be singled out for more detailed treatment.

To understand the development of the immigrants' attitudes in Australia, it is necessary first to go back to the period before they reached this country. The Displaced Persons used to speak of themselves with pride as 'political refugees', in contrast to groups like the Dutch, Germans, and Italians who left their home countries voluntarily to better their fortunes; and some still do so. But only a minority of those in Australia or elsewhere suffered victimization for their political beliefs. The eastern Europeans living in Germany at the end of the war were prisoners of war, or forced, or semi-forced, labourers, or they had willingly thrown in their lot with the Axis powers, expecting to share in the fruits of victory. By far the greater proportion of these people went home when the war was over. But about one million refused to do so for various reasons: some were afraid of reprisals for their support of Nazism or opposition to Communism; some had lost all contact with their families or had married German women; some were ethnic Germans. Unless the ethnic Germans succeeded in passing as nationals of some other country, as many of them did, they were not eligible for assistance from the International Refugee Organization, but most of the rest of these non-repatriates qualified for assistance and eventually for resettlement under the various schemes organized by the IRO. In Yugoslavia the Chetnik resistance movement led by General Mihailovic was at first encouraged by the Allies, but British support was withdrawn at the end of 1943 and the Chetniks who later escaped to Italy were for a time classified as 'surrendered enemy personnel'; but they too eventually came under IRO care. Most of
the Hungarians who left home after 1946 were escaping from Communist rule. So were the Czechoslovaks who fled to Germany in 1948, but after that year most Czech refugees were 'economic dissidents'—persons escaping from compulsory labour and low living standards—or young men trying to avoid military service. Many of the Yugoslavs who poured into Austria and Italy from 1945 onwards belonged to the same category of refugees as these later Czech refugees. But, irrespective of the motives for their emigration, most of these post-war refugees also became eligible for settlement overseas under IRO schemes (Vernant, 1953).

The displacement of population in Europe during and after the war presents an extremely confused picture; the several waves of emigrants listed above are simply the main groups from which the Displaced Persons eventually resettled by the IRO were drawn. The Displaced Persons who were brought to Australia included a good cross-section of these various categories of emigrants. The research sample itself is fairly representative, as is indicated by the following classification, based on the national-cultural group in which each individual was reared:

1 Pole in Polish army, taken P.O.W. by Germans, labourer in Germany
1 Pole in Anders' army, formed in Russia
1 Polish woman, forced labourer sent to Germany
1 Pole, Austrian father, to Austria 1938, employed by Germans
1 ethnic German, Polish nationality, in German army

1 Lithuanian in German army
1 ethnic German, Lithuanian nationality, employed by Germans

1 Latvian in German navy
2 Latvian women, 1944 refugees
1 Latvian in Russian army, taken P.O.W. by Germans

1 Estonian woman, 1944 refugee

1 Hungarian, employed in Germany
1 Hungarian in German army
2 Hungarian women, 1944-5 refugees
1 Hungarian, sent by government to France 1947
1 Hungarian woman, from Romania, employed by Germans
1 ethnic German, Hungarian nationality, in Hungarian army

1 Czech, 1948 refugee
3 Czechs, including one married couple, 1949 refugees
1 ethnic German woman, Czech nationality, 1948 refugee
Refugee Settlers

2 Serbs, Mihailovic fighters, to Italy 1944
1 Serb, taken P.O.W. by Germans
1 White Russian woman, Yugoslav nationality, 1945 refugee
1 ethnic German woman, Yugoslav nationality, employed in Austria

2 ethnic Germans, married couple, Ukrainian nationality, employed by Germans

Many of the Displaced Persons, expecting some miraculous liberation from their misery, or anticipating, more concretely, a third world war, at first refused to be resettled overseas. It was only when they were forced to recognize that their destinies were not to be resolved in ways like this, that they began to think seriously about countries they might emigrate to; even then, many of them still regarded resettlement as a temporary expedient to tide them over until they could return home. Most of the subjects of this study and the larger sample of Displaced Persons interviewed in 1953 had chosen to migrate to Australia faute de mieux, when efforts to get to the United States, Canada, or South America had failed. A few of the people interviewed did, however, choose Australia in preference to other countries, because of its remoteness from the troubles of Europe or because they thought the economic opportunities would be greater in such a young and undeveloped land than elsewhere.

By 1953 the individuals in the research sample had been in Australia for periods ranging from two to five years. They had had time to form distinct and comprehensive, though not necessarily stable, attitudes to the country and its people. Nearly all of them, no matter what their background, agreed that Australia enjoys a higher standard of living than Europe and that working people here have a better chance to improve themselves financially. ‘People eat here every day as if it was Sunday or a holiday’ was a remark often made by people of lower status background. Nothing else about Australia elicited such generally favourable comment as did these features of the economy, but a few people praised the working conditions, the democratic form of government, and the freedom of speech, association and movement. Not all who saw some good in this country were prepared to allow Australians credit for the well-being and prosperity which they observed: these blessings followed from the good fortune of being isolated and homogeneous, and not from any worthy qualities in Australians themselves.
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Most judgments about Australia were, however, unfavourable. The treatment of immigrants in this country came in for endless criticism. 'Everyone knows', said Mr K., 'that British countries are not good for foreigners. British people are snobs towards strangers.' I have already described how the subjects resented the coldness and jealousy of Australian fellow-workers and the reluctance of Australians to recognize European trade and professional qualifications. General comments and accounts of particular incidents from numerous individuals made it clear that these people often emerged from contacts with Australians feeling unwanted and inferior. They also objected to what they interpreted as pressure to become 'assimilated'—a word with unhappy associations for many continental peoples—and demands or requests that they should speak English in public rankled more than anything else. They felt that Australia was interested in them only as an addition to the labour supply and a source of increased population: her professed humanitarian motives in bringing them here were merely window-dressing. They disliked being lumped together as a homogeneous mass, irrespective of class, national and ethnic differences. 'Out of various nations they made "Balts", and out of ex-enemies and ex-allies they made "New Australians"', as Mr G. put it. Many of the immigrants were also deeply resentful that as a body they should be held responsible for the misdeeds of individuals. An incident related with suppressed anger by one impulsive young man, Mr Q., illustrates how sensitive they could be to such injustice:

He was having a drink in a hotel when an Australian began talking to him about a recent murder by two Hungarians in W. Mr Q. told him that it was not his fault if other immigrants committed murder. Then this Australian went on to complain that a New Australian once drank his beer. He went crook at all New Australians because one had taken his beer. So Mr Q. went to the barmaid and got ten beers. He told the Australian they were to make up for the one he had lost. The Australian wanted to shake hands, but Mr Q. wouldn't. He walked out of the hotel leaving the Australian sitting there with the ten beers lined up in front of him.

The people interviewed in 1953 were critical of many features of Australian life besides those bearing specifically on the treatment of immigrants. They complained of Australia's lack of

1 An analysis of comparisons between Australia and the home country (or Europe generally) made by thirty-five Displaced Persons in 1953 gave a ratio of twenty comparisons favourable to Australia to sixty-one unfavourable.
Kultur, by which they could mean anything from preoccupation with drinking, gambling, and sport to the incivility of shop-assistants, or the infertile, limitless and unpeopled aspect of the Australian landscape. They deplored the cold materialism of Australian family life, the lack of responsibility and respect shown towards the aged, the looseness of sexual morality, the independence of wives and their neglect of the arts of home-making.

Europeans are well-informed about Australian family life: [wrote Mr G.] the over-emancipation of women, resulting in fantastically increased divorces... women are mostly very poor cooks, but very sociable.

Children were thought to be over-indulged and under-disciplined. ‘This is certainly a democracy, for the children too’, said Mr R. Criticism of the improvidence of Australians and what these immigrants saw as the characteristically carefree attitude to life was less intense and indeed often tinged with a hint of wistful envy: they would have liked to ‘take it easy’—a favourite phrase—with equal unconcern.

Condemnation of the lack of discipline in Australian life ran through judgments on a variety of institutions and practices: the relations between employer and employee, the educational system, the treatment of criminals and the insane and the activities of the press. In short, ‘the government’ was as supine in exercising authority over citizens as the father was in controlling his family. The government had also failed to develop the country effectively; worst of all, it had deplorably neglected the people’s housing needs. Some of the immigrants also questioned the integrity of parliamentarians and public servants; they credited unseen sinister forces with the power to control official policy and action; they complained of Australian nationalism and insularity, and they were more than sceptical about the moral superiority that they believed all Britishers claimed over other peoples, especially their recent enemies. Occasionally they ventured some cynical observations on the motives and conduct of the Allies in the war.2

2 Kovacs (1955) reports that the 155 usable replies received from Displaced Persons to a questionnaire distributed in Melbourne contained a number of criticisms of Australians for their hypocrisy and claim to cultural superiority, and for discriminating against foreigners (pp. 391-2). What the respondents especially liked about Australia were liberty and economic opportunities (pp. 393, 410). Kovacs also notes the marked elements of authoritarianism in the Displaced Persons’ suggestions about what should be done to better Australia (pp. 399, 401).
Before beginning the systematic interviews in 1962 I made some preliminary visits to several of the subjects who were still living in Burton. These contacts convinced me that, since I could fit in only two or three interviews with each individual, I must devise some formal questionnaire which would provide information on attitudes comparable to the material I had collected in 1953, and which would, at the same time, stimulate the subjects to expand on their present conceptions of Australia, their homelands, and other countries. Little of this information was forthcoming spontaneously—not, it seemed, because I had failed to recapture the confidence of my informants, but because the things that they were so ready to talk about in 1953 no longer claimed their interest. Subsequent interviews confirmed these earlier impressions: judgments about Australia, comparisons between this country and others, and all the variety of evaluative comments that pushed their way into the forefront of most conversations in 1953 were now replaced by other topics—sickness, the children, financial ambitions, marital problems, the war in Cuba, and the Common Market. When Mrs H. had finished filling in the formal questionnaire which I eventually gave to all the subjects, she said:

when she first came to Australia she had judged everything, but afterwards she had learned to understand why a lot of things were as they were and she doesn't judge any more. She has put everything behind her now.

In other words, the distinctive body of 'D.P. opinion' which was readily identifiable in 1953 had largely disintegrated by 1962. The recurring themes of the earlier interviews belonged to the period when these people were, above all, Displaced Persons and newcomers to this country. By 1962 most of them were mixing more with Australians and less, particularly at work, with Europeans. Only one or two were living in communities where there could be as much recurrent casual contact with a group of Displaced Persons (or other immigrants) as there was among the two hundred refugees in Burton in 1953. Increased exposure to the mass media has combined with the scattering of the subjects into more varied social environments to weaken the significance of group opinion.3

The questionnaire which I ultimately devised for the 1962 study touched on most of the topics which the people inter-

3 Television was introduced in Australia in 1956. By 1962, seventeen of the thirty-one subjects had TV sets.
viewed in 1953 had felt strongly about (see Appendix). It was translated into German or the native tongue for the benefit of those subjects whose English was weak. Although the alternative responses offered in the questionnaire included 'agree strongly' and 'disagree strongly', the questionnaire material could give little indication about the extent of the subjects' emotional involvement in the topics covered. This common limitation of the questionnaire technique is, however, partly offset by the fact that in most of the interviews we also talked informally around the issues raised.

In 1953 I had used the ratio of favourable to unfavourable comments on Australia to measure roughly the subjects' overall identification with this country. Mainly because of the different volume of material obtained from different individuals, this proved an unsatisfactory approach. But I should not in any case have been able to use it again in 1962, because, as mentioned above, my informants showed little inclination to make such judgments in the second study. As a substitute measure of overall identification with Australia, I therefore constructed a numerical index from responses to six of the questionnaire items. The possible range of scores was six to thirty. The subjects' actual scores varied from nine to twenty-six, with an average score of eighteen. As the 1953 and 1962 measures of Identification with Australia were not comparable, no attempt has been made to use them in assessing changes in individual attitudes from the first period to the second. The real value of the questionnaire—and the purpose for which it was developed—lies in the subjects' responses to particular statements, to be described in more detail below. Some suggestive connections between the Index of Identification with Australia and certain immigrant characteristics did, however, occur. The most interesting finding was a marked negative relationship between score on this Index and age on arrival in Australia; the questionnaire showed older people far more critical of Australia than younger people, and far more unhappy about the position of European immigrants in this country. There was also some indication that a high score on the Index was related to a high score on the test of English ability and a low rating on the number of years between arrival and naturalization.

The evidence from both interviews and questionnaires leaves the unmistakable impression that these immigrants were generally less critical of Australia in 1962 than in 1953. The focus of their interest in family life had moved from the defects of Australian
patterns to general problems of family living. Although seventeen of the thirty-one subjects agreed with the statement, 'Australian married women have too much freedom', and three more were undecided about this, general comments indicated a far more understanding and tolerant attitude to Australian women than existed in 1953. This change seems to have come about, not only because closer contact with local families has broken down the old stereotypes but also because the immigrants themselves are no longer as anxious and possessive about their own women as they used to be. The imbalance between the sexes among the Displaced Persons and the inaccessibility of Australian women produced a great deal of anxiety about getting and keeping a woman in the early years of large-scale immigration. Quarrels and fights over women were common in Burton at the time of the first study. Men watched their women jealously and were quick to suspect them of philandering, and some of the women certainly enjoyed being in such demand. This situation helps to explain why Australian women—wanted by the men, but inaccessible, and envied by the women for their apparent freedom from male control—became targets for contempt or hostility. Anxiety aroused in both sexes by the changing status of immigrant women—with money of their own, a role outside the home, and no large family or community group to influence their behaviour—exacerbated the situation. To the men, Australian women were all the more suspect because they provided a model which women from Europe seemed only too ready to follow. To the women, they were to be envied, and hence disapproved, for the independence which the immigrant women themselves both wanted and feared. Since 1953, numerous factors have eased this situation and the attitude of the immigrants has softened accordingly. If Mr G.'s statement, quoted above, represented the tone of the subjects' reactions in 1953, Mr S.'s was more typical of thinking in 1962: 'Australian women work harder than if they were in Siberia, and they don't get a lot of pleasure out of life.'

It seems to have been more difficult for the immigrants to get used to Australian ways of bringing up children. Not one of the subjects disagreed with the statement, 'Australian children have too much freedom', although three answered 'undecided'. Twenty of the thirty-one subjects even underlined 'Agree strongly' to this statement, by far the largest number using one of the

4 Of the 170,700 Displaced Persons admitted into Australia, 100,022 were males and 70,678 females. Figures supplied by the Department of Immigration, Canberra.
extreme responses in the whole questionnaire. Nevertheless, these people are not as angrily involved in this issue today as they were in 1953. As on a number of other issues, they keep their own opinions, but are less forceful in pressing the distinction between themselves and Australians.

The themes underlying most of the criticism of Australia’s treatment of immigrants in 1953 were, first, that newcomers were made to feel inferior, and, second, that they were expected to renounce their own traditions and allegiances and become Australian too quickly. In order to find out whether the subjects felt these pressures as keenly in 1962, I asked them to comment on what I thought were two clear-cut statements. The first was: ‘This country has tried to assimilate the New Australians too quickly.’ Their comments indicate that the subjects did not interpret the statement exactly as I had expected them to. To most of them, quick assimilation has come to mean quick acceptance by the Australian community. The phrase no longer has the marked negative overtones implying pressure from Australians and resistance by newcomers. This new interpretation indicates an important change in emphasis in the subjects’ conception of their place in Australian society. Distress because of the demand that they become rapidly Australianized has been replaced by bewilderment that, changed as they themselves are, so many Australians still keep their distance, and by an uneasy suspicion that what the Australian wants is not, after all, simply the adoption of certain obvious local customs—like the language—but more subtle, intangible, and elusive changes that reach much deeper into the immigrant’s personality. In their responses to the statement as I put it, then, the majority of the subjects—nineteen disagreed and three were undecided—were saying, in effect, ‘This country has not accepted New Australians as quickly, or as whole-heartedly, as it should have.’

The second statement relating to the general position of immigrants was: ‘New Australians will always be second class citizens here, whether they are naturalized or not.’ Fourteen agreed with this, six were undecided, and eleven disagreed. The term ‘second class citizen’ was and is in common use among the people interviewed. It conveys either or both of the notions that immigrants suffer legal and institutionalized disabilities, or that they are unofficially—at a personal, non-formalized level—treated as inferior to Australians. Comments on this statement indicate that many of the subjects are anxious about the possi-
Attitudes and Sentiments

bility that, when they need help, they may not be eligible for age, invalid, or widows' pensions. These were the only commonly mentioned criticisms of government policy at the present time. As noted in chapter 1, very few of the subjects complained that they had ever suffered discrimination in the crucial area of employment and promotion. Some fairly half-hearted criticisms of government failings in the past—like the unsuitability of jobs given to migrants on arrival, or the housing shortage—came out in response to another statement, 'The Australian government has given New Australians all the help it could have.' But the trend of responses to this statement—sixteen agreed, five were undecided, and ten disagreed (only two strongly)—confirm the impression that, in this sample of Displaced Persons, there is some fairly mild irritation at government neglect or indifference, but no general tendency to blame officialdom for keeping them in the status of 'second class citizens'.

It is in the area of personal contacts that many of these people still feel they may be humiliated or treated with condescension. Although most of those interviewed have one or two Australian working people as friends, the common feeling is that most of the hostility towards immigrants emanates from the working class. This was reflected in responses to the statement, 'Working people are more friendly to New Australians than are other groups in the community.' Five people agreed with this statement, five were undecided, and twenty-one disagreed, eight of them strongly. From the working class, it is believed, come the Australians who are most jealous of immigrant successes, who refuse to admit that they could learn anything from the newcomers, and who, as Mr W. put it, 'can't bear you to be different from them'. This section of Australian society—sometimes conceived as identical with the whole of the working class, sometimes as an atypical fringe—is described as 'ignorant, never travelled, don't read anything, interested only in the pub and in sports' (Mrs V.). And, 'They give the wife a few pounds for the week's housekeeping on pay day, then go to the pub to spend the rest of their wages with the boys' (Mr S.). Explaining his

5 In order to qualify for an age, invalid or widows' pension, an applicant must be a British subject. There are also residential qualifications: subject to certain modifications, continuous residence in Australia for ten years and five years, respectively, is required to qualify for age and invalid pensions; to qualify for a widows' pension a woman must normally have resided in Australia for five years immediately prior to lodging her claim, but this period may be reduced to one year if the widow and her husband were both permanently resident in Australia when he died.
strong disagreement with the statement about the friendliness of working people, Mr X. said:

Working people are usually jealous of New Australians. The only ones they like are those who drink and gamble, that is, the poorer types. But anybody who is a little bit polite, reserved, well-dressed, quiet, the Australians don't like him. They are jealous of him. To the working people, New Australians would always be second class citizens.

Those individuals who tried to make me understand why they did not feel fully equal with Australians often seemed to be struggling to express an awareness that both ethnic and class factors entered into the situation. Mr X., whose remarks have just been quoted, is an ex-army officer. Other middle status people, sharing the contempt or condescension that they believed Australians felt towards lower status Europeans, were highly sensitive to any sign that they themselves were being denigrated in the same way. In 1953 these people were well aware of the anomaly of a situation in which they wanted to be regarded as equals by Australians to whom they were inferior in wealth and jobs and in whose eyes they literally had no social standing. During the first study, Mrs H., a dignified, self-controlled, but tense woman from a professional background, described the place of immigrants in Australia like this:

There are the wealthy people and the poor people in Australia. Australians think of immigrants as all the same. They are all grouped with the poor people. And so the rich have nothing to do with them. It is the same in every country: when you no longer have money, the rich are not interested in you any more.

In 1962 Mrs H. told me that her daughter had married an Australian from a wealthy and prominent family. At the time of the wedding she herself became acutely depressed and apprehensive:

She felt that her daughter would want to cut off all contact with her now, that she would be ashamed of her, and that her life had lost all usefulness and point. As a mother, she was letting her daughter down because she had no standing, no position, no money to offer her when she was getting married.

But things have not turned out as Mrs H. feared. Her relationship with her daughter continues to be close and affectionate. With a job that she is proud of and earning enough money to live in
reasonable comfort, she feels that there is no reason for her daughter to be ashamed of her now, but nevertheless she keeps in the background. She has weathered illness and hard times without calling on her daughter for help, and she remains more determined than ever that she will never be a burden to her children. Good manners permit only a hint of irony in her voice when she remarks that she has had no contact with her son-in-law's family since the wedding day.

Like Mrs H., most of the other middle status subjects have, over the years, become less worried about being in an anomalous class position. Since they are no longer working and living amongst a mixed group of Displaced Persons as they were in Burton in 1953, they are less likely to have the experience of being treated as if there were no difference between themselves and their social inferiors. With more money and more suitable jobs, they have regained some of their self-respect, and they have found enough response from congenial Australians not to be much worried about the others.

Some of the lower status subjects also felt that class and ethnic factors commingled to form the attitudes of Australians towards them, but the situation did not look quite the same to them as to the middle status people. Lower status immigrants tended rather to resent the fact that respectable working class Australians—people whom they could regard, by 1962, as of much the same economic status as themselves—thought of them as socially inferior because they did not eat the same food at the same times in the same way, because they did not observe the expected forms of polite behaviour, because they laughed and talked with too much animation. It seemed altogether unjust to them that Australians should interpret cultural differences in class terms, as it seemed equally unfair that they should be denounced as money-grubbers—'hungry' they would say—because they worked and saved to survive.

Mr and Mrs L., who are unpretentious people with a poor command of English, have a son married to an Australian girl. After Mrs L. had told me how this girl 'without coming out into the open', constantly makes herself and her husband feel that they are 'not good enough for her', another relative of Mrs L.'s, an intelligent and articulate young man, tried to describe the basic differences between Europeans and Australians:

The trouble with Australians is that they don't get past the outward behaviour, that is the 'personality' of someone they meet. If a New Australian doesn't eat properly and say 'please'
and ‘thank you’ in the right places, then he is condemned, and no one tries to find out what his ‘character’ really is. This is the barrier between Australians and New Australians. In Europe it is the ‘character’ that matters.

The subjects naturally varied a great deal in the way they expressed friendliness or antagonism towards Australia. The most vociferous people were usually among the most hostile, but a disinclination to express any attitudes could mean either that the individual was afraid, or—for a variety of reasons—reluctant to express his criticisms, or that he was still making up his mind, or that he was not a person of strong opinions, or that he felt quietly contented with what he had found here. The point would be too obvious to be worth labouring were it not that the manner in which the immigrant expresses his feelings has an undoubted influence on the relationships he establishes with Australians, and indeed with other immigrants. The sample contains several lower status individuals who, in 1953, were well-known because they never missed an opportunity to tell anyone who would listen what they thought was wrong with this country, in lurid, dramatic, and emotional terms. Often they seemed to have no control over how they expressed themselves, although they could try to be tactful when they wanted to make a good impression on someone like the boss, the hostel manager, or myself. But they were lacking in the skills of social intercourse, and these attempts were painful or laughable, and always transparent. To other Europeans these people were an embarrassment; to Australians they epitomized the ingratitude, arrogance and unadaptability of foreigners at their worst. No one liked or trusted them.

The sample contained other individuals who were no less hostile towards Australia but who made quite a different impact on the people around them. Indeed, just because these were better educated people from a middle status background, their criticisms were more sharply pointed and elaborate and cut deeper into the fabric of Australian life. They had some skill in the handling of personal relations—a talent sharpened by their experiences in wartime and post-war Europe, when there were signal advantages to be won by the individual who could adapt himself to varying demands and pressures and could conceal or ignore his inner feelings. The dark eddies of aggression that simmered beneath the polite, well-controlled manner of these people were obvious enough when one came to know them well; more casual contact—such as they had with most Australians—
left a highly favourable impression. Mrs B. was such a person. Although she fled from her own country hastily and with few possessions, she was able to ensure the well-being of herself and her children through varied and unpromising circumstances in Germany. She was intelligent, well-educated, and tri-lingual. By making herself useful to inexperienced American and British officials, by judicious flattery here and a timely present there, she secured all manner of concessions, ranging from extra food rations to a rapidly arranged passage to Australia when she wanted it. The people who came into contact with her in Europe must have had much the same reaction as the employer in Australia who marked her file, ‘pleasant personality and fine type of woman’. This is exactly the impression she has made on Australians who have met her socially in Burton. At the same time there is in her personality a considerable reserve of generalized aggression, and hostility towards Australia in particular, which reveals itself in numerous roundabout, self-deprecating, but barbed, observations—usually preceded by some kind of apology—and which also showed up clearly in her answers to the questionnaire: she was amongst the eight subjects most unfavourable to Australia on the Identification with Australia Index.

Finally, there were yet other people in the sample, of both lower and middle status, who appeared, on the rough measures of identification referred to, to have just as negative an attitude as the individuals who have already been discussed, but whose point of view was in fact far more rationally based and whose criticisms had little emotional significance. Except that these people were not so likely to give the extreme responses of ‘agree’ (or ‘disagree’) ‘strongly’, their reactions to the questionnaire do not distinguish them from the more emotionally involved of the hostile subjects, but analysis of the total interview material on each individual sets the two patterns of thinking apart quite clearly.

Irrespective of how they feel about Australia, practically all the immigrants in the sample have now learnt techniques for avoiding humiliation and unpleasantness. These techniques were already familiar to many of them in 1953, but today they have become second nature. These people avoid potentially distressing situations by ‘going round’, to use Mr T.’s apt phrase quoted in chapter 1, or simply by limiting their contacts to the groups, the shops, the occasions where they know they will be ‘safe’.

Asked to expand on what he meant by saying that he would
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'in a certain sense' always be a second class citizen here, Mr C., a successful businessman, replied:

It would be the same in any other country. He thinks there would be certain clubs, like Tattersalls for instance, that a New Australian couldn't join—and he himself wouldn't think of trying—unless perhaps he had been here a great many years. This is partly because a New Australian doesn't have the contacts to get him into the more select groups.

Mr T., to quote again from this gentle, insightful man of peasant birth, described his own philosophy of 'assimilation':

Wherever he is he doesn't like to be different from other people. If he goes amongst people who are dressed up, then he likes to be smart too. But here [in Burton] when he mixes with people and goes down the street they are all casually dressed; he dresses the same way so that he won't be 'exposed as being different'. In the same way, if he went among intelligent people he wouldn't know how to talk to them properly so he is better to keep away. When he first came here this is what he tried to do, to fit in so as not to be obviously different from anybody else. By contrast, there are other people who always want to be 'the picture in the frame'.

In forming their judgments about Australia many Displaced Persons were clearly influenced by the attitudes towards Britain which they held long before coming to this country. Numbers of them had fallen under the influence of Nazi propaganda, which, under Dr Goebbels' heady guidance, from before 1939 to 1945, denounced and derided everything British. Over one-third of the immigrants interviewed in 1953 were highly prejudiced against Britain. In declaring that Britain was not to be trusted and that her claim to moral superiority was only a sham to hide the ruthless pursuit of her own economic and political interests, they were echoing sentiments which, as Bramsted (1956) points out, had long been essential features of German anglophobia. But to the Displaced Persons these criticisms gained their emotional immediacy from the happenings of the last war and after, when, contrary to all her pledges, Britain sacrificed Poland, the Baltic countries, Yugoslavia, and eventually the whole of eastern Europe to Communist control.

Other aspects of British policy and the British way of life also came in for criticism. Britain was widely condemned for exploit-
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ing Australia financially, for keeping her a 'dependent colony', for the outmoded institutions of the monarchy and the aristocracy, and for British snobbery and smugness. Britain, said Mrs B., has 'milked Australia dry'. Mr K.

couldn't understand why the British should make such a fuss about the Germans and Hitler when their own Queen was just to them what Hitler was to the Germans, except that the feeling was much stronger.

Some of the people interviewed obviously enjoyed watching what they believed to be the decline of Britain as a world power.

Britain won the war [said an ethnic German (not in the sample)], but look at her now. She is poor and her people still have ration tickets for food. Germany lost the war, but she has plenty of food.

To gain some idea of how the subjects' attitudes to Britain have changed over the years, I included the following statement in the questionnaire: 'Australia would be better off if she were independent of Britain.' Only eight people agreed with this statement, five were undecided, and eighteen disagreed (nine strongly). The immigrants' comments show that they have developed some misgivings about Australia's ability to finance her economic development or to play a role in international affairs without Britain's help. Their animosity towards Britain seems to have lost much of its fire, although no warmth of affection has appeared to take its place. Mr G. probably interpreted the attitude of other Displaced Persons correctly when he said:

New Australians today don't worry much about England. At the end of the war a lot of them had a strong grudge against her. But since England's prestige has gone down more and more during the last few years, the D.Ps. feel that she has no significance any more.

Like the ethnic German just quoted, many of the people interviewed made comparisons between Australia and England, on the one hand, and Germany on the other. A few individuals condemned the brutalities of Nazi rule, but far more commonly Germany was admired and respected for her powers of endurance, her capacity for organization, her technical prowess, her conformity to a stern discipline in all aspects of life from the army to the family, and the spirit and drive that had enabled her to rise triumphant above military defeat. Even in 1962 some of
the immigrants could still be moved to pity by the unforgettable horror of the bombing of German cities in the last stages of the war.

It is not surprising that many of the immigrants should look to Germany to provide the standard against which they judged life in Australia, for the sample consisted mostly of individuals who had spent some years just preceding their emigration in Germany or amongst Germans in occupied countries. But the only individuals who so identified themselves with Germany that they altogether repudiated their 'home' countries were five ethnic Germans and the Polish-Austrian, whose nationality remains obscure. One ethnic German expressed an attitude typical of this group when he said:

he didn't think he would ever go back to Poland. Poland didn't give him anything. He left his country when he was eighteen and travelled all over Europe. He saw how much better life was in other countries.

An ethnic German from Lithuania told another Lithuanian who was intensely proud of his country: 'Lithuania is finished. You want to forget all about Lithuania.'

Apart from these particular cases, all of the Displaced Persons in the sample showed some attachment to their home countries, but they varied considerably in the extent to which they kept up contact with people at home or maintained an interest in emigrant national institutions. In 1953 there was no contact between the nine people from the Baltic countries and the Ukraine and their homelands, while half of the remaining immigrants (from the other Communist, but not Soviet-occupied countries—Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia) were in touch with relatives at home. By 1962, five of the first-mentioned nine subjects had established contact with relatives at home, and the number of people from the independent Communist countries writing home had risen to sixteen. The total number in contact thus increased from eleven in 1953 to twenty-one in 1962. This increase is due largely to the thaw in east-west relations. The Displaced Persons feel that it is no longer dangerous to their people at home to be in touch with relatives overseas, who—since they refused to return to their own countries after the war or fled later—would be assumed to be hostile to the Communist régime.

To be precise, twenty-two of the thirty-one subjects had spent five or more years under these conditions; the average period was five and a half years, and the range from nought to eleven years.
Over the years all manner of accidental circumstances have also brought Displaced Persons into contact with relatives whom they thought long dead or lost in one of the countless movements of peoples carried out by Germany and Russia in their various attempts to relocate the population of eastern Europe. The subjects who are now in touch with people at home communicate, in most cases, with only one or two relatives, to whom they send money, food, clothes, or medicines as well as letters. Some of them only reluctantly assume such obligations, and some resent the requests of their more importunate kin. Mr W., for instance, related with explosive indignation how his brother, who had recently been promoted to an executive job, had written asking him to send a gold watch suitable for the incumbent of such a position. ‘What does he think I am?’ demanded Mr W., ‘I couldn’t even afford one for myself.’ But in general the immigrants seem willing to accept responsibility towards relatives at home—particularly aged parents. Indeed, these relationships can contribute to the well-being of immigrants in diverse ways: they can help to assuage the sense of rootlessness and loss of identity that seems to have beset most Displaced Persons at some time or other; they provide the immigrants with a sense of purpose, an object for acts of kindness and thoughtfulness that few of them have found—outside their immediate families—in the Australian community; and, by bridging the gap between Europe and Australia, they help the Displaced Persons to accept and live with the unpalatable experiences of the past. Whether these people do in fact keep in touch with relatives at home depends on the fate of their families and their personal sentiments. It has nothing to do with their attitudes towards Australia, the well-disposed being as likely to have contacts at home as the hostile.

Nor was the tendency to maintain contacts with the home country related to the subjects’ sense of identification with their homelands. This ‘national identification’, as I shall call it, is an elusive, many-faceted concept. It refers to the immigrant’s overall feeling for his own country, both as he knew it himself and as it is today. It refers also to his interest—as passive imbibor active creator—in maintaining the continuity of the traditional culture, and his support for the activities of national institutions—including refugee political organizations—established overseas. It involves the complex notion of his readiness to think of himself as a ‘Pole’, ‘Hungarian’, etc. in this country: that is his inclination to seek the company of fellow-countrymen, to share their enthusiasms and grievances, and to help and accept help
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from them. The conditions under which the Displaced Persons migrated to Australia and lived on their arrival here did not encourage them to preserve traditional patterns of domestic or community life: they had been years away from their own countries before they reached Australia; most of them came singly or as part of truncated family units; for some considerable time they had no stable, independent places to live. Since, at the most, they brought with them only a few personal effects and cherished photos, in their homes today they are surrounded by none of the familiar objects which make it possible to recreate an old atmosphere in a new setting. Apart from occasional books, newspapers, or records, their living-rooms contain nothing to distinguish them from Australian households.

To the extent that they were influenced by these various factors discouraging the perpetuation of national culture patterns, the research sample was representative of the Displaced Persons as a whole. But the sample was atypical in that immigrants who wanted to live in a settlement of fellow-nationals, or who were interested in giving active support to national organizations, were likely to have left Burton for the city by 1953. The only person in the original sample who was involved in any nationalist movement was a Latvian woman who is now living in the United States. She seems to have been attracted to America partly because active nationalist groups were established there.

There are thus good reasons why one would not expect the immigrants in the research sample to display the more extreme forms of national identification that have commonly occurred in other types of immigrant group. Some differences among the subjects do, however, emerge clearly enough, despite the fact that much of their thinking around this question is amorphous and full of contradictions. I shall first of all discuss their attitudes on four specific topics mentioned in the questionnaire: reading ethnic papers, children learning their parents' native language, friendships with fellow-nationals and the role of national associations in the adjustment of migrants.

For the purpose of this analysis, individuals who regularly saw foreign-language newspapers, whether published in this country, Germany or the United States, were classified as reading ethnic papers, but the two women who read only German art and news magazines were not. The number of people reading ethnic papers, so defined, declined from seventeen in 1953 to ten in 1962. Of the ten people still reading ethnic papers in 1962, nine were of lower status, compared to nine of the twenty-one not reading ethnic
papers; the average English ability score of the ten readers of ethnic papers was 32, compared to a score of 65 for the nonreaders. In 1962 neither middle status people with a relatively poor command of English nor lower status subjects who were relatively competent in English read ethnic papers.

Unfortunately, in 1953 I did not make a point of finding out the attitude of the people interviewed to children learning their parents' language. In 1962, in response to the statement, 'It is desirable that the children of New Australians should learn their parents' native language', twelve people said they agreed strongly, ten agreed, two were undecided and seven disagreed, one of them strongly. The subjects who agreed with this statement did not differ in status from those who disagreed, but they did differ in terms of reading ethnic papers: of the twenty-two who agreed with the statement, nine read ethnic papers, compared to one of the seven who disagreed. A few of the people who said they agreed with this statement added that it depended on what the parents' language was: the child should learn it only if it was likely to be useful to him later on, as French or German might be. The people who disagreed with the statement thought that it would hamper a child in becoming a 'real Australian' if he were burdened with learning his parents' tongue.

One of the statements on the questionnaire was designed to reveal more directly the strength of solidarity that the subjects felt with their fellow-countrymen here. This statement, 'The best friendships are with people from your own country', proved to be useless in discriminating among the subjects, because only four of them agreed with it, two were undecided, and twenty-five disagreed. In response to another statement, 'National associations have played an important part in helping New Australians to adjust themselves in this country', the subjects were divided almost evenly into those who agreed, disagreed, or were undecided. Of the eleven who agreed, five read ethnic papers, compared with five of the twenty-one who disagreed or were undecided.

A National Identification Index was constructed from the responses of the subjects to the statements on national associations and on children learning the parents' native tongue, and from the reading of ethnic papers. The possible scores ranged from two to fourteen. Actual scores fell between four and fourteen, with a mean of eight. The more competent the subjects were in English, the lower was their National Identification score. The average
score for middle status subjects was 9.1 compared to 7.1 for immigrants from a lower status background.

On closer inspection, it became clear that the National Identification score was hiding important qualitative differences between the subjects. More rewarding was the attempt to delineate patterns of national identification. Individuals showing extreme behaviour and attitudes were, as usual, the easier to classify. The ethnocentric subjects could be recognized at once. They thought in terms of black and white: all the virtues attached to their own national group, all the vices to the out-groups they selected as their particular targets. Their attachment to their own countries was as irrational and impervious to modification by objective evidence as was their antagonism to these other groups. When challenged they could become frighteningly emotional and bellicose. They all read ethnic newspapers both in 1953 and in 1962, and, although there were slight variations among them, they tended in 1962 to be strongly in favour of children learning their parents’ language and to agree that national associations help immigrants to adjust. Two married couples and two other individuals had this kind of ethnocentric attitude towards either their own countries or—in the case of three individuals who were ethnic Germans—to Germany or their own minority group.

Two of the other ethnic Germans seemed to have similar personality characteristics to these ethnocentric individuals, but the pattern of their national identification was more complex. (One of these two has changed in outlook over the years and will be mentioned again below.) Encouraged by Nazi promises that the *Herrenvolk* would share in the power and prosperity of a victorious Germany, they had rejected the countries they grew up in, thrown in their lot with the Reich, and identified themselves with German aims and values. But after the war they found themselves as much despised and unwanted in Germany as they could ever have been in their countries of origin. When I first knew them in 1953, their thinking was still jammed with what looked like Nazi ideas: hatred of Britain; the notion of racial superiority, and the complementary notion that the inferior are simply ‘rubbish’, to be disposed of like pigs’ food’, as one of them put it; the doctrine that might is right; and the virtue of unquestioning obedience to authority. But in their feelings towards Germany herself there was some ambivalence: an almost obsessive admiration and envy on the one hand, bitterness and resentment at their rejection on the other.

There were other people in the sample who showed no loyalty
or affection, nor any particular hostility, towards their homelands or to any other country. They were six in all: one ethnic German, one Pole (Austrian father), a Hungarian who had been brought up in a Hungarian minority in another country, a White Russian and two young men who had left their own countries at a very early age. These people represented, in a sense, the prototype of the uprooted: they owed no allegiance and acknowledged no responsibility to any group larger than their immediate families. This sense of being without roots was, in some measure, common to most of the people interviewed in 1953, but only in a few cases did it seem to have become stabilized as an essential part of their personalities. By 1962 none of these people was reading an ethnic paper (one had been in 1953); all except one of them thought that children should learn their parents’ language; none of them agreed that national associations had helped immigrants to adjust. Mr A. was one of these people. He recounted in a matter-of-fact way how he had secretly escaped from his own country to avoid being forcibly evacuated by the Russians, and how he had worked for the Germans until the end of the war, when he went into a Displaced Persons camp.

He did this [he explained] because it was of material benefit to him. Technically he was a ‘D.P.’ because he was away from his own country. He wasn’t really, of course, because he had left voluntarily. . . . One reason why he thinks he has got on better here than some other migrants is that this is his second migration. He worked only with Germans during the war. Within six months he could speak their language as well as he now speaks English, and within four years he could speak it like a German. That was good. It was to his advantage that people should think he was a German at that time. He had to give up all his sentiments during this period, and that is why he can settle here so easily. He has been stripped of all these feelings, and all that is left is that he should pursue his own material interests. He didn’t think it was likely he would again build up deep sentiments here.

Most of the immigrants fell between these extremes of ethnocentrism and rootlessness. They had retained some affection for their homeland, some pride in its past, and some interest in its present well-being. There were nine well-informed people, of middle status background, who had a warm pride in their national culture, and felt that impediments of time and distance should not prevent them from nurturing, in the microcosm of their own lives, a fraction of their cultural heritage, nor excuse them from keeping abreast of developments at home. These were the
people most likely to accept responsibility for fellow-countrymen in need of help—at home, in Germany, or in Australia—but they were not necessarily sympathetic towards national clubs. By 1962 none of them was reading ethnic papers. They varied in their responses to the statements on the questionnaire about learning the parents' native language and about the role of national associations.

There were eight immigrants of lower status background whose feeling for their home countries was based on familiarity with the local community and its parochial culture and, in some cases, on an ingrained attachment to the soil. But because poverty, war, or foreign oppression had caused them much hardship, they did not think of their countries with great affection. They were not exactly glad—but they were grateful—to be far away from the places that they associated with suffering, however much they might be moved to unbearable nostalgia by the sound of familiar songs and music, or the memory of some traditional pastime or family celebration. By 1962 only three of these people were still reading ethnic papers (five had been in 1953). Six of them were in favour of children learning their parents' language. Only one of them thought that national clubs had helped immigrants to adjust in this country—a finding that is in line with their generally passive attitude towards their national heritage.

These predominating types of national identification have been described without particular reference to the period of the first or the second study because they proved to be highly stable. But there were some shifts in attitude and one superficially dramatic change on the part of Mr P., the ethnic German who, in 1953, showed a degree of identification with Germany and rancour against Australia which was equalled by only one other subject. In 1962 Mr P. was still very well-disposed towards Germany, but he could no longer be described as ethnocentric, because by this time he was well on the way towards substituting Australians for the part that Germans had played in his thinking in 1953, and New Australians for Australians. Australians have taken on the good qualities of generosity, neighbourliness, and honesty, and all the abuse that he previously directed at them is now concentrated on his selfish, materialistic, untrustworthy, and ungrateful fellow-immigrants.

Some four or the people who were classified as rootless in 1953 have now, despite themselves, established such ties in the communities where they live that the description is no longer quite apt. Resentment at their loss of independence—epitomized in
1953 by the feeling that there was nothing to stop them from packing up and leaving Australia whenever they wanted to—is tempered by pride in the homes, families, and jobs that now tie them here. As one would expect, there has also been a slackening in the intensity of national identification amongst the subjects as a whole. Evidence for this trend comes not only from the immigrants' preoccupation with the present and the future, rather than the past, but from their own assessments of what has happened to them. Many of them expressed themselves in much the same way as Mrs H., who says she has 'put everything behind her now'. Others told me with some amusement how tedious they find it now to read in their own language and how poorly they can express themselves in it.

There are, however, five individuals whose attachment to their home countries patently did not decline between 1953 and 1962. Four of them were classed as ethnocentric on the 1953 material, two of these being ethnic Germans who were strongly identified with their own ethnic minorities rather than with Germany herself. Failure to establish themselves in the kind of jobs and positions that they wanted in Australia has combined with the fact that they are still in constant touch with relatives at home to preserve in three of these five people a homeland-centred rather than an Australian-centred outlook. Although these three immigrants realize that there is no likelihood that they will ever return, they still talk about the property they 'own' at home and how well they could live if they could get possession of it again. Mrs Z., the ethnic German among these three, used to be a journalist but she has had only menial jobs in this country. Over the past years she has spent her leisure writing articles and stories in German and translating Australian works into German. She has tried to get these efforts published in Germany, and is now preparing a history of a German expedition to New Guinea during the last century. The other ethnic German is the cheerful Mrs L., who has close relatives settled in Germany, and who, when I last saw her, was thinking of returning to Germany with her niece, who is married to a German. The fifth person in this category is Mrs H., who, on the 1953 material, was classified as one of those middle status people with a firm, but not excessive, attachment towards her own country. Having now moved to the city and become active in a national club, she is much more absorbed in the interests and activities of her own people than she was in 1953. She is an avid reader; with more money than she had nine years ago, she can now afford to buy books and maga-
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zines in her own language and in German. But it would still be quite wrong to describe Mrs H. as ethnocentric. In her case the shift in emphasis needs to be seen as part of a change in her general situation: she is now sixty years old and, all her children being married, she lives alone. She is not nostalgically turning back to the past, but—alert, intelligent, and attractive as she is—chances of making a satisfying and new life for herself at this stage are meagre. Without rejecting opportunities of contact with Australians, she has simply picked up the threads of long-established interests because they were readily available.

For convenience I have separated the discussion in this chapter into the immigrants' attitudes to Australia, on the one hand, and to their home countries, on the other. I have left it to this point to refer to naturalization and attitudes to returning home or settling in some other country—two items which are sometimes seen as nodal points where the lines of attraction to the country of origin and to Australia intersect. At first glance, it seems reasonable to assume that both of these items represent a crucial test of the immigrant's willingness to recognize that he has, permanently and irrevocably, adopted a new homeland in place of the old. It is doubtful, however, whether either can be interpreted as a crucial test, in this sense, for the Displaced Persons to whom this study refers.

At the time of the first study in 1953 none of the subjects was naturalized; indeed only the two who had been here just on five years would have been eligible. But they could all have put in a Declaration of Intention, the formal procedure by which aliens at that time signified their intention to apply for naturalization. In fact, only twelve of the thirty-one subjects had lodged such a Declaration by 1953. Eight of these people were of middle status background; of the remaining four, two were married to Australians.

A variety of considerations influenced the immigrants in their attitudes towards naturalization at this time. Those who had not put in a Declaration of Intention by 1953 had not necessarily decided against becoming Australian citizens. Many of them simply felt no urgency about the matter; being still unsettled and having little sense of permanence in this country, they were disinclined to take any decisive and irrevocable step like this. Others, however, had specific reasons for being reluctant to become Australian citizens: a few did not want to sever their
last symbolic ties with the country of origin; some feared that, by becoming naturalized, they would risk losing their freedom to return home, if this should ever become possible; others believed that, in the event of a third world war, their alien status would save them from being called into the Australian army. Others again would have accepted Australian citizenship, but rejected the idea of becoming *British* subjects.

The better educated, more worldly immigrants took less time than others to put in a Declaration of Intention, mainly because the business of filling in forms was more a matter of routine to them (and they could carry out this part of the procedure themselves, without having to resort to the help of fellow-immigrants), and because they grasped more clearly the objective advantages of Australian citizenship. Those in government employ were well aware that they could not become permanent public servants until they were naturalized; some felt that, if they wanted to leave this country, an Australian passport would be better than no passport at all; others were anxious to avoid the status of enemy alien in the event of war. There was also the feeling that to be an Australian was at least to be something, a feeling that was best expressed by one lower status migrant with no great love for this country, who told me:

> We are only New Australians now. That is like being a D.P., just nothing. If you went to America and said 'I am a New Australian', what would that mean?

In 1953, the question of whether to become naturalized or not was a common topic of discussion among the Displaced Persons. It was of no interest to the immigrants whom I interviewed again in 1962. By that time, all except three of the subjects were naturalized. Of the fourteen migrants who were naturalized in eight years or less, nine were of middle status and five of lower status background; of the seventeen who took longer, or who were still not naturalized in 1963, thirteen were of lower status and only four of middle status background. Only two of the fourteen naturalized early still read ethnic papers in 1962, compared with eight of the remaining seventeen in the sample. The higher the subjects scored on English ability, the less time they took to become naturalized.

Some students of immigration (e.g. Fields, 1938; Poignant, 1949) take an immigrant's willingness to become naturalized as an index of his overall assimilation or his identification with the
new society. Others (e.g. Borrie, 1954; Gessain and Doré, 1946) deny that naturalization has this symbolic significance. My own impression is that the meaning attached to becoming naturalized varies in different countries and at different times. Despite official attempts to give an ideological and emotional significance to the act of taking out Australian citizenship, the immigrants in my own sample looked upon naturalization principally as a matter of expediency and convenience. Over the years, barriers against naturalization—in the form of ties to the homeland—have weakened, and the penalties of alien status have become more obvious. Nearly all the subjects in this sample are now well into their forties or over; one substantial reason why they have become naturalized is to ensure that they will be eligible for Commonwealth social service benefits should they become widowed or permanently incapacitated for work, and in their old age.

My conclusion that a variety of motives enters into the decision to become naturalized is confirmed by Taft and Doczy’s study of Hungarian intellectuals (1962) and by Taft’s survey of Dutch immigrants (1961), both Western Australian studies. Closer examination of my own material helps to illuminate the relationship between naturalization and attitudes towards Australia. Of the people who became naturalized within the minimum time (i.e. within six years, allowing one year’s grace), all except one had above average scores on the Identification with Australia Index; apart from this, there is much variability in the material, and no distinct patterns emerge. The individual with the lowest score on the Identification with Australia Index became naturalized within eight years of arrival; personal disappointments have led this woman to project an intense degree of hostility on to Australia and Australians; in 1962 her comment on naturalization was, ‘Naturalization! What’s the use of becoming an Australian citizen if it makes no difference to how you are treated?’

One of the three people who have not yet taken out Australian citizenship is a man whose vociferous anti-Australianism was familiar to everyone who had contact with him in Burton in 1953; by 1962 he was less outwardly aggressive, and he had an above-average score on the Identification with Australia Index; when we spoke about naturalization, he told me darkly, with an enigmatic smile, that he wasn’t ‘good enough to be an Australian citizen yet’. Some of the less educated subjects believed that in the eyes of Australians naturalization would provide tangible evidence of their loyalty. In a few of the immigrants
this anxiety to demonstrate that they were ‘good’ immigrants was obviously in inverse relationship to their affection for this country; these were people who, in all their contacts with Australians, expected to be rewarded for an outward show of conformity. One of them was amongst the bitterest critics of Australia in 1953; at the time of the second study he was one of three people in the sample whose living-room was conspicuously decorated with his framed naturalization certificate.

The conclusions suggested by this discussion of naturalization are that, firstly, for the individual immigrant, the significance of becoming naturalized varies according to the total pattern of adaptation, and that, secondly, for the group as a whole, naturalization trends are related to the objective advantages of Australian citizenship and the changing position of the group in Australian society. In short, naturalization behaviour cannot be interpreted directly as an index of any of the more elusive psychological or sociological variables. We shall now take up the related question: what is the significance of the immigrants’ stated attitudes to returning home?

In 1953 most of the people interviewed had already come to believe that it was unrealistic to imagine that they would ever return home. The prospect of their countries being liberated from Communist control looked more remote than ever. As each year passed, the people and places they knew would have changed more; eventually the home they remembered would no longer be there to go back to, irrespective of what political changes might occur. ‘You would be an immigrant again’, as Mr A. said. At the same time, the longer they stayed in this country the more they would have to lose by leaving it. They were already too old to make another start. There were, however, still some people who felt that they were not necessarily in Australia for ever. A few individuals who were not as well off here as they had been at home dreamed of returning, claiming their property, and living out the rest of their lives in comfort. Some found Australia so distasteful or were so attached to their own countries that they could not tolerate the idea of being permanently settled here. One well-educated Latvian woman, already referred to, whose heart was with the organizations of exiles working in the United States for the liberation of her home country told me:

She probably wouldn’t stay in Australia always. She was sure there would be another war to set Europe free, and then she would go back home. She could do nothing and make nothing
of her life here, but after the war she would return to help with the rebuilding of her own country.

By 1962 this woman had left Australia to live in the United States. Two other members of the original sample—lonely single men in their forties, with relatives in America—had done the same. Another seven subjects in the present sample of thirty-one have seriously contemplated emigrating to the United States or Canada at some stage since their arrival here. Many seem to have kept the possibility of leaving Australia for some other country in the back of their minds until quite recently. There is no doubt that this was one of the favourite topics of conversation among the Displaced Persons in 1953. Success stories about relatives or friends who had settled somewhere else—usually in the United States—circulated freely from one immigrant to another, adding to the favourable images of these countries already existing in the minds of many Displaced Persons and aggravating their discontent with conditions in Australia. With the exception of Mrs L., who may go to Germany to live, none of the people interviewed in 1962 still thought seriously either of going home or emigrating to another country. By this time, the question, ‘Would you return home now if you could?’ had become meaningless to all of them; to a few it sounded like a cruel joke. Like Mr M., one of the most intransigent of the ethnocentric subjects, the rest of these immigrants have come to realize, however reluctantly, that they will doubtless ‘die here anyway’. But this recognition implies nothing about their feelings towards Australia nor about the degree of happiness they have found in this country.

Neither willingness to become naturalized nor attitudes towards returning to the homeland provide a simple answer to the question, how does the immigrant balance off his feelings for his country of origin and his feelings for Australia? To make sense in terms of my own material the question has to be phrased more like this: how do attitudes and sentiments towards the home country, on the one hand, and Australia, on the other, fit together to form meaningful patterns? The following chapter will deal with these patterns as they are related to the general processes of adaptation, but it may be useful to summarize the more readily tabulated data here. Even with the small number of cases in the sample, the patterns revealed are highly complex. It would be out of place to take the statistics in the table below at all seriously, but the ethnocentric immigrants seem to stand out as
poorly identified with Australia, as slow to accept Australian citizenship, as unhappy about their own position in this country, and, as one would expect, as highly identified with their own countries. (Perhaps it should be emphasized that the subjects were, of course, classified into the several types of national identification on the basis of the general interview material, before the National Identification score had been calculated.)

NATIONAL IDENTIFICATION, 1953 AND 1962, 31 DISPLACED PERSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification with Australia</th>
<th>Ethnocentric</th>
<th>Rootless</th>
<th>Middle status with responsible chial pride</th>
<th>Lower status in home country</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953, 1953 and 1962 by 1962</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Identification Index (av. score)</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification with Australia Index, 1962 (av. score)</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree with statement 15 on Questionnaire* (%)</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Years between arrival in Australia and naturalization (av. no.) | 13 | 9  | 11 | 8  | 9  | 8  | 8  | 9  | 9  |

* 'New Australians will always be second class citizens here, whether they are naturalized or not.' This was one of the items used in constructing the Identification with Australia Index.

It will now be apparent that some of the immigrants to whom this study refers wanted to be able to think of themselves, and to be regarded by others, as Australians, while others have no wish ever to be anything but Hungarians, Latvians, etc., and others again were not sure what they wanted to be. But practi-
cally all of them have become used to the fact that they are, and will be as long as they speak English with an accent, New Australians. This is the term they use to apply to themselves as a matter of course.

What none of them wants to be is a 'D.P.' The term both implies inferiority and denies national, and hence individual, identity. In 1953 many of the immigrants were acutely resentful of this enforced status. It was like an ugly, inappropriate, and restricting garment which they were anxious to discard. But the Australians would not let them get rid of it. Some of the immigrants added this to other reasons for animosity towards the local people, and left it at that. Others turned their hostility from the Australians—the dominant group whom they were unwilling to antagonize—to the Displaced Persons themselves—unimportant, powerless, and altogether lacking in prestige, and hence both fit and safe objects for their contempt. These individuals made their criticisms in terms which showed they were projecting on to their fellow-Displaced Persons qualities that they could not accept in themselves: they dismissed the Displaced Persons as a whole as 'a lot of trash'; denounced them as impostors falsely claiming past importance, achievements, or sufferings; deplored their lack of interest in learning English, their obsession with getting rich quickly, their incapacity to settle down, their jealousy of each other, and their improvidence. They claimed that immigrant women, as one man put it, 'had been knocking about Europe for years with no one to control them and were not worth a penny for New Australians'. Few of them were quite as contemptuous as one young man who, after a bitter exchange with his wife, told her scornfully that 'she needn't think she would ever be like an Australian woman no matter how long she stayed here'. To which she replied, 'not as long as I live in this house with you and you treat me as you do'. But there were many whose attitudes, like this man's, could best be described in Lewin's apt phrase, 'group self-hatred' (Lewin, 1948, pp. 186-200).

I have already described how Mr P.'s attitudes towards Australians and New Australians went through this process of change between 1953 and 1962. In general, there was in 1962 less of the bitter condemnation of fellow-immigrants than there had been in 1953, but rather more people—about half the sample—made some explicit statement about avoiding too much contact with fellow-immigrants, or repeated in milder form the kind of complaints that were common in 1953, or—a new element—recounted
bitter experiences of business dealings with other immigrants. Like Mrs P., many of the subjects seem to have come to the conclusion that 'Australians are best for New Australians'. 'You can't learn anything from New Australians', said Mrs V. Mr S. caught the mood of many others when he told me:

It's better to have as little to do with New Australians as you need to. He would much rather have Australians visit his family at home than New Australians. If an Australian comes to see them, he is dressed properly; he sits down and speaks respectfully to his [Mr S.'s] wife. But if a New Australian comes, he doesn't care how dirty he is; he'll swear, talk rudely, and behave roughly, thinking to himself all the time, 'This bloke is just a bloody immigrant; I don't need to worry about him.'
Conclusion

I: PATTERNS OF ASSIMILATION

The task of analysing in some detail the adaptation of immigrants to a new environment requires that their characteristics, experiences, and mental reactions be split up into a number of separate, manageable units. So far I have followed this procedure, although at the same time I have tried to demonstrate inter-relationships between some of these units and others. But, having taken the individual migrants apart, one is finally confronted with the job of putting them together again. One wants to know how the various characteristics and items of thinking and behaviour cohere to form a total pattern, and, further, whether any marked combinations of features recur so frequently that one can say: here is a distinctive migrant type.

The literature on migrant assimilation contains numerous attempts to identify migrant types, varying from impressionistic sketches to models based on refined statistical techniques (see, e.g., Child, 1943; Cirtautus, 1957; Eisenstadt, 1954; Kosa, 1957; Taft and Doczy, 1962; Wentholt, 1956). In an important recent paper, Taft (1963) analyses a series of psychological studies of assimilation made in Western Australia, and offers the conclusion that ‘we shall have to call on typologies to help us sort out our results’. He also considers techniques which would serve to identify these types and the kind of patterns that might be expected to emerge.

The cases in my own sample are so few and so diverse that they would not stand the clearly desirable kind of statistical treatment that Taft advocates. Beyond the first simple inter-correlations, inspection of the data has had to suffice. I have collected into the one type people who share a series of characteristics which seem, from my understanding of the material as a whole, to hang together for good psychological and sociological reasons. The types are not all defined by exactly the same collec-
tion of variables: one group of migrants might be classified together because they have factors $a_1$, $b_1$, and $c$, in common; a second group because they share $a_2$, $b_2$, $d$, and $e$. But there is sufficient overlap in the key variables to ensure that the same individual could not be placed in more than one category. The variables used to define the type in the first place are the given background factors (like age and pre-migration status), and the several items of social and cultural assimilation and identification isolated in the previous chapters. Doubtless only a few of the full range of migrant types which occur among the Displaced Persons as a whole are represented in this sample. And it need hardly be added that no wider significance attaches to the proportions of each type found in this particular sample. Inevitably the description of the various types recapitulates material already presented in different contexts.

Statistical analysis of the data serves to distinguish a middle status group, who are competent in English, who do not read ethnic papers, who have acquired new interests or followed up old ones, and who become naturalized in the minimum time, or close to it, from a lower status group whose English ability is relatively poor, who read ethnic papers, who have no interests and who take longer to become naturalized. Within the lower status group, there is a further distinction between those who have remained in country areas, whose English ability is comparatively good, who have Australian friends, and who have followed up old interests or acquired new ones, and another group with the opposite characteristics. A closer scrutiny of the data indicates that some of the deviant cases form further distinct types. In all, five patterns stand out clearly, but they account for only twenty-one of the thirty-one subjects. The remaining members of the sample seem to represent variants of the main types, but it would be naïve to treat them as such when the number of cases is so small. They are therefore excluded from the analysis.

Amongst the immigrants of middle status background there is a clearly distinguishable category of what will be called 'functionally adapted' individuals. The six people who can be grouped in this way were all educated to secondary or tertiary level. They are at the top of the scale in English ability, and they have taken far less time to become naturalized than most of the other subjects. Their money has gone on good living; they have never found it easy to save, and none of them owns, or is buying, a house. Nor do any of them still live in Burton. When
these people first arrived in this country they looked forward to a time when they would recover the secure middle status position which they had been brought up to expect at home. Having, at the cost of much personal effort, attained responsible, semi-professional, reasonably well-paid jobs, they have gone some way towards achieving this aim: they can take pride in their work, even though in no case does it quite measure up to their earlier hopes; they can live decently in congenial surroundings; and they can satisfy their intellectual tastes by buying books, television sets, radiograms and records. Each of them has also one or two much valued contacts with congenial Australians, but none has been fully accepted into any informal friendship group of middle class Australians. This they no longer expect. Even though some of them are still only in their thirties, the pattern of their lives seems to have crystallized, and they are far less responsive than they were in 1953 to opportunities for mixing with Australians or taking part in social and cultural activities. These people make no particular point of maintaining contact with their fellow-countrymen or of avoiding them, but they cherish one or two long-established friendships with people from their own countries, and they accept responsibility for helping their compatriots in need. They also keep in touch with relatives in their homelands. Neither among Australians nor among fellow-immigrants do they have the continuous, regular contacts that would give zest and vigour to their pursuit of cultural activities. They rarely attend a theatre, concert, or any entertainment that takes them outside their homes; if they are married, they have interests in common with their husbands or wives, but otherwise their cultural life remains unshared, and—as they admit a little regretfully themselves—the less satisfying and viable as a result. But they are intelligent, dignified, and to all outward appearances independent and mature people. In talking about Australia or their own situation in this country, they temper reasonably expressed criticism with sincere praise. They have proved realistic and adaptable. When, as sometimes happens, they are saddened by loneliness and the thought of lost hopes, they do not look for scapegoats, nor try to impose their feelings on other people. If the kind of adaptation they have made has taken its toll, the scars may show in the disguised form of psychosomatic illness.

A group of six lower status subjects has made a similar kind of adaptation. Their English ability is above the average for individuals of the same status, and in some cases they come up to the middle status average. Having been trained as tradesmen in
Europe, they are now employed in their old trades here or have acquired new qualifications. They are still in Burton and working in jobs which they obtained during their first year or two in the town. They mix easily with their fellow-workers, who are mostly Australians, at least to the extent that they will have a drink at the local hotel, take part in the activities of clubs connected with the job, or join in sports. But these casual friendships barely impinge upon their family life. The few social activities which take place in their homes are likely to involve both Europeans and Australians (often neighbours), and the distant friends whom they keep in touch with are nearly all Europeans. But these people are by no means ethnocentric: they have no time for national clubs and they acknowledge no special responsibility towards fellow-countrymen in Australia—indeed, they are cautious about becoming involved with other immigrants. Some of them are rootless, lacking any marked affection or loyalty towards any country; others combine a warm attachment to their native land with a conviction that they are much better off away from it. What distinguishes these people sharply from the middle status ‘functionally adapted’ migrants is the single-mindedness with which they have worked towards establishing themselves financially in this country. They are now reaping the benefit of the industry, frugal living, and patient saving of their early years here. They live comfortably in homes that they own or are buying, and, proud of what they have accomplished, feel that they are altogether the equal of the average Australian. Persuaded that nothing will ever quite take the place of the easy, intimate sociability of the towns and villages they grew up in, they do not look for any closer relationships with Australians than they now have. Although they show little trace of sentimental attachment to this country—and some are even contemptuous or disparaging—they freely acknowledge that Australia has given them a standard of economic well-being that they would never have reached in Europe, and they expect their children to recognize this as their only home. They came to Australia as political refugees, but they are prototypes of the independent, industrious, self- or family-oriented individual, who commonly form the core of economically motivated migration movements.

The characteristics of the third migrant type have already been foreshadowed in chapters 1 and 2 in the discussion of the individuals who were primarily interested in their jobs as a source of symbolic status. Only two of the five people who were described in this way in 1953 have today sufficient additional
characteristics in common to suggest what the essential features of a 'status conscious' type might be. These are people of middle status background who already in 1953 possessed an excellent knowledge of English and had made Australian friends. Much of their thinking and planning at that time centred around getting into white-collar, socially respected occupations; by this means they hoped both to be able to make contact with the 'better' groups in the local community and to dissociate themselves from their despised fellow-immigrants. Today they are deeply involved in making a success of the fairly satisfying jobs to which they have gained access.

I do not pretend to have fathomed the complex psychological make-up of these two people, but some obvious interpretations suggest themselves. The deliberateness with which they have tried to erase all traces of their national background is not linked with any marked antipathy towards their countries of origin; it seems to stem rather from an inner inability to come to terms with their own past experiences. They are trying to erect a barrier that will separate the present, with its promise of fulfillment, from the past, with its unacceptable and painful elements. Their determination to become Australianized as quickly as possible also seems to spring more from their personality needs—in particular their exaggerated needs for approval and for identification with the superior, powerful elements in their surroundings—than from any genuine admiration for this country. Not, of course, that they can afford to make their disrespect obvious. By intellectualizing their own and other people's problems and feelings, they conceal their more intimate reactions from observation. It was only through the questionnaire administered during the second field study that the full force of their depreciation of this country became apparent, although the underlying assertion of superiority in much of their apparently objective criticism of Australia could be detected from the beginning. Outward conformity and the acquisition of symbols of intellectually refined, middle class status are the keynotes of their particular pattern of assimilation. The tensions from which they suffer seem to have been increased rather than reduced by their kind of adaptation to Australian society.

Distinctive again from the three types so far described is an-

---

1 Of the remaining three people who wanted symbolic status from their jobs, one has become the gentleman farmer referred to earlier in the text, the second belongs to the 'functionally adapted' middle status type, and the third is one of the 'isolated' migrants to be described below.
other group of migrants who were older than average on arrival in this country, whose educational level (apart from occupational training) was low, whose English remains extremely poor, who have worked and saved assiduously to gain financial security, whose friends are all fellow-countrymen, who still read ethnic papers and are high on the Index of National Identification, and who display markedly hostile attitudes to Australia. Two married couples fall into this category. In each case the husband has more negative attitudes to Australia than his wife and shows a more pessimistic outlook about his future life in this country. Before leaving their own countries, these two men had acquired occupational skills which were making it possible for them to move up the social and economic scale. The war blighted their bright prospects of further advancement. Convinced that if circumstances had turned out differently they would by now have been enjoying an enviable position in their home countries, they find little comfort in their economic achievements in Australia. Nor can they draw upon other sources of satisfaction like those at the command of the better-educated migrants. They have in fact found almost nothing in this country to quicken the imagination or soften their parochial outlook. Apart from attending church and national functions occasionally, they take no part in formal group life of any kind. They find their only pleasure in the companionship of their fellow-countrymen. They are little interested in what lies beyond the confined space of the shadows cast by their personal disappointments and problems.

The other patterns of adaptation that stand out in this sample of Displaced Persons are those followed by the markedly isolated immigrants. These people clearly belong to several different types, although the numbers in the sample are too small to allow one to do more than indicate what the decisive combination of factors in two of these types might be. There are, for instance, two people from professional families in Europe, both of whom arrived in Australia in their early twenties, soon learnt almost faultless English, and made Australian friends. They were full of plans for furthering their education and, in fact, taking up life again where they had left off at home. But these early ambitions were never realized. They both married Australians whom they regarded as of lower intellectual status than themselves and both marriages eventually broke up. One of these immigrants is now married to a European, but family circumstances and the nature of her husband's job encourage her isolation from any effective social contacts. The other is suffering from heart disease. Neither
of these people displays any bitterness against Australia, but they both share a deep-seated disappointment that they have never established lasting relationships with Australians of similar background to their own, nor realized the creative gifts which—probably quite rightly—they believe they possess. They are letting events sweep them along, having—at least for the time being—given up the struggle to fashion their lives after the images that guided them when they first came to this country.

Another type of isolated individual is exemplified by one young man, who seems to be of less than average intelligence, who has learnt only the minimum of English, who was regarded as an oddity by his fellow-workers in Burton in 1953, and whose clumsy efforts to make friends—and particularly to find a wife—have failed miserably. Working among immigrants, he has no interests that would give him a point of contact with Australians. Time hangs heavily on his hands when he is not on the job. Although he looks back to his childhood nostalgically and remembers his own country with affection, he harbours no antagonism towards Australia for the unhappiness he has experienced since coming here. After thirteen years in this country, he still shows the suspicious, uncomprehending, and ineffective reactions that were characteristic of many migrants when they first arrived. Changes for the better in his personal situation (his English, for instance, has improved a little; he has become part of a familiar work group, and he now owns a car) have been offset by his disappointments in personal relationships, and he remains lonely, sad, and apathetic. He summed up his own situation like this: 'You can get a good job here and have all the money you want—but inside there is nothing.' The paranoid trends shown by this immigrant follow a pattern similar to that described by a number of psychiatrists familiar with mental disorder among European immigrants in Australia, and among eastern Europeans in particular (see, e.g., Cade and Krupinski, 1962; Listwan, 1956, 1959; Saint, 1963).

At first glance the migrant types sketched out above may seem to fall into two distinct categories: some may appear to have been conceived in essentially sociological terms, others to depend more on psychological interpretation. The distinction arises not from a confusion of concepts and approaches but from differences in the extent to which the several patterns of adaptation assume, or depend upon, a particular kind of personality structure. The
functionally adapted' migrants of both middle and lower status background have made the kind of adaptation to life in Australia that presupposes a certain measure of rationality and efficiency but otherwise pushes personality factors into the background. Indeed the individuals who follow this pattern seem, from my limited observation, to be highly diverse in personality structure; in terms of a more penetrating typology, they might be found to fall into sub-types according to the various needs they seek to satisfy by assuming similar roles. In the 'status conscious' and paranoid types, on the other hand, the personality structure seems to dominate the pattern of adaptation. It is so obtrusive that it allows the individual only a narrow range of sociological choices. These migrant types, in other words, presuppose particular kinds of personality.

It is relevant at this point to try to explain why the factor of the immigrant's psychological adjustment has been excluded as an essential part of the concept of assimilation. To clear the ground for this explanation, however, it should first be emphasized that the process of adapting oneself to a new country usually involves, in some degree, feelings of loneliness, insecurity, inferiority, rejection, uncertainty about one's identity, and generalized anxiety. During their early years in a new country, immigrants are in what might be called a highly fluid situation: there is a great measure of instability and impermanence about the jobs they have, the places where they live, and the friends they make.2 In time their world assumes a firmer structure. The Displaced Persons in my own sample now feel that most of the crucial uncertainties which plagued them during their early years in Australia have been resolved. They now know fairly accurately the limits of their opportunities. And, although some of them hope to improve on their present achievements, they do not expect the pattern of their lives to be subject to the numerous and far-reaching changes that seemed always round the corner when they were first in this country. The social fields in which they move have thus become more structured with time, irrespective of the pattern of adaptation that they have followed (although degrees of structuring obviously vary). And the achievement of stability, in itself, has helped to disperse the

2 See Tyhurst (1955) for an enlightening discussion of the relationship between 'the uncertainty about self and the environment' of the newly resettled displaced person and his feelings of helplessness, which lead him to seek 'an absolute answer' in an 'obsessional preoccupation with self ... or with the environment'.
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symptoms of poor adjustment characteristic of the initial stages of resettlement. One task of the student of immigration is to examine how certain typically immigrant experiences produce or aggravate signs of stress (see, e.g., Eisenstadt, 1954a; Listwan, 1959; Murphy, 1955; Schaechter, 1962; Sterba, 1949), and to indicate, as I have tried to do in this study, how these symptoms often disappear with changes in the migrant's circumstances and in his perception of those circumstances.

But, granted the potential for poor adjustment in the initial stages of assimilation, the fact remains that the relationship between assimilation and psychological well-being is extremely variable. One cannot assume that migrants necessarily make the required overt adaptations with pleasure or sincerity; nor that the same adaptations mean the same thing to different people.3

Variations in the relationship between assimilation and personal adjustment can arise from a number of sources. In the first place, the migrant adjusts as a whole person, the circumstances of his personal life being as relevant to this adjustment as his progress along the road to assimilation. Illness affecting the immigrant or some member of his family, the death of husband or wife, separation and divorce, unemployment, and the financial burden of rearing a large family—these are some of the experiences that can be directly or indirectly the outcome of the immigrant's special situation, qua immigrant, but can also arise from quite different sources. All of these experiences—whatever their sources—certainly need to be seen in the context of the individual's total situation: the 'same' experience may well be more disorganizing to the immigrant than to the native. Unemployment, for instance, even though not the result of discrimination, can nevertheless affect an immigrant more seriously than a native, because he has no financial resources to fall back on, and no kin to provide material and moral support, and because he is already unsure of himself and fearful of failure. In examining the immigrant's reactions to unemployment it is certainly important to know if prejudice against foreigners has cost him his job; but whether this has in fact been the case or not, the individual is reacting in terms of his immigrant status if he believes it to be so. One person will complain, 'I've been sacked because I'm a New Australian.' Another, by contrast, looks for causes of misfortune (and solutions) in areas that have nothing to do with his immigrant status: he argues that he has been dismissed because

3 See Bendix (1952) for an insightful critique of attempts to infer psychological dispositions from conventionalized behaviour.
he is too old, or can't keep up the pace, or won't be a boss's man, or because his parsimonious employer always lays off staff before Christmas. In terms of assimilation, then, the vital question is not whether an immigrant is happily adjusted or not, but, first, whether the decisive factors affecting his present adjustment are related to his position as an immigrant, and, second, whether he perceives his present adjustment as determined by the peculiarities of his immigrant status. Assimilation not only requires that the immigrant's distinctive status in the community should become blurred and eventually disappear; it also involves the gradual differentiation of the individual's self-perceptions, so that he sees himself less and less in every context as an immigrant or non-Australian, but progressively more in terms of the varied roles and categories that compose the social fabric of the host culture. Because it is obviously one facet of the individual's changing sense of where he belongs, this aspect of adjustment is best treated as part of the identification process.

The relationship between assimilation and personal adjustment varies too, because, as my own material illustrates, the process of assimilation is often uneven, and progress in one direction may compensate for failure in another. Older, well-educated migrants may get a great deal of satisfaction from sharing in Australian culture, and, through this, may develop a strong attachment to the new country, while their lack of social participation with Australians may distress them hardly at all. Lower status migrants may gain such a sense of achievement and pride from their material successes that neither isolation from Australian society nor alienation from Australian culture disturbs their sense of well-being. No one facet of the immigrant's adaptation is necessarily linked to his adjustment, because each facet gains its significance from its place in the total pattern.

The general principles of psychology lead one to expect that the relationship between assimilation and personal adjustment will also vary because individuals react to stress in different ways. To give expression to uncontrolled outbursts of hostility or to nurse hidden hates are only two of a variety of possible means of dealing with stress. When more deep-seated, unconscious mechanisms are at work, the individual may retreat into neurotic or psychotic illness or present symptoms of some psychosomatic disorder. It seems likely that these various ways of dealing with stress are themselves patterned in some regular way in relation to the adaptation processes of different types of immigrants; although all of the mechanisms mentioned above were found in
my own sample, the instances are too few to give any useful indication of what this relationship might be. The crucial point is, however, clear enough. 'There are many ways of suffering' (Jahoda, 1960, p. 37), and some migrants express their suffering in a manner that plainly distinguishes them as misfits, while others—like the 'status conscious' people among my own subjects—seek to deal with their unresolved conflicts by means of a ritualistic conformity which meets with a good measure of social approval. In these latter cases, the very behaviour which proclaims the migrant as 'well assimilated' is symptomatic of a disturbed and insecure personality.4

One final source of variability between assimilation and personal adjustment needs to be mentioned. I have tried throughout this discussion to show that the process of assimilation takes a number of different forms. It may well be that, for different migrant types, there are different optimum degrees of adaptation for good personal adjustment. Most of the 'functionally adapted' lower status migrants in Burton seem, for the time being at least, to have reached such an optimum: they have achieved a sufficient degree of economic well-being, social acceptance, cultural conformity (particularly in the learning of English), and identification with the town to provide the conditions for a healthy personality adjustment. Any attempt at a more far-reaching adaptation might well expose them to experiences that would stir up their awareness of being different from Australians and revive in them the anxieties of their first years here. On the other hand, many of the middle status migrants seem to me to be still some way from the optimum of adaptation they could cope with; given a more encouraging environment than most of them have found, they could assume more demanding economic roles, join more formal groups, and take a more active part in the intellectual life of the community; and their psychological well-being would probably be enhanced thereby.

4 Wentholt (1957, p. 87) describes a similar type in his study of Dutch immigrants in New Zealand: 'the minority of people whose reaction to acculturation demands was to surrender completely to them, had not been very well adjusted individuals either. New Zealand society seemed to be a second chance for them to fit in. . . . It was interesting to see how this class of people learned to turn "being a foreigner" from a liability into an asset. . . . These people would seem the most completely readjusted variety in the field. In fact, they turned out in the questionnaire, in interviews and in field studies, to be full of ambivalence about the adjustment situation. Their apparent assimilation into New Zealand society was a triumph of mental restructuring but a strain on the personality.'
Conclusion

If the optimum degree of adaptation varies from one migrant type to another (and perhaps even within types), so also may the minimum. The 'functionally adapted' type, for instance, can be happily adjusted at a much lower level of assimilation than is tolerable for the 'status conscious' type. And, although my own material provides meagre evidence on this point, there is also a contrast between the situation of the minimally adapted migrant who has an established role in an ethnic group and another who has no group support at all. A number of studies have shown, indeed, that ethnic groups may discourage acculturation and social assimilation, while at the same time providing satisfactorily for the psychological well-being of their members (see, e.g., Horobin, 1957; Useem and Useem, 1945; Wirth, 1928; Young, 1936). These findings give further grounds for distinguishing between the processes of assimilation and the adjustment of the personality.

In summary, I have argued in the preceding pages that an immigrant's psychological adjustment cannot be inferred simply from a knowledge of the pattern of assimilation he has followed. Still less can anything be assumed from single items of behaviour. To appreciate the relationship between assimilation and adjustment, one needs to know as well what conscious motives make the individual act as he does and what meaning he attaches to his own behaviour; and how far he is impelled by unconscious forces towards a particular pattern of adaptation.

II: THE STUDY OF ASSIMILATION

The research worker's approach to the study of assimilation depends partly upon the kind of group he is concerned with, partly upon his theoretical orientation and partly upon the nature of the material available to him. I wish now to deal briefly with the first and last of these factors as they bear upon my own study.

The most notable works on assimilation have been concerned with immigrant groups—with their structure and function, the conditions under which they are consolidated or disintegrate, the relationship of the individual to the group and the circumstances of his breaking away to become a 'marginal man' or a fully integrated member of the host society (see, e.g., Eisenstadt, 1954a; Galitzi, 1929; Handlin, 1959; LaViolette, 1945; Reynolds,
The Displaced Persons covered in my own research did not belong to any groups that could properly be called ethnic communities, although most of them had some relationships with scattered fellow-countrymen and a few took part in the activities of national churches or societies. These people are making their adaptation to Australian society largely as individuals or family units, free from the mediating, cushioning, or retarding influence of effective ethnic groups. They could not provide the material for a study of immigrant communities. The experience of this small sample may not, of course, be typical of the Displaced Persons as a whole, but it is appropriate to consider briefly at this point whether the Displaced Persons may in fact represent a different kind of immigration from the great migrant waves which swelled the American population—and, to a lesser extent, the Australian—in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

It is reasonable to assume that immigrants who form a distinctive ethnic settlement belong to a more or less solidary ethnic community (or collection of communities). But the opposite does not necessarily hold true: though dispersed in space, ethnic minorities may constitute well-integrated communities, as the Greeks sparsely scattered through the country towns of New South Wales illustrate. Although census data are of some help in identifying these ethnic settlements, their value is limited because they do not distinguish between the Australian-born of British and of ethnic stock. Nor does the census allow one easily to differentiate ethnic family settlements from the ‘artificial’ concentrations of immigrants in, for example, migrant hostels and construction camps. Zubrzycki’s detailed analysis of the 1954 data (1960a, pp. 80-5) showed that at that time people born in Hungary, Poland, Latvia, and Yugoslavia (the majority of whom would be Displaced Persons) tended to cluster in particular local government areas within the metropolises considerably more than did the British-born, but markedly less than did the Greeks, Italians, and Maltese. Only a comparison of the 1954 and 1961 censuses will reveal whether immigrants from the Displaced Person

---

5 In her study of ‘ordinary urban families’, Bott (1957) adopted the term ‘network’, as suggested by J. A. Barnes, to refer to the collection of people with whom a family had external relationships. This term was preferred to ‘group’ because the component units did not form a social whole: only some, but not all, of them had relations with one another. The same distinction is useful in comparing the genuine ethnic group with the collection of more or less unrelated fellow-countrymen who surrounded most of the Displaced Person families.
countries have tended to concentrate more or to disperse in recent years, and this has not yet been undertaken.

Studies of the marriage patterns of immigrants make it clear that the Displaced Persons have tended to intermarry with Australians and with other Europeans more than have other foreign-born persons, except immigrants from the British Isles. When one also takes account of the fact that nearly 10 per cent of the 75,000 adult male Displaced Persons brought German wives to Australia, it is apparent that mixed-nationality families must be common among this group of immigrants. My own material suggests that the families established by Displaced Person husbands and German wives are affected by German traditions and links far more than they are by influences emanating from the husband's background—not least because German is the language commonly spoken in the home and because the wife has usually maintained close and continuous contact with family and relatives in Germany since her departure. I also have the strong impression that, where Displaced Persons have married Europeans of a different nationality since arriving in Australia, the cultural traditions of both partners disintegrate much more quickly than they do when both partners are of the same nationality. Kovacs (1955, p. 379) found that Displaced Persons who were married to Europeans of different nationality tended to speak English in the home, while in my own sample, the family language in these cases was usually a mixture of German or Russian, augmented by snippets of English and each partner's native tongue. But Kovacs's general finding is in line with my own: 'cultural adjustment', he says (p. 484), is promoted by the 'openness' of the migrants to their environment, resulting either from their not being married

---

6 See Price and Zubrzycki (1962a and b) for a detailed discussion of the use of intermarriage statistics and of immigrant marriage patterns in Australia. These authors use two ratios in their analysis of the Australian statistics. The A(b) ratio, which they consider the more reliable, is derived 'by relating persons marrying inside or outside their birthplace grouping to all married persons of that birthplace grouping in Australia'. For 1960, the male A(b) ratios for the British Isles, Baltic States, Poland, Greece, Italy, and Malta were, respectively, 35, 37, 21, 8, 12, and 34. The corresponding female ratios were 29, 28, 12, 7, 3, and 14 (1962b, p. 126).

7 Published statistics do not give the number of Displaced Persons who brought German wives to Australia, but Dr J. Zubrzycki has kindly supplied me with an estimate based on a sample survey of the Nominal Rolls prepared for each transport despatched to Australia from 1947 to 1952. According to this estimate, about 7,000 German women came to Australia as wives of Displaced Persons. The number of males aged 20 or over was 75,045.
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at all or their being married to persons of a different nationality.

Further considerations lead one to expect that ethnic solidarity might be comparatively weak in the various Displaced Persons groups. One of these considerations is the high masculinity ratio. As we know from material on Italian settlers in Australia, a high masculinity ratio does not necessarily mean that family life is weak and hence ineffective in preserving the traditional culture (Borrie, 1954; Price, 1963). Kin ties were in fact extremely important among the Italians; single males usually belonged to a well-integrated extended family, and the excess of males was resolved by deferring marriage until a visit could be made to Europe to secure a bride, or a fiancée brought out from the homeland, or until Australian-born children of Italian-born parents became available as wives. But the high ratio of ten males to seven females among the Displaced Persons has been associated with quite different circumstances: wider kinship ties have been unimportant, since few Displaced Persons (apart from some Yugoslavs) had relatives already established in Australia, and few came to this country as members of kinship units larger than the nuclear family; it was also impossible for these immigrants to bring wives or fiancées out from the home country, except that Poles and Yugoslavs have had limited opportunities to do this in recent years (see Price and Zubrzycki, 1962b). Under these conditions a high masculinity ratio implies that a considerable minority of Displaced Persons will fall outside the influence of ethnic family groups, either because they intermarry, or because they remain single.

The 1954 Census also suggests that women from the Displaced Person countries tend to be gainfully employed to a greater degree than do female immigrants from other countries or the Australian-born.8 In the well-integrated ethnic communities of the past, women usually stayed in the home, at least after marriage, speaking the mother tongue, cooking the traditional foods, guarding the conventional mores, and in general warding off the pressures towards change from the larger society. One

8 In his analysis of the 1954 Census data, Zubrzycki (1960a, pp. 98-100) shows that the mean proportion of women in gainful employment was 36.7 per cent for central and eastern European groups and around 20 per cent for those born in southern Europe, the British Isles, north-western Europe, and Australasia. But he goes on to suggest that 'the differences in age distribution could account substantially' for the differences between central and eastern Europeans (most of whom would be Displaced Persons) and others. From the viewpoint of my own argument, the volume of female employment is of course the crucial matter.
might therefore expect a high rate of female participation in the work force to be disruptive of ethnic solidarity. My own material suggests that working women are exposed to profound influences towards change which would largely pass them by if they stayed at home; that these influences tend to make them dissatisfied with their traditional role in the family; and that the employment of wives in itself forces adjustments, irrespective of any changes in attitude that might occur through outside contacts. These adjustments involve in particular the decline in male authority, the recognition of the women's economic independence, and the increased sharing of household tasks between husbands and wives. If the traditional family structure is challenged by adjustments of this kind, conditions are not favourable for the consolidation of ethnic groups.

Although statistical evidence is lacking, there is little doubt that the Displaced Persons moved about a great deal during their early years in this country. Because, with the exception of minor recessions, employment opportunities have been very good ever since they arrived here, these immigrants have also been absorbed into a great variety of occupations. These factors represent another reason for thinking that the Displaced Persons would be unlikely to form well-knit ethnic groups.

To try to infer the extent of ethnic solidarity among the Displaced Persons from indirect evidence of this kind is both risky and unsatisfactory. Only more refined analysis of the statistical data (like Zubrzycki's analysis of the 1954 Census, see Zubrzycki, 1960a) and field research on immigrant groups and institutions can reveal how important ethnic solidarity is among these immigrants. Pockets of concentrated settlement certainly exist here and there. So do ethnic newspapers (see Gilson, 1961), churches, schools, clubs, and self-help societies. My own impression, however, is that many—probably most—Displaced Persons live outside concentrations of this kind, and are influenced only marginally or superficially, if at all, by ethnic institutions.

It seems a reasonable hypothesis that immigrant groups arriving today in highly industrialized, affluent societies like the United States or Australia are less likely to form ethnic communities than were their predecessors of earlier periods. No matter where the immigrants come from, the cultural gulf between themselves and the host society is likely to be narrower than it

---

9 See Kosa (1957, p. 95), 'There are, indeed, many indications that in our times the adjustment and assimilation of immigrants is more rapid and complete than it was some decades ago.'
was fifty or a hundred years ago; and as a result they are less dependent on their ethnic group to protect, guide, and support them (although there will still obviously be variations from one group to another). In addition, the conditions in the host societies are themselves far less conducive to the formation of enclaves of any kind than they were in the past: the ready availability of mass-produced goods and the decline of crafts discourages the preservation of a distinctive material culture, and hence of distinctive customs, over a wide range of activities, from eating to equipping a home; the high rate of occupational mobility demanded by the economy and the wide choice of jobs discourages immigrants from settling and working together; the open class structure rewards immigrants for severing their ethnic ties and seeking to improve themselves within the context of the larger society; the centralization of major institutions like the press, radio, and television, together with the general commercialization of social activities, inhibit the development of ethnic institutions; the tendency for governments to assume responsibility for social welfare deprives the ethnic group of a powerful raison d'etre. Existing ethnic communities will of course persist for some time, but it seems unlikely that the familiar types of immigrant group, like those described in the classical studies mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, will appear again.

The study of assimilation lends itself to a variety of approaches. Even when interest is focused on immigrant adaptation, diverse purposes and methods of research are possible. A very different approach from my own is adopted, for instance, in a number of important studies concerned with what might be called, for want of a better term, the 'composite' concept of assimilation. Although it has not necessarily been their principal aim, these studies have tried to arrive at some overall, comprehensive measure of the degree of assimilation achieved; to identify regular sequences of stages in the assimilation process; or to develop some simple formulation of the host culture against which the immigrant's progress in assimilation can be assessed (in the same way as students of social stratification have used the notion of an all-embracing scale of class position, see Warner et al., 1949).

Taft and Doczy (1962, p. 54), for instance, combine desire to stay in Australia, membership in one or more Australian organizations, becoming naturalized within the minimum legal period, and command of English into 'an overall index of degree of
assimilation’. Richardson (1961) and Taft (1961) similarly seek to establish an ‘assimilation scale’.

Stages in the assimilation process are usually conceived rather broadly, as phases through which immigrant groups pass as they move towards the point where they lose their identity within the host society. Zubrzycki (1956) found that the adaptation of Polish refugees in Britain could be analysed in terms of the sequence originally suggested by R. E. Park: conflict, accommodation, assimilation. Describing in more individual terms the experiences of Displaced Persons in Georgia, U.S.A., Sebba (1955, p. 121) made what he called a ‘rough-hewn distinction’ to separate the three phases of accommodation, adjustment, and acculturation. More recent studies by Richardson (1961), Taft (1961), and Taft and Doczy (1962) have used statistical techniques to test Richardson’s theory that the psychological process of assimilation is one in which the immigrant moves from a stage of satisfaction to identification and finally to acculturation.

Although studies of immigrant adaptation rarely contain a satisfying discussion of the immigrant’s immediate milieu, several writers have tried to measure the immigrant’s progress in acculturation against some defined standard embodying the essential features of the host culture. Ruesch and his fellow-workers (1948, p. 32), for instance, estimated the degree to which immigrants conformed to what they called the ‘American core culture’, the system of beliefs and values that stems from middle class, Protestant, Anglo-Saxon traditions, and ‘which makes its appearance whenever somebody talks about something being typically American’. They devised a rating scale to measure how successfully the immigrant had adopted American culture patterns. Taft and his associates (Taft, 1962) have developed an opinion scale of ‘Australianism’, which, in a series of exploratory investigations in Western Australia, has proved useful in studying the convergence of immigrant to Australian norms.

Composite concepts of assimilation such as these can give a bird’s eye view of an unexplored field and pinpoint variations that require further investigation. Ruesch et al. (1948), for instance, found that they could identify the maladjusted individual by his tendency to show highly variable degrees of proximity to the American core culture over different areas covered by the rating scale. These formal ratings ‘then have to be supplemented by a more subtle and individualized investigation of difficulties

10 Eisenstadt’s works provide the most notable exceptions (see especially 1954a and b).
encountered in individual cases' (p. 15). Unfortunately few re-
search workers go on, as these writers do, to analyse deviations
from the predominant pattern.\textsuperscript{11} More commonly, this com-
posite approach seems to obscure variations and to dull the
student’s sensitivity to exceptions; cases that do not fit the pre-
dominant pattern are dismissed as anomalies, when further investi-
gation might show that they fall into a different but equally
meaningful pattern (e.g. Richardson, 1960, 1961).

Some studies of this kind present a further difficulty. Concepts
of a high degree of abstractness and generality are certainly
needed in the study of assimilation, as in other areas of social
investigation. But it is important that these concepts should grow
out of a rich understanding of the complexity and subtlety of
migrant experience.\textsuperscript{12} A possible danger in the kind of composite
approach that I have been referring to is that the development
of formal concepts may outrun the quality of the material to
which they are applied; vision may be limited to the range of
behaviour which is easily ordered and manipulated. To the
sociologist, for instance, the empirical studies of Richardson
(1961), Taft (1961), and Taft and Doczy (1962) give such a
meagre and unsatisfying impression of the substance of immigrant
thinking and activity that the theoretical arguments are less
convincing than they might be.

Instead of the diversity and complexity being squeezed out of
the assimilation process, they can become the essential ingredient
in the theoretical discussion. In his sensitive work on the absorp-
tion of immigrants in Israel, Eisenstadt (1954a) analysed the
impact of different situations (e.g. the bureaucratic structure,
the school, the army) on different types of immigrant group
(e.g. ‘the isolated, apathetic family’, ‘the self-transforming co-
hesive group’). Price’s recently published work (1963) shows
how the experiences of southern Europeans in Australia have
been affected by the conditions under which they arrived and
the kind of ethnic groups into which they moved; Price’s interest
is focused on patterns of settlement and he has accordingly
developed a typology of group settlements in Australia (from

\textsuperscript{11} For an illuminating discussion of deviant analysis, see Kendall and
Wolf (1949).

\textsuperscript{12} The unusual richness and authenticity of the migrant letters on which
Thomas and Znaniecki (1918-20) based their classical studies place these
volumes still amongst the most rewarding in the literature on immigration,
whether one is interested primarily in their empirical content or in their
theoretical insights.
Conclusion

the 'village settlement', at the one extreme, consisting of families from the same village at home, to 'Folk settlements', at the other).

It is this relatively complex approach to assimilation that has guided my own study. Inevitably, such an approach involves one in dealing with types, or patterns (of individuals or groups), in the plural.\textsuperscript{13} It also leads one to emphasize that the significance of any particular item of behaviour, like learning English, or being naturalized, or making Australian friends, can be appreciated only from a knowledge of the total pattern. From this, one wants to go on to explore the relationships between particular variables in different categories of immigrants. In other words, the most fruitful type of question to ask is not simply, 'What is the relationship between country-city residence and social assimilation?' It is, rather, 'What is the relationship between country-city residence and social assimilation for immigrants of low pre-migration status, on the one hand, and middle status on the other?' This oversimplified example serves to illustrate the point that the search for gross relationships within the total migrant population is likely to prove less rewarding than the search for relationships within sociologically meaningful categories.

A similar degree of refinement can be introduced into the analysis of stages of assimilation if we turn our attention away from the notion of generalized phases to the possibility that each type of migrant passes through a series of stages at a characteristic rate. I did not make any systematic analysis of my own material in terms of stages in assimilation, but even a superficial glance suggests how the several migrant types followed different sequences. The 'functionally adapted' immigrants of middle status background became quickly acculturated in the sense that they learnt English and the routines of living in the new country in a very short time; interested in Australia from the outset, they began reading Australian newspapers and following public events and cultural activities soon after their arrival; but it took much longer for them to establish lasting friendships with congenial Australians—this happened in fact only when they had moved into white-collar jobs and found decent and comfortable accom-

\textsuperscript{13} Although Taft has been referred to in the discussion of the composite approach, his work appears to be moving towards a more differentiated concept of assimilation. The analysis of types appeared rather as an afterthought in his report on the assimilation of Hungarian intellectuals (Taft and Doczy, 1962), but in his most recent contribution (1963) he has presented the case for a systematic exploration of migrant types, thus following through the implications of an earlier theoretical paper (1957).
modation; although today some of the people whom they describe as their closest friends are Australians, they still have more social contact with immigrants than with Australians. The 'status conscious' immigrants with a high standard of education also became acculturated very quickly; but, as the result of their own determination, they established friendships with Australians almost as quickly; for reasons that have been described previously they later came to mix with fellow-immigrants more than they did during their first years here; there is no consistency about their identification with Australia. Many lower status immigrants of various types took years to become even minimally acculturated and longer still to make Australian friends; their identification with Australia has developed slowly and unobtrusively alongside these other changes.

These three examples indicate crudely how the different migrant types might be found to pass through different phases as they adapt themselves to a new country. They also illustrate the point, made earlier, that the process of assimilation is not necessarily even or progressive. It may well be characteristic of certain types that they move some distance along the path of acculturation, social assimilation, or identification, and then stop at that point, either temporarily or for good. They may even regress. Among my own sample, minor regressions of one kind or another are so common that they may almost be regarded as characteristic of the assimilation process: in their early experimental years here, for example, a number of the subjects hopefully made contact with Australian churches, clubs, and societies, only to withdraw when the experience proved disappointing; failure to establish firm friendships with congenial Australians tended to make middle status people consolidate their relationships with fellow-countrymen or simply retreat into their shells. My own material and the interesting analysis of regression among Hungarian intellectuals by Taft and Doczy (1962, pp. 64-7) suggest that regression often occurs because the migrant's movement towards assimilation has been too fast or too uncompromising. He has attracted more attention, favourable or unfavourable, than he can cope with; he has been made to feel too different; he has been required to learn too much too quickly. The sociological symptoms of regression may be accompanied by regression in the psychological sense, the individual returning to a childish level of emotional dependence and expectation of immediate gratification (see also Ruesch et al., 1948, pp. 22-3).

My own material also suggests that some setback or crisis in
the individual's personal affairs is often followed by a period of regression: a serious illness, unemployment, a business failure, or the breakup of a marriage may lead to regression both for psychological reasons—the immigrant's confidence being undermined and his anxieties released—and for sociological reasons, his range of activities and interests being automatically curtailed because of his personal situation. Ageing is one of these individual experiences that can bring about a permanent regression in adaptation. Old age may deprive the immigrant of the incentive to go on learning and modifying his behaviour; it may narrow the scope of his interests and push his mind back to the past. Whether they are immigrants or not, old people can of course come to feel alien to the world around them, but the sense of alienation is obviously likely to be sharper for the immigrant than for the native-born. The immigrant is especially vulnerable because old age may catch up with him before he has had time to establish himself in a secure enough financial and social position to cope with it.

Studies which aim to encompass the complexity of the process of assimilation need to locate the immigrant in the particular social setting to which he has had to adapt. For this purpose overall composite characterizations of the host society or culture are of limited use. Australia, for example, is not a homogeneous society: an immigrant who goes to work on a Snowy Mountains construction job finds himself in a very different milieu from another who takes up residence in a small, 'cliquey' country town; in an ethnic farming community; in a raw, unorganized suburb on the fringe of a metropolis; in the cosmopolitan anonymity of the city centre—or indeed in a variety of other situations. It is true that he will find certain common basic institutions everywhere, and that the core culture represented by the mass media will follow him relentlessly wherever he goes, but it is through the people and customs of his immediate environment that the pressures of the culture will bear upon him; by contact with them, he will evolve his own interpretation of 'Australianism'; and it is their pattern of social groupings that will either invite him to take up new roles or discourage him from doing so.

Ideally, then, one needs to study the context in which immigrant adaptation takes place as thoroughly as one studies the immigrants themselves. My own work is seriously limited in this respect, but it does at least suggest the possible value of com-
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paring the experiences of immigrants in country towns and cities. Burton is the right place for an immigrant of limited education, with modest, realistic ambitions and the patience to wait for the slow consolidation of friendships and a gradual improvement in job status and financial position. But it exerts a strong centrifugal force on the more ambitious and on immigrants of higher status background. Cities obviously provide a variety of opportunities. They allow anonymity (and loneliness) to the mentally disturbed and to those who have not the self-assurance to venture into community life. They also provide the opportunity for immigrants to take part in the cultural life of the community, and to share what might be loosely called ‘middle class’ patterns of living and interests, without gaining access to an entrenched, old-Australian middle class group, as they would have to do in Burton. In the city, this way of life—or, more correctly, these ways—are maintained, not by a single homogeneous group, but by many groups, of varied composition, some of them as open to outsiders as the Burton group is closed. In the city too (as in some country areas with concentrations of people from the same ethnic background), the immigrant can, if he wishes, lead a self-contained existence within his own ethnic group.

Assimilation is thus a sorting out and a selective as well as an adapting process. The behaviour of the Displaced Persons on whom this study was based has exhibited certain common themes—resistance against the violation of the individual’s personal and cultural integrity; the attempt (not necessarily successful) to re-establish a stable existence, ordered in terms intelligible to the individual according to his past experiences; and—in a sense encompassing these first two themes—a partly deliberate and partly unacknowledged gravitation towards a milieu where the minimum degree of fundamental personality change would be required. This does not mean that these immigrants have avoided seeking new goals and acquiring new patterns of conduct and habits of mind. But it does mean that such changes represent no random selection from the variety of possibilities offered them in this country. On the contrary, the choices they have made reveal the working out of needs and aspirations well established long before these people knew that they would be called upon to remake their lives in a new homeland.
Appendix

QUESTIONNAIRE*

Please read each of the following statements carefully and underline the expression underneath each statement that best represents your own feeling about the statement.
Please give your honest opinion, and work quickly. We can discuss the statements when you have finished.

1. The Australian Government should have helped New Australians to take up farming.
   Agree strongly  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Disagree strongly
   12           8           8           3           0

2. Australian married women have too much freedom.
   Agree strongly  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Disagree strongly
   6           11           3          11           0

3. The best friendships are with people from your own country.
   Agree strongly  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Disagree strongly
   1           3           2         24           1

4. Australia was very fortunate to get so many Displaced Persons as immigrants.
   Agree strongly  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Disagree strongly
   11           7          11           2           0

5. The Australian Government has given New Australians all the help it could have.
   Agree strongly  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Disagree strongly
   5           11           5           8           2

6. Working people are more friendly to New Australians than are other groups in the community.
   Agree strongly  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Disagree strongly
   2           3           5         13           8

* The figures show the distribution of the subjects’ responses to each statement.
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7. The churches have played an important part in helping New Australians to adjust themselves in this country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Australia would be better off if she were independent of Britain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. It is desirable that the children of New Australians should learn their parents' native language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. It is hard for New Australians to make close friends in Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. National associations have played an important part in helping New Australians to adjust themselves in this country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Middle class Australians do not accept New Australians as equals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Australian children have too much freedom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. This country has tried to assimilate the New Australians too quickly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. New Australians will always be second class citizens here, whether they are naturalized or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tables

**TABLE 1** The samples of Displaced Persons who supplied life histories, compared with the total Displaced Person population of Burton, 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>20–29</th>
<th>30–39</th>
<th>40+ and unstated</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult population (N = 203)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life history samples—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detailed (N = 38)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incomplete (N = 33)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Total Population (N = 187)</th>
<th>Life History Samples—</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed (N = 38)</td>
<td>Incomplete (N = 33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia and the Ukraine</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 100 100

**Note:** Data on the Displaced Person population of Burton were obtained from an inter-censal Population Survey carried out by the Bureau of Census and Statistics in 1953. For Age and Sex the samples are compared with the total adult Displaced Person population; for Birthplace they can only be compared to the total Displaced Person population, which contained 15 persons under 20 years of age. The comparisons are only approximate, because, for the purposes of the Age and Sex tables, the Displaced Person population includes all adults born in the countries from which Displaced Persons came. Since a cross-classification of Birthplace by Period of Residence in Australia is available, however, the 31 persons classified as resident more than 6 years in 1953 are excluded from the Birthplace table. The Age and Sex calculations are thus based on an Adult Population (not adjusted for period of residence) of 203, and the Birthplace table on a Total Population (adjusted for period of residence) of 187 (i.e. 203 + 15—31).

It should be noted that if the Displaced Person population is estimated from Birthplace figures, children of Displaced Persons born in Germany, Italy etc., and in Australia, are excluded. Virtually no Displaced Persons were naturalized by 1953, but if the Displaced Person population of Burton were estimated from Nationality figures, the non-Displaced Person wives (mostly German-born) of Displaced Person males would be included. For the present purposes—where children and the non-Displaced Person wives of Displaced Persons were excluded from the sample—Birthplace figures provided the more appropriate estimate of the Displaced Person population.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>English ability score</th>
<th>Extra-occupational interests</th>
<th>Pre-migration status</th>
<th>Reading ethnic papers</th>
<th>Place of residence</th>
<th>No. years between arrival and naturalization</th>
<th>Age on arrival in Aust.</th>
<th>National Identification Index</th>
<th>Identification with Australia Index</th>
<th>Social relations with Australians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2: Attributes of 31 Displaced Persons, 1962—Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>English ability score</th>
<th>Extra-occupational interests</th>
<th>Pre-migration status</th>
<th>Reading ethnic papers</th>
<th>Place of residence</th>
<th>No. years between arrival and naturalization</th>
<th>Age on arrival in Australia</th>
<th>National Identification Index</th>
<th>Identification with Australia Index</th>
<th>Social relations with Australians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The following categories have been used in analysing the attributes listed in Tables 2, 3, and 4:

- **English ability:** Score on A.C.E.R., *Silent Reading Test*, Form C, Part I, *Word Knowledge*, 1962 (without time limit)
- **Extra-occupational interests:** Yes, new interests acquired or old ones revived; No, no interests
- **Pre-migration status:** Lower; Middle
- **Reading ethnic papers:** Yes; No
- **Place of residence:** Rural, country town or farm; City, metropolis
- **Number of years between arrival and naturalization:** Entries for subjects not naturalized by 1963 enclosed in parentheses; for the purposes of the calculations given in Tables 3 and 4, these subjects were assumed to have been naturalized within 14 years, i.e. within one year more than the maximum period for the subjects already naturalized by that date
- **Age on arrival in Australia:** Age in years
- **National Identification Index:** Score on responses to items 9 and 11 in Questionnaire (see Appendix), combined with score of 4 or 0 for reading, or not reading, ethnic papers, respectively
- **Identification with Australia Index:** Combined score on responses to items 2, 5, 10, 12, 14, and 15 in Questionnaire
- **Social relations with Australians:** Score on a 3-point scale, giving 1 for no Australian friends, 2 for Australian friends but no membership in Australian associations, 3 for Australian friends plus membership in at least one Australian association.
TABLE 3  Summary of tests calculated to determine relationships between attributes,  
31 Displaced Persons, 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Ethnic papers</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Soc. relations with Australians</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Ident. with Aust.</th>
<th>No. years between Arrival and Naturalization</th>
<th>Age on arrival</th>
<th>National identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English ability</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>4.43*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>3.49*</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>4.40†</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>0.16NS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic papers</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>0.25NS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>0.09NS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>4.67†</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>0.69NS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc. relations with Australians</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>3.02*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>0.60NS</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>0.77NS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>0.40NS</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f. = degrees of freedom</td>
<td>NS = not significant</td>
<td>* significant at 1 per cent level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As the sample of 31 cases was not selected at random, tests of significance should not, strictly speaking, be applied. Since, however, the sample appears to be closely representative of the Displaced Person population of Burton in 1953 (see Table 1), it is treated, for the purposes of this table, as if it were a random sample of the English-speaking Displaced Persons in Burton at that time, excluding the single men living in railway barracks. The sample is also known to be biased in that it underrepresents, although it does not exclude, immigrants who were extremely suspicious of the research (see pp. 5-6).
### TABLE 4 Summary of tests calculated to determine relationships between attributes, 18 lower status Displaced Persons, 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Social relations with Australians</th>
<th>Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.81* 16</td>
<td>t d.f.</td>
<td>3.01† 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Exact 2×2 Test</td>
<td>3.4NS</td>
<td>Exact 2×2 Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social relations with Australians Exact 2×2 Test</td>
<td>2.4NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Critical values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t, 16 d.f.</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 5 per cent level
† Significant at 1 per cent level

---

### TABLE 5 Acquisition of occupational skills, by status and place of residence, 31 Displaced Persons, 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle Status Rural</th>
<th>Lower Status Rural</th>
<th>Total Rural</th>
<th>Total City</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using pre-migration skills</td>
<td>1(1)* 3(1)</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>3(1) 5(1)</td>
<td>8(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New qualifications acquired</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>5 7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1(1) 0</td>
<td>3(2) 7(2)</td>
<td>4(3) 7(2)</td>
<td>11(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4(2) 9(1)</td>
<td>8(2) 10(2)</td>
<td>12(4) 19(3)</td>
<td>31(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures in parentheses indicate number married women no longer in full-time employment. These women are counted in the main entries and classified according to most recent job.
TABLE 6 Social relations with Australians, by status and place of residence, 31 Displaced Persons, 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Middle Status</th>
<th>Lower Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian friends and membership of Australian associations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian friends but no membership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Australian friends and no membership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In her compassionate and objective study, in the course of which she chronicles in detail some of the migrants' life histories, Dr Martin raises a number of problems about the migrants' relations with their hosts—both as individuals and as members of organizations—which should prod thoughtful Australians into serious consideration and reassessment of their attitudes to their immigrant settlers.
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